Seton Hall University
eRepository @ Seton Hall

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

Spring 5-2012

An Investigation of the Role of a Teacher Evaluation System and Its Influence on Teacher Practice and Professional Growth in Four Urban High Schools

Princess B. Towe
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
Towe, Princess B., "An Investigation of the Role of a Teacher Evaluation System and Its Influence on Teacher Practice and Professional Growth in Four Urban High Schools" (2012). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 1792.
https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/1792

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLE OF A TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM AND ITS INFLUENCE ON TEACHER PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH IN FOUR URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS

BY
PRINCESS B. TOWE

Dissertation Committee

Elaine Walker, Ph.D., Mentor
Daniel Gutmore, Ph.D.
Norma Fair Brown, Ph.D.
Rosalind Carmichael, Ph.D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

2012

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE

Doctoral Candidate, **Princess Towe,** has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the **Ed.D.** during this **Spring Semester 2012.**

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE
(please sign and date beside your name)

Mentor:
Dr. Elaine Walker Elaine M. Walker 3/1/2012

Committee Member:
Dr. Daniel Gutmore Daniel Gutmore 3/1/12

Committee Member:
Dr. Norma Brown Dr Norma 3/1/2012

Committee Member:
Dr. Rosalind Carmichael Rosalind Carmichael 3/1/2012

External Reader:

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation to be bound as page number two.

© Copyright by Princess B. Towe 2012
All Rights Reserved

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLE OF A TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM AND ITS INFLUENCE ON TEACHER PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH IN FOUR URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceptions of Language Arts teachers, Mathematics teachers, and administrators in four high schools in a large urban New Jersey school district regarding a standards-based teacher evaluation system implemented in 2003 adapted and modeled on *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (Danielson, 1996). The study sought to determine to what extent the implemented teacher evaluation process and the building administrators' roles as teacher evaluators influence improved teacher practice and professional growth. To date, there is no reported research on the extent to which the use of this standards-based model has improved teacher practice and professional growth in this public school district.

This study included two magnet high schools (N=11; n=5 LA, n= 6 Math), and two comprehensive high schools (N=19; n=13 LA, n=6 math). While the magnet schools are highly performing schools and consistently achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), the comprehensive high schools represent a range of performance from moderate to low, in that they may occasionally make AYP, or not, as measured in Language Arts and Mathematics by the NJ High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) and reported annually in the NJ State Schools Report Card.

A mixed method design was used to gather quantitative (N=30) and qualitative data (N=12; n=6 teachers, n=6 administrators). Data were collected via

a teacher questionnaire, teacher and administrator interviews, and review of state, district, and school documents. The survey instrument used, with permission, is the revised "Teacher Evaluation Profile Questionnaire" (TEP) (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). The findings show that teachers and administrators hold similar perceptions about the teacher evaluation process; they view the formative process as having limited impact on improved teacher practice, with the summative evaluation having a greater degree of impact on professional development. Recommendations include:

1. Design and implement measures of oversight to ensure that the teacher evaluation process is implemented with fidelity.
2. Design a study that examines the impact of the use of multiple data sources in teacher evaluation such as artifacts, self-evaluation, and peer evaluation on teacher practice and professional growth.
3. Design a study that examines the specific training needs of teachers and administrators in this district in order to promote a growth-oriented teacher evaluation system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the many individuals who have been indispensible to me as I traversed this challenging journey.

Dr. Caulfield and the entire faculty and staff of the Seton Hall Executive Doctoral Program, thank you. Dr. Caulfield, without your vision, none of this would have been possible. I thank you and am forever grateful for your selecting me as a member of Cohort XII. Thank you, also, for opening your home to us for *Law on the Lawn.* What an incredible experience!

Dr. Walker, a fantastic mentor, thank you for your patience, persistence, encouragement, and belief in me. Your guidance, genuine caring, gentle nudging, and calm nurturing manner mean more to me than I can adequately express.

Dr. Daniel Gutmore, thank you for serving on my dissertation committee; your knowledge and input are greatly appreciated.

Cohort XII, you have become my extended family. I thank you for all the shared knowledge, fun and laughter. When things appeared bleak, you were there rooting me on. A special thank you to Norm, Cayce, and Jill for your friendship and for always being there ready to lend a hand, no matter what. You kept me going. You are the best!

Dr. Norm Fair-Brown, thank you for serving on my dissertation committee and for your continuous encouragement, spiritual guidance, and strength. As my personal mentor and friend, I have learned so much from you, thank you. I am extremely grateful for your attention to detail.

Dr. Rosalind Carmichael, my friend, thank you for serving on my dissertation committee. Your quiet demeanor, brilliant and quick mind proved invaluable. Thank you for being the voice of reason, prodding me with thought-provoking questions that challenged me to dig deeper, and for meticulously reading my drafts with a keen eye.

Doris McNeil, my friend, confidant, and sister, your consistent check-in calls just to see how I was doing, along with your encouraging words and humor always calmed me down when I thought I would lose my mind. Thank you, my sister-friend.

Arts High School administrators, faculty and staff, especially the members of the Humanities Department, I sincerely thank you for your support, kind words and encouragement.

The members of the National Sorority of Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., you have shown the true spirit of sisterhood. Your collective and individual support, encouragement and love have been powerful motivating forces for me. A very special thank you to my sisters of Delta Pi Chapter for your love, prayers and encouragement.

My wonderful, loving and caring family and friends, thank you for believing in me when I did not believe in myself. Without your love and support, I could not have made this journey. I was not alone; you were with me every step of the way.

Thank you to the administrators and teachers who volunteered to participate in this dissertation project. Without you, this would not have been possible.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation:

To the memory of my parents, Prince and Bertha Bowden, who taught me at an early age that I could become anything I put my mind to, when such was not the normal teaching for young girls. I believed!

To the memory of my grandparents, Leon and Lacy Bowden, who raised me and instilled in me the values of hard-work, honesty, and perseverance.

To my daughter, Ericka, for believing in me, loving me, and sharing me when she needed me herself. I love you and hope that my efforts have inspired you to continue to soar like an eagle. You can become anything you put your mind to; I respect and admire your confidence and go-get-it attitude.

To my brother, Philip, and sisters, Sharlene and Jackie you are the best siblings one could have. You each have inspired me in your own way and for that I am forever grateful. I am proud of you for overcoming obstacles and making lemon aid from lemons. To Philip, thank you for your prophetic vision. You know what I mean.

To the memory of Carolyn Johnson, friend and dedicated educator, who left too soon. Her enthusiasm, excitement, encouragement propelled me to continue and complete this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

DEDICATION v

LIST OF TABLES ix

I. INTRODUCTION 1

- Theoretical Framework 6
- Statement of the Problem 7
- Purpose of the Study 9
- Research and Guiding Questions 10
- Significance of the Study 10
- Limitations of the Study 12
- Delimitations of the Study 12
- Definitions of Terms 13

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 17

- Historical Background 20
- School Leadership 35
- Summary – School Leadership 43
- Evaluations 43
- Summary – Evaluations 55
- Professional Development 56
- Summary – Professional Development 67

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 70

- Design 70
- Data Collection 72
- Setting/Selection Process 73
- Sample Population/Participants 75
- Instrumentation 76
  - Questionnaire 76
  - Interviews 77
- Data Analysis 79

IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS 80

- Introduction 80
- Quantitative Data 81
- Participants 82
  - Return Rate by School Type 83

Characteristics of Respondents 85
Research Questions 86
Research Question 1 86
Research Question 2 91
Research Question 3 94
Research Question 4 99
Research Question 5 104
Summary – Quantitative Data 115
Qualitative Data 115
Presentation of Qualitative Findings 117
Purpose 117
Implementation of the Teacher Evaluation Process 120
Effective Aspects of Teacher Evaluation 123
Effect on Instruction 126
Effect of Professional Growth 129
Improvements to the Teacher Evaluation Process 132
Summary – Quantitative and Qualitative Findings 136
Research Question 1 136
Research Question 2 137
Research Question 3 138
Research Question 4 139
Research Question 5 141

V. DISCUSSION, IMPLEMENTATION & RECOMMENDATIONS 144
Introduction 144
Research Questions 145
Summary of Findings 145
Research Question 1 145
Research Question 2 146
Research Question 3 148
Research Question 4 150
Research Question 5 151
Recommendations for Future Research 154
Policy 155
Practice 155
Concluding Statement 156

References 160

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	Teacher Interview Questions	182
	Teachers' Responses	184
APPENDIX B:	Administrator Interview Questions	201
	Administrators' Responses	202
APPENDIX C:	Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP)	215
APPENDIX D:	Teacher Evaluation Forms	223
APPENDIX E:	Frequency Tables	231
APPENDIX F:	IRB Approval	246
APPENDIX G:	Informed Consent Form	248
APPENDIX H:	Permission Granted	252

LIST OF TABLES

1. Magnet and Comprehensive schools 2004-2011 HSPA scores.....75

2. Alignment of Research Questions with TEP and Interview Questions.....78

3. Group Participation of Questionnaire.....83

4. Subgroup Participation of Questionnaire.....84

5. Teacher Demographics.....85

6. Participants' Perceptions of Contextual Characteristics of the Teacher Evaluation...88

7. Participants' Perceptions of Contextual Characteristics by School Status.....89

8. Participants' Perceptions of Contextual Characteristics by Subjects Taught.....89

9. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Context.....90

10. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects Taught and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Context.....90

11. Participants' Perceptions of the Impact of the Teacher Evaluation Process on Professional Practice and Professional Growth.....92

12. Participants' Perceptions of the Impact of the Teacher Evaluation Process by School Status.....93

13. Participants' Perceptions of the Impact of the Teacher Evaluation Process by Subjects Taught.....93

14. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher Evaluation Process.....94

15. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subject and Perceptions of Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher Evaluation Process.....94

16. Participants' Perceptions of the Evaluator.....96

17. Participants' Perceptions of the Evaluator by School Status.....97

18. Participants' Perceptions of the Evaluator by Subjects Taught.....97

19. One-Way analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of Evaluator....98

20. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subject and Perceptions of Evaluator....99

21. Participants' Perceptions of the Feedback Received During the Evaluation Process....102

22. Participants' Perceptions of the Feedback Received by School Status....102

23. Participants' Perceptions of the Feedback Received by Subjects Taught....102

24. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of Feedback....103

25. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subject and Perceptions of Feedback....104

26. Participants' Perceptions of Procedures Used During the Evaluation Process....106

27. Participants' Perceptions of Procedures Used During the Evaluation Process by School Status....106

28. Participants' Perceptions of Procedures Used During the Evaluation Process by Subjects Taught....106

29. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Procedural Techniques in the Teacher Evaluation Process....107

30. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects Taught and Perceptions of the Procedural Techniques in the Teacher Evaluation Process....107

31. Participants' Perceptions of the Sources of Information Used During the Teacher Evaluation Process....109

32. Participants' Perceptions of the Sources of Information Used During the Teacher Evaluation Process by School Status....109

33. Participants' Perceptions of the Sources of Information Used During the Teacher Evaluation Process by Subjects Taught....109

34. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Performance Information in Teacher Evaluation....110

35. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects Taught and Perceptions of the Performance Information in Teacher Evaluation....111

36. Participants' Perceptions of the Extent of the Observation Used in the Teacher Evaluation Process.....112

37. Participants' Perceptions of the Extent of the Observation by School Status.....113

38. Participants' Perceptions of the Extent of the Observation by Subjects Taught.....113

39. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Observation.....114

40. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects Taught and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Observation.....114

41. Frequency Tables (41-80).....231

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Long before the urgent rallying call to action 25 years ago in *A Nation At Risk*, long before No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and the more recent standards-based accountability measures for states and districts, researchers and policymakers realized that the state of affairs in the nation's schools had to change in order to improve student performance and learning. Although many initiatives and programs have been implemented toward improving student achievement (i.e., new configurations of the use of time in schools, high-stakes tests, rigorous graduation requirements, improved teacher training programs, and stricter requirements for teacher licensing, etc.), the factor that appears to have the greatest impact on student achievement is teacher performance (Danielson, 2001; Darling-Hammond, Wise & Klein, 1999; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), 1996; Tucker & Stronge, 2005). As a result of the new accountability standards for students and school administrators, a shift began to take place in the education arena (Haefele, 1993), from simply a focus on student outcomes to one that focuses on the relationship between teacher performance and student achievement. Marshall (2005) indicated that "It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation" (p.727), in order to link evaluation to student achievement (Tucker & Stronge, 2005).

Toch (2008) pointed out that "Among the many strategies for improving public schools teaching-performance pay, alternative certification, licensing exams, and professional practice-school reformers have long neglected a potentially powerful one: teacher evaluations. A host of factors…have produced superficial and capricious teacher evaluation systems that often don't even directly address the quality of instruction, much

less measure students' learning" (p.32). He maintained that "Through their focus on the quality of teaching, teacher evaluations are at the very center of the educational enterprise and can be catalysts for teacher and school improvement" (p.32). According to Boyd (1989), "A teacher evaluation system should give teachers useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity to learn new teaching techniques, and counsel from principals and other teachers on how to make changes in their classrooms. To achieve these goals, evaluators must first set specific procedures and standards. The standards should:

1. Relate to important teaching skills
2. Be as objective as possible
3. Be clearly communicated to the teacher before the evaluation begins and be reviewed after the evaluation is over, and
4. Be linked to the teacher's professional development (p.1).

A recurring theme in almost all successful evaluation systems is the importance of establishing clear understanding of the purposes of the system, which must then be reflected in procedures and processes (McGreal, 1983; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1984; Hannay, Telford & Seller, 2003). According to Costa et al., (as cited in Stanley & Popham, 1988), "Supervision must be ongoing. Staff development is a necessary component" (p. vi).

Evaluation systems work best when they are viewed as a subset of a bigger movement – a districtwide commitment to the enhancement of classroom instruction and teacher growth. Staff development research seems to clearly support the notion that the more people talk about teaching, the better they get at it. The responsibility of a school

district is to provide staff development opportunities that foster teaching talk and to employ an evaluation system that is both complementary and supplementary to staff development. This is the way evaluation and development are most logically linked (Sparks, 1986).

This study examined a teacher evaluation system, based on *Enhancing Professional Practice: Framework for Teaching* (Danielson, 1996), implemented in a large urban district, and the extent to which this appraisal system and the roles of building administrators, as evaluators, impact teaching practice and teacher professional growth.

As whole-school reform and restructuring swept the nation and states, states required more accountability of the local districts. New Jersey developed a state evaluation process that requires new teachers to be evaluated at 10, 20, (formative) and 30 (summative) week intervals. These evaluations are included as one component in the state's licensure requirements for individuals seeking a standard teaching certificate. Evaluation systems for novice (two to three years) and veteran teachers are the responsibility of individual districts. In 2003, the school district in this study implemented a new teacher evaluation system, *Achievement Through Teaching Excellence: A System of Teacher Observation and Performance Evaluation*. This system is modeled after *Enhancing Professional Practice: Framework for Teaching* developed by Danielson (1996). Before implementation of the new evaluation tool, the instrument that had been used to evaluate teachers, both formative and summative, was a simple checklist of behaviors with ratings of unsatisfactory and satisfactory.

In 1996, the tool was redesigned to include the areas of Lesson Summary (narrative), Evaluator's Narrative (teacher's strength and areas needing attention or improvement), Lesson Implementation, Teacher Characteristics, and Performance

Report. Each of these components contained a series of items to be checked as outstanding, satisfactory, needs improvement or unsatisfactory. The Annual Evaluation (summative) included only the areas of Performance Report and Summary Evaluation. The ratings were satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The evaluation instrument was used for new, novice, and tenured teachers.

The new instrument, *Achievement Through Teaching Excellence: A System of Teacher Observation and Performance Evaluation* is based on the understanding of effective teaching practices and student achievement. "The Achievement Through Teaching Excellence initiative strives to create a system that will enable teachers to continuously develop and grow in ways that research has shown are effective in improving student achievement" (Bolden, 2004, p. 2). Following the first year of implementation (2003), in 2004, the district formed a committee to evaluate the system. With a few wording modifications, the system remained intact. It was not evaluated for its effectiveness in impacting teacher practice, professional growth and student achievement.

A report by the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS), entitled "Raising Student Achievement in the … Public Schools," (2007) noted,

> "The Council's team saw irregular program implementation, uncertain curricular alignment, spotty classroom monitoring, weak instructional rigor, low expectations for student performance, fractured professional development, poor use of data to inform instructional decision-making, and an accountability system that was too new to have had much effect." The team was particularly concerned about the high schools in the district where instructional rigor was modest at best and sometimes, nonexistent (p.8).

To further stress the importance of a viable evaluation system, the Council commended the district for having "taken an important and relatively unusual step of making student achievement a factor in the evaluation of senior-instructional staff members, directors, principals, and high school department chairs. Assistant superintendents and principals even lose salary increments when goals are not achieved" (CGCS, 2007, p. 47). Though commended for these efforts, the Council recommended stricter measures: "increase the weight given to increasing student achievement in all staff evaluation forms and procedures" (p. 49). The district in this study has not yet taken the step of tying student achievement to teacher salary increments.

The Council's findings on the district's teacher evaluation system, "Achievement Through Teaching Excellence: A System of Teacher Observation and Performance Evaluation," included the following:

> The teacher evaluation procedures and documents do not require teachers to teach the curriculum. The Pathwise document, for instance, includes a framework for evaluating teachers. Only one component of the document, however, --1C—mentions the curriculum, and the one reference pertains only to teachers at the "distinguished" level. Consequently, a teacher can be rated effective without actually implementing the curriculum. Moreover, the document rates teachers as effective if they select their own goals for student learning, rather than the goals that the district has in mind (CGCS, 2007, p. 49).

These findings prompted the school district to revise the evaluation model in 2008. The revised areas are in Domain 1C and Domain 3B and 3C. Wording in Domain 1C was changed to "Implementing curricular goals and objectives." Domain 3B was changed to "Using questioning and discussion techniques with flexibility and

responsiveness'' and 3C now reads, "Attaining student achievement that meets or exceeds performance benchmarks." Since 2003, the evaluation tool had been used for teachers at all levels of the career scale – new, novice, and veteran. Beginning with the 2008-2009 school year, this was no longer the case. New teachers would be evaluated only with the state's 10-, 20-, (formative) and 30- (summative) week documents of the State's Provisional Teacher Program (PTP). Novice and tenured teachers would continue to be evaluated with the district's newly revised evaluation form. In the 2009-2010 school year, the evaluation document was changed to add a range of score points to accompany the existing domains and descriptors of teacher behavior.

Theoretical Framework

The push for both accountability and improvement has resulted in supervision relying on integrated models of formative and summative evaluation (Gullat & Ballard, 1998, p. 16). "A purposeful evaluation system measures teaching outcomes, not simply teaching behaviors" (Goldrick, 2002, p. 2). A standards-based teacher evaluation system should link district goals, school goals and teacher goals to the goal of school and teacher improvement. According to Darling-Hammond (2004) "Changes in instruction occur when teachers receive continuous support embedded in a coherent instruction system that is focused on the practical details of what it means to teach effectively" (p.1069). The evaluation process should be used to provide formative feedback and summative results that guide and inform personnel decisions. The teacher evaluation system should ultimately lead to enhanced student achievement. "Positive changes in student outcomes are the ultimate measure of professional development's success. Teacher learning should be driven by identified gaps between goals for student learning and actual student performance (Hawley & Valli, 1999, p.2).

This study investigated the influence of a standards-based evaluation system on teacher professional growth. For policymakers, strengthening teacher evaluation is a worthwhile challenge to undertake. It holds promise, not only to professionalize teaching, but also to invest educators with greater information, confidence, and ability to improve their instructional practices, as well as to help students achieve their fullest potential (Doherty, 2009; Goldrick, 2002).

Statement of Problem

Given the ongoing accountability demands on states, districts, and schools to demonstrate measurable student achievement gains, of necessary concern is whether teachers' professional growth is influenced by their formative performance evaluation. "Educational reform requires teachers not only to update their skills and information but also to totally transform their role as a teacher. It establishes new expectations for students, teachers, and school communities… Professional development is a key tool that keeps teachers abreast of current issues in education, helps them implement innovations, and refines their practice" (Darling-Hammond, 1990, p. 19).

"Linking evaluation and professional development is a difficult task for teachers, evaluators, and principals. Although there are few easy answers, evaluation can be used to work with teachers to set specific, achievable goals; provide constructive criticism and suggestions to improve weak areas and amplify specific strengths…"(Boyd, 1989, p. 3). As Cook and Fine (1997) stressed that "The ultimate worth of professional development for teachers is the essential role it plays in the improvement of student learning" (p. 1). That means that educators must pay attention to the results of professional development on job performance, organizational effectiveness, and the success of all students. Therefore, it is important and necessary that teacher formative evaluations are used to

influence teachers' professional growth. "If improvement results from change, there must be something to initiate that change, and what's going to initiate it other than staff development?" (Guskey, as cited in Asayeh, 1993, p. 24).

The role of teacher evaluations has surfaced only recently as an underutilized resource that might hold promise as a tool to promote teacher professional growth and measure teacher effectiveness in classrooms. When used appropriately, teacher evaluations should identify and measure the instructional strategies, professional behavior, and delivery of content knowledge that affect student learning (Danielson and McGreal, 2000; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995).

Although the school district in this study has made strides in implementing research-based programs in reading and mathematics at the elementary level, reform programs at the high school level, such as *Read 180* (a reading intervention program for struggling readers), have not produced appreciable student achievement gains. Research indicates that teacher practices and effectiveness directly impact student achievement and learning. Since 2003, this New Jersey public school district has implemented a new standards-based evaluation system, *Achievement Through Teaching Excellence: A System of Teacher Observation and Performance Evaluation* modeled on *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. This model has been modified to fit the needs of the district. After eight years of implementation, the impact of the use of this instrument on teacher performance has not been documented. This study examined the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation system by assessing its impact on improved teacher practice and professional growth through the perceptions of teachers and administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate and report findings from an examination of the relationship between a teacher evaluation system to that of teacher practice and professional growth in four high schools in an urban New Jersey district that, for eight years, have implemented a teacher evaluation system adapted and modeled on *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (Danielson, 1996). The Danielson model is closely aligned to the New Jersey Standards for Teachers and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; its design fosters deliberate and concise feedback in order to strengthen and enhance teacher professional practice and development, with the intent to improve student performance. The study attempted to determine to what extent the implemented teacher evaluation process has impacted teacher professional growth and practice in high school Language Arts and Mathematics. These areas were selected because they are the areas assessed on the state's high school exit exam, the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA). Although the evaluation instrument is organized with four domains: 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) Classroom Environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional Responsibilities, this study focused on Domain 3 and Domain 4 of the evaluation instrument and the accompanying components.

This study also sought to determine the role of the building administrators, as evaluators, in influencing teacher professional growth. Research indicates that the effectiveness of teacher evaluation can be significantly enhanced when teachers and principals share the similar views and purposes of the evaluation (Darling-Hammond, 1986; Weber, 1987). As yet, there is no reported research on the extent to which the use of this model has impacted improved teacher instruction and teacher professional growth in this New Jersey urban public school district.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions:

1. What is the perceived purpose of the teacher evaluation process?
2. What is the perceived effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and professional growth?
3. What is the perceived role of the building administrators in the teacher evaluation process toward improved teacher practice and professional growth?
4. What is the perceived impact of postobservation feedback on improved teacher practice and professional growth?
5. What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses, if any, of a standards-based teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and professional growth?

Significance of the Study

Evaluation systems which focus on accountability and professional growth are necessary in order to meet the needs of teachers, students, schools, and society at large (Stronge, 1997). An organization in which improvement is encouraged supports reflection on practice. As Cunningham and Gresso (1993) suggested,

> Organizational strengths are built upon individual strengths, and individual strengths grow from personal and professional development. Therefore, staff development is the cornerstone of an effective work culture (p. 188).

Learning how to continually improve practice should be part of the ordinary operations of a school. Schools need to be learning communities for teachers as well as students. Creating a culture which focuses on professional inquiry is important to school improvement (Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Not until fairly recently have there been studies that examined specific models of teacher evaluation systems and their influence on teacher practices and professional growth. Goe, Bell and Little (2008) synthesized the research on teacher effectiveness. Their findings demonstrate the difficulty of measuring teacher effectiveness: "Although there is a general consensus that good teaching matters...measuring teacher effectiveness has remained elusive in part because of ongoing debate about what an effective teacher is and does" (Darling-Hammond, 2000, p.2). Goe et al. (2008) argued that "There are many different purposes for evaluating teacher effectiveness; a key reason is to identify weaknesses in instruction and develop ways to address them. For this reason, one goal of evaluating teaching effectiveness should be to collect information that will be useful in designing appropriate strategies to improve instruction" (p. 50).

This study examined the influence on teacher professional growth of an evaluation system modeled from one that is highly regarded in the education arena, Danielson's *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (1996). The study will add to the body of literature that is now focused on teacher evaluations in various forms. It will also add to the research findings about standards-based programs - specifically, teacher evaluation, in urban schools and its influence on teacher practice and professional growth in high school Language Arts and mathematics. The study could be replicated in other large urban districts, as the findings could offer insights into the complex nature of evaluations and teacher growth and practices. Further, results from this study provide data for school and school district decision-making regarding teacher evaluation processes. The findings enhances understanding of the concerns about the process and promote mutual understanding,

better planning, and development of teacher evaluation practices that lead to continual teacher growth.

Limitations of the Study

The school district in this study is extremely large; a limitation in this study is the relatively small sample size, which included only four high schools, two magnet high schools and two comprehensives high schools. Another limitation is that participation is voluntary and limited to teachers in the Language Arts and Mathematics Departments in each school, as well as the department chairpersons of the respective departments. Language Arts and Mathematics were selected because they are the two areas of assessment on the New Jersey High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA). The validity of the study is limited to the reliability of the teacher survey questions, the teacher and administrator interview questions, and the interviewer's ability to conduct credible interviews.

Gay, Mills and Airasian (2009) noted the following limitations concerning self-reported data solicited via questionnaires: "Self-report instruments…have notable limits. The researcher can never be sure that individuals are expressing their true attitudes, interest, values, or personalities. A common problem with studies that use self-report instruments is the existence of a response set, the tendency of an individual to respond in a particular way" (p. 153).

Delimitations of the Study

One delimitation is in order to balance the study, two high-performing magnet high schools were randomly selected, along with two low-performing comprehensive high schools, as evidenced by the data gleaned from district performance reports and New Jersey's Annual School Report Card. Another delimitation of the study is that I am

employed at one of the high-performing magnet school which was not invited to be included in this study.

Definitions of Terms

For clarification and explanation, the following terms are defined as they are used in this study.

Abbott Districts – New Jersey School districts (31) covered by a landmark NJ Supreme Court ruling that found the funding and education provided to urban school children were inadequate and unconstitutional.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – The minimum level of improvement in 41 indicators that states, school districts, and schools achieve yearly, as mandated by NCLB. AYP in New Jersey, along with other indicators, is based on student assessment results in clusters of grade levels: NJ Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJ ASK) elementary grades 3, 4, and 5; middle school grades 6, 7, 8, and High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) high school grade 11.

Alternative High School Assessment (AHSA) – Measures high school competency in selected areas of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. It is intended to offer an alternative means of meeting the state graduation proficiency test requirement. The AHSA is available to students who have met all high school graduation requirements except for demonstrating proficiency in selected areas of the Core Curriculum Content Standards (N.J.S.A. 18A:7C-3 & N.J.A.C. 6A:8-4.1).

Comprehensive High Schools – Serve the needs of all students. Each of the comprehensive high schools offers courses of a specific career path, i.e., aviation, television production, law, and allied health.

Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJ CCCS) – A set of standards adopted in 1996 which enumerate what all NJ students should know and be able to do by the end of specified grades. The standards also define NJ's high school graduation requirements and the basis for assessing the academic achievement of students at grades 4, 8, and 11.

Elementary and Secondary Educational Act (ESEA) – Enacted in 1965 as President Johnson's *War on Poverty* to support education of America's poorest children. Congress reauthorizes the act every 5 or 6 years. Each subsequent reauthorization is a revision, and often raises the stakes for the nation's educational institutions. The most recent and far-reaching reauthorization is *No Child Left Behind Act (2001)* (NCLB).

Evaluation/Appraisal System – The process of collecting data and making professional judgments about performance for the purpose of decision-making.

Formative Evaluation – Evaluation with the emphasis placed on teacher development, growth, and improvement (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) – New Jersey's standards-based high school exit exam in Language Arts and Mathematics. The test is administered to students in the spring of the 11th grade. Students who are not successful on the initial administration have two additional opportunities to take the test in the fall and spring of the senior year.

Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) - A HQT is fully certified and/or licensed by the state, holds at least a bachelor degree from a four-year institution, and demonstrates competence in each core academic subject taught.

Magnet Schools – Public high schools outside of zoned school boundaries that offer a specific course of study; such as, performing arts, technology, science and mathematics, etc.

New Jersey School Report Card (NJSRC) – A 1995 NJ Legislature mandate (N.J.S.A. 18A: 7E 1-5) that requires a yearly-published report of the performance of each school in NJ. The law outlines the 35 fields of information in the categories of school environment, students, student performance indicators, staff, and district finances. The assessment results displayed on the NJ School Report Cards are based on the state assessment data without any NCLB conditions applied. Therefore, the assessment data in the NJSRC may be different from the assessment data displayed on the NCLB Reports where there have been NCLB conditions applied to the test results.

Professional Growth/Development – Continuous endeavor by a professional to increase the knowledge of his/her craft through the process of collaboration, reflection, teaching and learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) – A collegial group of administrators and school staff who are united in their commitment to student learning. They share vision, work and learn collaboratively, visit and review other classrooms, and participate in decision-making (Hord, 1997).

Portfolio Assessment – A teacher professional portfolio is a documented history of a teacher's learning process against a set of teaching standards. It is an individual portrait of the teacher as a professional, reflecting on his or her philosophy and practice. The teacher selects the artifacts that provide insight into the teacher's growth (Painter, 2001).

Standards-based Evaluation – A vision of teaching standards that are broad domains of research-based teaching practices, comprehensive standards, and detailed criteria through rubrics. The standards are intended to be public, consensus-based, and provide detailed performance expectations (Kimball, 2001).

Summative Evaluation – Evaluation of summary used in decision making for future employment. The focus of summative evaluation is on rating, ranking, and making decisions about the adequacy of the performance of teachers as they carry out their professional responsibilities (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Teacher Practices - As delineated in *Achievement Through Teaching Excellence: A System of Teacher Observation and Evaluation* - Domain 3: a-Communicating clearly and accurately, b-Using questioning and discussion techniques with flexibility and responsiveness, c-Engaging students in learning, d-Providing feedback to students, and e-Attaining student achievement that meets or exceeds performance benchmarks. Domain 4: a-Reflecting on teaching, b-Maintaining accurate records, c-Communicating with families, d-Contributing to the school and district, e-Growing and developing professionally, f-Demonstrating promptness and attendance, and g-Implementing district policies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A variety of writings and studies permeate the literature about the impact of teacher evaluation on teacher performance. Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) defined teacher evaluation as "the systematic assessment of a teacher's performance or qualifications in relation to the teacher's defined professional role and the school's and district's mission" (p. 86). The literature suggests that the evaluation strategies to be used vary depending on the objective. If the objective is accountability, summative evaluation strategies should be used; if the objective is professional growth, formative strategies should be employed (McDougall, 2001). Formative evaluation strategies are designed to encourage professional growth. These evaluation strategies do not collect externally controlled data for evaluative purposes; they are "teacher-directed, individualized, and supportive of personal growth" (McColskey & Egelson, 1993, p. 6). Although the literature indicates that teacher quality and effectiveness have the most impact on student outcomes, many students still do not demonstrate achievement and growth at desired levels. This holds true for this New Jersey district. In some schools, student performance as measured on the HSPA reflects little growth, and in some cases, a decline is evident in both Language Arts and Mathematics measured scores.

There is a growing trend to link teacher evaluation to student achievement (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Stronge and Tucker, 2000; NAGC, 2009). The National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) advocates for growth models (Value-Added Models [VAMs]) that track individual student progress over a given period of time. Stronge and Tucker (2000) cautioned about connecting student achievement to teacher

evaluation. The authors offered nine considerations for connecting student performance measures to professional performance reviews:

1. Use student learning as only one component of educator evaluation system that is based on multiple data sources.
2. When judging educator effectiveness, consider the context in which teachers and administrators work.
3. Use measures of student growth versus a fixed achievement standard or goal.
4. Compare learning gains from one point in time to another for the same students, not different groups of students.
5. Recognize that test score gains have pitfalls that must be avoided.
6. Use a time frame for evaluation allows for patterns of student learning to be documented.
7. Use fair and valid measures of student learning.
8. Select student assessment measures that are most closely aligned with existing curriculum.
9. Don't narrow the curriculum and limit teaching to fit a test unless the test actually measures what should be taught (p. 16).

These nine conditions are in stark contrast to others who advocate linking student outcomes to teacher evaluation systems.

According to Gary Huggins, Director of Commission on NCLB, "It was very clear to us in traveling the country…that HQT focuses on the wrong thing - it's about qualifications to enter the classroom and tells us nothing about performance in the classroom. Student gains on state tests should account for at least half of the measure of teacher quality, with the remainder based on 'evaluation by principals or peer-review

panels'" (Khadaroo, 2007, p. 2). In recommendations to Congress, Secretary Tommy G. Thompson echoed this point:

> In statutory provisions requiring all classrooms to be staffed with highly qualified teachers are laudable, but do not go far enough to accomplish NCLB's ambitious goals. There needs to be recognition of the connection between teacher effectiveness and increased student performance as well as stronger focus on ensuring teachers receive the supports and training necessary to be effective once they are in the classroom (Thompson & Barnes, 2007, p.21).

The recommendations further stress the fact that teachers are to be not only highly qualified, but also highly effective. The shift toward linking student growth to teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation is a radical one with far-reaching implications.

NCLB's accountability standards ushered in a new era of teacher accountability. Increased attention was given to teacher performance and how that performance impacted student achievement. Further, NCLB requires that schools employ highly qualified teachers (HQT) in all instructional settings. Mandating that teachers meet the minimum requirements to be considered highly qualified is a first step toward ensuring teacher effectiveness, but just meeting those requirements is no guarantee that teachers will be effective (Goe, 2007). Along with other measures to ensure teacher quality and effectiveness, new performance systems were developed for the purposes of teacher evaluation. Some performance models focus on standards for instruction, which include content-specific pedagogy (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 1999; Nelson & Sassi, 2000). The current accountability demands represent a challenge for schools that aim to achieve academic success for all students through a comprehensive teacher evaluation system (Ovando, 2001, p. 213).

In *It's Time to Rethink Teacher Supervision and Evaluation*, Marshall (2005) advocated linking supervision and evaluation to high student achievement by suggesting a new theory of action. The action behind supervision and evaluation, "the engine that drives high student achievement, is teacher teams working collaboratively toward common curriculum expectations and using interim assessments to continuously improve teaching and attend to students who are not successful" (p.731). Marshall outlined 10 reasons to support his contention that the conventional supervision and evaluation process is not an effective strategy for improving teaching and learning. He also offered 12 steps to linking supervision and evaluation to high student achievement.

Historical Background

Teacher evaluation as a practice has a long history in the United States. As early as the colonial times teachers were evaluated. Then, according to Peterson (1982), evaluation was a means of terminating perceived ineffective teachers. The basis for the evaluation focused on cultural norms, beliefs, and religious ideology. Peterson (1982) noted that these evaluations were not conducted by educators, but by men perceived to be knowledgeable and experienced.

Throughout the succeeding decades, teacher evaluation experienced various transformations. The Industrial Revolution impacted education in America as a result of the shift from farming to industry and population growth, and large centralized areas developed. Teachers were more in demand, and so were individuals to supervise and evaluate them (Clark, 1993; Logue-Belden, 2008; Peterson, 1982). Superintendents were hired to meet this demand. The enormity of the task proved greater than the superintendents could manage. The task of teacher supervision and the management of the school went to the principal (Elsbree, 1939).

At the turn of the century, the scientific model of management was applied to schools. Early in the 20th Century, John Franklin Bobbitt impacted the educational world with his views on the purpose of education and how the youth of the day should be educated. His book, *The Curriculum*, written in 1918, was the first of its kind. In it, he wrote, "This is the first book in a field that until recently has little cultivated. For a long time, we have been developing the theory of educational method, both general and special; ...recently, however, we have discerned that there is a theory of curriculum-formulation that is no less extensive and involved than that of method. To know what to do is as important as to know how to do it" (Bobbitt, 1918, pg. v). *The Curriculum* became the standard for American educational curriculum design. Bobbitt's curriculum design was based on the principles of Frederick Taylor's System of Scientific Management. In applying the scientific method to curriculum design and development, Bobbitt saw schools as "factories" with hierarchies of management. The principal was the manager, the teacher was the supervisor, and the students were the workers.

Throughout the 30s and 40s, women dominated the field as teachers. The 50s witnessed an influx of men in the public schools as teachers. Their entry changed the public perception of schools: "Teaching was now seen as a profession that was no longer female oriented, but one where the male was equally accepted" (Clark, 1993, p. 7). Russia and the Cold War were instrumental in getting America to take a new look at its teachers and to search for better teachers to fill the classrooms. The belief was that, in order for America to compete against the Soviets, America's students had to be taught by the best teachers available, especially in the area of science (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983). Many college students joined the ranks of the profession. As their numbers grew, so did the unions.

Strike and Bull (1981) pointed out that the union contracts affected the evaluation process by specifying the frequency of evaluation, the evaluation criteria to be used, who could or could not participate in the evaluation process, and methods of collecting data. Several different assessment tools were developed: behavior checklists, rating scales, and classification systems (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). The influence and "role of the unions in teacher evaluation offered the profession the respect long overdue. Public perceptions of the school system were positive as students emerged ready for college industries and democracy prospered"(Clark, 1993, p. 7). Although unions have a great deal of influence, Toch (2008) pointed out that "the unions have not, in the main, sought to improve the unproductive ways that teachers are evaluated in most school systems today" (p. 15).

Yet, Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), understood the necessity of raising the caliber of the profession when, in 1985, he made a compelling case for union support of rigorous evaluations while addressing constituents at a union convention in Niagara Falls. "We don't have the right to be called professionals and we will never convince the public that we are, unless we are prepared honestly to decide what constitutes competence in our profession and what constitutes incompetence and apply those definitions to ourselves and our colleagues" (as cited in Toch & Rothman, 2008, p.15).

"The public education culture is so deeply rooted in the industrial model of labor-management relations that union people and administrators find it extremely difficult to be proactive. The natural response is to be on the defensive" (Toch & Rothman, 2008, 16). Despite Shanker's view of how to improve the status of public school teachers, local, state, and national union leaders continue to hold on to the impulse to protect the

jobs of their members. "They have not pressed for more rigorous evaluation systems for fear that such systems may result in more teachers being dismissed for poor performance..."(Toch & Rothman, 2008, p. 15).

In 1965, the federal government enacted the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act (ESEA). Born as part of Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty in 1965, this $11-billion-a-year Act has been sending federal assistance to poor schools, communities, and children for over 40 years. Each subsequent reauthorization focused on some form of accountability that raised the stakes in educational reform. From 1980 to 1990, the second phase of ESEA, there was no significant increase in funding for the Act, and President Reagan block-granted and consolidated several ESEA programs. Also during this time, A Nation at Risk (1983) was released. This placed education in the national political scene and linked the state of America's schools to the nation's economic productivity. Teachers were viewed more as laborers implementing a prescribed program in a manner determined by policy makers, than as professionals with a repertoire of techniques and the ability to decide for themselves how techniques should be applied. Policymakers sought to "fix" the problems by enacting more regulations (Clark, 1993). Student failure to achieve higher-level learning was attributed to the nonconformity of the schools and/or teachers to the prescribed methods of education. The solution to this problem was more detailed curriculum prescriptions and more careful monitoring of their implementation (Alexanderov, 1989).

A Nation at Risk called for a movement away from the "one-size-fits-all" approach to teaching, and towards the emergence of effective teachers who would lead the schools to new levels of excellence. This would occur through using the established methods of evaluation, as based on the descriptions of public education by Alexanderov.

These evaluations were not designed to identify effective teachers, but those who met the minimum requirements to be a teacher. The requirements included punctuality, providing a safe learning environment, and upholding school rules and district policy (Alexanderov, 1989).

In 1971, the National Education Association (NEA) published *Schools For the 70s and Beyond: A Call to Action,* wherein the association outlined what was wrong with the public schools and the teachers' misplaced role in its function. This book detailed the problems with the education system, which were the factory approach to educating students, failure to recognize individual student needs, viewing teachers as laborers rather than as professionals, a centralized administration that lacks sensitivity to the actual educational process, and a curriculum that offered little relevance to the parties involved. NEA offered a definition of an effective teacher and stressed that the evaluation of teachers needed to play a role in the emergence of professional growth among all educators. This seminal work mirrors the current research findings.

Although NCLB requires that schools must have highly qualified (credentialed) teachers, it does not mandate or suggest a mechanism for determining teacher effectiveness; this determination is left to the states and local districts. "Public education defines teacher quality largely in terms of the credentials that teachers have earned, rather than on the basis of the quality of the work they do in their classrooms…"(Toch & Rothman, 2008, p. 2). "Because teacher evaluations are at the center of the educational enterprise, the quality of teaching in the nation's classrooms, they are a potentially powerful lever of teacher and school improvement" (Toch & Rothman, 2008, p. 1).

In 1988, the reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) conditioned the states' receipt of the funds upon some accountability for improved

outcomes. Congress allowed Title 1 funds to be used for schoolwide programs as a way of responding to the urgent call for more wide-sweeping reform outlined in a Nation at Risk. From 1990 to the present, the education debate has been dominated by the desire of policymakers to see evidence that federal investments in education programs yield tangible, measurable results in terms of student achievement and success.

The two main examples of this approach occurred in 1994 and in 2001, with the passage of President Clinton's Goals 2000 and the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) and President George W. Bush's No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). President Clinton's reauthorization built upon the standards-based reform initiatives of many governors. Goals 2000, passed in 1993, required all states to develop challenging standards for all students in reading and math, as well as to issue school report cards. IASA required states to develop and administer statewide assessments to all low-income students at least once in elementary school, once in middle school, and once in high school, and to develop plans to improve their educational outcomes. In 2003, Congress implemented the revision to NCLB that required states to monitor and hold local educational organizations responsible for student progress (Archived: ESEA & IASA of 1994).

Although President Obama has presented his ESEA reauthorization plan, *A Blueprint for Reform* (2010), to Congress, it was not acted on by the Congress until October, 2011. In September, 2011, President Obama introduced his plan to relieve states of some of the requirements of NCLB with a flexible system of waivers. He stated, "So starting today, we'll be giving states more flexibility to meet high standards. Keep in mind, the change we're making is not lowering standards; we're saying we're going to give you more flexibility to meet high standards. We're going to let states, schools and

teachers come up with innovative ways to give our children the skills they need to compete for the jobs of the future."

Following the recent focus on standards-based accountability, views about student achievement and teacher practices have become core variables in the reform movement. Studies demonstrate that teacher knowledge and know-how are important to student performance. "States and districts began various efforts to improve teacher quality. These included new standardized tests of minimum competency, added undergraduate course requirements, practice teaching, and in-service activities" (Darling-Hammond, 1999, p. 32). The new focus on preteacher requirements, though a good start and designed to ensure improved teacher quality, may not have had the impact on improved teacher performance and student achievement as intended. Improving teaching practices in order to influence student achievement is more than a matter of requiring new inservice activities, adding and requiring new course work, or "by conducting infrequent drop-in visits by an evaluator" (Toch, 2008, p. 32). According to Glickman (2002), such behaviors "lead to the deadening and routinizing [sic] of practice and the diminishment of teaching as a profession"(p.4). It is a difficult and daunting task. Nonetheless, a focused and structured method was needed to ensure continued professional growth and performance practices that could measure teacher influence on student achievement.

Toch (2008) offered examples of evaluation models that improve teaching. He contended that "A number of promising evaluation models point to a way out of the morass" (p.32). These models are: The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) launched by the Milken Family Foundation in 1999, and The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Together, they demonstrate that it is possible to evaluate teachers in much more productive ways than most public schools currently do. These models share

several key characteristics: 1) explicit standards; 2) multiple measures of evaluation; 3) drive-in, rather than drive-by, evaluations; and 4) stress teamwork (p.34).

Long before the landmark state intervention takeover, judicial involvement in education finance reform in New Jersey began over three decades ago and deepened (Access Quality Education: New Jersey, 2001-2008). In 1973, the New Jersey Supreme Court declared, in Robinson v. Cahill, that New Jersey's school funding statute was unconstitutional because it violated the "thorough and efficient education" requirement of the state constitution. The court defined the "Thorough and Efficient" clause as requiring "a certain level of educational opportunity, a minimum level, that will equip the student to become 'a citizen and… a competitor in the labor market'" (Abbott v. Burke, 119 NJ 287, 306 (1990) (Abbott II), citing Robinson v. Cahill, 62 NJ 573, 515 (1973) (Robinson I). Additionally, the court has recognized that certain students have particular disadvantages that may require the provision of additional programs and services to have that opportunity. These rulings led to the identification of 28 districts known as Abbott Districts. These districts were identified as "poorer urban districts or special needs districts." The characteristics of these districts included:

1. must be those with the lowest socioeconomic status, thus assigned to the lowest categories on the New Jersey Department of Education's District Factor Groups (DFG) scale;
2. "evidence of substantive failure of thorough and efficient education;" including "failure to achieve what the DOE considers passing levels of performance on the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA);"
3. have a large percentage of disadvantaged students who need "an education beyond the norm;"

4. existence of an "excessive tax [for] municipal services in the locality where the district is located.

In 1998, the Legislature classified three additional districts, bringing the total districts to 31 (Abbott Districts). The district in this study is one of the original districts included in the Abbott Districts.

A Nation of Risk emphasized the importance and urgency of America educating its citizens:

> The people of the United States need to know that individuals in our society who do not possess the levels of skill, literacy, and training essential to this new era will be effectively disenfranchised, not simply from the material rewards that accompany competent performance, but also from the chance to participate fully in our national life. A high level of shared education is essential to a free, democratic society and to the fostering of a common culture, especially in a country that prides itself on pluralism and individual freedom (1983).

In response to this report and other aspects of the reform movement, New Jersey began the process of developing standards across the educational spectrum. In 1996, the New Jersey State Board of Education adopted the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS). These standards were created to improve student achievement by clearly defining what all students should know and be able to do at the end of 13 years of public education. Five years later, a required review and revision of the standards ensued. Achieve, Inc. and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) reviewed several content areas. As a result of this review, the NJCCCS were revised with a greater degree of specificity and depth of content that would better prepare students for post-secondary education and employment.

To assist teachers and curriculum specialists in aligning curriculum with the standards, the department provided local school districts with a curriculum framework for each content area. The frameworks provided classroom teachers and curriculum specialists with sample teaching strategies, adaptations, and background information relevant to each of the content areas. In addition, the statewide assessments were aligned to the NJCCCS. This alignment of standards, instruction, and assessment was unprecedented (Academic & Professional Standards, 2006). The most recent review and revision of the NJCCCS occurred in January 2008. In June 2010, NJ adopted the newly formed Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which replaces the NJCCCS.

Following the creation and implementation of the NJCCCS, in January 2004, New Jersey revised its Licensure & Credentials requirements. In the mid-1980s, a series of reforms were initiated that eliminated the practice of emergency certification from teaching fields and created a system of qualifying examinations for most teaching fields. Particularly noteworthy was the introduction of one of the nation's first "alternate route" to teacher certification. Additional amendments followed in the 1990s that included the issuance of provisional certificates with accompanying induction year requirements for both teachers and administrators (NJ Licensure and Credentials, 2004). Prospective teachers are required to meet the requirement of the highly qualified teacher as mandated by the federal government. The new NJ requirements included taking and passing Praxis II, maintaining a specific grade point average, completing an approved college-level teaching training program or completing the alternate route program.

Teachers who successfully meet the requirements receive either a Certificate of Eligibility (CE) or a Certificate of Eligibility with Advanced Standing (CEAS). Individuals who receive the CE are those seeking certification through the state's

alternate route program and have not completed a traditional college-level teacher preparation program, but demonstrate successful completion of the Provisional Teacher Program (PTP), a school-based training and evaluation program provided during the first year of teaching. A provisional teaching certificate is issued until the teacher has met all requirements of the program and is then eligible to receive a NJ Standard Teaching Certificate.

Individuals who receive the CEAS are those who have completed a traditional college-level program and satisfy all other requirements. They are issued a provisional teaching certificate and must complete a site-based mentoring program. Upon successful completion, they are then eligible to receive a New Jersey Standard Teaching Certificate.

In 2003, the State Board of Education adopted the New Jersey Professional Standards of Teachers and School Leaders. According to the introductory statement in the document, "NJ Professional Standards for educators provide a clear vision and the needed support called for in the revised Core Curriculum Content Standards"(NJ Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders (2004).

There are ten standards for teachers:

1. **Subject Matter Knowledge:** Teachers shall understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, structures of discipline, especially as they relate to the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (CCCS), and design developmentally appropriate learning experiences making the subject matter accessible and meaningful to all students.
2. **Human Growth and Development:** Teachers shall understand how children and adolescents develop and learn in a variety of school, family and community

contexts and provide opportunities that support their intellectual, social, emotional and physical development.

3. **Diverse Learners:** Teachers shall understand the practice of culturally responsive teaching.
4. **Instructional Planning and Strategies:** Teachers shall understand instructional planning, design long- and short-term plans based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, community, and curriculum goals, and shall employ a variety of developmentally appropriate strategies in order to promote critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills of all learners.
5. **Assessment:** Teachers shall understand and use multiple assessments and interpret results to evaluate and promote student learning and to modify instruction in order to foster the continuous development of students.
6. **Learning Environment:** Teachers shall understand individual and group motivation and behavior and shall create a supportive safe and respectful learning environment that encourages positive interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.
7. **Special Needs:** Teachers shall adapt and modify instruction to accommodate the special needs of all children.
8. **Communication:** Teachers shall use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal and written communication techniques and the tools of information literacy to foster the use of inquiry, collaboration and supportive interactions.
9. **Collaboration and Partnerships:** Teachers shall build relationships with parents, guardians, families and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

10. **Professional Development:** Teachers shall participate as active, responsible members of the professional community, engaging in a wide range of reflective practices, pursuing opportunities to grow professionally and establish collegial relationships to enhance the teaching and learning process.

The development of these new standards shifts the model of teachers from mere imparters of information to one that emphasizes the complex and multifaceted role of teachers who use knowledge to improve student learning. In order to adequately measure whether teachers were meeting the standards, newly developed teacher evaluation processes were needed.

Historically, the purpose of teacher evaluation has been to improve instructional practices (formative) and/or to determine the retention of a teacher in a teaching position (summative). Long before the current standards-based movement emerged, educators advocated teacher evaluation reform. During the mid- to late-80s, Madeline Hunter introduced Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP). What began as a professional development activity in lesson construction and was not designed for teacher evaluation, became an evaluation tool because several states and school districts used the model for evaluation purposes. Principals used the model as an evaluation checklist, and if teachers did not demonstrate all components of the checklist, they received low evaluation ratings.

Hunter herself lamented the incorrect use of the model, "...because the model has been so successful in helping teachers plan lessons; unfortunately it has become a checklist" (Goldberg, 1990, p.43). Hunter did not anticipate the leap to the psychological generalization and "artistic practice", the acceptance of her principles as absolutes, the mandated use of the model, and the lack of adequate training (Hunter, 1985).

The advent of the standards movement called for more effective evaluation systems that would allow for more concise measures of teacher performance. Several different teacher evaluation models emerged. During the early part of the 1980's, one study examined the practices through a conceptual framework of teacher evaluation. Darling-Hammond et al., (1983) studied the divergence between theory and practice in teacher evaluation by examining two strands of theoretical literature: teaching effectiveness and organizational and implementation research. The authors' contention was that the purpose of evaluation and organizational conditions dictates a level of standardization in evaluation processes and adherence to validity and reliability in evaluation decisions. They argued that, for evaluation to be effective in improving teacher performance, it must have a balance between standardized, centrally administered performance expectations with teacher-specific approaches to evaluation and professional growth (Kimball, 2001).

In this climate of accountability at all levels of the educational spectrum, it is vitally important that teachers and school leaders are focused on what matters most - student achievement. The reform movement ushered in a new paradigm for the roles of teachers and school administrators. Cuban (1992) described two types of reform efforts - incremental and fundamental:

> "School reforms over the last century and half can be divided into incremental and fundamental changes. Incremental reforms are those that aim to improve the existing structures of schooling. The premise behind incremental reforms is that basic institutional structures are sound but need tinkering to remove defects and make their operations more effective and efficient...Fundamental reforms, on the other hand, are those that aim to transform and alter permanently those very same

institutional structures. The premise behind fundamental reforms is that basic structures are irremediably flawed and need a complete overhaul, not renovations"(p.228).

Cuban (1992) further contended that neither can be accomplished without adequate professional development. "Never before has there been a greater recognition of the importance of professional development for teachers. Every proposal to reform, restructure, or transform schools emphasizes professional development as the primary vehicle in efforts to bring about needed change"(Guskey, 1994, p. 42). Although the need for reform and changes in education is of vital importance, Fullan (1991) pointed out that "The implementation of educational change involves 'change in practice.' Real change involves changes in conceptions and role behavior, which is why it is so difficult to achieve... changes in actual practice along the three dimensions—in materials, teaching approaches, and beliefs, in what people do and think are essential if the intended outcome is to be achieved" (p. 37).

Along with the reform movement came the changing roles of teachers and school leaders. McDiarmid (1995) described the changing roles of teachers: Learning new instructional roles in the classroom is only part of what teachers must do to realize the reform. Teachers must also assume new roles *outside* the classroom. When many of today's teachers chose the profession, expectations-although always high-were modest compared to those embodied in the reform. Generally, teachers were expected to follow the directives of their principal and the school board, teach the curriculum supplied by the district, honor local values, and keep parents informed of their children's performance. The official curriculum—consisting primarily of information and procedures that teachers were supposed to ensure that students remembered—posed modest intellectual

challenge. Most of what teachers were expected to teach was the same information and procedures they themselves had learned as students. Student learning was assessed with standardized, multiple-choice tests that might or might not cover what teachers actually taught (p. 6).

School Leadership

An area of focus that warrants attention is that of the changing leadership role of principals in the teacher evaluation and professional growth processes. "The principal is the key person in determining whether a school succeeds. Good principals are focused on instruction and student learning" (Sparks, 2002, p. 7-1). The role of the principal has taken on new dimensions; "they are asked to give up 'command-and-control' views of leadership and to be instructional leaders steeped in curriculum, instruction, and assessment who can coach, teach, develop, and distribute leadership to those in their charge" (Sparks, 2002, p. 7-2). "Leadership is commitment; leadership is having wisdom; leadership is possessing a sense of mission" (Caulfield, 1989. p.13). Heifetz (1994), citing Burns, indicated that leadership should be adaptive work. "Adaptive work consists of the learning required to address conflicts in the values people hold, or diminish the gap between the values people stand for and the reality they face. Adaptive work requires a change in values, beliefs, or behaviors" (p. 22).

Many experts agree that the principal has a great impact on the culture of the school and the effectiveness of a school (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Fullan, 1991; Joyce & Showers, 2002). According to Davis et al. (2002), schools that embrace leadership density promote the use of teacher performance evaluation systems that:

1. Encourage collaborative group engagement
2. Enhance opportunities to improve student learning

3. Define and discuss processes for improving student achievement
4. Support positive organizational change
5. Create greater program coherence
6. Build strong professional relationships that strengthen leadership density and strengthen individual and collective efficiency beliefs.

Principals need to have a positive relationship with their teachers in order to initiate the evaluation in a manner conducive to professional practice. The teacher-principal relationship becomes a significant factor in supporting the evaluator's use to promote professional growth (Rowe, 2000). "To promote a sense of accomplishment, principals should help teachers track and evaluate their own growth by inquiring about changes they have implemented in their teaching practices and changes they have noted in their students' motivation and achievement. And, they should model for their faculties the process of being a learner, by participating either as a member of a building learning team or as a member of district leadership learning teams" (Chappuis, Chappuis & Stiggins, 2009, p. 59).

The newly revised Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 (CCSSO, 2008) recognizes the changing role of the school leader. "Research now shows that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among school-based factors that influence student outcomes. Effective leaders can enhance teachers' performance by providing targeted support, modeling best practice, and offering intellectual stimulation" (p. 9).

Sergiovanni (1996) contended that "purpose and vision should be socially useful, should serve the common good, should meet the needs of followers, and should elevate to a higher moral voice" (p. 94). He further emphasized that "moral authority allows the

schools as community to speak to teachers, students, and parents as a moral voice" (p. 57). Bolman and Deal (2003) supported the construct of moral leadership and moral discourse as vital elements of the organization: [Leaders] can and should take a moral stance; can make their values clear, hold employees accountable, and validate the need for dialogue about ethical choices" (p.219). Also, "...leaders...serve a deeper, more powerful, and more durable function if they are models and catalysts for such values as excellence, caring, justice, and faith" (p. 408).

Standards-based reform focused on accountability of both teachers and school leaders. School leaders began to take on a new role-instructional leadership. The reform led to new roles for teachers and administrators, as related to the evaluation of teaching to the standards and assessing student learning. "The increase in calls for equity and excellence in schools demands higher levels of accountability from all school personnel, including principals who perform supervisory functions" (Ovando, 2005, p. 171). As comprehensive teacher evaluation systems have been created to improve teaching and learning, new expectations and proposals for principals' leadership have also emerged (Ovando & Ramirez, 2007). Ovando (2005) conducted an action research study with aspiring school leaders. Her goal was to afford the participants the opportunity to engage in hands-on experience of the teacher evaluation process. Her findings indicate that the experience was a practical one and had the potential to build the instructional leadership capacity of the participants. This study focused on teacher feedback that was timely and constructive.

Constructive feedback is critical in influencing teacher behavior. Frase (1992) pointed out that "feedback has too often been inaccurate, shallow and at times mean-spirited, rather than helpful and uplifting" (p. 179). When an evaluation fails to motivate

a mediocre teacher to improve, it will not inspire a good teacher on to excellence (Marshall, 2005). Without quality feedback to inform teaching, a teacher's independent creation of meaningful goals for his or her own professional growth probably will not happen (Feeney, 2007).

Nelson and Sassi (2000) found that principals tended not to delve deeply into issues of content-specific pedagogy. Instead, principals focused classroom observations on teaching processes that were more generic. Research stresses the importance of training for evaluators. In a study conducted of 100 school districts, Loup, Garland, Ellett and Rugatt (1996) found evaluator training lacking, and few districts reported practices that included performance standards or orientation for evaluators.

Although teachers are asked to set goals for one or two specific elements in the domains on which they are evaluated, written feedback is seldom specifically tied to the standards. Maintaining a focus on the evaluation standards beyond the goal setting process could help to more directly link goal-setting, evaluation feedback, and overall improvement in the teacher evaluation system (Halverson, Kelley & Kimball, 2004).

The necessity and importance of the school leader in the role of instructional leader is evident in the Commission on NCLB's report to Congress. One recommendation to Congress calls for "enhancing school leadership by establishing a definition of a Highly Effective Principal (HEP)" (Thompson & Barnes, 2007, p. 50). This requires principals to obtain certification or licensure as required in their state, demonstrate the necessary skills for effectively leading a school and, most importantly, produce improvements in student achievement that are comparable to high-achieving schools made up of similar children with similar challenges (Thompson & Barnes, 2007, p. 51). The literature indicates that the school leader has a pivotal role in the overall

improvement of the school, teacher practices, and student outcomes. While this may be true, some suggest that, "liberating principals to do the right kind of work is one of the most important aspects a school district can take..." (Marshall, 2005, p. 735).

Both research on school reform and practical knowledge of what it takes to run a successful school have pointed to the importance of administrators to school success. Research on the roles of the principals in effective schools, school improvement, restructuring, instructional improvement, and standards-based reform, all support a need for well-prepared leaders. Principals are key to initiating, implementing, and sustaining high-quality schools (Kelley & Peterson, as cited in The Jossey-Bass Reader on Educational Leadership, 2007, pg. 356).

In 2004, in a quantitative study, Katz examined the attributes of principals who have become effective change agents in their schools. His study included 78 principals in three northern New Jersey counties in both Abbott and affluent districts. Twenty-seven research-based attributes of effective principals were identified. These attributes formed the basis of the researcher developed Likert Scale survey. In addition to looking at the identified attributes, Katz (2004) compared the skills and attributes of male and female successful principals as change agents. Male and female successful principals identified similar skills and attributes as important to being successful change agents.

His findings show that an overwhelming percentage of the respondents (96.2% - 98%) identified nine major skill areas that they deemed essential for principals as successful change agents. These are: Identify and Analyze Problems; Make Decisions; Communicate Orally; Generate a Clear Vision: Motivate others; Generate Trust; Interpersonal Skills; Monitor Progress; and Evaluate Progress. These findings support the literature in that, when the change process begins with a clear understanding of the

proposed change and ends with the need for principals to build capacity of their staff and to implement appropriate staff development opportunities (Covey, 1990), effective and sustaining change occurs.

Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2003) created a balanced leadership framework based on quantitative analysis of 30 years of research, an exhaustive review of theoretical literature on leadership, and the research team's more than 100 years of combined professional wisdom on school leadership (p.2). They identified 21 leadership responsibilities that are significantly associated with student achievement. These responsibilities were organized as a "knowledge taxonomy: Experiential knowledge - knowing why this is important; Declarative knowledge - knowing what to do; Procedural knowledge - knowing how to do it; and Conceptual knowledge - knowing when to do it" p.13). The authors contended that "The meta-analysis gives us 21 research-based responsibilities and associated practices that are significantly associated with student achievement" (p.13). They continued: "We believe the McRel balanced leadership framework is the most comprehensive, rigorous, and useful integration of research and theory into a practical format available to education leaders today. McRel's framework is not a silver bullet. It can become, however, a tool that will help leaders and leadership teams add value to the work of all stakeholders to improve student achievement" (p.14).

The important role of the principal in facilitating meaningful change in a school is well established. "The best way for principals to fulfill that role is by creating conditions which promote the growth and development of the professionals within their schools" (Dufour & Berkey, 1995, p. 2). Ernest Boyer (as cited in Sparks, 1984) noted: "When you talk about school improvement, you are talking about people. That's the only way to improve schools... The school is people, so when we talk about excellence or

improvement or progress, we're talking about the people who make up the building" (p. 9). Fullan (1993) (as cited in Dufour & Berkey, 1995) shared this view and recognized the importance of the individuals in an organization: "Focusing on people is the most effective way to change any organization. In fact, it can be argued that organizations do not change only, individuals change. It is only when enough of the people within an organization change that the organization can be transformed" (p.2).

In his book, *The Six Secrets of Change*, Fullan (2008) identified six areas (secrets) of focus that are necessary for leaders to affect lasting and sustaining change: love your employees, connect peers with purpose, capacity building prevails, learning in the work, transparency rules, and systems learn. He pointed out that "One of the ways you love your employees is by creating the conditions for them to succeed. It is helping all employees find meaning, increased skill development, and personal satisfaction in making contributions that simultaneously fulfill their own goals and the goals of the organization" (p.25). Sparks (2007) agreed: "Significant changes must occur in what leaders think (depth of understanding and beliefs), say (both the content and form of our speech), and do (a continuous flow of powerful actions within a culture of interpersonal accountability)" (p. xvii). Sparks narrowed his focus to specifically address the principal as leader. "Skillful leadership by principals…is essential if quality teaching is to occur in all classrooms. An essential part of such leadership is the creation of a performance-oriented culture that has professional learning and collaboration at its core" (Sparks, 2007, p. 111). "The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers" (Fullan, 2008, p. 23).

Bulach and Peterson (1999) reported a study conducted to investigate the levels of openness that exist between teachers and their principal. The authors concluded, based

on their assessment of the leadership skills of 51 aspiring school leaders, that over 50% have weaknesses in the human relations area. Sergiovanni (1992) also stressed the importance of human relations in school culture and climate.

Leading and teaching with integrity comes first when administrators are open and honest with themselves; and secondly, when they are able to move those barriers that keep them from being authentic and revealing themselves to others. Bolman and Deal (2001), in *Leading with Soul*, suggested that leadership first begins with a connection to the heart and not with management skills. The more leaders are seen as being authentic and able to live in harmony with their moral and spiritual beliefs, the more they will be perceived as being open and trustworthy (p. 11).

Ovando and Ramirez (2007) conducted a study to identify principals' instructional leadership actions within a comprehensive teacher evaluation system in successful schools. Participants included six school administrators within the same school district. Three were principals and three assistant principals, representing all three levels of schools - elementary, middle, and secondary. Three main common instructional leadership actions emerged from the data. These included setting clear expectations to clarify the process and activities expected during the year, monitoring instruction through walk-through observations with immediate feedback, and connecting teacher's performance evaluation data to professional development. The findings indicate that "the instructional leadership actions of principals associated with teacher evaluation aim at enhancing teachers' instructional capacity to make sure that all students are successful and therefore, their instructional leadership actions are, student centered" (Ovando & Ramirez, 2007, p. 108).

Summary - School Leadership

Research supports the connection between leaders who displayed instructional leadership behaviors and school effectiveness and improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Fullan, 1991; Joyce & Showers, 1995). Fullan (as cited in Sparks, 2003) suggested that school leaders might begin by stressing the importance of teachers as learners, that helping teachers understand that improving practice by acquiring new knowledge and skills is a professional obligation, and that the work of becoming a great teacher is a career long endeavor. "Principals don't just set the tone and climate of the building – they also influence the overall culture in which everything else operates" (Chappuis et al., 2009. p.59).

Evaluations

The related literature indicates that in the past the results from teacher evaluations were often not used to benefit practice. "While there is a tremendous amount of effort put into evaluation by supervisors in many boards, we cannot really say that the results are used to any great effect. Personnel files are filled with thousands of reports that are never really used once they have been written. In addition to the better use of appraisals to help individuals improve, they could be used to inform decisions about changes in board goals, objectives, and structures" (Lawton, Hickcox, Leithwood & Musella, 1988, p. 40). Marshall (2005) argued that "The theory of action behind supervision and evaluation is flawed and the conventional process rarely changes what teachers do in their classrooms" (p. 724). He offered an alternative theory: The engine that drives high student achievement is teacher teams working collaboratively toward common curriculum expectations and using interim assessments to continuously improve teaching and attend to students who are not successful" (p. 724). Dufour & Berkey (1995),

Schmoker (1999), Reeves (2004), and Wiggins & McTighe (2005) have agreed that this approach is a critical element in high achievement. Marshall (2005) contended that "If a school adopts this theory, it must change the way teachers are supervised and evaluated. If it doesn't, the principal won't have the time, energy, and insight to get the engine started and monitor it during each school year" (p. 731).

Evaluation should serve two needs: accountability (summative) and improvement (formative) (McGreal, 1983; Stronge, 1997; Danielson & McGreal, 2000), but one system cannot effectively satisfy both the purposes of evaluation. Many states are creating dual or multipurpose systems to address this concern (McColskey & Egelson, 1993). Although summative teacher evaluations are required by local and state mandates, formative evaluations are not (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Duke & Stiggins, 1986; Danielson & McGreal, 2000). The question, then, is, How does formative evaluation contribute to sustained continuing professional growth of teachers? Is the formative evaluation used, as the research indicates, to improve identified areas of weakness and to enhance areas of strength (Clark, 1993; Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; McGreal, 1982; Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985)?

Kelley and Maslow (2005) contended that "Teacher evaluation systems ideally should foster improvement in both professional development opportunities and teaching practices" (p. 1). Even as national, state, and district standards require, no matter the cycle, teacher evaluations, many still adhere to what Toch (2008) called "drive-by" evaluations. "The typical teacher evaluation in public education consists of a single, fleeting classroom visit by a principal or other building administrator untrained in evaluation who wields a checklist of classroom conditions and teacher behaviors that often don't focus directly on the quality of instruction" (p. 32). This type of evaluation

process does not lend itself to facilitating the evaluator's ability to adequately capture the true essence of the teacher. As Kelley and Maslow (2005) indicated, "...Evaluations may present an inaccurate view of teacher performance, especially with respect to standards-based instruction" (p. 1). They contended that conditions that compromise the ability of evaluation to enhance teaching practice include:

1. Limitations in supervisor competency;
2. Inadequate time for observation and feedback;
3. Lack of teacher/administration understanding and acceptance.
4. Narrow conceptions of teaching
5. Lack of clarity about evaluation criteria;
6. Classroom observations that are subject to evaluator preferences;
7. Conflicts between the roles of evaluator as instructional leader and staff supervisor; and
8. Principals' lack of content-specific knowledge, resulting in evaluation feedback that focuses on general behaviors, such as delivery, rather than on content-specific pedagogy (p. 1).

The goal of teaching is to cause an increase in knowledge, and teacher evaluation may be the prime factor in this achievement – not so much by seeing if the teacher is teaching, but by seeing how the teacher can become a better teacher. Teacher evaluation should be a driving force in selecting staff development topics (Clark, 1993). Newton and Braithwaite (1988) found that teachers saw little actual purpose in evaluations, though the teachers' perceptions placed a high value on evaluations. Teachers felt that evaluations, while assessing their abilities, must lead to feedback and improvement in their own profession. Beerens (2000) argued that, rather than having a performance

appraisal focus solely on competency, principals should use the tool to guide all teachers through professional growth.

As noted elsewhere, the evaluation process plays a powerful role in developing and nurturing a teacher's instructional capacity, which, in turn, contributes to students' academic successes (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 2002). According to Glickman (2002), "The teacher evaluation helps provide a forum, structure, and plan for teachers and evaluators on which to reflect, change, and assess professional practice" (as cited in Feeney, 2007, p. 191). An important variable of the teacher evaluation process is quality feedback. "Feedback refers to relevant information provided to those engaged in the teaching-learning process regarding their performance so that they may introduce modifications, correct errors or engage in professional development that will lead to enhanced teaching and learning" (Ovando, 2005, p. 173). The goal of the feedback is to improve the effectiveness of teaching and promote professional growth (Feeney, 2007). To satisfy this goal, the feedback should:

1. be based on descriptive observable date (Danielson & McGreal, 2000);
2. provide characteristics of effective teaching (Danielson, 1996; Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001); and
3. promote reflective inquiry and self-directness to foster improvements in teaching supported by evidence of student learning (Glickman, 2002)

Teacher feedback should and must be timely. Marshall (2005) argued that evaluators need to "Give teachers prompt, face-to-face feedback after every classroom visit. Teachers should not be left in the dark about what the principal thinks" (p. 728).

Follow-up talks are most effective when they happen within 24 hours: "Better 120 seconds of feedback the same day than a five-page essay delivered a month later," according to Douglas Reeves (2004) (as cited in Marshall, p. 733).

Traditionally, teacher evaluation systems did not focus on teacher practices and student outcomes. Also, supervision connoted authority, control, and hierarchy. However, as a result of recent shifts in the purpose and the process of teacher evaluation, several different forms of evaluation are taking shape. One such form is the use of teacher professional portfolios as an evaluative tool. According to Doolittle (1994), as a form of authentic assessment, teacher portfolios may play a major role in the overall evaluation of a teacher. The portfolio can be used as a means of authentic assessment in evaluating effectiveness of a teacher for licensure and/or employment decisions. It can also be used to provide feedback to teachers so that they may improve their teaching and level of professionalism (p.2).

Sally L. Zepeda (2002), a proponent of teacher portfolios, conducted a two-year study in one elementary school. She indicated that the study was deliberately narrow in order to highlight how the portfolio was linked to the process of supervision and what the principal did to maintain the momentum for ongoing shifts in practices. The first year was devoted to studying the portfolio-planning process; the portfolio procedure was inaugurated during the second year. The portfolio was voluntary, except for teachers with less than three years of employment. Participants could opt out of the process at any time.

A review of the year's results revealed a number of benefits attributed to the processes of developing the portfolio, the interaction between portfolio mentor pairings, and classroom observations. Processes that had the most impact on teacher development

included artifact analysis through reflection and feedback. At the end of the year, teachers shared their portfolios with the principal. The teachers led the conferences.

One teacher explained:

> I felt responsible for my own learning, and my efforts to grow were being affirmed. We usually have an obligatory conference with the principal at the end of the year, but this [conference] was different....I felt listened to... I wasn't forced to politely sit and listen to what someone else was saying (p. 99).

The portfolio development reasonably can provide the link between supervision and adult learning theory by fostering the consciousness that "occurs as a result of reflecting critically about what influences behavior or changes in practice" (Zepeda, 2002, p. 88).

Principals and supervisors struggle to meet all the accountability mandates. Although teacher evaluation is a given, research shows that clinical supervision as teacher evaluation, with its implication of remote control of teaching, began to lose its prominence in 1980s when the focus shifted to more viable means of teacher evaluation. Manatt (1997) noted that "Teaching is so complex, interactive, and contingent that script tapes and time lines...did not result in valid measures of practitioners" (p. 2). The School Improvement Model research team at Iowa State University's College of Education noted that most teacher evaluation models ignored the most important question: Do students learn? The team concluded that different approaches were needed for different classes of employees. As a result, they concluded that producing feedback from all directions for teachers provided the same 360-degree feedback for principals and superintendents (Manatt, 1997, p. 2).

This form of evaluation requires feedback from all stakeholders - principals, peers, students, and parents. According to Manatt, this form of evaluation allows more time for principals and supervisors to focus on the business of schools, since the 360-degree process is done once a year. Its aim is to give teachers practical and informative feedback on their practices and professional growth goals. He cited a five-year study of 360-degree feedback in Hot Springs County School District in Thermopolis, Wyoming, that identified a 15% increase in achievement across all subjects measured by the SRA standardized tests. These gains occurred over the period, with no decline in morale among teachers and principals due to the ironclad accountability of 360-degree feedback (p. 1). These alternative methods of teacher evaluation show promise; however, they are not yet in the mainstream.

Some studies have been done that examine teacher evaluation and student achievement. A large study was conducted by Linda Darling-Hammond (2002), who used data from 50 states to examine the ways in which teacher qualifications and other school inputs are related to student achievement. The author maintained that, according to the finding, both "qualitative and quantitative analysis suggest that policy investment in the quality of teachers may be related to improvements in student performance" (Darling-Hammond, 2000, p. 1). These findings appear to be in agreement with other studies that found the "effects of well-prepared teachers on student achievement can be stronger than the influences of student background factors, such as poverty, language background, and minority status" (Darling-Hammond, p.39).

In a study conducted in Washoe County, Nevada, by Geoffrey D. Borman and Steven M. Kimball (2005), 400 teachers and achievement results for over 7,000 students were rated against a standards-based evaluation tool. The findings indicated that teacher

quality is not distributed equitably among classrooms. Lower-achieving students tended to be in classrooms with teachers who received low ratings on the standards-based rating. The study further pointed out that better teachers may be assigned, and seek out assignments, to classrooms with more advantaged, nonminority, and high-achieving students. This inequality could represent an important mechanism that systematically constricts the educational opportunities offered to students from less-advantaged backgrounds.

The suggestion here is that, although these two sets of teachers may be similar in quality, those who taught in classes with low-achieving students might be rated lower by the evaluator based on the perception that the teacher is less effective. This is true for the teacher who teaches in the classroom with high-achieving students. Borman and Kimball (2005) found that school context plays an important role in teacher performance, in that "limited school organizational capacity, or lack of strong professional culture, can also constrain the performance of good teachers in high-poverty, high-minority, and low-achieving schools" (p.17).

A major study that looked at teacher practices and student achievement was done by Guillermina Jauregui (2006). This study was one of 15 done in a cohort throughout California. Jauregui thoroughly outlined the impact of NCLB on the State of California and the need for a statewide evaluation system. The study examined the practices and school programs that contributed to success in an urban high school. The school in the study exceeded its API goals for 3 consecutive years, and gained California Distinguished School Status, AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) certification and a six-year WASC FOL (Western Association of Schools and Colleges Focus on Learning) accreditation. The author found that California used the summative

evaluation practice, called Stull Evaluation, without correlating to student achievement. The findings showed that the formative evaluation process was more effective in changing teacher practices (Jauregui, 2006). Though this study has some relevance to the study that is the subject of this dissertation, the following study is more closely related to it.

In 2001, Steven Kimball examined two schools that had implemented a standards-based evaluation system modeled on the Danielson model, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. One school was completing its third year of implementation, while the other was completing its first. The study focused on two main areas, the process of new program design, implementation, and program structures. The second area was participants' perceptions of the evaluation system. A detailed description of the model and its components is included in that paper.

Kimball concluded that the implementation of the new evaluation changed the nature of teacher evaluation in the districts studied. Further, teachers and administrators generally understood the evaluation system and its standards. The participants largely agreed that the system has enhanced feedback, and that it appropriately focused on teacher growth and accountability. As a whole, teachers have yet to see the system's substantially influencing dialog about instruction outside of the evaluation setting, or their own professional growth, teaching, and student achievement (Kimball, 2001, p.203).

The findings of the study noted that one school appeared to have less difficulty with implementation than the other. The author attributed this to the possibility that one district received more extensive training on the use of the model. Kimball suggested that further study should be conducted on the way that these evaluation systems impact the evaluation process and outcomes relating to instructional change and student

achievement. In this study, I examined the variable of training on the model in the study of the four New Jersey high schools.

Teachers' and school leaders' attitudes and perceptions about the evaluation process need to be considered, because what teachers and administrators perceive about the value of evaluations can inform state and local policy on effective formative evaluation on teacher performance.

Doherty (2009) studied the perceptions of 170 teachers and 14 administrators in a Massachusetts suburban school district of the effectiveness of a standards-based teacher evaluation system used in that district. The findings showed that high school teachers had mixed perceptions about the impact that the teacher evaluation system has had on changing teaching practices. Also, the teachers "did not see the teacher evaluation system as having an effect on professional growth; rather it was other external factors such as district professional development offerings, state and federal certification requirements, and contractual salary incentives" (p. 237). Administrators in this study perceived that the standards-based teacher evaluation process has positively changed teaching, most notably in the areas of technology, use of educational objectives, and as a tool for new teachers. High school administrators indicated that professional growth is driven by federal and state recertification requirements, as well as contractual incentives. (p. 235).

In 1994, the National Center for Educational Statistics conducted a study that found that 89% of teachers believed that their last performance evaluation provided an accurate assessment of their teaching performance, and 74% thought their last evaluation had been useful for improving classroom instruction.

Rindler (1994) sought to examine the perceptions of teachers of evaluation systems that promote teacher growth. The revised TEP was used to gather data from 222 teachers. Interviews were conducted to explain the findings. The findings indicated the following attributes as having the most significant impact on teacher growth: usefulness, suggestions and persuasiveness of rationale provided by evaluators, credibility and level of trust of the evaluator, evaluator's capacity to model suggestions, quality of the ideas and specificity of information presented in feedback, amount of information contained in the feedback, time spent on the evaluation, evaluation focused on standards that were clear and endorsed by the teacher, role of the evaluation (summative or formative), and teacher's prior evaluation experience.

Anecdotal evidence gleaned through interviews explained the findings. Rindler (1994) concluded that the attributes of feedback and the evaluator were perceived as the most significant attributes of the evaluation process that lead to teacher growth.

Argotsinger (2002) investigated a performance-based teacher evaluation system and its impact on facilitating teacher growth in Missouri. The findings indicated that teachers perceived that certain practices facilitated their professional growth. These practices include professional dialogue, collaboration, self-reflection, feedback, risk-taking, and goal-oriented development plans. This study has significant implications, because empirical research on teacher evaluation has shown relationships between teacher performance on evaluations and student achievement. Additionally, teacher evaluation has the potential to increase student achievement by encouraging the teacher to use effective teaching strategies (Logue-Belden, 2008; Danielson, 2001; Darling-Hammond et al., 1999; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF], 1996; Tucker & Stronge, 2005).

Conversely, Bastarache (2000) found, in a study of three Massachusetts urban school districts, that principals and teachers do not agree that teacher evaluations improve teacher practices in instruction. The teachers felt their evaluations had little or no influence on improving their performance in the classroom. According to Zepeda and Ponticell (1998), teachers need to feel some degree of freedom to move into action.

Natriello (1984) found that teachers viewed evaluations as a way for building administrators to wield control over classroom instruction and dictate what and how to teach. Newton and Braithwaite (1988) also found that teachers perceive evaluations as bureaucratic control by administrators.

Ovando and Harris (1993) reported the findings of a study conducted with 109 teachers. The study's focus was to clarify teachers' perceptions associated with the postobservation conference. Based on the findings, the researchers concluded that teachers perceived the postobservation conference as a vehicle for providing feedback and constructive criticism, which are key components of formative evaluation. Teachers' perceptions support an open, collaborative relationship for the purpose of achieving quality teaching for successful learning, stressing the importance of the postobservation conference (Peters, 1989).

Gordon, Meadows and Dyal (1995) studied 148 practicing principals in three states to ascertain the principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of formal classroom observations procedures in improving instruction. Using a quantitative approach, the researchers found that, in terms of classroom effectiveness, formal classroom observation is a valuable tool (McGreal, 1983) used by principals to measure teaching effectiveness. According to Duke and Stiggins (1986), "the goal of observations is to obtain a representative sample of teacher performance from which to draw conclusions about

teacher competence" (p. 28). The majority of the principals in this study perceived that formal observations provide some degree of effectiveness in improving their school's instructional program (Gordon et al., 1995). An effective formal observation process constitutes a critical element of the school's overall instructional program (Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990).

Summary - Evaluations

The teacher evaluation process may be one of the most effective ways to improve student performance. In order to do so, teachers must perceive the process as helpful, unbiased, and worthwhile. A review of the research literature indicated an emphasis on the importance of a supportive environment in the success of a teacher evaluation system. School cultures focused on teaching and learning for all, collaboration between teachers and reflection on practice benefited the outcomes of teacher evaluation. Danielson and McGreal (2000), Peterson (2000), and Stronge (2000) indicated that the essential contexts of teacher evaluation include: attending to the climate of a school and the nature of ongoing professional development as a contributor to effective evaluation; attending to the sociology of teacher evaluation; promoting connections between evaluation and school improvement, professional development and student learning; and understanding the role of the principal as an instructional leader.

The research findings indicate that many teachers and administrators perceive the formative evaluation, when done with improvement or enhancement as the goal, as a powerful tool for influencing teacher professional growth practices toward student achievement. The research findings on teachers' perceptions indicate that a majority of teachers believed that the supervisor's knowledge of technical aspects of teaching, experience in classrooms, and ability to provide and model useful suggestions are very

important (Colby, 2002). According to Heneman and Milanowski (2003), a standards-based teacher evaluation system is a complex one that demands evaluation. "Evaluation data is crucial to guide changes in implementation of the system. Through the development of such data and sharing of it, standards-based evaluation systems may grow in importance and become not just an evaluation system, but a key tool for driving improvement in teacher competency and student learning" (p. 193).

On March 1, 2011, the New Jersey *Educator Effectiveness Task Force Report* was released. The task force was formed as a result of an executive order from New Jersey Governor Chris Christie as part of his educational reform initiative in New Jersey. The report outlines recommendations for a new statewide assessment system for teachers and principals. In September 2011, pilot implementation of the new teacher evaluation system will begin in selected schools and all state recipient schools of the School Improvement Grant (SIG).

Professional Development

As noted elsewhere in this paper, professional development "should be planned to include differentiated activities that take into account adult learning styles and the level of expertise of the participants" (Racek, 2008, p. 93). Historically, professional development was, and in many cases, still is, developed by school leaders without involving stakeholders – the teachers - to voice an opinion in developing and implementing professional development. Years of research conducted in the area of effective professional development has not had a sustaining influence on schools in implementation of effective practices. Accountability requires that, in order for student performance to change, schools must change and teachers must change. Sparks and Hirsh (1997) agreed: "America cannot climb past its current achievement plateau without

educating teachers, administrators and other educators in what they need to reach the higher levels" (p. 35).

As school leaders are faced with the inevitable NCLB and high-stakes testing, determining the content, context, and process to implement professional development is key to the success of professional development (Spicer, 2008). The role of the principal is vital in the development and implementation of effective schoolwide professional development. While school leaders need to engage themselves more in the area of professional development, research shows that many principals see their involvement in professional development as a secondary concern (Dufour, 1991). School leaders need to realize that their involvement is the catalyst for effective change through professional development.

Although research-based evidence indicates that teacher development has an invaluable impact on student learning and achievement and is considered an essential mechanism for school reform (Darling-Hammond et al., 1999), widespread effective professional development practices have failed to materialize for most teachers, schools, and districts. However, a large enough body of knowledge exists so that any school district can successfully engage in professional development practices that will support the learning, growth and achievement of staff and students (Joyce & Showers, 2002).

While there have been many studies about the impact of professional development on teacher effectiveness and student achievement, their recommendations seem to fall short on bringing about the anticipated changes in practice (Guskey, 2000; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Killion, 2002; Loucks-Horsley, 1996; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Sparks & Hirsch, 2000). Unfortunately, according to Guskey (2002), "A lot of good things are done in the name of professional

development, but so are a lot of rotten things"(p. 51). Schmoker (2006) pointed out that professional development practices implemented in an effective manner can have an impact on school improvement, teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Professional development may improve how current resources are being spent; and send a message to teachers that their professional growth is valued and important (Mathers, Olivia & Laine 2008).

Racek (2008) examined teachers' perceptions concerning the impact of professional development as presented in their school and across the school district. Using the NSDC SAI questionnaire to collect data, his findings support the literature, in that "there are differences that can be associated with specific knowledge of existing standards that have been developed for staff development" (p. 92). Two-thirds of the participating teachers indicated that they did not have any knowledge of the NSDC Standards for Staff Development. Further, teachers who had knowledge of the NSDC Standards perceived professional development practices in their schools as being more effective. These results reflect the statement in the forward to the NSDC Standards Revised (2001) that the greatest challenges lay ahead. In the ensuing years since the revised standards were introduced, the majority of the educators in this study were not aware that these standards exist to provide a framework to increase the responsiveness and effectiveness of staff development activities.

This study adds to the growing body of literature that emphasizes the vital importance of professional activities for teachers aimed at student achievement. It also adds to the importance of evaluation of professional development activities, specifically the work of Guskey (2002) and Killion (2002). Their extensive research and practical applications demonstrate how important evaluations are to staff development of any size

or setting (Racek, 2008). Learning how to effectively evaluate staff development activities can enable the district to determine the impact on achievement that can be attributed to the actual professional development.

In a study of 211 teachers, Spicer (2008) sought to give voice to those who are least likely to have a voice in the types of professional development activities offered in their schools. In order to maintain anonymity of the school district under study, she reported the findings under the pseudonym, October Morning Ranch, a southeastern city school district of 428 teachers. Through a survey instrument and one open-ended question, Spicer (2008) was able to gather information based on teachers' perceptions about professional development in their schools. This study allowed teachers to give voice to their perceptions. The following statements are representative of the findings as expressed in the teachers' words:

> *"If OMR really wants for its teachers to develop professionally, it should pay all the expenses for graduate-level professional development courses. Paying for only 40% of one class a year does not show commitment to teacher professional development."*
>
> *"Professional development should include dialogue, not just being talked at. Teachers should be encouraged to talk, share and observe constantly other professionals."*
>
> *"Because of high stakes testing, some principals are extremely reluctant to allow teachers to attend professional development opportunities that are offered outside of the school system. Teachers are told that they need to be in their classroom rather than attend conferences. Teachers want to increase their level of expertise, but are not allowed."*

"It seems like the teachers' opinions are discounted and that there are few people making decisions for the majority. This leaves teachers feeling like they have no say-so in what and how they teach. This lack of empowerment leads to frustration and apathy."

"Stop spouting random buzzwords and micromanaging classroom instructions. Look at teachers' efficacy BEFORE telling individual teachers to change what they are doing. Try actually teaching a class before telling someone else what they heard or read somewhere. Stop finger-pointing and lead by example."

"Those teachers who are allowed to attend conferences tend to be the gifted specialists or a selected chosen few among the staff. Teachers who teach the on-or-below-grade classes often are discounted and do not feel that the professional development activities are geared toward their level of learners. Stop playing favorites with professional development so everyone can get quality information."

"Allow time for teachers to process what they have in the classroom, on their computers, and with other teachers" (p.78).

Having teachers who value the knowledge they receive, believe in their professional development, and demonstrate learning through their daily routines will ultimately be reflected in student outcomes and achievement (Spicer, 2008). The teachers' authentic voices clearly support the research and literature (Fullan, 2001; Sparks, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 1990; Dufour, 1991; Guskey, 1994; and Joyce & Showers, 1995), in that effective professional development must be comprised of the following components:

1. needs assessments/empowerment;
2. principal as instructional leader;
3. sustainability;
4. active learning, engaging, and high-quality quality professional development;
5. opportunities to learn new content and instructional strategies;
6. collaboration and reflection among educators;
7. differentiated professional development for content, learning style, and for adult learners; and
8. evaluate professional development.

Moore (2002) conducted a study of 224 teachers' and 23 administrators' perceptions regarding the NJ Professional Development initiative. The findings, at that time, indicated "considerable disjuncture between what teachers value and what they do in the area of professional development" (p. 156). The findings reinforce the idea that one size does not fit all, and professional development should be tailored to teacher needs in order to bolster teacher personal growth and organizational change. Moore found "widespread disagreement regarding the potential impact of this initiative to enhance teacher capacity in New Jersey" (p.157). New Jersey's professional development program still requires teachers to obtain 100 hours of professional activities within a five-year period. This was a concern in Moore's study, because initially there were no clear guidelines to indicate what activities were to be counted in the 100 hours. According to Moore, professional development was simply a "compliance vehicle" with teachers "playing it safe and accruing workshop hours in order to accumulate the 100 hours" (p. 158). The focus was not on personal professional growth.

In the late 80s and early 90s, a different model of professional development emerged—the professional development school (PDS). Profitt, Madden, Wittman and Field (2004) highlighted the Towson Professional Development School Network. Since the inception of the program in 1994, it has grown from one school to 80 schools in several districts in the Washington, DC, and Baltimore, MD, areas. The program was identified by the Maryland State Department of Education in 1997 as "State Leader in Professional Development Schools." Other names attributed to this form of professional development are "Clinical Schools" and "Professional Practice Schools".

Darling-Hammond (1994) summarized the goals of PDS:

> PDS aim to provide new models of teacher education and development by serving as exemplars of practice, builders of knowledge, and vehicles for communicating professional understanding among teacher educators, novices, and veteran teachers. They support the learning of prospective teachers and beginning teachers by creating settings in which novices enter professional practice working with expert practitioners, enabling veteran teachers to renew professional development and assume new roles as mentors, university adjuncts, and teacher leaders. They allow school and university educators to engage jointly in research and rethinking of practice, thus creating an opportunity for the profession to expand its knowledge base by putting research into practice - and practice into research (p.3).

At its 2008 Annual Conference, the National Association for Professional Development Schools released a policy statement, entitled *What It Means to Be a Professional Development School.* The statement was an outgrowth of concern that the term *PDS* was being used as a catchall for various models of school-university

partnerships that may or may not be best described as PDS. The policy statement emphasizes nine essentials, or fundamental qualities, of a Professional Development School. These nine essentials are:

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools, and by potential extension, the broader community.
2. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;
3. A school-university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;
4. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
5. A *shared* commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
6. Engagement in, and public sharing of, the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;
7. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;

8. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;
9. Work by college/university faculty and P-12 faculty in formal roles across institutional setting; and
10. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures (p. 1).

The NAPDS Executive Council and Board of Directors have asserted that these nine essentials are integral to the philosophies, policies, and processes of Professional Development School partnerships (NAPDS, 2008). Although this form of professional development holds promise, it has not taken on widespread implementation in the greater New Jersey area.

Yet, one such school, the Harold Wilson Professional Development School (PDS), was established in 1991 in the district of this study. It was formed in partnership with the Teachers' Union and Montclair State University. As the literature and research suggest, it is important that evaluation of program be an ongoing component of professional development (Guskey & Sparks, 1996). Just as assessing students in the classroom is important to gauge effective teaching, assessing professional development programs can provide an insight into improving programs (Loucks-Horsley, 1996; Guskey, 2000).

In 1995, Walker, Hochwald, Cai and Ramaswami reported the results of an evaluation study of the Harold Wilson PD School. "The school was used primarily as a center for retooling elementary teachers in grades 6, 7, and 8" (p. i). "The goal of the program is to provide teachers with instructionally and professionally enriching

experiences, which will ultimately result in positive outcomes for student learning in the District" (p. 6).

Teachers in the program spent several days at the professional development school, while teachers from the PDS taught the teachers' classes in the home schools. Ideally, the goal and purpose of the school addressed the standards of effective professional development, but based on the findings of the evaluation, in reality certain aspects of the program did not. "...it was noted that the initial training offered by the PDS while in the broader sense was linked with improving the delivery of instruction and student achievement..., in a more narrow and concrete vein was not related to school initiatives for change. The general tenure of the research findings indicates that this oversight is now an area of grave concern" (Walker et al., 1995, p. 61). According to Hawley and Valli (1999), effective professional development alone will not create educational reform, but when viewed as part of a comprehensive change process that is multifaceted, improvements will inevitably follow.

Another major area of concern centered on the support, or lack thereof, that teachers experienced following the training. "Teachers leave the PDS program and return to home schools where the support for implementing what has been learned is minimal in some cases. The absence of support structures after training significantly reduces the possibility of successful translation of knowledge into practice" (Walker et al., 1995, p. 61). Hirsh and Killion (2009) pointed out that "Change requires leaders who are committed to ensuring that those engaged in change have the necessary knowledge, skills, support, and opportunities to learn. Committed, skillful leadership enables systems to make deep change. Yet not all leadership is equally effective" (p. 465). Leadership that promotes deep change, said Peter Senge (2006), requires replacing the "hero-leader"

with leadership communities. The leadership in the home schools of the teachers in the PDS program failed to exercise the kind of leadership suggested here.

A three-year longitudinal study (reported in 2000) by the United States Department of Education, entitled "Does Professional Development Change Teaching Practice?", identified the importance of professional development and its impact on changes in instructional practices. The study identified teachers' involvement in various activities and demonstrated that professional development activities have a direct affect on instructional process and a positive impact on student learning. Porter, Desimone, Yoon and Birman (2000) reported that participation in professional development activities that include higher-order teaching strategies increased teachers' use of those strategies in instruction. Researchers agree that the changes in instructional methodologies are necessary. "The new paradigm of instruction results in a student-centered approach to teaching where greater emphasis is placed on thinking, analysis, problem solving, and the integration and application of knowledge" (Corcoran, 1995, p. 13).

A study conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reiterates the link between professional development and instructional practices. A teacher's participation in professional development was associated with the various types of instructional practices that are currently being advocated as effective; such as, cooperative learning, portfolios for assessment, and the use of technology in the classroom (NCES, 1998).

Ruberto (2003) identified the consistency concerning "veteran teachers' attitudes toward professional development and the relevance of the professional development activities" (p.4). The veteran teacher, here, is the teacher who has taught 10 or more

years. Ruberto concluded that professional development should focus on the needs of the teacher. In doing so, teachers become empowered and are more likely to change their instructional practices to meet the needs of their students. Further, she contended that "policies must acknowledge the veteran teacher's experience and wisdom" (p. 90). Professional development must be continuous and appropriate for each teacher. Policies that empower the teacher to participate in professional development activities that focus on their individual needs encourage and offer incentives to the teacher. The teachers should have time to reflect upon implementation of new strategies and identify their own effectiveness. "The use of data to align the professional development with student learning would individualize the approach and address the individual learning of the teachers and the needs of a particular class, school, or district" (Ruberto, 2003, p. 93). Analysis of the data in this study indicates that the majority of the teachers have a positive attitude toward professional development in their school district.

Goal 4 of Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994) synthesizes the recommendations of the National Educational Goals Panel (NEGP). Goal 4, Teacher Professional Development, acknowledges that professional development as an essential role in successful education reform. "The mission of professional development is to prepare and support educators to help all students achieve at high standards of learning and development. It is professional development that allows for the continued growth and development of teachers' skills and areas of expertise" (p. 6).

Summary – Professional Development

A review of the literature by Colby, Bradshaw and Joyner (2002) confirmed the necessity of focusing on professional development in order to make teacher evaluation more meaningful. Chappuis et al. (2009) indicated that "it's essential to emphasize the

long-term, ongoing nature of professional development as opposed to a short term commercially promised quick fix" (p. 57). Effective professional development is supposed to foster lasting change in the classroom. Professional development works best when it's onsite, job embedded, sustained over time, centered on active learning, and focused on student outcomes (Sparks, 2003; Guskey, 1995; Chappuis et al, 2009).

Citing Denver's Professional Compensation System, Goe et al., (2008) suggested that one way to improve instruction is by "allowing teachers to plan their own professional growth" (p. 50). "Collaborating with principals and supervisors, teachers can create a plan for their professional development, including taking courses that will address gaps in their knowledge. Teachers and supervisors can use evaluation results (from classroom observations and student achievement gains) to help them determine areas that need to be addressed" (p. 50). Duke (1993) noted that, when the evaluation of teachers, especially experienced ones, is based, year in and year out, on the same set of basic teaching competencies or performance standards, "the standardization of practice - rather than professional growth - becomes the chief focus of attention" (p. 702). According to McColskey & Egelson (1993), a formative evaluation system can help encourage continual teacher self-evaluation and reflection and discourage the development of teaching routines that never change.

Guskey (1995) warned that the one-size-fits-all approach cannot be applied any longer if effective professional development is what we want for our teachers. We want the greatest impact possible from professional development and, in doing so, professional development must be designed, implemented, and evaluated to meet the special needs of particular teachers in particular settings.

Duke (1993) cautioned that "professional growth is not staff development" (p. 702), though it may be stimulated by staff development. Professional growth involves learning, but it is more than learning; ... growth implies the transformation of knowledge into development of the individual. Growth is qualitative change, movement to a new level of understanding, the realization of a sense of efficacy not previously enjoyed" (p. 702). Districts have attempted to remedy the situation by the methods used in the evaluation of their teachers. The problem lies in what the districts are really trying to evaluate, and how these evaluations are used in the educational system (Clark, 1993). Evaluation should have the capacity to distinguish highly effective teachers, to offer professional development and growth recommendations, and to link teacher performance to student learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Duke & Stiggins, 1990).

Given the widespread study of the value of professional development, Hawley & Valli (2000) have concluded, "...in the last few years, we have witnessed the development of consensus among both researchers and expert educators about essential characteristics of professional development" (p. 9). Yet, there is growing evidence that indicates only a small percentage of what is known is actually implemented (Spicer, 2008). Achilles and Tienken (2003) found that, based on two experimental studies, "professional development can change teachers' instructional behaviors when (a) implemented in a deliberate and planned manner, (b) embedded in teachers' job and class, (c) conducted with small groups of teachers, and (d) guided by change and communication theory. Changes in teacher behavior can lead to changes in student outcomes, but student outcomes cannot be assumed without prior teacher change" (p. 313).

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methods and procedures used to investigate the influence of a standards-based evaluation system on teacher professional growth in a large urban NJ school district. The methods and procedures are discussed in the following sections: a) design, b) data collection, c) setting/selection process, d) sample population, e) instrumentation, and f) data analysis.

Design

This chapter explains the research design, population, sample, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis that were used. The purpose of this study is to determine how a teacher evaluation system influences teacher professional growth. To collect data, this study used a mixed-method design, both quantitative and qualitative methods. "The kind of research methodology most likely to be productive in exploring and understanding issues related to implementation of effective growth-oriented evaluation systems is district case-study methodology" (Stiggins & Duke, 1988, p. 127). In this study, quantitative data is primarily used, with the integration of qualitative data to provide support for understanding the results from the quantitative research. "In practical terms, priority occurs in a mixed-methods study through such strategies as whether quantitative or qualitative information is emphasized first in the study" (Creswell, 2003, p. 212). Priority was given to the quantitative data. According to Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), the goal of mixed methods research is to draw from the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of single research studies.

Although the main source of data collection used in this study was a teacher questionnaire (TEP) (quantitative), interviews (qualitative) were conducted with sample

teachers, and with administrators who evaluate teachers in their schools. I also viewed the New Jersey Department of Education's (NJDOE) website and database and district documents for high school AYP data for the previous eight years. This data is available on the Internet at the NJDOE's website and from the district Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Testing. This mixed-methods study followed the guiding principles of scientific research in education, because I posed significant questions in the survey and interview protocols, linked the research findings to relevant theory, used methods that permit direct investigation through a survey and face-to-face interviews, provided a sound chain of reasoning and disclosed research to encourage professional scrutiny and critique (Shavelson & Towne, 2002).

"Quantitative research is the collection and analysis of numerical data to describe, explain, predict, or control phenomena of interest" (Gay et al., 2009, p.7). The term "survey" means "to look or see over or beyond the casual glance or superficial observation" (Leedy, 1997, p. 190). Babbie (1999) indicated that "survey research is probably the best method available to the social scientist interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly" (p. 234). Leedy supported this idea of the use of the survey as "a commonplace instrument for observing data beyond the physical reach of the observer" (p. 190).

According to Bogdan and Biklen (1998), qualitative research takes place in the natural setting with the researcher as the key instrument, is descriptive, deals with process rather than just outcomes, tends toward inductive data collection, and holds meanings as the main concerns. The human researcher is responsive and adaptive to the context, is sensitive to nonverbal cues, can process data instantly, can clarify and summarize as the research progresses, and is free to explore unusual or varying responses and the reasons

why (Fasanella, 2002; Patton, 2002). Qualitative research is typically used to answer questions about the complex nature of phenomena, often with the purpose of describing and understanding the phenomena from the participants' point of view (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001).

Data Collection

This study relied on data collection from a teacher survey, interviews, and review of documents. A quantitative study alone, such as a survey, would not capture the details of the evaluation system's operation and the mechanisms by which it affects teacher and administrator attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, a small number of (qualitative) interviews were conducted. These interviews were conducted after the quantitative data had been collected in order to obtain deeper explanations for the numerical data (Gay et al., 2009). I gained permission to use the *Teacher Evaluation Profile* (TEP) from Suny Press and the revised TEP from Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. This questionnaire was used to gather data from teachers in the study. With university Institutional Review Board (IRB), District IRB permission to conduct the research in the schools and to contact the targeted individuals, arrangements were made with the school personnel to have the research packet hand-delivered to the schools. In December, 2009 and January, 2010, I hand-delivered and placed the research packet in the school mailboxes of the Language Arts and Mathematics teachers. The packet contained a cover letter of introduction and invitation to participate in this research project, an Informed Consent Form, Interview Consent Form, and the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire. Separate, self-addressed stamped envelopes were included for returning the questionnaire, the formed Consent Form, and the Interview Consent Form. All participation was voluntary; participants (N=30) were assured of the confidentiality

of their responses and that the responses would be used only for the purposes of this study. Participants were asked to return completed materials by the end of December and January, respectively. Due to the slow return rate, I hand-delivered a second research packet to two of the participating schools, in an attempt to garner additional responses. By mid-February, 2010, 30 completed questionnaires had been returned. Due to the time restraints, I proceeded with the data collected.

Upon receipt of signed Consent Forms and Voluntary Participation Forms, scheduled appointments were made for March and April of 2010 to conduct face-to-face or telephone interviews with teachers and administrators in the four schools included in this study. Due to various circumstances, several interviews were cancelled by the participants; a few rescheduled appointments were also cancelled. The resulting interviews were conducted with six teachers and six department chairs through May of 2010. Although this was a relatively small interview sampling (n=6 teachers and n=6 administrators), the qualitative data may help to generalize findings and support the quantitative data. The interview questions were gleaned from existing ones developed and used in similar studies. All interviews were tape recorded to assist in analysis of interview notes and to confirm quotations.

Setting/Selection Process

All of the district's magnet and comprehensive high schools were invited to participate in this research project, with the exception of the magnet school where I am employed and one other magnet school that had not yet participated in HSPA testing. Of the nine invited high schools, only four principals responded within the prescribed time period. Before the research project could be conducted, I had to obtain district and university approval. One additional principal agreed to participate in the study; however,

the response was received after district and university IRB approval. In the interest of time, the first eligible (magnet or comprehensive) schools to accept my written invitation to participate in this research project were submitted to IRB and were approved through the district's Internal Review Board (IRB) process. The four selected schools could pose a potential bias, but their selection was based solely on their being the first to respond and accept the invitation to participate. The magnets are representative of the six magnet schools in this Public Schools District, and have consistently met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standards for the past eight years (2004-2011). While the magnet high schools are highly performing schools, the comprehensive high schools represent a range of performance from moderately high to low, in that they may occasionally make AYP, or they do not.

For the schools in this study, Table 1 displays the eight-year total percent of student achievement in Language Arts and mathematics at the Proficient (200-249) and Advanced Proficient (250+) levels, as measured by the *NJ High School Proficient Assessment* (HSPA). These achievement levels are a major factor in determining schools' status of having achieved Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) or receiving the designation of "In Need of Improvement", which indicates that the school has not met AYP standards based on student achievement in Language Arts and mathematics, as mandated by *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB).

Table 1

AYP (Magnet) & NON-AYP (Comprehensive) Schools HSPA Scores 2004-2011

Year	Magnet 1 (M1)	Magnet 2 (M2)	Comprehensive 1 (C1)	Comprehensive 2 (C2)
2004				
LA	98.8	95.4	43.3	25.4
Math	91.1	92.5	20.4	7.9
2005				
LA	98.8	91.7	50.7	31.3
Math	96.2	91.8	20.3	17.0
2006				
LA	98.5	92.6	54.3	28.2
Math	99.3	92.6	24.8	18.8
2007				
LA	100.0	93.9	52.6	28.9
Math	95.3	91.3	25.5	43.2
2008				
LA	99.2	86.7	48.1	29.3
Math	97.8	93.8	30.0	25.7
2009				
LA	99.6	84.8	48.0	34.7
Math	96.6	79.5	32.0	26.5
2010				
LA	97.5	92.1	54.9	38.7
Math	96.4	92.1	36.8	26.0
2011				
LA	100.0	97.2	69.4	37.9
Math	98.8	91.6	39.5	18.8

Source: New Jersey Department of Education NCLB Report," School Report Card"
**Figures represent total percent of student achievement at the Proficient (200-249) and Advanced Proficient (250+) levels.*

Sample Population/Participants

The sample population consists of Language Arts (n-18) and Mathematics (n=12) teachers from the selected schools who have gone through the district's evaluation process. Inasmuch as department chairpersons are primarily responsible for the formative and summative evaluations of secondary teachers in the district, the Language

Arts and Mathematics Department Chairpersons (n=5), along with one vice principal who evaluates mathematics teachers in his school, were interviewed for this study.

In order to ascertain the total number of prospective Language Arts and Mathematics teachers in each of the schools, I requested this information from the district supervisors of Language Arts and Mathematic in the Teaching and Learning Department. My targeted number of prospective teacher participants was 64, and a minimum of eight evaluating administrators, two in each school (one Language Arts Department Chairperson and one Mathematics Department Chairperson). All teachers of Language Arts and Mathematics in the four schools were invited to voluntarily participate in both the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. The selected administrators were invited to participate only in the qualitative phase.

Instrumentation

Questionnaire

A modified version of the revised Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire was used to collect data related to the components of the evaluation model used in the schools studied. The revised instrument was chosen for this study because it includes elements related to teacher evaluation present in the school district being studied. The revised TEP, as the original, asks teachers to rate their most recent evaluation experience for its overall quality. The TEP is a 46-item questionnaire developed by Stiggins and Duke (1988) at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. The TEP was designed to validate a list of key attributes of teacher evaluation by determining if these attributes related to professional growth outcomes of evaluation. "The TEP allows the user to analyze the growth-producing potential of their particular teacher evaluation environment" (Stiggins & Nickel, 1988 p. 150). TEP uses five subscales: 1) attributes of

the teacher, 2) perceptions of the evaluator, 3) procedures of the evaluation system, 4) feedback received, and 5) evaluation context. Duke and Stiggins (1990) merged the five subscales into three areas of interest: 1) people (attributes of teacher and perceptions of the evaluator), 2) procedures (attributes of the system and feedback), and 3) the environment (attributes of the evaluation context). The TEP allows researchers and participants to document the nature of the teacher evaluation environment in a particular school or school district (Hughes, 2006). Instead of using the original "A B C D E" response scale, the modified TEP presents items with a Likert scale response from one to five in order to simplify processing the data. Participants respond based on the degree to which they perceive the range of each item.

The TEP has been found to be an instrument of high reliability. Dependability of TEP results was established by demonstrating that combined set of 46 items provides an internally consistent portrait of a teacher evaluation environment. The internal consistency reliability of the instrument as a whole is .94 (Stiggins & Nickel, 1988). The reported internal consistency reliability suggests that the scales of each attribute are both internally consistent and highly correlated.

Interviews

As a data collection tool, interviews provide timely opportunity for probing data clarification, and help to create depth in responses (Barnett, 2006). "Because it is desirable to acquire the subject's own words, good interviews are those in which the subjects are at ease and talk freely about their point of view. Good interviews produce rich data filled with words that reveal the respondent's perspectives" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 95). For this study, a small sample of volunteer teachers (n=6) were

interviewed; administrators (n=6), who evaluate teachers, in the four schools were also interviewed. In order to ensure accuracy of statements, all interviews were recorded.

Table 2 displays the alignment of the guiding research questions in this study with the Teacher Evaluation Profile questions and the interview questions.

Table 2

Alignment of Research Questions with TEP and Interview Questions

Research Questions	**Quantitative** ***TEP Survey Items***	**Qualitative** ***Interview Questions***
1. What is the perceived purpose of the teacher evaluation process?	48-49	T-1 A-1
2. What is the perceived effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?	2-3	T-2-4 A-7-8
3. What is the perceived role of the building administrator in the teacher evaluation toward improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?	12-22	T-8-9 A-2-4, 6
4. What is the perceived impact of post-observation feedback on improved teacher practice and teacher professional Growth?	36-44	T-6-7 A-5-9
5. What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?	23-35	T-10 A-10

T=Teacher interview Questions (Appendix A)
A=Administrator interview Questions Appendix B)
TEP=Teacher Evaluation Profile (Appendix C)

Data Analysis

Appropriate methods of data analysis were used. These methods included frequency totals, means and standard deviation, and ANOVA. Survey responses were tabulated, collated, and ranked based on frequency of each response in predetermined thematic categories. A computer SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program was used to ascertain the degree of variance, if any, among the survey responses. Interview responses were codified, transcribed, and categorized. As themes emerged from coding, new categories which were relevant to the study were created and appropriately populated. Frequency of responses for each was interpreted for meaning and usefulness. One-way ANOVAs were performed. In the one-way analysis of variance, the main effects are school status and subjects taught. The independent variable is the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP).

Detailed analysis of the data and findings, discussion, and conclusion are presented in Chapters 4 and 5.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This study sought to understand how a standards-based teacher evaluation system implemented in September, 2003, in a large northern New Jersey urban school district impacted improved teacher instruction and teacher professional growth. The perceptions of Language Arts and Mathematics teachers in four of the district's high schools were gleaned via a mixed-methods approach to answer the following research questions.

1. What is the perceived purpose of the teacher evaluation process?
2. What is the perceived effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?
3. What is the perceived role of the building administrator in the evaluation toward improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?
4. What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses, if any, of a standards-based teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?

This chapter reports the results of the groups of teachers' responses to the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire administered to teachers in two participating high schools that consistently make Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP), and two participating schools that do not consistently make AYP. NCLB requires states and districts to annually determine whether school districts and schools meet AYP requirements. To meet these requirements, schools must meet achievement levels in Language Arts

Literacy and Mathematics. The high schools in this study represent two magnet schools that have consistently met AYP requirements and two comprehensive high schools that have not consistently met AYP requirements. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality, the schools are coded as M (magnet) or C (comprehensive), along with a corresponding number of 1 or 2.

Of the 64 surveys distributed, 30 were returned, giving a return rate of 46.8%. It appears to now be common for educational researchers to use survey data with a response rate of less than 50%. This practice is consistent with other studies conducted in the social sciences that also obtained return rates of less than 50% (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003). Perception was measured on a five-point Likert scale from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating low perception and 5 indicating high perception. The data presented are reported in order to answer the five research questions investigated in this study. The data are presented as follows: The research questions related to the subcategory are stated; the subscale categories are examined using a frequency analysis for each question (Appendix E); means and standard deviations are provided with regard to school status (non-AYP and AYP) and subjects (Language Arts and Mathematics), with a brief summary to follow; further analysis is supported with table(s) of the data (ANOVA for school status and subjects taught) to identify whether or not there is statistical significance with regard to the research question posed; a discussion of the results; and a summary of the findings for each research question is given.

Quantitative Data

As indicated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study was to report the findings from an examination of the perceptions of teachers and building-level administrators in four urban high schools in a northern New Jersey public school district regarding the

influence on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth of a standards-based teacher evaluation system first implemented in 2003 and based on *Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework For Teaching*, by Charlotte Danielson (1996). Although all district high schools (6 magnet and 6 comprehensive high schools) that fit the target schools (AYP & non-AYP), with the exception of my own (AYP) school, were invited to participate in this study, the four schools in the study were selected from the first four eligible schools to accept my written invitation to participate in this research project. A limitation in this study is that it included only four high schools, two magnets and two comprehensives. Another limitation is that the participation is voluntary and limited to teachers and administrators in the Language Arts and Mathematics Departments in each school. Language Arts and Mathematics were selected for this study because they are the two subject areas of assessment on the New Jersey High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA). The validity of the study is limited to the reliability of the teacher survey questions, the teacher and administrator interview questions, and my ability to conduct credible interviews.

Participants

The participants for the study consist of high school teachers of Language Arts and Mathematics. A cover letter with invitation to participate in this study, The *Teacher Evaluation Profile* (TEP), and Informed Consent Form were hand-delivered and placed in the mailboxes of 64 Language Arts and Mathematics teachers in the four selected schools. Thirty (46.8%) completed and usable teacher questionnaires were returned. Although this is not consistent with Colby's (2001) TEP survey return rate of 55%, the return rate does exceed other similar studies (Hughes, 2006; Logue-Belden, 2008).

The percentage of participants for the two subgroups ranged from 58% of Language Arts teachers to 36% of Mathematics teachers. A description of each group's participation, including the total number of possible participants, the number of questionnaires that were returned for each subgroup and the percentage for each subgroup of the total returned questionnaires for this study, is displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Group Participation of Questionnaire

Group	Number of Potential Participants	Number of Returned Questionnaires	Percentage of Total Returned Questionnaires
LA Teachers	31	18	58%
Math Teachers	33	12	36%
Totals	64	30	48%

Return Rate by School Type

Table 4 shows subgroup participation of the four schools: two comprehensive non-AYP schools (C1 & C2) and two magnet AYP schools (M1 & M2), the number of potential participants in each subject area, the actual number of returned questionnaires, and the percentages. The possible number of participants (n=10) at school C1 in Language Arts; seven (7) respondents yielded a 70.0% return rate. Of the total number of possible participants (n=8) at school C2 in Language Arts, six (6) respondents represent a 75.0% return rate. The two comprehensive high schools represent an overall return rate in Language Arts of 72.2% of the total possible number of participants (n=18) in the comprehensive schools. Of the two magnet schools, in Language Arts, the possible number of participants in M1 is (n=7) with a return number of three (3), yielding a return

rate of 43.0%. The possible number of participants in M2 was (n=6), of which two (2) questionnaires were returned, yielding a return rate of 33.3%. The total number of returned questionnaires from the magnet schools in Language Arts is five (5), representing 38.4%.

At school C1, the possible number of participants in Mathematics is (n=10) of which four (4) responded, yielding a return rate of 40%. Of the possible participants (n=9) at C2, two (2) questionnaires were retuned, yielding a return rate of 22.2%. The overall return rate in Mathematics in the comprehensive schools is six (6), resulting in a return rate of 31.5%. Of the possible number of participants (n=8) at M1, four (4) questionnaires were returned, yielding a return rate of 13.3 %. At M2, of the possible participants (n=6), two (2) questionnaires were returned, yielding a return rate of 6.7%. The overall number of returned questionnaires of the possible participants in the magnet schools in mathematics is six (6), yielding a return rate of 42.8%.

Table 4

Subgroup Participation of Questionnaire

School Type	Number of Potential Participants	Number of Returned Questionnaires	% of Total Returned Questionnaires
C1 - LA	10	7	70.0
C2 - LA	8	6	75.0
M1- LA	7	3	43.0
M2- LA	6	2	33.3
C1 - Math	10	4	40.0
C2 - Math	9	2	22.2
M1- Math	8	4	13.3
M2- Math	6	2	6.7
Total	64	30	46.8

C (1 & 2) = Comprehensive High Schools
M (1 & 2) = Magnet High Schools

Characteristics of the Respondents

The participants were asked to provide demographic information in five areas: (1) gender, (2) years of experience, (3) earned degree levels, (4) school's AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) status, and (5) current teaching assignment.

Demographics. As Table 5 indicates, of the total number responding (n=30), 18 (60%) are female teachers and 12 (40%) are male teachers. They varied in their years of experience, earned degree levels, knowledge of the school's AYP status, and current teaching assignment.

Table 5

Teacher Demographics
Gender

n=30	***f***	***%***
Female	18	60.0
Male	12	40.0
Totals	30	100.0
Years of Experience		
1year	1	3.3
2-5 years	8	26.7
6-10 years	6	20.0
11-15 years	7	23.3
16 or more years	8	26.7
Degree Levels		
Bachelors	15	50.0
Masters	15	50.0
Doctorate	0	0.0
Knowledge AYP Status		
Yes	11	36.7
No	7	23.3
Don't Know	8	26.7
Note. Total of n=4 teacher respondents (13.3%) did not respond to question 4.		
Current Teaching Assignment		
H.S. Language Arts	18	60.0
H.S. Mathematics	12	40.0

Years of experience. The teachers' years of experience range from less than one year to more than 16 years of teaching experience. Of the 30 respondents, only one teacher (3.3%) reported less than one year experience.

Eight of the 30 reported 16 or more years teaching experience (26.7 %).

Earned Degree Levels. The degree attainment of the respondents indicates that 15 (50%) hold a Bachelor's Degree and 15 (50%) hold a Master's Degree.

Knowledge of School's AYP Status. Eleven of the respondents (36%) indicated that their school had maintained AYP status in the previous year (2009). Seven (23.2%) indicated that their school had not met AYP in the previous year. Eight (26.7%) did not know the school's AYP status.

Current Teaching Assignment. Eighteen (60%) of the respondents were teachers of Language Arts and 12 (40%) were teachers of Mathematics.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

What is the perceived purpose of the teacher evaluation process?

Participants' perceptions of contextual characteristics of teacher evaluation process.

Survey questions (45-49) looked at the contextual aspects of the teacher evaluation process based on the district's values and policies. These aspects are *amount of time spent of evaluation process, time allotted during the school year for professional development aligned with the standards, availability of training programs and models of good practice, clarity of policy statements regarding purpose of evaluation, and intended role of the teacher evaluation.* Table 6 shows the results of the participants' responses. The mean scores range from 2.47 to 3.37, with the lowest mean

score being *intended role of the teacher evaluation* and the highest mean score being *clarity of policy statements*. Regarding the purpose of the teacher evaluation, n=10; 33% of the teachers perceive the district's policy of purpose as somewhat clear, while n=5; 16.7 % perceive it as very clear, n=6; 20% perceive it as very vague. Regarding the intended role of the evaluation process, n=7; 23% of the participants perceive the role of teacher evaluation as a process to foster teacher growth, while n=16; 53.3% perceive it as a process to ensure teacher accountability.

Tables 7 and 8 report the mean scores by school status and subjects taught. Non-AYP schools reported mean scores of 2.63to 3.32, with the lowest being *intended role of the teacher evaluation* and the highest mean score being *clarity of policy statements.* The data also show mean scores of 2.72 for *availability of training programs*, 3.05 for *time allotted for professional development*, and 3.21 for *time spent on the evaluation process*. The data suggest that teachers in non-AYP schools perceive *intended role of teacher evaluation process* and *availability of training programs* as areas that need strengthening. The reported mean scores for AYP schools range from 2.18 to 3.55, with the lowest mean score being *intended role of the teacher evaluation* and the highest mean score being *clarity of policy statements*. The data also show the mean scores of 2.91 for *professional training programs*, 3.09 for *time allotted for professional development*, 3.45 for *clarity of policy statements*. The data suggest that teachers in AYP schools perceive *intended role of the teacher evaluation* and *availability of training programs* as areas that need to be strengthened.

Looking at the data by subjects taught, Language Arts teachers reported mean scores from 2.50 to 3.50, with the lowest mean score being *intended role of teacher evaluation* and *clarity of policy statements* being the highest. Language Arts teachers

also reported mean scores of 2.71 for *availability of training programs*, 2.89 for *time allotted for professional development*, and 3.39 for *time spent on teacher evaluation process*. The data suggest that Language Arts teachers perceive the areas of *intended role of teacher evaluation*, *availability of professional development training programs*, and *time allotted for professional development* as areas that need to be strengthened. Mathematics teachers reported a range of mean scores from 2.42 to 3.25, with the lowest mean score being *intended role of teacher evaluation* and the highest mean score *being amount of time spent on the evaluation process*. The data also show mean scores of 2.92 for professional development training, 3.17 for *clarity of policy statements*, and 3.33 for *allotted time for professional development*. The data suggest that Mathematics teachers perceive *professional development training* and *time allotted for professional development* as areas needing to be strengthened.

Table 6

Participants' Perceptions of Contextual Characteristics of the TE Process

	Mean Score	SD
Amount of Time Spent on Evaluation Process (45)	3.33	1.028
Time Allotted During School Year for Professional Development Aligned with the standards (46)	3.07	.944
Availability of Training Programs and Models of Good Practice (47)	2.79	1.114
Clarity of Policy Statements Regarding Purpose of Evaluation (48)	3.37	1.129
Intended Role of Evaluation (49)	2.47	1.358

Table 7

Participants' Perceptions of Contextual Characteristics by School Status

School Status		Time Spent	PD Time	PD Training	Policy	Role
Non-AYP	Mean	3.21	3.05	2.72	3.32	2.63
	N	19	19	18	19	19
	SD	1.134	.970	1.179	1.250	1.342
AYP	Mean	3.55	3.09	2.91	3.45	2.18
	N	11	11	11	11	11
	SD	.820	.944	1.044	.934	1.401
Total	Mean	3.33	3.07	2.79	3.37	2.47
	N	30	30	29	30	30
	SD	1.028	.944	1.114	1.129	1.358

Table 8

Participants' Perceptions of Contextual Characteristics by Subjects Taught

Subject		Time Spent	PD Time	PD Training	Policy	Role
Language Arts	Mean	3.39	2.89	2.71	3.50	2.50
	N	18	18	17	18	18
	SD	.979	.832	1.105	.857	1.249
Mathematics	Mean	3.25	3.33	2.92	3.17	2.42
	N	12	12	12	12	12
	SD	1.138	1.073	1.165	1.467	1.564
Total	Mean	3.33	3.07	2.79	3.37	2.47
	N	30	30	29	30	30
	SD	1.028	.944	1.114	1.129	1.358

One-way ANOVAs were performed. In the one-way analysis of variance, the main effects were *school status* and *subjects taught* to determine if there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding contextual characteristics of the teacher evaluation process. Tables 9 and 10 show the ANOVA calculations. There were no statistically significant differences among the groups by school status and subjects taught.

Table 9

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Context

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Amount of time spent on TE process…	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.781 29.885 30.667	1 28 29	.781 1.067	.732	.399
Time allotted for professional development…	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.010 25.856 25.867	1 28 29	.010 .923	.011	.917
Availability of training programs…	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.238 34.520 34.759	1 27 29	.238 1.279	.186	.669
Clarity of policy statement…	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.134 36.833 36.967	1 28 29	.134 1.315	.102	.752
Intended role of evaluation process	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1.409 52.057 53.467	1 28 29	1.409 1.859	.758	.391

Table 10

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Context

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Amount of time spent on TE process	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.139 30.528 30.667	1 28 29	.139 1.090	.127	.724
Time allotted for professional development…	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1.422 24.444 25.867	1 28 29	1.422 .873	1.629	.212
Availability of training programs…	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.313 34.446 34.759	1 28 29	.313 1.276	.2458	.625
Clarity of policy statement…	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.800 36.167 36.967	1 28 29	.800 1.292	.619	.438
Intended role of evaluation process	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.050 53.417 53.467	1 28 29	.050 1.908	.026	.873

Research Question 2

What is the perceived effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?

Participants' perceptions of the impact of the teacher evaluation process on professional practice and professional growth.

The quantitative data for this research question were derived from questions 1-3 in the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) survey instrument and analyzed by the groups' school type and subjects taught. Section 2 of the TEP (Questions1-3) looked at the teachers' perceptions of the overall quality and impact of the teacher evaluation process on teacher practice and professional growth. Participants were asked to give an overall rating of quality, teacher practice, and professional growth via a five-point Likert scale. Table 11 reports the total mean scores for this section on the TEP of 3.00 to 3.43 with a standard deviation of .817. Frequency (Appendix E) of responses for each question indicate that 14 (46%) of the teachers perceived the degree of impact of the teacher evaluation process on their practices as moderately strong. Twelve (40%) rated the impact as having somewhat of an impact, while four (13.3%) rated it as weak or having no impact. The mean score for this area of focus is 3.33 with a standard deviation of .844.

On the question of the impact of the teacher evaluation process on teacher professional growth, 15 participants (50%) reported the teacher evaluation process as having somewhat of an impact; eight (26%) indicated a moderately strong, to strong, impact, while seven (23.4%) indicated a weak, to no, impact.

Table 12 presents the mean scores by school status. Non-AYP schools reported mean scores from 2.74 to 3.37, with the lowest mean score for impact on professional

growth and the highest mean score for quality of teacher evaluation. The data show the mean score of 3.32 for impact on teaching practice. Teachers in non-AYP schools perceived that the impact on teaching practice needs strengthening. The mean scores for AYP schools range from 3.45 to 3.55, with the lowest mean score for impact on professional growth and the highest mean score for quality of evaluation. AYP schools also reported a mean score of 3.36 for impact on teaching practice. All of the reported mean scores for AYP schools are above the mid-point mean score of 3.00, suggesting, overall, that the teachers perceive the teacher evaluation process as positively influencing their teaching practice and professional growth.

Table 13 reports the means by subjects taught. Language Arts teachers reported the following mean scores that ranged from 2.83 for impact on professional growth: 3.44 for quality of evaluation, and 3.33 for impact on teaching practice. The data suggest that Language Arts teachers perceive impact on practice and quality of teacher evaluation favorably and impact on professional growth as having little impact on their professional growth. Mathematics teachers reported mean scores ranging from 3.25 to 3.42, with the lowest mean score being impact on professional growth and the highest mean score being quality of teacher evaluation. Mathematic teachers reported all mean scores above 3.00, suggesting they perceive the teacher evaluation process as effective.

Table 11

Participants' Perceptions of the Impact of the Teacher Evaluation Process on Professional Practice and Professional Growth

	Mean Score	SD
Overall quality of Evaluation (1)	3.43	.817
Overall impact of evaluation on … professional Practice (2)	3.33	.844
Overall impact of evaluation on Professional Growth (3)	3.00	.817

Table 12

Participants' Perceptions of Impact of TE by School Status

School Status		Quality	Practices	Growth
Non-AYP	Mean	3.37	3.32	2.74
	N	19	19	19
	SD	.831	.946	.991
AYP	Mean	3.55	3.36	3.45
	N	11	11	11
	SD	.820	.647	.522
Total	Mean	3.43	3.33	3.00
	N	30	30	30
	SD	.817	.844	.910

Table 13

Participants' Perceptions of Impact of TE by Subjects Taught

Subject		Quality	Practices	Growth
Language Arts	Mean	3.44	3.33	2.83
	N	18	18	18
	SD	.922	.686	.857
Mathematics	Mean	3.42	3.33	3.25
	N	12	12	12
	SD	.669	1.073	.965
Total	Mean	3.43	3.33	3.00
	N	30	30	30
	SD	.817	.844	.910

ANOVA testing was performed by school status and subjects taught to determine if there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding the influence of the teacher evaluation process on teacher practice and professional growth. As reported in Table 14, the ANOVA calculation by school status was statistically significant in one area. *Impact on professional growth* was statistically significant for $F=4.923$; $df=1, 28$; and $p \leq .035$. These results suggest that teachers in the magnet schools were more likely to perceive that the teacher evaluation process has a significantly stronger impact on their professional growth than teachers in the

comprehensive high schools. Table 15 shows there were no statistically significant differences among the groups by subjects taught.

Table 14

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of Overall Effectiveness of TE process

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Overall quality of the teacher evaluation	Between Groups	.218	1	.218	.319	.577
	Within Groups	19.148	28	.684		
	Total	19.367	29			
Impact on professional practices	Between Groups	.016	1	.016	.022	.884
	Within Groups	20.651	28	.738		
	Total	20.667	29			
Impact on professional growth	Between Groups	3.589	1	3.589	4.923	.035
	Within Groups	20.411	28	.729		
	Total	53.467	29			

*$p \leq .05$

Table 15

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subject and Perceptions of Overall Effectiveness of TE process

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Overall quality of teacher evaluation	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.008	.929
	Within Groups	19.361	28	.691		
	Total	19.367	29			
Impact on professional practices	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	20.667	28	.738		
	Total	20.667	29			
Impact on professional growth	Between Groups	1.250	1	1.250	1.538	.225
	Within Groups	22.750	28	.813		
	Total	24.000	29			

Research Question 3

What is the perceived role of the building administrator in the teacher evaluation process toward improved teacher practices and teacher professional growth?

Participants' perceptions of the teacher evaluator.

The TEP questions (12-22) looked at 11 characteristics of the evaluator. Teachers described their perceptions of the evaluator based on the 11 characteristics of the teacher evaluation process. As seen in Table 16, the mean scores ranged from 3.43.to 4.23, with the lowest mean score 3.43 (n=17; 56.6%) for the administrator's ability to model or demonstrate needed improvements and the highest mean score 4.23 (n=25; 83.3) for the flexibility of the administrator. The data also show the following mean scores for each characteristic: credibility 3.80 (n=18; 60%), working relationship 4.10 (n=24; 80%), level of trust 3.97 (n=22; 73%), interpersonal manner 4.13 (n=25; 83.3%), temperament 4.17 (n=25; 83%), knowledge of technical aspects of teaching 4.17 (n=24; 80%), familiarity with teaching assignment 3.80 (n=18; 60%), usefulness of suggestions 3.70 (n=17; 56.6%), and persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions 3.67 (n=17; 56.6%). The data show that all groups reported mean scores above the midpoint (3.00) on the 1-5 point Likert scale; and therefore, indicate, overall, that the teachers had a positive perception of the evaluator's abilities.

Table 17 presents the mean scores by school status. Non-AYP schools reported mean scores from 3.32 to 4.32, with the lowest mean score being capacity to model or demonstrate needed suggestions and the highest mean score being interpersonal manner and flexibility. The data also show the mean scores for each of the other nine characteristics: credibility 3.84, working relationship 4.11, trust 4.16, temperament 4.26, knowledge of technical aspects of teaching 4.11, familiarity with teaching assignment 3.75, usefulness of suggestions for improvement 3.79, and persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions 3.79. Overall, teachers in non-AYP schools indicate a positive perception of the evaluator. The mean scores for AYP schools range from 3.45 to 4.27, with the lowest

mean score for persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions and the highest mean score for knowledge of technical aspects of teaching. All of the reported mean scores for AYP schools are above the mid-point mean score of 3.00, suggesting, overall, that the teachers perceive the evaluator positively.

Table18 reports the mean scores by subjects taught. Language Arts teachers reported the following mean scores that ranged from 3.44 for capacity to model or demonstrate needed improvements to 4.22 for flexibility. The data suggest that Language Arts teachers perceive the evaluator favorably. Mathematics teachers reported mean scores ranging from 3.42 to 4.25, with the lowest mean score for capacity to model or demonstrate needed improvements and the highest mean score being flexibility. Mathematic teachers reported all mean scores above 3.00, suggesting that they perceive the evaluator favorably.

Table 16

Participants' Perceptions of the Evaluator

	Mean Score	SD
Credibility as a source of feedback (12)	3.80	1.157
Working relationship with you (13)	4.10	1.094
Level of Trust (14)	3.97	1.299
Interpersonal Manner (15)	4.13	1.137
Temperament (16)	4.17	1.147
Flexibility (17)	4.23	1.006
Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching (18)	4.17	.834
Capacity to model or demonstrate needed Improvements (19)	3.43	1.194
Familiarity with your teaching assignment (20)	3.80	1.126
Usefulness of suggestions for improvements (21)	3.70	1.149
Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions (22)	3.67	1.155

Table 17

Participants' Perceptions of the Evaluator by School Status

School Status		Cred	Rel	Tr	Inter	Tem	Flex.	Tech	Mod	Famil.	Use	Ration.
Non-AYP	M	3.84	4.11	4.16	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.11	3.32	3.75	3.79	3.79
	N	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
	SD	1.302	1.286	1.344	1.057	1.284	1.003	.875	1.250	1.273	1.316	1.273
AYP	M	3.73	4.09	3.64	3.82	4.00	4.09	4.27	3.64	3.82	3.55	3.45
	N	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	SD	.905	.701	1.206	1.250	.894	1.044	.786	1.120	.874	.820	.934
Total	M	3.80	4.10	3.97	4.13	4.17	4.23	4.17	3.43	3.80	3.70	3.67
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
	SD	1.157	1.094	1.299	1.137	1.147	1.006	.834	1.194	1.126	1.149	1.155

Table 18

Participants' Perceptions of the Evaluator by Subjects Taught

Subjects Taught		Cred	Rel	Tr	Inter	Tem	Flex.	Tech	Mod	Famil.	Use	Ration.
LA	M	3.89	4.11	3.94	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.44	3.61	3.72	3.61
	N	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
	SD	1.183	1.132	1.392	1.150	1.166	.943	.857	1.199	1.195	1.127	1.037
Math	M	3.67	4.08	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.25	4.17	3.42	4.08	3.67	3.75
	N	12	12	12	112	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
	SD	1.155	1.084	1.206	1.165	1.165	1.138	.835	1.240	.996	1.231	1.357
Total	M	3.80	4.10	3.97	4.13	4.17	4.23	4.17	3.43	3.80	3.70	3.67
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
	SD	1.157	1.094	1.299	1.137	1.147	1.006	.834	1.194	1.126	1.149	1.155

ANOVA testing was performed on data for school status and subjects taught, to determine if there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding the administrator as evaluator. Tables 19 and 20 show there were no statistically significant differences among the groups by school status or subjects taught.

Table 19

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of Evaluator

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Credibility as a Source of Feedback	Between Groups	.092	1	.092	.066	.798
	Within Groups	38.708	28	1.382		
	Total	38.800	29			
Working Relationship	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.001	.973
	Within Groups	34.699	28	1.239		
	Total	34.700	29			
Level of Trust	Between Groups	1.895	1	1.895	1.127	.297
	Within Groups	47.072	28	1.681		
	Total	48.967	29			
Interpersonal Manner	Between Groups	1.725	1	1.725	1.351	.255
	Within Groups	35.742	28	1.276		
	Total	37.467	29			
Temperament	Between Groups	.482	1	.482	.358	.554
	Within Groups	37.684	28	1.346		
	Total	38.167	29			
Flexibility	Between Groups	.352	1	.352	.340	.564
	Within Groups	29.014	28	1.036		
	Total	29.367	29			
Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching	Between Groups	.195	1	.195	.274	.605
	Within Groups	19.971	28	.713		
	Total	20.167	29			
Capacity to model or demonstrate needed improvements	Between Groups	.716	1	.716	.493	.488
	Within Groups	40.651	28	1.452		
	Total	41.367	29			
Familiarity with individual teaching assignment	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.004	.948
	Within Groups	36.794	28	1.314		
	Total	36.800	29			
Usefulness of suggestions for improvement	Between Groups	.415	1	.415	.307	.584
	Within Groups	37.885	28	1.353		
	Total	38.300	29			
Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions	Between Groups	.781	1	.781	.578	.454
	Within Groups	37.885	28	1.353		
	Total	38.667	29			

Table 20

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects and Perceptions of Evaluator

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Credibility as a Source of Feedback	Between Groups	.356	1	.356	.259	.615
	Within Groups	38.444	28	1.373		
	Total	38.800	29			
Working Relationship	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.004	.947
	Within Groups	34.694	28	1.239		
	Total	34.700	29			
Level of Trust	Between Groups	.022	1	.022	.013	.911
	Within Groups	48.944	28	1.748		
	Total	48.967	29			
Interpersonal Manner	Between Groups	.050	1	.050	.037	.848
	Within Groups	37.417	28	1.336		
	Total	37.467	29			
Temperament	Between Groups	.139	1	.139	.102	.752
	Within Groups	38.028	28	1.358		
	Total	38.167	29			
Flexibility	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.005	.942
	Within Groups	29.361	28	1.049		
	Total	29.367	29			
Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	20.167	28	.720		
	Total	20.167	29			
Capacity to model of demonstrate needed improvements	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.004	.952
	Within Groups	41.361	28	1.477		
	Total	41.367	29			
Familiarity with individual teaching assignment	Between Groups	1.606	1	1.606	1.277	.268
	Within Groups	35.194	28	1.257		
	Total	36.800	29			
Usefulness of suggestions for improvement	Between Groups	.022	1	.022	.016	.899
	Within Groups	38.278	28	1.367		
	Total	38.300	29			
Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions	Between Groups	.139	1	.139	.101	.753
	Within Groups	38.528	28	1.376		
	Total	38.667	29			

Research Question 4

What is the perceived impact of postobservation feedback on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?

Participants' perceptions of feedback.

The survey instrument (36-44) asked participants to provide their perceptions about the feedback received during the teacher evaluation process. The nine categories

measured were: 1) *amount of information provided,* 2) *frequency of formal feedback,* 3) *frequency of informal feedback,* 4) *depth of information provided,* 5) *quality of ideas, and suggestions contained in the feedback,* 6) *specificity of information provided,* 7) *nature of information provided,* (2002) *timing of feedback,* and 9) *whether the feedback focused on the evaluation standards.* These questions looked at whether the feedback given was of high quality and useful to the teachers' improved practice and professional growth.

As Table 21 displays, the *frequency of informal feedback* had the lowest mean score of 2.45 (n=23; 76.7%), while *feedback focused on the evaluation standards* had the highest mean score of 3.67 (n=14; 46.7%). Overall, the data show mean scores for the following characteristics of *amount of information received* M=3.30 (n=16; 53.4%), depth of information M=3.00 (n=19; 63.3%), *quality of the ideas and suggestions* M=3.10 (n=18; 60%), *specificity of feedback* M=3.27 (n=16; 53.4%), *nature of feedback* M=3.50 (n=15; 50.0%), *timing of feedback* M=3.37 (n=14; 46.7%), *and feedback focused on the teacher evaluation standards* M=3.67 (n=14; 47.7%). The mean scores above 3.00 suggest areas of strength in the evaluation process. The data also indicate that teachers perceive *depth of information provided* (mean score 3.00) and *quality of ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback* (mean score 3.10) as areas that need to be strengthened. The data suggest that teachers perceive the evaluation process to be strong in *nature of the information provided* (mean 3.50) and *feedback focused on the teacher evaluation standards* (mean score 3.67). *Frequency of formal feedback* (mean score 2.87) and *frequency of informal feedback* (mean score 2.45) were below the mean of 3.00, indicating perceived areas of weakness in the teacher evaluation process.

Table 22 presents the mean scores by school status. Non-AYP schools reported mean scores from 2.44 to 3.58, with the lowest mean score for *frequency of informal*

feedback and the highest mean score for *nature of information provided*. Overall, teachers in non-AYP schools perceive *frequency of informal feedback, depth of information provided*, and *quality of ideas and suggestions* as areas of weakness in the teacher evaluation process. The mean scores for AYP schools range from 2.45 to 3.91, with the lowest mean score being *frequency of informal feedback* and the highest mean score for *feedback focused on the teacher evaluation standards*. The data also suggest that teachers in AYP schools perceive *frequency of formal feedback* as an area of weakness in the teacher evaluation process.

Table 23 reports the mean scores by subjects taught. Language Arts teachers reported mean scores that ranged from 2.29 for *frequency of informal feedback* to 3.67 for *feedback focused on the teacher evaluation standards*. The data suggest that Language Arts teachers perceive *quality of ideas and suggestions* as an area that needs to be strengthened. Mathematics teachers reported mean scores ranging from 2.42 to 3.67, with the lowest mean score being *frequency of informal feedback* and the highest mean score for *feedback focused on the teacher evaluation standards*. Mathematics teachers perceive the characteristics of *frequency of formal* and *frequency of informal feedback* as areas that need to be strengthened.

Table 21

Participants' Perceptions of the Feedback Received During the Evaluation Process

	Mean Score	SD
Amount of information received (36)	3.30	1.119
Frequency of formal feedback (37)	2.87	1.432
Frequency of informal feedback (38)	2.45	1.378
Depth of information provided (39)	3.00	1.114
Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained (40) In the feedback	3.10	1.242
Specificity of information provided (41)	3.27	1.143
Nature of information provided (42)	3.50	.938
Timing of feedback (43)	3.37	1.189
Feedback focused on the evaluation standards (44)	3.67	1.061

Table 22

Participants' Perceptions of Feedback Received by School Status

School Status		Amount of Time	Freq. Form	Freq. Inform	Depth	Quality	Specificity	Nature	Timing	Focus
Non-AYP	M	3.32	3.05	2.44	2.89	2.89	3.11	3.58	3.37	3.53
	N	19	19	18	19	19	19	19	19	19
	SD	1.204	1.393	1.338	1.197	1.370	1.243	1.121	1.165	1.172
AYP	M	3.27	2.55	2.45	3.18	3.45	3.55	3.36	3.36	3.91
	N	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	SD	1.009	1.508	1.508	.982	.934	.934	.505	1.286	.831
Total	M	3.30	2.87	2.45	3.00	3.10	3.27	3.50	3.37	3.67
	N	30	30	29	30	30	30	30	30	30
	SD	1.119	1.432	1.378	1.114	1.242	1.143	.938	1.189	1.061

Table 23

Participants' Perceptions of Feedback Received by Subjects Taught

Sch. Type		Amount of Time	Freq. Form	Freq. Inform	Depth	Quality	Specificity	Nature	Timing	Focus
LA	M	3.33	3.17	2.29	3.00	2.94	3.22	3.56	3.56	3.67
	N	18	18	17	18	18	18	18	18	18
	SD	1.029	1.295	1.263	1.138	1.305	1.166	.856	1.042	.970
Math	M	3.25	2.42	2.67	3.00	3.33	3.33	3.42	3.08	3.67
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
	SD	1.288	1.564	1.557	1.128	1.155	1.155	1.084	1.379	1.231
Total	M	3.30	2.87	2.45	3.00	3.10	3.27	3.50	3.37	3.67
	N	30	30	29	30	30	30	30	30	30
	SD	1.119	1.432	1.378	1.114	1.242	1.143	.938	1.189	1.061

ANOVA testing was performed on data for *school status* and *subjects taught* to determine if there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding feedback provided during the teacher evaluation process. Tables 24 and 25 show there were no statistically significant differences among the groups by school status or subjects taught.

Table 24

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of Feedback

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Amount of information received	Between Groups	.013	1	.013	.010	.921
	Within Groups	36.287	28	1.296		
	Total	36.300	29			
Frequency of formal feedback	Between Groups	1.792	1	1.792	.870	.359
	Within Groups	57.675	28	2.060		
	Total	59.467	29			
Frequency of informal feedback	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.000	.985
	Within Groups	53.172	27	1.969		
	Total	53.172	29			
Depth of information	Between Groups	.574	1	.574	.454	.506
	Within Groups	35.426	28	1.265		
	Total	36.000	29			
Quality of feedback	Between Groups	2.183	1	2.183	1.438	.241
	Within Groups	42.517	28	1.518		
	Total	44.700	29			
Specificity of feedback	Between Groups	1.350	1	1.350	1.035	.318
	Within Groups	36.517	28	1.304		
	Total	37.867	29			
Nature of feedback	Between Groups	.323	1	.323	.359	.554
	Within Groups	25.177	28	.899		
	Total	25.500	29			
Timing of feedback	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.992
	Within Groups	40.967	28	1.463		
	Total	40.967	29			
Focus of feedback (standards)	Between Groups	1.021	1	1.021	.903	.350
	Within Groups	31.646	28	1.130		
	Total	32.667	29			

Table 25

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subject and Perceptions of Feedback

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Amount of information received	Between Groups	.050	1	.050	.039	.846
	Within Groups	36.250	28	1.295		
	Total	36.300	29			
Frequency of formal feedback	Between Groups	4.050	1	4.050	.2.046	.164
	Within Groups	55.417	28	1.979		
	Total	59.467	29			
Frequency of informal feedback	Between Groups	.976	1	.976	.505	.483
	Within Groups	52.196	27	1.933		
	Total	53.172	29			
Depth of information	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.1.000
	Within Groups	36.000	28	1.286		
	Total	36.000	29			
Quality of feedback	Between Groups	1.089	1	1.089	.699	.410
	Within Groups	43.611	28	1.558		
	Total	44.700	29			
Specificity of feedback	Between Groups	.089	1	.089	.066	.799
	Within Groups	37.778	28	1.349		
	Total	37.867	29			
Nature of feedback	Between Groups	.139	1	.139	.153	.698
	Within Groups	25.361	28	.906		
	Total	25.500	29			
Timing of feedback	Between Groups	1.606	1	1.606	1.142	.294
	Within Groups	39.361	28	1.406		
	Total	40.967	29			
Focus of feedback (standards)	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	32.667	28	1.167		
	Total	32.667	29			

Research Question 5

What are the perceived strengths and weakness, if any, of the standards-based teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and professional growth?

Participants' perceptions of the procedures of the teacher evaluation process.

The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questions (23-26) sought the participants' perceptions on the procedural techniques used during the teacher evaluation process. These are: *effective communication of standards, clarity of standards, appropriateness of standards for teaching assignment,* and *the uniqueness of standards for individual teachers*.

Table 26 presents the data as reported by the participants. The mean scores ranged from 2.27 (n=5; 16.7%) to 3.83 (n=20; 66.7%), with the lowest mean score being *standards tailored for unique needs*, while the highest mean score being *standards were communicated effectively*. The data show that *clarity of standards* 3.80 (n=22; 73.4) and *appropriateness of standards* 3.59(n=16; 53.3%), and *effective communication of standards* 3.83 exceed the mean of 3.00 suggesting areas of strength in the teacher evaluation process. The data suggest that there is a need to develop standards for specialized teaching assignments, such as special education.

Table 27 presents the mean scores by school status. Non-AYP schools reported mean scores from 2.32 to 3.84, with the lowest mean score being *standards tailored to individual needs* and the highest mean score *being clarity of standards.* Teachers in non-AYP schools perceived *standards tailored to individual needs* as an area of weakness in the teacher evaluation process, while they perceived *clarity of evaluation standards* as a strong area of the teacher evaluation process. The mean scores for AYP schools range from 2.18 to 4.09, with the lowest mean score being *standards tailored to individual needs* and the highest mean score being *communication of evaluation standards*.

Table 28 reports the mean scores by subjects taught. Language Arts teachers' mean scores ranged from 2.11 for *standards tailored to individual needs* and 3.83 for *clarity of standards*. Mathematics teachers reported mean scores ranging from 2.50 to 3.92, with the lowest mean score for *standards tailored to individual needs* and the highest mean score for *communication of standards*.

Table 26

Participants' Perceptions of Procedures used during the Evaluation Process

	Mean Score	SD
Standards Communicated (23)	3.83	.986
Standards are Clear (24)	3.80	.887
Standards Appropriate for Teaching Assignment (25)	3.59	.907
Standards Tailored for Unique Needs (26)	2.27	1.337

Table 27

Participants' Perceptions of Procedures used during the Evaluation Process by School Status

School Status		Comm. of Standards	Clarity of Standards	Endorsement Standards	St. Tailored to Need
Non-AYP	Mean	3.68	3.84	3.56	2.32
	N	19	19	18	19
	SD	1.108	1.015	1.042	1.293
AYP	Mean	4.09	3.73	3.64	2.18
	N	11	11	11	11
	SD	.701	.647	.674	1.471
Total	Mean	3.83	3.80	3.59	2.27
	N	30	30	29	30
	SD	.986	.887	.907	1.337

Table 28

Participants' Perceptions of Procedures used during the Evaluation Process by Subjects Taught

Subjects Taught		Comm. of Standards	Clarity of Standards	Endorsement Standards	St. Tailored to Need
LA	Mean	3.78	3.83	3.47	2.11
	N	18	18	17	18
	SD	.878	.707	.800	1.183
Math	Mean	3.92	3.75	3.75	2.50
	N	12	12	12	12
	SD	1.165	1.138	1.055	1.567
Total	Mean	3.83	3.80	3.59	2.27
	N	30	30	29	30
	SD	.986	.887	.907	1.337

ANOVA testing was performed on data from *school status* and *subjects taught* to determine if there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding the procedural techniques used in the teacher evaluation process. Tables 29

and 30 show there were no statistically significant differences among the groups by school status or subjects taught.

Table 29

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Procedural Techniques in the Teacher Evaluation Process

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Communication of standards	Between Groups	1.152	1	1.152	1.194	.284
	Within Groups	27.014	28	.965		
	Total	28.167	29			
Clarity of standards	Between Groups	.092	1	.092	.113	.739
	Within Groups	22.708	28	.811		
	Total	22.800	29			
Endorsement of standards	Between Groups	.045	1	.045	.052	.821
	Within Groups	22.990	27	.851		
	Total	23.034	29			
Standards tailored to needs	Between Groups	.125	1	.125	.068	.797
	Within Groups	51.742	28	1.848		
	Total	51.867	29			

Table 30

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects and Perceptions of the Procedural Techniques in the Teacher Evaluation Process

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Communication of standards	Between Groups	.139	1	.139	.139	.712
	Within Groups	28.028	28	1.001		
	Total	28.167	29			
Clarity of standards	Between Groups	.050	1	.050	.062	.806
	Within Groups	22.750	28	.813		
	Total	22.800	29			
Endorsement of standards	Between Groups	.549	1	.549	.659	.424
	Within Groups	22.485	27	.833		
	Total	23.034	29			
Standards tailored to needs	Between Groups	.1.089	1	1.089	.600	.445
	Within Groups	50.778	28	1.813		
	Total	51.867	29			

Participants' perceptions of the type of performance information used.

In order to measure if a variety of sources was used, the TEP questions (21-31) required the participants to rate five sources of performance information considered in the teacher evaluation process. These sources include *classroom observations, meetings with the evaluator, examination of artifacts, examination of student performance, and self-evaluation.*

Table 31 shows that the mean scores range from 2.53 (n=22; 73.3) to 4.30 (n=27; 90%), with the lowest mean score for *self-evaluation* and the highest mean score for *observations of classroom performance.* The data indicate that classroom observation is considered the primary method used in teacher evaluations, while self-evaluation is not frequently used as a source in the teacher evaluation process. The data also show that *meetings with evaluator* mean, score 3.13 (n=16; 53.3); *examination of artifacts,* mean score 3.47 (n=24; 80.00); and *examination of student performance,* mean score 3.44 (n=16; 53.3), are used in many evaluations.

Table 32 presents the mean scores by school status. Non-AYP schools reported mean scores from 2.79 to 4.26, with the lowest mean score for *self-evaluation* and the highest mean score for *classroom performance.* Teachers in non-AYP schools perceived *self-evaluation* as an area of weakness in the teacher evaluation process, while they perceived *classroom performance* as a strong area of the teacher evaluation process. The mean scores for AYP schools range from 2.09 to 4.36, with the lowest mean score for *self-evaluation* and the highest mean score for *classroom performance.*

Table 33 reports the mean scores by subjects taught. Language Arts teachers' mean scores ranged from 2.28 for *self-evaluation* and 4.28 for *classroom performance.*

Mathematics teachers reported mean scores ranging from 2.92 to 4.33, with the lowest mean score for *self-evaluation* and the highest mean score for *classroom observations*.

Table 31

Participants' Perceptions of the Sources of Information used During TE Process

	Mean Score	SD
Observation of Classroom Performance (27)	4.30	.750
Meetings with Evaluator (28)	3.13	1.332
Examinations of Artifacts (lesson plans, materials, Home/school communication, etc.) (29)	3.47	1.196
Examination of Student Performance (30)	3.41	1.268
Self-evaluation (31)	2.53	1.383

Table 32

Participants' Perceptions of Sources used in TE Process by School Status

School Status		Classroom Perform	Meeting w/Evaluator	Artifacts	Student Perform	Self-Evaluation
Non-AYP	Mean	4.26	3.16	3.68	3.33	2.79
	N	19	19	19	18	19
	SD	.872	1.500	1.204	1.455	1.619
AYP	Mean	4.36	3.09	3.09	3.55	2.09
	N	11	11	11	11	11
	SD	.505	1.044	1.136	.934	.701
Total	Mean	4.30	3.13	3.47	3.41	2.53
	N	30	30	30	29	30
	SD	.750	1.332	1.196	1.268	1.383

Table 33

Participants' Perceptions of Sources Used in TE Process by Subjects Taught

Subject		Classroom Perform.	Meeting w/Evaluator	Artifacts	Student Perform.	Self-Evaluation
LA	Mean	4.28	3.22	3.67	3.29	2.28
	N	18	18	18	17	18
	SD	.752	1.215	1.138	1.448	1.274
Math	Mean	4.33	3.00	3.17	3.58	2.92
	N	12	12	12	12	12
	SD	.778	1.537	1.267	.996	1.505
Total	Mean	4.30	3.13	3.47	3.41	2.53
	N	30	30	30	29	30
	SD	.750	1.332	1.196	1.268	1.383

ANOVA testing was performed by school status and subjects taught to determine if there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding the

performance information used in the teacher evaluation process. Tables 34 and 35 show that there were no statistically significant differences among the groups by school status or subjects taught.

Table 34

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Performance Information in Teacher Evaluation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Classroom performance	Between Groups	.022	1	.022	.038	.846
	Within Groups	16.278	28	.581		
	Total	16.300	29			
Meeting with evaluator	Between Groups	.356	1	.356	.195	.662
	Within Groups	51.11	28	.1.825		
	Total	51.467	29			
Examination of artifacts	Between Groups	1.800	1	1.800	1.271	.269
	Within Groups	39.667	27	1.417		
	Total	41.467	29			
Student performance	Between Groups	.588	1	.588	.357	.555
	Within Groups	44.446	28	1.646		
	Total	45.034	29			
Self-evaluation	Between Groups	2.939	1	2.939	1.567	.221
	Within Groups	52.528	28	1.876		
	Total	55.467	29			

Table 35

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects and Perceptions of the Performance Information in Teacher Evaluation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Classroom performance	Between Groups	.022	1	.022	.038	.846
	Within Groups	16.278	28	.581		
	Total	16.300	29			
Meeting with evaluator	Between Groups	.356	1	.356	.195	.662
	Within Groups	51.11	28	.1.825		
	Total	51.467	29			
Examination of artifacts	Between Groups	1.800	1	1.800	1.271	.269
	Within Groups	39.667	27	1.417		
	Total	41.467	29			
Student performance	Between Groups	.588	1	.588	.357	.555
	Within Groups	44.446	28	1.646		
	Total	45.034	29			
Self-evaluation	Between Groups	2.939	1	2.939	1.567	.221
	Within Groups	52.528	28	1.876		
	Total	55.467	29			

Participants' perceptions of the extent of the observations used in the evaluation process.

TEP questions (32-35) examined the classroom observation. This information included the *number of formal observations per year, the frequency of informed observations, the average length of formal observations*, and *the average length of informal observations*. The questions in this section measured whether the number and length of formal and informal observations were adequate as a source for teacher evaluation.

As Table 36 reports, the mean scores ranged from 2.36 to 4.73, with the lowest mean score for *average length of informal observations* and the highest mean score for *average length of formal observations*. The data show that *number of formal observations* per year is between 2 and 3 observations, with an average length of 30 to 40 minutes. The number of formal observations is consistent with the district's requirements.

Table 37 presents the mean scores by school status. Non-AYP schools reported mean scores from 2.72 to 4.79, with the lowest mean score for *length of informal observations* and the highest mean score for *length of formal observations.* Teachers in non-AYP schools perceived *length of informal observations* as an area of weakness in the teacher evaluation process, while they perceived *length of formal observations* as a strong area of the teacher evaluation process. The mean scores for AYP schools range from 1.70 to 4.64, with the lowest mean score for *length of informal observations* and the highest mean score for *length of formal observations.*

Table 38 reports the mean scores by subjects taught. Language Arts teachers' mean scores ranged from 2.44 for *length of informal observations* and 4.83 for *length of formal observations*. Mathematics teachers reported mean scores ranging from 2.25 to 4.58, with the lowest mean score for *length of informal observations* and the highest mean score for *length of formal observations*. The data indicate that teachers in all schools perceived the *length of informal observations* as a weak area of the teacher evaluation process.

Table 36

Participants' Perceptions of the Extent of the Observations Used in the Evaluation Process

	Mean Score	SD
Number of formal observations (32)	3.20	.714
Frequency of informal observations (33)	3.37	1.299
Average length of formal observations (34)	4.73	.691
Average length of informal observations (35)	2.36	1.062

Table 37

Participants' Perceptions of the Extent of the Observations by School Status

School Status		Formal Observations	Informal Observations	Length of Formal Obs.	Length of Informal Obs.
Non-AYP	Mean	3.21	3.53	4.79	2.72
	N	19	19	19	18
	SD	.787	1.219	.535	1.074
AYP	Mean	3.18	3.09	4.64	1.70
	N	11	11	11	10
	SD	.603	1.446	.924	.675
Total	Mean	3.20	3.37	4.73	2.36
	N	30	30	30	28
	SD	.714	1.299	.691	1.062

Table 38

Participants' Perceptions of the Extent of the Observations by Subjects Taught

Subjects Taught		Formal Observations	Informal Observations	Length of Formal Obs.	Length of Informal Obs.
LA	Mean	3.06	3.28	4.83	2.44
	N	18	18	18	16
	SD	.725	1.179	.514	.892
Math	Mean	3.42	3.50	4.58	2.25
	N	12	12	12	12
	SD	.669	1.508	.900	1.288
Total	Mean	3.20	3.37	4.73	2.36
	N	30	30	30	28
	SD	.714	1.299	.691	1.062

ANOVA testing was performed on data for *school type* and *subjects taught* to determine if there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding the extent of the observations during the evaluation process. As reported in Table 39, the ANOVA calculation using all schools was statistically significant in *length of informal observations*. *Length of informal observations* was statistically significant for $F=7.36$; $df=1, 28$; and $p\leq.012$. The mean scores for rating the *length of informal observations* by school type were: non-AYP schools ($M=2.72$) and AYP schools ($M=1.70$). The data suggest that teachers in AYP schools perceived the *length of informal observations* as too short, and have little to no impact on their improved practice

or professional growth. Table 40 reports the ANOVA calculations for all groups by subjects taught. The data show no statistically significant differences among Language Arts and Mathematics teachers.

Table 39

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to School Status and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Observation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Number formal of observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.006 14.794 14.800	1 28 29	.006 .528	.011	.918
Number of informal observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1.321 47.646 48.967	1 28 29	1.321 1.702	.776	.386
Length of formal observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.163 13.703 13.867	1 28 29	.163 .489	.334	.568
Length of informal observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	6.717 23.711 30.429	1 28 27	6.717 .912	7.36	.012

*p≤.05

Table 40

One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Subjects and Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Observation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.
Number formal of observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.939 13.861 14.800	1 28 29	.939 .495	1.897	.179
Number of informal observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.356 48.611 48.967	1 28 29	.356 1.736	.205	.654
Length of formal observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.450 13.417 13.867	1 28 29	.450 .479	.939	.341
Length of informal observations	Between Groups Within Groups Total	.241 30.187 30.429	1 28 27	.241 1.161	.208	.652

Summary – Quantitative Data

The quantitative data show very little differences between school status and subjects taught in teachers' perceptions of the influence of the standards-based teacher evaluation process on their teaching practices and professional growth. Statistically significant differences in teacher perceptions were evident in two areas: the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation on professional growth (2002), and perceptions regarding the length of informal observations. Teachers in AYP schools perceived the teacher evaluation process as having a stronger impact on their professional growth than teachers in non-AYP schools. Also, teachers in AYP schools perceived the length of informal observations as too short, and have little to no impact on their teaching practice or professional growth.

Overall, the quantitative data suggest that teachers in this study perceived the teacher evaluation process as a measure for accountability. Teachers reported positive perceptions of the evaluator, and perceived the evaluator as having the knowledge and expertise to adequately evaluate their teaching using the standards-based teacher evaluation instrument. Teachers in this study perceived the postobservation conference and feedback as vital to their improved teaching practices and professional growth.

Qualitative Data

The participants for the qualitative part of this study were a random sample of Language Arts teachers, Mathematics teachers, and administrators. Sixty-four teachers and eight administrators were invited to participate in this study.

There were six teachers, representing 9.3% of the possible participants (64), and six administrators, representing 75% of the possible participants (eight) who volunteered

to be interviewed for this study from four high schools in a northern New Jersey urban school district.

The four high schools in this study represented two schools that have consistently met AYP (magnets) requirements and two that have not met AYP (comprehensives). The schools are coded as M (magnet) or C (comprehensive), along with a corresponding identifying number of M1, M2, C1, or C2. Each group, teachers and administrators, was asked a series of 10 questions (Appendices A and B) that centered on eliciting their perceptions on the impact of a standards-based teacher evaluation process on improved teacher instruction and teacher professional growth. The questions also sought the perceptions on the role of the building administrators in the evaluation process and the impact of that role on improved teacher instruction and teacher professional growth. The interview questions facilitated better understanding of the data gleaned from The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire used to gather quantitative data in this study.

Scheduled appointments were made to conduct one-on-one, recorded, interviews with teachers and building administrators in each of the four schools included in the study. The interview questions were modified and gleaned from existing ones that were developed and used in similar studies. Interviews were conducted in the participants' places of employment, a mutually agreed upon location, or via telephone contact. Most participants appeared relaxed and genuinely eager to participate in the study; however, one of the teacher participants appeared angry or agitated, not with me, but with her immediate Language Arts supervisor. Some of her responses were curt and brief. I wondered if those responses were the teacher's true perceptions, or, if in fact, the responses were merely a means of blowing off steam. When asked if she would prefer

doing the interview at a later time, she responded, "No, I am fine." Her responses are therefore included.

Presentation of Qualitative Findings

The presentation of the findings is structured according to categories and the emergent subthemes. Discussion also points out differences between AYP and Non-AYP school participants.

Purpose

When attempting to discover the relationship between the teacher evaluation and improved teacher practices and promotion of professional growth, it was important to ascertain how the teachers and administrators perceived the purpose of the teacher evaluation. Fostering growth and teacher accountability emerged as the two major themes.

Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) described the use of teacher evaluation as "improving the performance of teachers, students, and the organization as a whole" (p.2). Haefele (1993) and the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994) indicated that a teacher evaluation system should look at all aspects of human resource activities, including conducting the hiring process, providing constructive feedback, recognizing and reinforcing outstanding teaching practices, aligning staff development activities, documenting evidence for dismissal, and unifying teachers and administrators in their collective efforts to educate students.

Teachers and administrators reported their perceptions regarding the purpose of the teacher evaluation. I found that five of the teachers perceived the purpose of the teacher evaluation as a way to foster growth in teachers.

Sub-theme: Foster growth.

A Language Arts teacher stated:

"For the most part, I believe it is to assist and improve in direct instruction to students..."

Another Language Arts teacher indicated:

"The purpose of the evaluation process should be to provide teachers with guidance, encouragement, ways to improving, and constructive criticism when applicable."

One mathematics teacher said:

"...The process encourages discussion around best practices and ways in which to improve these practices. Teachers should be evaluated in such a way that encourages an environment of instructional risk-taking and reflection where a teacher feels supported and comfortable in this type of environment..."

Although most teachers agreed that the purpose of the teacher evaluation should be to foster teacher growth, one teacher suggested that this is not always the case:

However, what seems to actually take place in some cases involves catching individuals doing the wrong thing in order to negatively evaluate them without providing assistance toward improvement.

When asked the same questions, the administrators echoed the perceptions of the teachers that the teacher evaluation process was used to foster teacher growth. Two mathematics department chairpersons added the specific components of "reflection", "collaboration", and "feedback" regarding the purpose of the evaluation process.

One Language Arts (AYP) department chairperson said,

"...I'd like to think of it as a means to assist teachers in improving their practices and offering professional development that may best service teachers in improving targeted practices..."

Another Language Arts (AYP) department chairperson indicated:

"[It's] to monitor and modify instruction, if necessary, as well as document and celebrate effective teaching strategies."

Sub-theme: Accountability.

Only one Language Arts teacher (non-AYP) and one Language Arts Department Chairperson (AYP), respectively, reported that they perceived the teacher evaluation purpose as a mechanism to hold teachers accountable.

". . . to make sure that we're kept up to date with whatever codes, standards, whatever comes from district, whatever comes from state. It's just to make sure that we're being held accountable for being professionals as the professional teachers we are."

"Now, the summative evaluation. . . I see that process as using all data collected via formative evaluations to summarize teachers' overall performance, i.e., citing areas delineating growth, proficiency, mastery or areas that remain challenges."

Unlike any of the other department chairpersons, the department chairpersons at the same non-AYP school mentioned identification of the elements of "strengths and weaknesses" in their responses to their perceptions relative to the purpose of the teacher evaluation. These are indicated below:

"...provide teachers with areas of strengths and weaknesses."

"...to recognize their strengths and weaknesses."

The data suggest that both teachers and administrators hold similar perceptions about the purpose of the teacher evaluation process in their schools. However, one administrator added that it is also a means for teacher and administrator collaboration, while another indicated that, in addition to its formative purpose, it serves in the process for summative evaluation of teachers. A third administrator further pointed out that the process allows for reflective practices that lead to improved instruction.

Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Process

Sub-theme: District driven.

All administrators indicated that the teacher evaluation process is directed by the district's policy and guidelines. The responses varied in degree of specificity:

> *"The district determines what observation tools are used and has the school administration explain its purpose and use to the entire faculty."*
>
> *"The school follows the [district timeline] for observations: three for non-tenured teachers before mid March and two for tenured teachers by April."*
>
> *"As per the district, administrators are given a calendar of due dates when the evaluations must be completed, a reminder that a minimum of three evaluations for nontenured teachers, and a minimum of two for tenured teachers. We have a three-part process: preobservation, observation and postobservation."*
>
> *"The evaluation process involves, minimally, three formal observations for nontenured teachers and two formal observations for tenured teachers during the course of the year. These observations can be announced or unannounced. With announced observations, a preconference takes place where the teacher describes to the observer what will be seen during the observation. After the*

observation, a postconference is held to discuss what occurred during the observation..."

"Along with these formal observations, informal observations, walkthroughs, and directed rounds are conducted... A midyear evaluation is now given to nontenured teachers to help them gauge their performance midway through the year."

"Each department is supervised by a department chairperson who is responsible for observing and evaluating the teachers in their department. The district has set minimum times that both nontenured and tenured teachers are to be evaluated within a given time frame. An annual summative evaluation is done on all teachers, for non-tenured, by April and for tenured by June..."

Sub-theme: Administrators' role.

The evaluator plays a vital role in the teacher evaluation process. Teachers and administrators reported their perceptions about the influence of the evaluator on the teacher evaluation process. On the question of whether the evaluator takes adequate time to observe the teacher's performance, three teachers reported that the administrator remained in the class the entire allotted time, as one Language Arts teacher said, "*Yes, and that's what I like. My DC is there the whole time...*" Two Language Arts teachers (Non-AYP) indicated that the evaluator did not always remain the entire time, and added their concerns about the evaluation outcome.

"Sometimes she does not always stay for the block, but she can always write a full evaluation report, which I feel is not fair or accurate."

"Sometimes he usually stays the entire block. Other times he does not. It is frustrating when he does not and then completes an entire observation [report]."

Although one Mathematics teacher reported that her administrator did not stay the entire time, she offered her perception as to why this may occur.

"No, in my opinion, and not frequently enough . . . I would love it if somebody could stay the whole period. That's not the reality of how the school day works. I mean there are so many things to do; so I understand it."

When asked if the evaluator considered all multiple sources of evidence when evaluating, five of the six teachers indicated that the evaluator did not, as noted by one Language Arts teacher and one Mathematics teacher:

"I don't think so. I think it's usually done in that snippet, in that period of time - what's observed, what's heard, what's seen. Obviously, they refer to lesson planning for that particular lesson - [to] make sure the objective is met. But outside of that, I don't think so."

"No, no. I think it has generally been my experience whoever is doing the evaluation is very much within their own [sic] position, not really considering other perspectives.

Most of the teachers reported that they believe their evaluator knows and understands the evaluation standards, *"Yes, I believe that my DC understands the standards"*, or *"I believe so. He refers to the standards in the written feedback ...,"* but may not fully understand the rubrics in each domain of the evaluation tool. This was indicated by, *"I don't necessarily know if they understand all of the rubrics."* Another

commented, *"...Rubrics can be open to slightly different interpretations leading to a subjective viewpoint and disagreement..."*

When asked about their role in the teacher evaluation process, all administrators reported that they are responsible, according to the district's guidelines and policies, for conducting teacher evaluations and providing evaluation feedback to teachers in their schools. They all reported having received adequate training and continue to receive follow-up training and possess the knowledge required to effectively evaluate teachers. In addition to reporting the physical role, only one Language Arts administrator mentioned descriptive words to further define her perception of her role as evaluator, *"I see my role as coach, colleague ... [and] instructional leader."*

Effective Aspects of Teacher Evaluation

Sub-theme: Postobservation conference.

In addition to eliciting the respondents' perceptions of the purpose of the teacher evaluation, I sought to ascertain their perceptions of the effective aspects of the teacher evaluation process in their schools. The postobservation conference, along with the feedback offered, emerged as the dominant perceived effective aspects.

> *"At this point, I would say ... it would be the after-evaluation conference to give you feedback on your interaction with students, especially when it comes to delivery."*
>
> *"I think the most effective aspects has [sic] to be the one-on-one with the evaluator at the end. Without that piece, it's just a piece of paper. That has to be the most effective aspect".*
>
> *"The most effective, I think are the postobservation conferences; ...the feedback part of things is extremely valuable."*

Five teachers indicated that they have had postobservation conferences, some more consistently than others. Their responses were mixed, as one teacher mentioned, *"It is personal and valuable."* Another noted, *"It is always very open and the conversation is very valuable."* One teacher described the postobservation conference as *"short, terse, and frustrating"*, while another described the postobservation as *"a requirement...and does not delve into meaningful discourse."* Only one teacher indicated that the postobservation conference was *"nonexistent"* for her.

Sub-theme: Feedback and recommendations.

Constructive feedback is critical in influencing teacher behavior. Frase (1992) pointed out that "Feedback has too often been inaccurate, shallow and at times mean-spirited, rather than helpful and uplifting" (p. 179). When an evaluation fails to motivate a mediocre teacher to improve, it will not inspire a good teacher on to excellence (Marshall, 2005). Without quality feedback to inform teaching, a teacher's independent creation of meaningful goals for his or her professional growth probably will not happen (Feeney, 2007).

An important variable of the teacher evaluation process is quality feedback. "Feedback refers to relevant information provided to those engaged in the teaching-learning process regarding their performance so that they may introduce modifications, correct errors or engage in professional development that will lead to enhanced teaching and learning" (Ovando, 2005, p. 173).

Although all teachers reported that they receive written and/or verbal feedback from their administrators, the perceptions about the quality and utility of the feedback are mixed. Some perceived the feedback positively as helpful and specific, while others described it as *"not accurate," "too general"* or *"too little"*. One Language Arts teacher

(non-AYP) said, *"I find feedback helpful...it helps me to reflect."* A Mathematics teacher (AYP) commented in a similar manner, *"I always feel like feedback is worth my time. It's all useful..."* Another Language Arts (non-AYP) added, *"I think the best feedback is when they give you specific things to use."* Several other teachers reported different perspectives: *"There is usually not anything of substance that would help me"* and *"I would welcome a little more dialogue between myself and the DC..."* When asked if the recommendations given were implemented, five teachers reported a resounding *"yes"!*

One Language Arts (non-AYP) teacher said,

> *"Absolutely ...I try to implement the recommendations that I usually get in the written narrative after an observation."*

A mathematics teacher (AYP) commented,

> *"I personally view recommendations as an opportunity to improve and seriously reflect on how I can incorporate these recommendations into my lessons and teaching."*

The administrators' perceptions are similar to those of the teachers in that they, too, report that teachers receive feedback and recommendations based on the observed teacher needs. The administrators perceive their feedback to teachers as helpful; they all mentioned that the feedback is based on the observed strengths and challenges. One administrator pointed out, *"compliments, as well as suggestions are given"*. Only one administrator indicated, *"Teachers are given the opportunity to accurately reflect on their lessons"*. Another indicated, *"There is feedback; however, more meaningful than the written document is the verbal conversation where feedback is presented to the teacher"*. This point seems to be aligned with the teachers' report that they would like more discussion and conversation.

Effect on Instruction

According to Darling-Hammond (2004),"Changes in instruction occur when teachers receive continuous support embedded in a coherent instruction system that is focused on the practical details of what it means to teach effectively" (p.1069). Others contended, "... the greatest impact on student achievement is teacher performance" (Danielson, 2001; Darling-Hammond et al., 1999; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), 1996; Tucker & Stronge, 2005). Teachers and administrators were asked what effect, if any, the teacher evaluation process had on their teaching.

Teacher responses were mixed. Four teachers reported that their teaching had been affected by the teacher evaluation process:

"For the most part, suggestions on differentiated instruction ... those suggestions have been helpful."

"It improved in a sense that whatever comments have been made, telling me what I doing wrong is not going to help me. That's why that postobservation conference becomes so important. I need to know what I can do to correct or improve on aspects of my teaching. ...I actually incorporated that in my lesson and they [students] became excited about it. So, that actually worked."

"Unfortunately for me, not enough, although I have become more aware of the kinds of questions I ask and have tried to incorporate more higher order questions in my instruction."

"It has actually pushed me in a couple of very specific directions because, over time, I noticed that the feedback tends to always go toward the same strengths...and not so much the same weaknesses. There have been key things

that I would really like to improve on. So, I focus my attention on the delivery of my lessons in those areas and try to push myself to the next level on the evaluation scale in that domain, from proficient to distinguished".

A Mathematics teacher indicated that, as a result of the evaluation, she analyzed and reflected on the process:

"After reviewing an evaluation, I keep in mind that the ultimate goal of this evaluation is to improve upon my practice for the betterment of my students. I take it upon myself to analyze those observations made...and reflect upon how I can improve..."

One Language Arts teacher felt that the teacher evaluation process has not changed her teaching at all. This response suggests that the teacher devalues the teacher evaluation as a result of her past experiences with the process. Yet, she indicates a desire for constructive feedback.

"The evaluation process has had no effect on improving my teaching. I never get any positive comments... I do not know if anything I do is good. I would appreciate if she would give me concrete examples or suggestions that I could use to improve."

With the exception of one, all of the teacher respondents indicated that the teacher evaluation process had some degree of influence on improving their teaching. Some of their responses pointed out very specific areas of instructional improvement; such as, differentiating instruction, implementing suggested strategies, focusing on lesson delivery, and reflecting on teaching practices.

Some administrators identified ways that the teacher evaluation process has changed teaching in a positive manner in their schools. For example, one Language Arts

Department Chairperson stated, *"I have noted an improvement in instruction because I tailor the feedback based on what the teacher and I agreed upon to examine or observe during either the pre-observation conference or informal observation that I had done."*

Another Language Arts Chairperson pointed out:

> *"There is more of a connection with new, nontenured teachers, where suggestions are taken into serious consideration and practice altered, if need be."*

A mathematics chairperson indicated:

> *"It depends on the teacher. Some have responded by using the rubric as a means to set short term goals."*

Another mathematics chairperson noted:

> *"I believe, for some teachers, instruction has improved through the evaluation process mainly through the suggestions given to the teacher in how to develop better teaching practices."*

While some administrators believe the teacher evaluation has a positive impact on instruction, others indicated different perspectives as indicated by the following:

> *"Unfortunately, there hasn't been a clear connection. A few teachers view it as a formality and continue ineffective practices."*

> *"Some do not change or react to the evaluation responses, especially when they are tenured. Some react only when given negative feedback and then put on a show for the observation."*

When looking at the teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the impact of the teacher evaluation on instruction, the data suggest that the two groups share some ideas. Overall, both groups suggest that feedback is the impetus that leads to change in instructional practice. The areas of perceived improvement include implementation of

suggestions through feedback, setting short- and long-term goals, collaboration to address areas of challenge, and maintaining a climate of high expectations, respect, and rapport.

While some administrators perceive the process as positively impacting instructional practice, some indicated that some teachers may view the process as simply a perfunctory one and has no connection to their teaching practices. Some tenured teachers are perceived as not taking the evaluation process seriously, and view it simply as a "formality and continue …ineffective practices." Further, they indicated that the process seems to be valued more by new and nontenured teachers.

Effect on Professional Growth

"Professional development is a key tool that keeps teachers abreast of current issues in education, helps them implement innovations, and refines their practices" (Darling-Hammond, 1990, p. 19).

Sub-theme: Educational pursuits.

Two teachers indicated that the teacher evaluation process motivated them to continue educational pursuits.

> *"I have gone back to school and earned a Master's Degree. Since I want to become the best teacher I possibly can, I am seeking* [National Board for Professional Teaching Standards] *NBPTS certification. I think the evaluation process…helped motivate me to seek what I consider the ultimate professional growth as a teacher."*

One administrator echoed this point, "*Many teachers are enrolled in graduate programs…*"

Sub-theme: District and school-level professional development opportunities.

Teachers expressed that they perceive the teacher evaluation process as having some impact on their professional growth. As one Language Arts teacher noted, the *"...individual lesson observation...not to a large degree...",* but perceives the annual as having the greater influence.

> *"My overall annual observations tend to be more helpful in planning. I just feel that the overall observation at the end of the year when we sit down and have discussion about the year, the various areas about the tool, and there is a dialogue about what my supervisor may see and what I may have planned for my areas of professional growth is more effective."*

Another Language Arts teacher echoed this point,

> *"It is during the annual evaluation conference and development of my PDP for the next year that discussion about professional growth is emphasized."*

In response to the question regarding their perceptions about the influence of the teacher evaluation on teacher professional growth, one Language Arts administrator indicated,

> *"Although many of our professional development opportunities are borne from our department meetings, the teacher evaluations from directed rounds, walkthroughs, informal observations and formal observations lay the groundwork for most of the professional growth activities in our school.*

A mathematics administrator noted a similar perception:"

> *"I think the evaluation process has impacted professional development and growth in several ways in our school. Many teachers here are enrolled in graduate programs. Teachers are encouraged to use data to guide instruction. They participate in formal PLCs and regularly view, log, and reflect on various*

PD 360 videos selected as in-house professional development activities. Teachers are encouraged to select specific videos that meet their individual needs as well. The district has purchased this on-line Internet professional development product."

The teacher responses indicate that they perceive the teacher evaluation process as having some impact in various areas. These are open collaboration with administrators, awareness of alignment of standards with teaching practices, enrollment in graduate programs, and as one teacher indicates, *"I am seeking NBPTS certification. I think the evaluation process in my district helped motivate me to seek what I consider the ultimate professional growth as a teacher."* One teacher perceives the teacher evaluation process as merely perfunctory, *"I don't believe it has much effect on my professional growth. In most cases, it seems that the evaluation is completed because it is a mandatory policy rather than a tool to promote professional growth."* One Language Arts administrator mentioned a similar perception when he said, *"Very little; basically, they [teachers] appear to think the evaluation is a necessary requirement and not something that could benefit them."* He also mentioned that an apparent disconnect exists, *"My teachers do not appear to make the connection between the evaluation process...and their growth."*

Overall, there seem to be similarities in perceptions between teachers and administrators on the impact that the teacher evaluation process has on professional growth of teachers. The administrators perceive the teacher evaluation process as having an impact on teacher professional development to lesser or greater degree in a variety ways. Many of the professional development activities are district or school driven. However, they indicate that some teachers have enrolled in graduate courses, consistently participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and regularly access individual

professional development opportunities through PD 360, an Internet-based program purchased by the district. One administrator mentioned that teachers in his school attend various workshops and conferences as well. Another mentioned that budgets and time constraints inhibit the number of out-of-district workshops or conferences teachers can attend.

Improvements to Teacher Evaluation Process

Teachers and administrators were given the opportunity to express their perceptions as to any changes that would improve the teacher evaluation process. Several themes emerged as a result. The dominant themes were instrument design and the need for teacher training.

Sub-theme: Instrument design.

Three teachers mentioned aspects of the design of the teacher evaluation instrument that need improvement. As two Language Arts teachers (non-AYP) and one mathematics teacher (AYP) noted,

> *"I know they [evaluation forms] were changed this year and looking at what the domains are this year, it seems that they are worse than the ones before. I think they're not designed too well to focus on one lesson."*

Another Language Arts teacher (non-AYP) indicated,

> *"It's on a 100% scale and you just add up the points per domain. But, if you're evaluating a lesson where one of the components is not within that lesson, but maybe was in a previous one, it's not shown on that evaluation form. I think they are not designed too well to focus on one lesson."*

A mathematics teacher said,

"There's been recent adjustments[sic] to this tool. Now, they're adding like a number system, which I like because I'm a math person, and that makes sense to me. But, I can see people arguing that you can't really put a number on the type of quality of teaching..."

Four of the administrators held similar perceptions regarding the design of the teacher evaluation tool. A Language Arts administrator (non-AYP) indicated,

"I would revisit the point scale and its effectiveness."

Another Language Arts administrator (AYP) added,

"I would add a component for teachers who have earned distinguished at least two years in a row."

A mathematics administrator (non-AYP) said,

"I would choose the point values assigned to each domain. It appears that the point value given to each domain is skewed".

Another mathematics administrator (non-AYP) expressed,

"The point system used in the tool is incorrectly weighted. I would make certain that the points work correctly..."

Sub-theme: Training.

One teacher and two administrators perceive the need for more training for teachers. A Language Arts teacher (non-AYP) reported,

"I think there needs to be more training on the use of the tool at all levels so that we're all on the same page and understand the purpose and how it would be used most effectively."

A similar view was voiced by a Language Arts administrator (AYP),

"One change would be training, not just for administrators, but training for teachers as well. The process is cumbersome, whether lack of teacher training, I am not certain, but I spend too much time explaining components of each domain of the formative evaluation rubric to the teachers."

A slightly different look at teacher training was expressed by a mathematics administrator (AYP), who felt that the teacher evaluation process should remove low-performing teachers from the classroom and require that they seek additional training, with the exception that they would undergo rigorous scrutiny prior to returning to the classroom.

In response to the question that asked what improvements made to the teacher evaluation process would strengthen instruction, various responses were given. One teacher indicated the need for more transparency surrounding the process, as well as training for teachers in the use of the document. Another teacher pointed out that more written feedback and collaboration would be helpful. Another pointed out that, if the tone of the process were different - one that showed teachers that the process was to support them and not simply an obligatory process - then improvement would be seen in instruction, student achievement, and school climate. One teacher commented that, to ensure fairness and accuracy, evaluations should be conducted by the principal and vice principal in addition to the supervisor.

When administrators were asked a similar question regarding improving the evaluation process, three indicated that the point values assigned to each domain need to be weighted differently. One administrator thought that more frequent formal observations of teachers would strengthen the process. Another agreed with one of the teachers by suggesting that teachers should be trained on the tool - not just

administrators. One Language Arts chairperson thought a change in the requirements for "distinguished" teachers requiring them to conduct professional development activities would improve instruction and professional growth. A similar idea was suggested by another administrator, who indicated that teachers who are ineffective and perform at unacceptable levels should be removed from the classroom and be *"required to seek additional training with the expectation that they would undergo rigorous scrutiny prior to returning to the classroom."* In addition, high-performing teachers would be encouraged to continue to grow professionally by continuing education and attending various workshops. Also, this same administrator agreed with one teacher about the idea that *"the teacher evaluation process should be used as one way to strengthen teachers' skills and not just as a requirement."*

Summary – Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

This chapter presented a description of the quantitative and qualitative findings of this study. Chapter V will present the conclusions drawn from the findings and discussion of their relationship to the theory and literature discussed in Chapter II. Chapter V will conclude with a discussion relative to implications for policy and practice and recommendations for future research.

Research Question 1

What is the perceived purpose of the teacher evaluation process?

The quantitative data from the TEP survey regarding the purpose of the teacher evaluation is not consistent with the data collected during the interview sessions. TEP Question 49 asked participants for their perception of the intended role of the teacher evaluation process. The quantitative data show a mean score of 2.47 (n=16; 53.3%), indicating that teachers tend to perceive that the intended purpose of the teacher evaluation focused more on teacher accountability than on teacher growth. However, during the interview sessions, the dominant theme that emerged indicated that both teachers and administrators perceive the intended purpose to the teacher evaluation as a mechanism to foster teacher growth. One teacher indicated that, *"for the most part, I believe it is to assist and improve direct instruction to students."* While another teacher said, *"the process encourages discussion around best practices and ways in which to improve these practices."* Administrators shared similar perceptions, *"I'd like to think of it as a means to assist teachers in improving their practices and offering professional development that may best service teachers in improving targeted practices."* One teacher expressed that although the process should foster teacher growth, she perceives the reality of that differently, and stated, *"However, what seems to actually take place in*

some cases involves catching individuals doing something wrong in order to negatively evaluate them without providing assistance toward improvement." One teacher and one administrator mentioned accountability as the intended role of the teacher evaluation. The data collected during the interviews do not clearly support the quantitative finding.

Research Question 2

What is the perceived effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and professional growth?

The TEP survey Question 2, asked the teachers for their perceptions about the impact of the teacher evaluation process on their teaching practices and professional growth. The mean score (3.33) for Question 2, displayed in Table 11, indicates the teachers' reported perceptions that the teacher evaluation has some degree of impact on their teaching practice. During the interview sessions, teachers and administrators discussed their perceptions about the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and professional growth. Their responses support the quantitative data. With the exception of one teacher, all the teachers reported that the teacher evaluation had some impact on improving their teaching practices. Some administrators also felt that the teacher evaluation had some impact on improved teaching practices. However, two administrators perceived that the process was not effective for all teachers, because as one administrator indicated, *"...a few teachers view it as a formality and continue ineffective practices."* Another mentioned that some tenured teachers do not take the process seriously. Some administrators indicated that, overall, the process seems to be taken more seriously by novice and nontenured teachers.

TEP Question 3 had a mean score of 3.00, suggesting that teachers perceive the teacher evaluation process has had little impact on their professional growth. The

quantitative data show a statistically significant difference at $p \leq .035$ between teachers in non-AYP and AYP schools. Teachers in AYP schools perceive that the teacher evaluation process has a significantly stronger impact on their professional growth than teachers in non-AYP schools. The mean score of 3.45 for AYP schools is reported in Table 12. During the interview process, the participants' responses were mixed. Two teachers indicated that the annual observation had more impact on their professional growth than the formative classroom observations. Two others mentioned that they had enrolled in graduate classes. A teacher in a non-AYP school pointed out, *"I am seeking National Board For Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification. I think the evaluation process...helped motivate me to seek what I consider the ultimate professional growth as a teacher."* One administrator in an AYP school also mentioned that some teachers in his school had enrolled in graduate courses. Most administrators indicted that many of the professional development opportunities were district and school-based driven. However, the overall perceptions expressed by the teachers and administrators suggest that they do not perceive the teacher evaluation process as having a great degree of impact on teacher professional growth. This is consistent with the reported quantitative data.

Research Question 3

What is the perceived role of the building administrators in the teacher evaluation process toward improved teacher practice and professional growth?

The section of the TEP survey asked a series of questions (12-22) regarding the evaluator's role in the teacher evaluation process. The mean scores for this section ranged from 3.43 to 4.23. The data indicate that there is a high level of trust and a strong

working relationship between teachers and administrators. When asked about the evaluators, one teacher commented,

> *"It is the responsibility of the supervisor to motivate, inspire, and create a professional environment in which the teacher feels capable of improvement.*

Another referred to the administrators as *"instructional experts"*, while still another administrator expressed a similar point: *"I see my role as coach, colleague, and instructional leader."* Administrators described their responsibilities to include the district requirements of conducting the prescribed formative observations, as well as conducting informal walkthroughs. One administrator also perceived the role as a collaborative one, wherein the teacher and administrator share in the process toward improved teacher practices and professional growth. Additionally, administrators expressed confidence in their knowledge and ability to adequately evaluate teachers as a result of their training and background.

The quantitative data show that all teacher groups reported mean scores above 3.00, indicating that teachers perceive the evaluator's role as having a positive impact on improved teacher practices and professional growth. The qualitative data support this finding.

Research Question 4

What is the perceived impact of postobservation feedback on teacher practice and teacher professional growth?

The quantitative data gleaned from TEP questions (36-44) regarding teachers' perceptions about the postobservation feedback show mean scores of 2.45 to 3.67, with the lowest mean score being frequency of informal feedback and the highest mean score being feedback focused on the evaluation standards. During the interview process, two

themes emerged as effective aspects of the teacher education process: postobservation conference and feedback. Teachers and administrators reported their perceptions about the effectiveness of these two areas. One teacher said, *"...it would be the after evaluation conference to give you feedback."* Another noted, *"...the one-on-one with the evaluator..."* And, another, "*...the postobservation conferences...the feedback part of things is extremely valuable."* One teacher held a different perspective and described it as *"a requirement... and does not delve into meaningful discourse."* Although reporting having received feedback, one teacher noted, *"The postintervention conference is nonexistent for me."* Some administrators expressed similar points to those of teachers. One administrator agreed that feedback is necessary and noted, *"However, more meaningful than the written is the verbal conversations where feedback is presented to the teacher."* All administrators mentioned that the feedback they give to teachers is based on *"observed strengths and weaknesses"*. One administrator noted, *"I tailor the feedback based on what the teacher and I agreed upon..."*

The findings suggest mixed perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the postobservation conference and feedback. Overall, teachers and administrators agree that the postobservation conference and feedback are important aspects of the teacher evaluation process. However, some teachers raised concern about the fidelity of the process as suggested by statements, indicating that the postobservation conference does not always occur as is required in the formal evaluation process.

Research Question 5

What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses, if any, of a standards-based teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?

TEP questions (23-35) asked for perceptions in three areas used in the teacher evaluation process: 1) procedures (2.27-3.83), 2) evaluation sources (2.53-4.30), and 3) extent of observations (2.36-4.73). As indicated in Tables 24 through 38, there were several areas that emerged as perceived strengths, indicated by mean scores of 3.5 or higher for all teacher groups. These characteristics included communication of standards (3.83), clarity of standards (3.80), observation of classroom performance (4.30), and average length of formal observations (4.73). The characteristics of reported mean scores below 3.0, and thereby indicating perceived weaknesses in the evaluation process, are standards tailored for unique needs (2.27), self-evaluation as an evaluation source (2.53), and average length of informal observations (2.36). Length of informal observations was statistically significant for $F=7.36$; $df=1, 28$; and $p \leq .012$. This data indicate that teachers in AYP schools perceive the length of informal observations as too short and have little to no impact on improved practice or professional growth.

The qualitative data appear to support some of the quantitative findings. When teachers were asked their perceptions about needed changes to the teacher evaluation process, the themes that emerged were *instrument design* and *teacher training.* Three teachers expressed the need for improvement of the evaluation document regarding the use of a number scale to evaluate teachers in the various domains. One teacher said about the scoring rubric,

"It's on a 100% scale and you just add up the points per domain. But if you're evaluating a lesson where one of the components is not within that lesson, but maybe was in a previous one, it's shown on that evaluation form. I think they are not designed too well to focus on one lesson".

Four administrators voiced similar perceptions as one noted, *"I would revisit the point scale..."* Although the TEP did not ask about instrument design specifically, teachers and administrators mentioned the rating scale as a weakness in the teacher evaluation process. Quantitative data indicate that teachers perceive another area of weakness as *standards tailored for unique needs*. Qualitative data findings support this perception by both teachers and administrators. One teacher indicated, *"I am not always sure that all administrators who come in from time to time understand that things may look unstructured because of the differentiation of instruction that I use to address the needs of individual students. The administrators' comments do not always indicate they fully understand the nature of my classes."* One administrator also intimated that there needed to be levels of differentiation in the evaluation tool for teachers who consistently receive a "distinguished" rating. One teacher felt that a component should be added to the evaluation tool *"that asks the administrators to check on parental contact or community involvement, something above and beyond what they are observing in the classroom."*

Discussion about the frequency of observations also supports the quantitative data. One teacher noted that *"More evaluations should be conducted by a principal, vice principal or other person...Someone other than the immediate supervisors should also observe and evaluate teachers."* An administrator also indicated, (2002) *"I think more*

frequent formal evaluations would be a start" [toward improvement of the teacher evaluation process].

Training is another area that was discussed as an area in need of improvement. TEP Question 46 asked for the perceptions regarding availability of training programs (mean score 2.79). Qualitative data support the quantitative data. One teacher noted, *"I think there needs to be more training on the use of the tool at all levels so that we're all on the same page and understand the purpose and how it would be used most effectively in our school."* A similar idea was expressed by an administrator: *"One change would be training, not just for administrators, but training for teachers as well."*

Several teachers voiced the need for more collaboration among teachers and administrators as a source of improving teacher practice and professional growth. This was apparent when one teacher said, *"We should be each others' resources as a direct result of what you learn from your observations."* Another teacher indicated, *"I would welcome a little more dialogue between myself and the DC..."* And, another said, *"There is usually not enough time allocated for this discussion."*

Overall, quantitative and qualitative data suggest that teachers and administrators in non-AYP and AYP schools hold similar perceptions about the overall teacher evaluation process in this district. The data show some variations in perceptions of teachers and administrators in both school types, but with the exception of the statistically significant findings already discussed, there are no other major statistically significant differences in their perceptions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter includes: Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusions. The purpose of this study was to understand the perceptions of Language Arts and Mathematics teachers and building administrators in four high schools in a northern New Jersey urban public school district regarding the impact of a standards-based teacher evaluation system on improved teacher instruction and teacher professional growth, initially implemented in September 2003. This study included two magnet high schools (N=11; n=LA 5, n=Math 6) that consistently make AYP and two comprehensive high schools (N=19; n=LA 13, n= Math 6) that do not, as measured in Language Arts and Mathematics by *New Jersey's High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)* and reported annually in the NJ State Schools Report Card. The reader is cautioned not to overgeneralize this study's findings, as the sample size may not adequately reflect the perceptions of the teachers in the broader school community in this district.

This study highlights the research findings of other studies found in the literature. Basically, as the literature on teacher evaluation shows, as currently practiced in many districts, the teacher evaluation process does not greatly impact teacher improved practice and professional growth (Danielson, 2001; Doherty, 2009; Glickman, 2002; Peterson, 2000; Stiggins & Duke, 1988).

Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. *What is the perceived purpose of the teacher evaluation process?*
2. *What is the perceived effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?*
3. *What is the perceived role of the building administrator in the teacher evaluation process?*
4. *What is the perceived impact of post-observation feedback on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?*
5. *What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses, if any, of a standards-based teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?*

Summary of the Findings

Research Question 1

What is the perceived purpose of the teacher evaluation process?

According to the literature, the goal of teacher evaluation, formative and summative, has served the purposes of professional growth and accountability. Formative evaluation fosters professional growth of teachers, while summative evaluation provides information for making personnel decisions (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Peterson, 2000; McGreal, 1983; Stiggins & Duke, 1988).

The quantitative data in this study suggest that teachers perceive the teacher evaluation process as a measure for accountability. The data show 53.3% reported a mean score of 2.7, while 23% perceive the purpose of the teacher evaluation process as a

measure for fostering teacher growth. The qualitative data suggest that teachers and administrators perceive the intended purpose of the teacher evaluation process as a mechanism of fostering teacher growth. The qualitative data do not totally support the quantitative findings.

Research Question 2

What is the perceived effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and teacher professional growth?

Some teachers in this study perceive the teacher evaluation process as perfunctory and done simply to satisfy district and state mandates. Some also indicated that the process is not always performed with fidelity. Danielson (2000) indicated that obstacles to effective evaluation lie, quite often, in the attitudes of teachers and evaluators about each other, about consistency, feedback, and multiple purposes used for evaluation. When teachers perceive the evaluation process as something required to be done and not for the purpose of personal development, there is likelihood that the teacher evaluation process will not be effective in improving teacher practice or fostering professional growth. Johnson-Hall (2008) found that, if teachers perceive the evaluation goals as unrealistic, or that the sanctions are not real, they choose to ignore the system. However, if they believe the sanctions of the system are real and tied to performance, they would consider the system as having merit and benefit to them. Good and Brophy (2002) noted:

> It is extremely important for schools and districts to assure that the accountability system does not undermine professional growth. Teachers, especially experienced teachers, consider evaluation systems which are primarily designed to identify incompetence (or minimum competence) as punitive, limiting, as

punitive, limiting, and inconsistent with teacher improvement and empowerment (p. 501).

The reported quantitative mean scores (3.33) (Table 11) show the teachers' perceptions relative to the impact of the teacher evaluation process on their teaching practice and its impact on their professional growth (3.00). These data suggest that teachers perceive that the teacher evaluation process has some degree of impact on their teaching practice, while they perceive the process as having little impact on their professional growth. There are some differences in reported mean scores between Language Arts and Mathematics teachers. The quantitative data show a statistically significant difference at $p \leq .035$ between non-AYP and AYP schools.

Qualitative data show that, with the exception on one teacher's response, all other teachers reported that the teacher evaluation process had some impact on improving their teaching practice. Some administrators also reported that the teacher evaluation process has some impact on improved teaching practice, especially for new, novice, and nontenured teachers. This is consistent with Peterson (2004), who posited that beginning teachers expect and solicit evaluation because it strengthens their efforts and classroom practices. Although the overall findings of the perceptions of teachers and administrators suggest that the formative teacher evaluation process has little impact on professional growth, two teachers noted that as a result of the summative evaluation they had enrolled in graduate level programs, one of which is the *National Board for Profession Teaching Standards* (NBTS). One administrator also mentioned that some teachers in his school had enrolled in graduate courses or programs. As Danielson (Oct., 2011) noted that "A commitment to professional learning is important, not because teaching is of poor quality and must be *fixed*, rather because teaching is so difficult that we can always improve it."

However, literature also reveals that many schools continue to implement ineffective approaches to professional development that may be instrumental in enhancing teacher learning (Guskey, 2003).

One area of concern that emerged was the suggestion that professional development was not the school's responsibility, but was the responsibility of the district. This point was borne out, as most administrators indicated that many of the professional development opportunities were district-driven. Many professional development opportunities in this district are designed top down, with the district office mandating and executing professional development activities. Little (1993) noted in her research findings that, when professional development is primarily controlled by the district office, a site's individual strengths and areas for improvement are largely ignored. Teachers in AYP schools perceive that the teacher evaluation process has a stronger impact on their professional growth than do teachers in non-AYP schools. Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, and Birman (2002) found that professional development that actively engages teachers in discussion of pedagogy increases teachers' use of those activities in the classroom. The researchers further noted that, when teachers experience enhanced knowledge and skills, there is considerable positive influence on change in instructional practice. Overall, qualitative data suggest that teachers and administrators do not perceive the teacher evaluation process as greatly impacting teacher professional growth. This finding is consistent with the quantitative finding.

Research Question 3

What is the perceived role of the building administrators in the teacher evaluation process toward improved teacher practice and professional growth?

Literature indicates that the role of the evaluator is one of the most important and

essential components in a successful teacher evaluation system (Colby et al., 2002). This study's findings show that teachers have confidence in the evaluator and the evaluator's ability to adequately assess their performance.

The reported quantitative mean scores show a range from 3.43 to 4.23 regarding teachers' perceptions of the role to the administrator in the teacher evaluation process. These mean scores suggest that teachers perceive the administrator favorably and perceive the evaluator's role as having a positive impact on their improved teacher practice and professional growth. With the exception of a mean score of 3.32 (non-AYP schools) for *capacity to model or demonstrate needed suggestions,* all other evaluator characteristics received mean scores well above 3.50. "Effective leaders can enhance teachers' performance by providing targeted support, modeling best practice, and offering intellectual stimulation" (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC, 2008*, p.9).

The reported qualitative data show that teachers and administrators perceive the administrator's role as positive in the teacher evaluation process. One teacher referenced the administrators as "instructional experts". This suggests that the administrators are perceived as knowledgeable and capable. This finding is supported by experts in the field who maintain that teachers highly regard evaluators with deep knowledge of curriculum, content, and instruction who can provide suggestions for improvement (Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Wise et al., 1984). Administrators expressed confidence in their knowledge and capabilities to adequately and positively evaluate teachers. These qualitative data support the quantitative findings.

Research Question 4

What is the perceived impact of postobservation feedback on teacher practice and teacher professional growth?

The value of constructive feedback promoting improved teacher practice and professional growth cannot be underestimated (Feeney, 2007; Frase, 1992; Marshall, 2005; Marzano et al., 2001; Ovando, 2005). Overall, teachers and administrators agree that the postobservation conference and feedback are important aspects of the teacher evaluation process. However, this study revealed some disparity in the quality and utility of written and verbal feedback provided by administrators. The literature on teacher evaluation and feedback strongly suggests that authentic, specific feedback is a critical aspect of fostering professional growth in teachers.

The quantitative findings suggest mixed perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the postobservation conference and feedback. The reported mean scores indicate that *depth of information provided* (3.00) *and quality of ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback* (3.10), *frequency of formal feedback* (2.87), *and frequency of informal feedback* (2.45) are areas of weakness in the evaluation process. The data further show that teachers perceive that *the nature of information provided* (3.50) *and feedback focused on the teacher evaluation standards* (3.67) as strengths in the evaluation process.

Although the qualitative findings indicate that teachers and administrators perceive the postobservation conference and feedback as necessary components in the teacher evaluation process, some concerns emerged. All but one teacher reported having participated in postobservation conferences. Nonetheless, all the teachers reported receiving some form of feedback, either written, verbally, or both. Stiggins & Duke (1988) pointed out the danger of evaluators not fully implementing all aspects of the

evaluation process: "Each shortcut increases the likelihood that teachers will not take the evaluation process seriously and, consequently, not derive maximum benefit from it" (p. 91).

Research studies highlight the importance of the feedback in the teacher evaluation process. Ovando (2005) conducted a study with instructional leaders which concentrated on delivering constructive and timely feedback to teachers. The findings suggest that the hands-on experience greatly enhanced the participants' ability to provide constructive and timely feedback to teachers. As this study found, teachers perceive the need for evaluators to give useful feedback with depth and meaning. This is consistent Nelson and Sassi's (2000) finding that administrators did not delve deeply into issues of content-specific pedagogy. Conversely, the administrators focused on teaching processes that lack specificity. Stiggins & Duke (1988) noted that "a continuous cycle of feedback … is needed to promote teacher development" (p. 22).

Research Question 5

What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses, if any, of the standards-based teacher evaluation process on improved teacher practice and professional growth?

The quantitative data show several areas of perceived strengths, with mean scores of 3.5 or higher, in the teacher evaluation process. These are *communication of standards (3.83), clarity of standards (3.80), observation of classroom performance (4.30) and average length of formal observations (4.73).* The areas that emerged as perceived areas of weaknesses are *standards tailored for unique needs (2.27), self-evaluation as an evaluation source (2.53), and average length of informal observations (2.36).* Length of informal observations was statistically significant at $p \leq .012$. These data suggest that teachers in AYP schools perceive the length of informal observations as

too short; and therefore, have little to no impact on improved practice or professional growth.

Although the district in this study uses a standards-based teacher evaluation tool, a perceived weakness by the teachers is that the standards are not tailored to their individual needs. The literature indicates that flexible, individualized, teacher-centered evaluation is essential for professional growth (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Toch, 2008). One administrator pointed out a need for differentiation in the standards for teachers who consistently receive a "distinguished" rating. This also includes teachers in specialized roles (i.e., special education), and teachers at various levels on the career ladder; such as, new, novice, and veteran teachers.

As the quantitative data show, teachers perceive the lack of self-evaluation in the teacher evaluation process as a weakness. Leading authorities in the field emphasize the importance of teachers engaging in self-reflection and evaluation in order to facilitate their growth. Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) noted that "As professional people, teachers themselves must engage in evaluation for both professional development and accountability (p. 8). Reflection and self-assessment are vital to teacher growth, because, through the process, the teachers analyze their own instruction retrospectively. "Requiring reflection as part of an evaluation process may encourage teachers to continue to learn and grow throughout their career" (Mathers et al., 2008, p. 6).

Teachers and administrators expressed the need for more evaluations, both informal and formal. "Infrequent evaluations…create missed opportunities to inform teaching practices and improve student learning. Both tenured and non-tenured teachers should receive frequent evaluations" (Mathers et al., 2008, p. 9).

The qualitative data support some of the quantitative findings. When asked what changes were needed in the teacher evaluation process, the themes that emerged were *instrument design* and *teacher and administrator training*. The evaluation instrument in this district contains a numeric scoring rubric, which poses some confusion for the teachers and administrators. Teachers and administrators expressed concerns about the utility and effectiveness of its use. An evaluation instrument is considered reliable if two or more evaluators use the same evaluation instrument and come to the same conclusion. The reliability is increased when the evaluation instrument has clearly defined nonsubjective criteria that require minimum interpretation. Equally important to ensuring that evaluation measures are reliable, the tool must be valid, meaning the rubric must assess the teacher performance it was designed to measure (Mathers et al., 2008). Using rubrics successfully will not only increase the uniformity of implementation, it will encourage objectivity.

On the discussion of training, teachers and administrators expressed the need for more training in the use of the evaluation tool and its purpose. Training for teachers and administrators is a necessary component in the teacher evaluation process. According to Mujis (2006), as cited in Mathers et al., (2008):

> Lack of training can threaten the reliability of the evaluation and the objectivity of the results. Not only do evaluators need a good understanding of what quality teaching is, but they also need to understand the evaluation rubric and the characteristics and behaviors it intends to measure (p. 10).

Stiggins & Duke (1988) also contended that "All evaluators and staff must be thoroughly trained. Everyone involved in the evaluation should know how to use evaluation instruments to acquire useful, objective data, interpret results, and use those

results to advantage" (p. 24). Barnett (2006) stressed that training needs to include a general outline of the process, exposure to the documents used in the evaluation process, and how the evaluation should be adapted to meet the needs of different types of teachers; training must extend over time.

Additional themes emerged during the interview sessions: the need for transparency regarding the evaluation process, and more collaboration and dialogue between and among teachers and administrators.

The quantitative and qualitative data show that teachers and administrators hold similar perceptions about the teacher evaluation process in this district. With the statistically significant findings, no other statistically significant differences emerged.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Conduct a similar study in other secondary schools in this district, in order to understand teacher and administrator perceptions about the impact of the teacher evaluation system on improved teacher practice and professional growth.
2. Conduct a comparative study in other New Jersey urban school districts that use a standards-based teacher evaluation system to understand its impact, if any, on improved teacher practice and professional growth.
3. Conduct a comparative study in New Jersey urban and suburban school districts that use a standards-based teacher evaluation system in order to understand differences, if any, in teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation system on improved teacher practice and professional development.

4. Conduct a study of all secondary evaluating administrators in this urban school district in order to understand their perceptions about their role in the teacher evaluation process toward improved teacher practice and professional growth.
5. Conduct a longitudinal study of one school in this district to determine teacher and administrator perceptions about the impact of the teacher evaluation system on improved teacher practice and professional growth.
6. Conduct a study of research-based professional development models at the secondary level that focus on content skills and adult learning.
7. Conduct a study of online professional development programs for their effectiveness in improving teacher practice and promoting professional growth.
8. Conduct a study on teacher motivations that affect adult learning (andragogy).

Policy

1. Implement an ongoing teacher evaluation training program for teachers and administrators.
2. Implement a fully-funded professional development program that focuses on differentiated needs of teachers via a wide range of topics.
3. Develop a multitiered evaluation program that considers years of experience and teacher status.

Practice

1. Design and implement measures of oversight to ensure that the teacher evaluation process is implemented with fidelity.

2. Design a study that examines the impact of the use of multiple data sources in teacher evaluation; such as, artifacts, self-evaluation, and peer evaluation on teacher practice and professional growth.
3. Design a study that examines the specific training needs of teachers and administrators in this district in order to promote a growth-oriented teacher evaluation system.

Concluding Statement

Peterson (2000) reported that the concept of using teacher evaluation to improve practice is the "most discussed purpose of teacher evaluation" (p.37). However, he pointed out, "Most current teacher evaluation systems overemphasize the function of evaluation to improve practice. Actually, there is little evidence that evaluation actually does improve practice" (p. 36).

Initially, my assumption was that the teacher evaluation process, in fact, had some influence on teacher practice and professional growth. To test this idea, I sought to see to what extent the process impacted teacher practices and professional growth of Language Arts and Mathematics teachers in four different high schools in the same school district, two high-performing magnet schools and two low-performing comprehensive schools. The schools included were based on their performance as measured by student achievement in Language Arts and mathematics on the state's HSPA which determines the schools' NCLB AYP status.

Before the onset of this research project, I had no idea of the depth and breadth of issues around teacher evaluation at all levels: local, state, and national. While engaged in the research, it became apparent to me that the matter of teacher evaluation had taken center stage in the American education reform movement. Some proponents of teacher

evaluation revision have suggested various components that should be included in the overall evaluation process. These include, but are not limited to, merit pay, student achievement outcomes, and value-added measures, to name a few. Although there may be cogent arguments for and against each of these proposed additional measures, the fact remains that teaching is a complex endeavor and there may not be *one* full-proof approach that fairly and adequately measures teacher performance and effectiveness.

Yet, it is logical to assume that, if the purpose of teaching is student learning, then I contend that measures used to evaluate teachers must take into consideration this very essential element - student learning (Marzano et al., 2001). This does not suggest that teacher evaluation should be contingent solely on students' standardized test scores, as is the practice in many teacher evaluation systems currently in operation. I advocate for attaching student growth measures from a variety of sources to teacher evaluation as *one* measure of teacher effectiveness. As students should be given time to demonstrate progress (growth) over a prescribed time period, teachers should, likewise, be evaluated over a period time following instructional practice in order to determine student growth as a result of that instruction. Classroom observations are simply "moments" in time and, therefore, should not be the sole measure of teacher effectiveness. Multiple measures must be considered; for example, teacher collaboration, teacher portfolios, self-reflection, and self-evaluation, as well as student growth. Danielson (Oct. 2011) supported this concept: "If we want to design teacher evaluation systems that teachers find meaningful and from which they can learn, we must use processes that not only are rigorous, valid, and reliable, but also engage teachers in those activities that promote learning—namely self-assessments, reflection on practice, and professional conversations" (pg. 25).

In a recent interview with Rick Hess (2011), Charlotte Danielson reiterated this point:

> "I thought about what it would take to do teacher evaluation well, and I discovered that doing it well means respecting what we know about teacher learning, which has to do with self-assessment, reflections on practice, and professional conversation. And when you do those things, you have enormous growth... [because] people appreciate the opportunities to talk in-depth about the challenges of practice, and it becomes a vehicle for professional learning instead of just a ritual you go through."

A credible system of teacher evaluation requires higher levels of proficiency of evaluations than the old checklist, "drive-by" observation model (Toch, 2008). Classroom observations have an important place in the evaluation process, but should be one of many measures of teachers' effectiveness. If classroom observations are done with the intent of facilitating teachers' instructional practice, then it is essential that the process is a collaborative one. On the point of conducting effective observational evaluations well, Danielson (to Hess, 2011) advised:

> The first thing to do is to arrive at consensus around what is good teaching...Having a shared and common understanding about what is good teaching is important. Ask teachers, what does this look like in my classroom? If you do nothing but that, you'll improve because a lot of other things fall into place. That is, if you know what good teaching is, then how will you know it when you see it? How do you evaluate it? But that conversation should not be shortchanged.

Evaluators need to be able to assess accurately, provide meaningful feedback, and engage teachers in teachers in productive conversations about practice that will lead to the ultimate goal of student learning and success. An effective teacher evaluation system must be designed to encompass as many measures as possible that fairly and accurately gauge teachers' abilities. The significance of the teacher's role in impacting student learning cannot be understated. Therefore, the methods used to ascertain teacher effectiveness must be robust, research tested, and fair.

Hopefully, this study can add to the body of work and offer some suggestions that will further elevate teachers to the highest levels of their potential, thereby ensuring that students reap the benefits of improved teacher practice and professional growth.

References

Academic and Professional Standards (2006). NJDOE, Trenton, NJ.

Access Quality Education: New Jersey (2001-2008). National Access Network. NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Achievement through teaching excellence: A system of teacher observation and performance evaluation, Guidebook for school administrators and teachers (2004, 2006, 2008). Newark, NJ: Newark Public Schools.

Achilles, C. & Tienken, C. (2003). Professional Development and Education Improvement? In Larry Huges, (Ed.) 2005. *Current Issues in School Leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Alexandrov, D. (1989). *Teacher evaluation in an era of school reform.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED318081).

Argotsinger, J. (2002). Components of performance-based teacher evaluation systems related to teacher growth: A case study. Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Asayeh, G. (1993). Staff development for improving student outcomes. *Journal of Staff Development, 14* (3), 24-27.

Babbie, E. (1999). *The basics of social research.* Albany, NY: Wadsworth.

Barnett, J. (2006). Considering growth in teaching: Teacher perspectives on the Ontario Performance Appraisal. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Bastarache, R. (2000). Purposes, methods, and effectiveness of teacher evaluation: Perceptions of urban elementary teachers and principals. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Beerens, D. (2000). *Evaluating teachers for professional growth: Creating a culture of motivation and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Bobbitt, J. F. (1918). *The curriculum*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1998). *Quality research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolden, M. (2004). *Achievement through excellence: A system of teacher observation and performance evaluation: Guidebook for school administrators and teachers*. Newark, New Jersey: Newark Public Schools.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2001). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8) 2004.

Borman, D., & Kimball, S. (2005). Teacher quality and educational equality: Do teachers with higher standards-based evaluation ratings close student achievement gaps? *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 106 (1) pgs.3-19.

Boyd, R. T. C. (1989). Improving teacher evaluations. *Practical assessment, Research & Education,* 1(7). Retrieved March 24, 2009 from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=1&n=7.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington: National Academy Press.

Bulach, C., & Peterson, T. (1999). Levels of openness and trust: Do principals "walk the talk"? Paper presented at the proceedings of the Eastern Educational Research Association conference (Report No. EA029703). Hilton Head, SC.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal, evaluation and performance standards. NASSP Bulletin, 90(3), 221-237.

Caulfield, J. (1989). *The role of leadership in the administration of public schools.* Union, NJ: Newfield Press.

Chappuis, S., Chappuis, J., & Stiggins, R. (2009). Supporting teacher learning teams. *Educational Leadership*, *66*(5), 56-60.

Clark, D. (1993). Teacher evaluation: A review of the literature with implications for educators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED359174).

Colby, S. (2001). A comparison of the impact of state mandated and locally developed teacher evaluation system. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62:02*, 401.

Colby, S. (2002). Teacher evaluation: A review of the literature. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED464915).

Colby, S., Bradshaw, L., & Joyner, R. (2002). Perceptions of teacher evaluation systems and their impact on school improvement, professional development, and student learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED464916).

Cook, C. J., & Fine, C. S. (1997). *Critical issue: Evaluating professional growth and development.* Oaks Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Corcoran, C. (1995). *Transforming professional development for teachers: A guide for state policymakers*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Costa, A. L., Garmston, R. J., & Lambert, L. (1988). Evaluation of teaching: The cognitive development view. In S. J. Stanley and W. J. Popham (Eds.), *Teacher Evaluation: Six Prescriptions for Success*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Council of Chief State School Officers (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008. Interstate school leaders licensure consortium: Standards for school leaders.* Washington, DC.

Council of the Great City Schools (2007). *Raising student achievement in the Newark public schools*. Washington, DC.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cuban, L. (1992). What happens to reforms that last? The case of the junior high school. *American Educational Research Journal*, *29*(2), 227-251.

Cunningham, W. C., & Gresso, D. W. (1993). *Cultural leadership: The culture of excellence in education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A Framework for teaching. Alexandria,* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2001). *New trends in teacher evaluation: Educational leadership.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (Oct., 2011). It's your evaluation: Collaborating to improve teacher practice. *NJEA Review,* 85(2), 24-27.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986). A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(4), 531-551.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teacher evaluation in transition: Emerging roles and evolving methods. In J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers* (pp. 17-32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Target time toward teachers. *Journal of Staff Development,* 20(2), 31-36.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives,* 8(1).

Darling-Hammond, L. (2002, September 6). Research and rhetoric on teacher certification: A response to "Teacher Certification Reconsidered," *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10* (36). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, accountability, and school reform. *Teachers College Record, 106*(6), 1047-1085.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Klein, S. P. (1999). *A license to teach: Raising standards for teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research,* 53(3), 285-328.

Davis, D., Ellett, C., & Annunziata, J. (2002). Teacher evaluation, leadership and learning organizations. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16* (4), 287-301.

Desimone, L., Porter, A., Garet, M., Yoon, K., & Birman, B. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study [Electronic version]. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 24(2), 81-112.*

Doherty, J. (2009). Perceptions of teachers and administrators in a Massachusetts suburban school district regarding the implementation of a standards-based teacher evaluation system. Doctoral Dissertation. South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall University.

Doolittle, P. (1994). Teacher portfolio assessment. ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation. Washington, DC.

Dufour, R. (1991). *The principal as staff developer.* Bloomington, Indiana: National Education Service.

Dufour, R. &, Berkey, T. (1995). The principal as staff developer. *Journal of Staff Development, 16(4), 2-6.*

Duke, D. (1993). Removing barriers to professional growth. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *74*(9), 702-707.

Duke, D., & Stiggins, R. (1990). Developing teacher evaluation systems that promote professional growth. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education,* 4(2), 131-144.

Duke, D., & Stiggins, R. (1986). *Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service ED275069).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (1965).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (1994). Improving America's School Act (IASA). P.L. 103-382

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (2001). No Child Left Behind Act. P.L. 107-110.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (2010). A Blueprint for Reform.

Elsbree, W. (1939). *The American teacher: Evolution of a profession in a democracy.* NY: American Book Company.

Fasanella, K. (2002). The professional teaching portfolio as a tool for formative evaluation. A case study. Doctoral Dissertation. South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall University.

Feeney, E. (2007). Quality feedback: Essential ingredient for teacher success. *Clearing House, 80*(4), 191-198.

Frase, L. E. (1992). Constructive feedback on teaching is missing. *Education 113*(2), 176-181.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* London: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Jossey-Bass.

Gay, L., Mills, G., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and applications.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Glickman, C. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Goe, L. (2007). *The link between teacher quality and student outcomes: A research synthesis.* Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis.* Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Goldberg, M. F. (1990). Portrait of Madeline Hunter. *Educational Leadership, 47*(5).

Goldrick, L. (2002). *Improving teacher evaluation to improve teaching quality.* Issue Brief. Education Policy Studies Division, National Governors Association Center for Best Practices.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (2002). *Looking in classrooms* (8th ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley Longman.

Gordon, B., Meadows, R., & Dyal, A. (1995). School principals' perceptions: The use of formal observation of classroom teaching to improve instruction. *Education, 116*(1), 9-15. Chula Vista, CA.

Gullatt, D., & Ballard, L. (1998). Choosing the right process for teacher evaluation. *American Secondary Education, 26*(3), 13-17.

Guskey, T. R. (1994). Results-oriented professional development: In Search of an optimal mix of effective practices. *Journal of Staff Development, 15*(4), 42-50.

Guskey, T. R. (1995). Professional development in education: In search of the optimal mix. In T.R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development education: New paradigms and practices* (pp.114-131). New York: Teachers College Press.

Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(6), 45-51.

Guskey, T. R. (2003). What makes professional development effective? *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(10), 748-750.

Guskey, T. R., & Sparks, D. (1996). Exploring the relationships between staff development and improvements in student learning. *Journal of Staff Development, 17*(4), 1-7.

Haefele, D. (1993). Evaluating teachers: A call for change. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7*(21-31.

Halverson, R., Kelley, C., & Kimball, S. (2004). Implementing teacher evaluation systems: How principals make sense of complex artifacts to shape local instructional practice. Paper in *Educational Administration, Policy and Reform: Research and Measurement Research and Theory in Education Administration,* Vol. 3. W.K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel (Eds.). Greenwich, CT:

Information Age Press.

Hannay, L. M., Telford, C., & Seller, W. (2003). Making the conceptual shift: Teacher performance appraisal as professional growth. *Educational Action Research, 11*(1), 121-137.

Hawley, W., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development. In Darling-Hammond, L. & Sykes, G. (eds.) *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hawley, W., & Valli, L. (2000). Learner-centered professional development. *Research Bulletin 27*(1), 7-10. www.pdkkintl.org/edres/resbul27.htm.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heneman, H. G., & Milanowski, A. T. (2003). Continuing assessment of teacher reactions to a standards-based teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *17*(2), 173-195.

Hess, R. (2011). Straight up conversation: Teacher evaluation guru Charlotte Danielson. http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/rick_hess_straight_up/2011/06/.

Hirsh, S., & Killion, J. (2009). When educators learn, students learn: Eight principles of professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(7), 464-469.

Hord, S. (1997). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hughes, V. M. (2006). Teacher evaluation practices and teacher job satisfaction. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Missouri-Columbia.

Hunter, M. (1985). What's wrong with Madeline Hunter? *Educational Leadership, 42(*5), 57-60.

Jauregui, G. (2006). Teacher evaluation and effective school practices that improve student achievement: An urban high school case study. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Southern California.

Johnson-Hall, C. (2008). Teachers' responses to high-stakes evaluation systems. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Virginia.

Johnson, R,. & Onwuegbuzie, S. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research Paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1994). *The Program Evaluation Standards* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Staff Development.

Katz, M. (2004). A Descriptive Study of the skills and attributes of principals who have become effective change agents in their schools. Doctoral Dissertation. South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall University.

Kelley, C., & Maslow, V. (2005). The effects of teacher evaluation on equity and system change in large, diverse high schools. From a paper presented at the April 2005 conference of the American Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Khadaroo, S. (August, 2007). How should teachers be graded? *Christian Science Monitor.*

Killion, J. (2002). *What works in the high school: Results-based staff development.* Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Kimball, S. M. (2001). Innovations in teacher evaluation: Case studies of two school districts with teacher evaluation systems based on the framework for teaching. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Lawton, S. B., Hickcox, E. S., Leithwood, K. A., & Musella, D. F. (1988). Performance appraisal in Ontario schools. In E. S. Hickcox, S. B. Lawton, K. A. Leithwood, & D. F. Musella (Eds.), Making a Difference through Performance Appraisal (pp. 12-41). Toronto, ON: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Leedy, P. (1997). *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2001). Practical research: Planning and Design (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Little, J. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation Policy Analysis, 15*(2), 129-151.

Logue-Belden, J. (2008). Teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation in high- and low-achieving middle schools as measured by the Pennsylvania State System of Assessment. Doctoral Dissertation. Duquesne University.

Loucks-Horsley, S. (1996). Principles of effective staff development for mathematics and science education: A synthesis of standards. NISE Brief 1(1), Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Loup, K., Garland, J., Ellett, C., & Rugatt, J. (1996). Ten years later: Findings from the replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in our 100 largest school districts. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10*(3), 203-226.

Manatt, R. P. (1997). Feedback from 360 degrees: Client-driven evaluation of school personnel. *The School Administrator*. American Association of School Administrators.

Marshall, M. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*, 727-730.

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

Mathers, C., Olivia, M., & Laine, S. (2008). Improving Instruction through effective teacher: evaluation: Options for states and districts. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ). Washington, DC.

McColskey, W., & Egelson, P. (1993). *Designing teacher evaluation systems that support professional growth.* Greensboro, NC: University of North Carolina.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1995). *Realizing new learning for all students: A framework for the professional development of Kentucky teachers*. (NCRTL special report). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

McDougall, H. (2001). Teachers' perceived effectiveness of their evaluation process at selected school districts. Doctoral Dissertation. University of San Francisco.

McGreal, T. (1982). Effective teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership, 39*(4), 303-305.

McGreal, T. (1983). *Successful teacher evaluations*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Millman, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.) (1990). *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary teachers.* Newbury Park, CA: Publications.

Moore, L. (2002). A study of the perceptions of teachers and administrators concerning the NJ Professional Development for Teachers' Initiative. Doctoral Dissertation. South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall University.

National Association for Gifted Children, (Nov. 2009). *Growth in achievement of advanced students* (Growth Models). Washington, DC.

National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) (2008). *What it means to be a professional development school.* Retrieved from http://www.napds.org/about_napds.htm.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Inequalities in public school district revenues*. Washington, DC.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* Woodbridge, VA.

National Educational Goals Panel (2000). Educators, researchers urge change in ways teachers are prepared to link professional development to standards. (Available online: www.nationaleducationgoalspanel)

National Governors Association (NGB) & Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSS) (2010). Common Core State Standards. Washington, DC.

National Staff Development Council (2001). Standards for staff development (rev. ed.) http://www.nsdc.org/educatorindex.htm.

Natriello, G. (1984). Teachers' perceptions of frequency of evaluation and assessments of their effort and effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal, 21*(3), 579-595.

Nelson, B.S., & Sassi, A. (2000). Shifting approaches to supervision: the case of mathematics supervision. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36*(4), 553-584.

New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force (2011): Interim Report. www.nj.gov/education/educators/effectiveness.pdf.

New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders. (2004). State of New Jersey Department of Education. Trenton, NJ.

New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program (1985). State of New Jersey Department of Education. Trenton, NJ.

New Jersey Statute Annotated (1995). New Jersey School Report Card. N.J.S.A. 18A:7E 1-5.

Newton, E., & Braithwaite, W. (1988). Teacher perspectives on the evaluation of teachers. *Educational Studies, 14(*3), 275-288.

Obama, B. (2011). President Obama on NCLB waivers, flexibility [full text]. *Education News*, September 26, 2011. Retrieved from http://www.educationnews.org/education-policy-and-politics/president-obama-on-nclb-waivers-flexibility.

Ovando, M. N. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of a learner-centered teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15*(3), 213-231.

Ovando, M. N. (2005). Building instructional leaders' capacity to deliver constructive feedback to teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 18*,171-183.

Ovando, M. N., & Harris, B. (1993). Teachers' perceptions of the post-observation conference: Implications for formative evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7*, 301-310.

Ovando, M. N., & Ramirez, A. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20,* 85-110.

Painter, B. (2001). Using teaching portfolios. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 31- 34.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd. ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Peters, D. (1989). *How to get the most from teacher observation: Tips for principals from NASSP.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No.ED305 760).

Peterson, C. H. (1982). *A century's growth in teacher evaluation in the United States.* New York, NY: Vantage Press.

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, 88*(639), 60-79.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Porter, A., Garet, S., Desimone, L., Yoon, K., & Birman, B. (2000). *Does professional development change teaching practice? Results from a three-year study.* US Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary. Retrieved from http://www.wd.gov/legislation/document #2000-04.

Porter, S., & Whitcomb, M. (2003). The impact of contact type on web survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 67*, 579-588.

Profitt, T., Madden, M., Whittman, C., & Field, T. (2004). History and development of Towson professional development school network. Transitions, standards, & transformations: A model for professional development school networks. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Racek, C. (2008). Perceptions of professional development in a small school district. Doctoral Dissertation. Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

Reeves, D. (2004). *Accountability for learning: How teachers and school leaders can take charge.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rindler, B. (1994). The attributes of teacher evaluation systems that promote teacher growth as perceived by teachers of intensive English programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boston University, Boston, MA.

Rowe, B. W. (2000). The influence of teacher efficacy and readiness for self-directed learning on the implementation of a growth-oriented teacher performance appraisal process. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (Report No. SP039393). New Orleans, LA: AERA (EDRS Document Reproduction Services No. ED4444942).

Ruberto, J. S. (2003). A study of the attitudes of veteran teachers toward professional development. Doctoral Dissertation. South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall University.

Schmoker, M. (1999). *Results: The keys to continuous improvement.* Alexandria, VA: Association of supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schmoker, M. (2006). How can we achieve unprecedented improvement in teaching and learning? Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schools for the 70's and beyond: A call to action (1971). A Staff Report, published by NEA.

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Leadership for schoolhouse.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Shavelson, R., & Towne, L. (2002). *Scientific research in education.* Washington, DC: National Research Council, Center for Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Science and Education.

Shinkfield, A. J., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice.* Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sparks, D. (1984). Staff Development and school improvement: An interview with Ernest Boyer. *Journal of Staff Development*, 5(2), 32-39.

Sparks, D. (2002). *Designing professional development for teachers and principals.* Retrieved from http://www.nsdc.org/sparksbooks.html.

Sparks, D. (2003). Change agent: An interview with Michael Fullan. *Journal of Staff Development, 24*(1), 55-58.

Sparks, D. (2007). Leading for results: Transforming teaching, learning, and relationships schools. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sparks, D., Hirsh, S. (2000). *A national plan for improving professional development.* Retrieved from http://www.nsdc.org/library/NSDCPlan.html.

Sparks, G. M. (1986). The effectiveness of alternative training activities in changing teacher practices. *American Educational Research Journal,* 23 (2), 217-225.

Spicer, K. A. (2008). Professional Development in an era of accountability: Teachers' perceptions. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Virginia.

Stanley, S., & Popham, W. (Eds.). (1988). *Teacher evaluation: six prescriptions for success.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stiggins, R. J., & Bridgeford, N. J. (1985). Performance assessment for teacher Development. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7*(1), 85-97.

Stiggins, R. J., & Duke, D. (1988). *The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stiggins, R. J., & Nickel, P. (1988). The teacher evaluation profile: A technical analysis. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 2:151-165.

Strike, K., & Bull, B. (1981). *Fairness and the legal context of teacher evaluation: Handbook of teacher evaluation.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.

Stronge, J. (1995). Balancing individual and institutional goals in educational personnel evaluation: A conceptual framework. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 21,* 131-151.

Stronge, J. (Ed.). (1997). *Evaluating teaching: A Guide to current thinking and best practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Publications [Author].

Stronge, J., & Tucker, S. (2000). Guidelines for linking student achievement to teacher evaluation. *School Administrator,* Vol. 57(9), 16-22.

The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership (2nd ed.) (2007). Introduction by Michael Fullan. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, T., & Barnes, R. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the Promise to Our Nation's Children.* Commission on NCLB. The Aspen Institute, Washington, DC.

Toch, T. (2008). Fixing teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 66*(2), 32-37.

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). A rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education. *Educator Sector Reports.* Washington, DC.

Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

United States Department of Education. (1994). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act.* Washington, DC: Author: www.ed.gov/legilation/Goals2000/TheAct/.

United States Department of Education. (2000). *Does professional development change teaching practice? Results of a three year study. Retrieved from* http://www.we.gov/legislation/document #2000-04

United States Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. (2010). Blueprint for Reform: The Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Walker, E., Hochwald, E., Kopacsi, R., Cai, Y., & Ramaswami, S. (1995). *An evaluation of the professional development school in Newark: The impact of training on teacher attitudes, teacher behaviors and student outcomes.* Education Office of Planning, Evaluation and Testing. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service ED431827).

Walters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL).

Weber, J. (1987). *Teacher evaluation as a strategy for improving instruction.* Synthesis of Literature. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Lab. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service ED287213).

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1984). *Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices*. (Report No. R-3139-NIE). Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Zepeda, S. L. (2002). Linking portfolio development to clinical supervision: A case study. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,* Vol. 18(1), 83-102.

Zepeda, S., & Ponticell, J (1998). At cross-purposes: What do teachers need, want, and get from supervision? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,* 14(1), 68-87.

Appendices

Appendix A

INTERVIEW SCRIPT

TEACHERS

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is Princess Towe; I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University. Thank you for consenting to spend a few minutes of your time to answer some questions regarding your ideas and perceptions about the influence of the teacher evaluation process on your professional growth.

My purpose is to gather information that will assist me in completing my dissertation. With your permission, I would like to record your responses as this will allow me to accurately maintain your actually words. I welcome and encourage your candid, straight forward and honest answers. I assure you that your responses will be kept confidential, so please answer the questions to the best of your ability. I am most interested in what you have to say.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

AFTER THE INTERVIEW

Again, thank you for your time. I greatly appreciate your cooperation and willingness to assist me in this endeavor.

Interview Questions For Teachers

T1. What do you perceive as the purpose of the evaluation process in your school?

T2. What, if any, are the most effective aspects of the evaluation process in your school?

T3. What effect, if any, has the evaluation process had on improving your teaching?

T4. What effect, if any, has the evaluation process had on your professional growth?

T5. What effect, if any, has the evaluation process had on school improvement?

T6. What is the postevaluation meeting like?

T7. What is the nature of feedback you receive post-evaluation?

T8. Regarding the evaluator:

a) Does the evaluator take adequate time to observe your performance?
b) Does the evaluator consider all multiple sources of evidence when evaluating you?
c) Does the evaluator know and understand the standards and the rubrics?

T9. Do administrative recommendations have an effect on your teaching practice? If so, how? If not, why?

T10. How would you improve the evaluation process used in your school so that it would be more effective in strengthening your instruction?

Teachers' Responses to Interview Questions

1. What do you perceive as the purpose of the teacher evaluation process in your school?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *For the most part, I believe it is to assist and improve in the direct instruction to students so that in turn, we improve and increase student achievement so that students do the best they can, not only on standardized tests, but in their future endeavors in colleges, vocational schools, so forth.*

Teacher 2: *It's basically to make sure the teachers are using the best practices in their classroom to make sure that the students are learning to the best of their ability. It's also to make sure that we're kept up to date with whatever codes, standards, whatever comes from district, whatever comes from state. It's just to make sure that we're being held accountable for being professionals as the professional teachers we are.*

Teacher 3: *The purpose of the evaluation process should be to provide teachers with guidance, encouragement, ways of improving, and constructive criticism when applicable. It should provide teachers with information on how to explore new teaching strategies and ways to make learning more interesting for the students.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *At my school, I understand the purpose of the evaluation process as an instrument to measure your ability in striving for and maintaining a level of accomplished teaching.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *For me as a teacher, the evaluation process in my perception is that it's a formative type of assessment using described tools and rubrics and things of that nature that my department chair or even my principal could come in to observe whatever items that he is assessing for that particular day. They would come in and carry out an observation of some kind.*

3. M2

Teacher 1: *I believe the true purpose is to promote professional growth among teachers and the school environment.*

2. What, if any, are the most effective aspects of the evaluation process in your school?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *At this point, I would say, if it was happening, it would be the after evaluation conference to give you feedback on your interaction with students, especially when it comes to the delivery. Was there enough discussion between teachers and students to ensure that students were actually comprehending what the teacher was trying to deliver, bring across to the class? Obviously using higher order questioning; was there communication going on between teachers and students? Did you see interaction between students and students? Did you see students talking about what their purpose for learning? Did the students truly understand the purpose of the lesson being given during the observation? For me, I would say right now, it's mostly in writing. Not necessarily by the post conference. I haven't experienced those; so it's been mostly what has been written in the narrative portions of the written evaluation.*

Teacher 2: *I think the most effective aspects has [sic] to be the one-on-one with the evaluator at the end. Without that piece, it's just a piece of paper. That has to be the most effective.* [So, you're referring to the postevaluation conference and the feedback?] *That's correct.*

Teacher 3: *Unfortunately in the last few years I have not experienced many positive aspects of the evaluation process.* [Would you care to elaborate more?] *I always dread when I am going to be observed because it appears that no matter what I do, I am going to get a negative report.* [Does this occur no matter who evaluates you?] *No, I am referring to when my DC formally observes me. When others do walkthroughs, the response is usually positive.* [Have you requested to be formally evaluated by another administrator?] *No, but I think I will. I think that the principal or vice principal should do formal observations. I will ask for one of them.*

2. C2-B

Teacher 1: *Looking at lesson plans and then the lesson. Do lesson plans indicate knowledge of students and subject matter? In observing the lesson does the teacher know how to transfer subject matter knowledge to students? I have learned from NBPTS that teachers must know their subjects and how to teach them to their students, and that, teachers must know their students. An evaluation is effective if it helps produce those results.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *The most effective, I think, are the post observation conferences that occur between whoever did the observation and the teacher. I think this is the most... the feedback part of things we don't even think about that someone sitting in your classroom observing, points out to you, is extremely valuable.*

4. M2

Teacher 1: *When used for its correct intention, the process encourages discussion surrounding best practices and ways in which to improve upon these practices. Teachers should be evaluated in such a way that encourages an environment of instructional risk-taking and reflection where a teacher feels supported and comfortable in this type of environment. However, what seems to actually take place in some cases involves "catching individuals" doing the wrong thing in order to negatively evaluate them without providing assistance toward improvement.*

3. What effect, if any, has the evaluation process had on improving your teaching?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *For the most part, suggestions on, I would say, differentiated instruction. How you could maybe teach the same thing at different levels to students who are obviously coming in at different levels; being able to touch all learning styles, including suggestions for more tactile things for students who learn in that fashion. I do not tend to go in that direction, a lot is auditory and visual. So, more hands-on activities that could help students reinforce the concepts [that are] being introduced. Those have been some suggestions and have been helpful.*

Teacher 2: *It has improved in a sense that whatever comments have been made, telling me I'm doing something wrong is not going to help me. That's why that post observation conference becomes so important. I need to know what I can do to correct or improve on aspects of my teaching. One of the lessons I taught with Greek mythology, my DC, she actually said that one of the things she used to do was reference how Greek mythology had found its way in modern times, and I actually incorporated that in my lesson and they [students]became excited about it. So that actually worked and was helpful.*

Teacher 3: *The evaluation process has had no effect on improving my teaching. Since I never get any positive comments from my DC, I do not know if anything I do is good. Instead of simply pointing out the negatives, I would appreciate it she would give me concrete examples or suggestions that I could use to improve.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *Unfortunately for me not enough. Although, I have become more aware of the kinds of questions I ask and have tried to incorporate more, higher order questions in my instruction. One reason why I decided to seek NBPTS certification is because I want to be an accomplished teacher.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *It has actually pushed me in a couple of very specific directions because, over time, I've been teaching for seven years, and noticed that the feedback tends to always go toward the same strengths repeatedly and not so much the same weaknesses.*

But, there have been key things that I would really like to improve on. So, I focus my attention on the delivery of my lessons in those areas and try to push myself to the next level on the evaluation scale in that domain, from proficient to distinguish.

4. M2

Teacher 1: *After receiving an evaluation, I always keep in mind that the ultimate goal of this evaluation is to improve upon my practice for the betterment of my students. I take it upon myself to analyze those observations made by my supervisor and reflect upon how I can improve upon those areas of weakness. Although, this is an important piece of the evaluation process, the supervisor, who should also be an instructional leader, should lead by example to assist the teacher in achieving these goals. The manner in which this is done is of the utmost importance. I think it is the responsibility of the supervisor to motivate, inspire, and create a professional environment in which the teacher feels capable of improvement.*

4. What effect, if any, has the evaluation process had on your professional growth?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *The individual lesson observation, I would say, not to a large degree. I find that my overall annual observations tend to be more helpful in planning. I just feel that the overall observation at the end of the year when we do sit down and have discussion about the year, the various areas about the tool, and there is a dialogue about what my supervisor may see and what I may have planned for my areas of professional growth is more effective.*

Teacher 2: *As a professional, it's made me more in tuned with what's required. I think we all have a passion and philosophy on what teaching is, but we sometimes kind of forget what our obligations are according to what the state standards are. It's made me become a professional in that aspect, having my practices be aligned with what the standards are.*

Teacher 3: *Although not positive for me, it has allowed me to grow professionally. I have gone back to school and earned a masters degree. I take pride in continuing to be the best that I can be despite what is written about me. I do try to make changes based on what is given in the form of feedback.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *The classroom observations will ultimately lead to the yearly annual evaluation. It is during the annual evaluation conference and development of my PDP (Professional Development Plan) for the next year that discussion about professional growth is emphasized. However, as I said before, since I want to become the best teacher I possibly can, I am seeking NBPTS certification. I think the evaluation process in my district helped motivate me to seek what I consider the ultimate professional growth as a teacher.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *I think I've opened up a lot of conversations with administration about things like an AP Statistics program and other outside of the box items that I would like to see in place. I feel empowered to try to establish and to try and get approval for those things during those times. So, if certain things are being brought up as far as constructive feedback for a weakness that I might have in my lesson, that automatically opens the door to say, well being that's the case, I see an opportunity and I'll bring something up that I think I need, resource wise, that I can ask for at that time.*

4. M2

Teacher 1: *I don't believe it has much effect on my professional growth. In most cases, it seems that the evaluation is completed because it is a mandatory policy rather than a tool to promote professional growth.*

5. What effect, if any, has the evaluation process had on school improvement?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *To my knowledge, because I do not know about school-wide, I personally don't see that having much effect because I am not involved in the whole school's discussions. All I can rely on is discussions I have with my coworkers, and really they limit the conversation to what their actual observation grade was. We do not sit and talk about evaluations. I would hope that, anyway, we improve instruction would be something effecting (sic) our overall school improvement. I don't have direct information on how it is happening right now.*

Teacher 2: *I am not sure about overall school improvement, but I know that we, as teachers, and administrators have begun using the terms of the domains more. I have noticed more discussion in department and faculty meetings about teaching and learning and many times the language that is used comes directly from the components of the domains on the evaluation form. In PLC's we have looked at student work and talked about what differentiated or modified instruction means and what it could look like. I know for me, I was never clear on what differentiated instruction was. I think I understood the concept, but I really didn't know what I was expected to do. Collaborating with other teachers in PLCs and watching the PD 360 videos has helped me and others in this area. Also, overall there seems to be less classroom management problems, because that is an area in one of the domains. I think because the administrators are offering ways to help teachers in this area may be the reason. One thing I have noticed school-wide is more student work is posted in the classrooms and hallways. Since this is an area of evaluation, I think more teachers are displaying student work. This is an improvement in the environment because it shows the students that we care about their work. I really cannot speak about other areas of school improvement.*

Teacher 3: *Some departments have been encouraged to do better and given more positive feedback on their teaching methods. In the end, if students benefit from this it does improve the school in some way. In my department only some teachers are offered positive feedback. The feedback I am given is usually negative and does not help me improve as it should. [Are you offered suggestions?] Rarely. Usually the discussion centers on what I did not do, or something I did was not correct, but in terms of giving me concrete examples of suggestions of resources I can go to, that doesn't happen.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *That's difficult to determine from where I am. I am isolated in my classroom. However, I do see some improvement in teacher collaboration through grade level PLCs. I also think that the climate in the building has changed based on what we tend to talk about when it comes to teacher expectations, responsibilities and student learning. I feel that there is still much to be done in the overall school environment. I am not sure how the evaluation process of teachers has much impact in many areas of school improvement. But, some teachers appear to be more aware of what they need to do. Maybe that is a result of the evaluation process. I am not sure.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *That's an interesting question. I don't get a bird's eye view about how the overall evaluation process would work. I have no idea. I would love to see some kind of domain that they've set in that assessed within that evaluation tool that asks the administrators to check on parental contact or community involvement, something above and beyond what they are observing in the classroom. I haven't seen anything like that. I think that would have a direct impact on the community outside of your classroom. But I don't know what the overall arching school influence that tool would have. I have no idea.*

4. M2

Teacher 1: *I don't see this process as having an effect on school environment. Most teachers seem fearful of being evaluated because they know the process does not involve supportive guidance. Looking at data involving school attendance, GPA's, and standardized testing it seems to have had little or no effect as it relates to student achievement.*

6. What is the postevaluation meeting like?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *For me, nonexistent. I haven't had a postobservation at least in the past couple of years. I haven't had one at all this school year or [sic] I didn't have one at all last year. I've had two formals this year and several informal evaluations. You get walk by kind of thing. Okay, you had everything, that kind of thing, but not to sit down and discuss it. I do see some merit in that. I am sure I could insist on having them*

[postobsevation conferences], but I do not necessarily assert because, as I said before, I'm not quite sure how I feel about the individual lesson observations. Then I do not put that much emphasis on the post conference.

Teacher 2: *It's very personal and that's what I like. It's upsetting on a personal note that you left, but we were fortunate enough to have someone with the same care as you had. And, I think that makes you want to become a better person as well. Because if you're open to criticism and it's always positive criticism, then that makes you want to become a better professional.* [So, during that post-observation, do you feel that feedback you get is valuable?] *It's valuable and it's not just positive. But, after every evaluation there's always something that is said in terms of what I can do differently in an assessment piece, what I can improve, in maybe directed instruction, or in a mini lesson that could be added in certain areas that I probably didn't think of then and there, but could be added for the next time I do the lesson.*

Teacher 3: *The postevaluation is short, tense, and usually frustrating. It is usually not very productive.* [Would you care to elaborate?] *Well, in my experience, it is usually the Department Chairperson doing all the talking. When I try to get a word in edge-wise, I am cut off and ignored. If I do not agree with a point, we cannot seem to address in a positive manner. Although there is never an outright argument, there is this feeling that we are fighting over something that has nothing to do with the evaluation. I really do not under-stand what the problem could me. I try to remain positive, but it is hard. I hold on to my faith and do the best I can. Most of the time I just want to get it over with and get out of there.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *Wow! I would welcome a little more dialogue between myself and the DC before signing the evaluation. Often times, if we meet, there is little opportunity for a conversation. It is usually the DC going over what is written on the form. This does not always occur, but I wish that there is always that one on one time to discuss areas of concern. Sometimes there isn't a post-evaluation conference at all, even though there should be. My DC will simply put the evaluation form in my mailbox and I am to review it, sign it, and return it to him. As I said, even if there is a postevaluation conference, there is not always much dialogue that takes place.*

<u>Mathematics Teachers</u>

3. M1

Teacher 1: *It's always been very open. I don't feel intimidated in any way. I always feel like the feedback is worth my time. There are certain questions that are asked or apply on paper that are just kind of filler and almost not appropriate to this specific situation. But, during the postobservation conversation you're asked to read over them and you just sign if you agree. So, I prefer spending time having the conversation about things that do apply. So, I think there are responses on paper that don't really have as much bearing as what the actual conversation would have. So, I think that the conversation and meeting itself are so important.*

4. M2
Teacher 1: *Generally it is done because it is required. There is usually not enough time allocated for this discussion, if any at all. It usually consists of a re-cap of what is written on the evaluation. It usually does not delve into meaningful discourse surrounding instructional strategies and best practices.*

7. What is the nature of feedback you receive postevaluation?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1
Teacher 1: *As I said, that would* be mostly in informal comments, more verbal comm*ents. Obviously, in the narrative portion of all evaluations there's some feedback in there. So, I do take heed to the evaluation and I do try to implement in my future planning. Usually, it's related to incorporating various types of learning styles. As I said before, differentiated instruction; make sure you're doing small group kind of instruction. So they're helpful, but they're noted mostly in the narrative portion of the evaluation.*

Teacher 2: *As I said before, I find the feedback very helpful. Generally, the post-observation begins with my DC asking how I thought the lesson went. I try to be as honest as I can. We discuss each domain that was observed. Sometimes things that I thought went well, my DC may not think so. She will then discuss certain areas with me that help me to reflect on what I did. In most cases, I agree, because as I said, sometimes I am not aware of these things until they are brought to my attention. And, even when I may not agree, I try to incorporate the suggestions in my future lessons.*

Teacher 3: *The feedback I get is not accurate, unfair and discouraging. I wish I could have a different person other than my Department Chairperson observe me. At one point I even considered asking for a transfer because I had become so frustrated here. I think it is very unprofessional for the administrator to make the evaluation process something personal rather than a professional opportunity to help improve the teacher.*

2. C2
Teacher 1: *I have always desired more pertinent feedback. The feedback I receive seems too general. The kind of feedback is basically a reiteration of what was on the evaluation form. There is usually not anything of substance that would help me improve.* [Do you initiate discussion about the feedback or the observation?] *Yes, sometimes I get specific suggestions when I ask, but I think the DC should be ready to offer as much detailed feedback that would help me improve in the areas rated basic or unsatisfactory on the form. If I do not know what I need to do to improve, then how am I going to become a better or accomplished teacher. Even when I get proficient or distinguished in some of the domain categories, I would still like to know what I did well. I want to know as much as I can to improve myself and my teaching because this will only help my students.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *I think it's all useful feedback. There is generally positive feedback in my traditional response strengths. As a teacher, I mean, it's been pretty consistent that if they're assessing this specific domain, I already know which ones are going to be good. Because it's been that long and I just know I've got that part down. And, several administrators have been impressed with my strengths. And then I love to hear what an administrator has to say about the weaknesses because they all have different perspectives. So, I think when they make specific suggestions, something along the lines of what has worked for me before, I love to try anything that's going to help me improve and then if it works out, and I like it, then I usually stick to it. Something that is going to improve the classroom flow, or even just the student learning in a certain topic, whatever, that's definitely where I think most useful comments. It's one thing to give feedback, positive/negative, whatever, but I think the best feedback is when they give you specific things to use.*

4. M2

Teacher 1: *I generally receive proficient or distinguished ratings and am highly commended for strategies that I have put in place in my classroom. There is always room for improvement, which is minimally discussed, but as I said earlier there is usually not a great deal of time given to discuss the evaluation, which in turn, fails to guide teachers toward professional growth.*

8. Regarding the evaluator:

a. Does the evaluator take adequate time to observe your performance?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *Yes. Usually the two formal observations I've had this year, the person was in the room the entire 80-minute block.*

Teacher 2: *Yes, and that's what I like. That is one of the things I was a little upset about with this CAPA review. They're only in there for five or ten minutes, but when we're observed, my DC is there the whole time and that's really good to see because it kind of goes through the lesson on what happened in the beginning and how you get through A to B to C. So that you see all the scaffolding within the lesson; see how the kids go from you directing them, you modeling for them, and then kind of slowly going into a partner group or group work, then to finally on their own. So, they're kinda, again, taking away a little by little. That's what I like, the fact that, if you're going to observe a class, stay there and observe the class. You don't see too much in five or ten minutes.*

Teacher 3: *Sometimes. She does not always stay for the block, but she can always write a full evaluation report, which I feel is not fair or accurate.* [Have you discussed your

concerns with the Department Chairperson?] *I have tried, but it usually does not make a difference.*

2. C2
Teacher 1: *Yes, sometimes. Sometimes he usually stays the entire block. Other times he does not. It is frustrating when he does not and then completes and entire observation. How can that be helpful to me if he does not see all that goes in during that class? I think the formal observation should take more than a short visit. As I said before, I really want constructive feedback, but I do not always get that.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1
Teacher 1: *No, in my opinion no; and, also, not frequently enough. That's kind of a two-way street though. So, it's kind of like, how much time do you actually need to formally observe a classroom when you're already kind of involved within what's going on in class on a daily basis anyway? I think that because we're a small school, there are administrators who are very privy to exactly what's going on in the classroom. So, the formal observation time doesn't need to be lengthy. I would love it if somebody could stay the whole period. But, that's not the reality of how the school day works, I mean there so many things, to do; so I understand it. But then, there's also outside of those formal evaluative observations. There's always ongoing conversation as to what is going on in the classroom. Not even on subject matter and what materials are being used, but also students with behaviors and what kind of resources we can offer certain students if they're special needs or anything. Just the other day, we had a meeting after school, voluntary involvement, where a technology person from Texas Instrument came to show us how to use the Inspire, which is a brand new calculator, brand new technology, and I have been putting that off for a long time. So, it opened a brand new door and even if the evaluative reflective kind of, you know, how am I teaching; is this working, if that conversation even doesn't happen with the DC, within those kinds of opportunities, it should be happening with other teachers. I think pretty much overall, at least in the math department here, I think we're very close-knitted and everybody knows what's going on in each other's classrooms. So, it's okay that it's not so long, even though it would be nice if it were longer.*

4. M2
Teacher 1: *My supervisor generally remains during the entire block. However, I think it is also important for the observer to see how the previous class ended and to see how the class following will begin in relation to the lesson.* [Do you have an opportunity to share this before the actual observation?] *Yes, during the preobservation. But sometimes for tenured teachers like myself, there may not be a pre-observation conference.*

b. Does the evaluator consider all multiple sources of evidence when evaluating you?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *I don't think so. I think it's usually done in that snippet, in that period of time-what's observed, what's heard, what's seen. Obviously, they refer to lesson planning for that particular lesson-make sure the objective is met. But outside of that, I don't necessarily think so.*

Teacher 2: *I don't think so, only because if you're not aware of what happened the previous day because sometimes lessons are actually continuous. So, especially if it's a novel or even a short story, those lessons are not in isolation. Sometimes if the evaluator is not aware of what you had done previously, sometimes that lesson may not make sense or something is missing, but the kids know what's going on because they were there the day before. But for the most part, whoever, is evaluating (other evaluators), I let them know what we did before. But when I am evaluated by the DC I usually let her know in the pre-observation, if there is one. If it's an unannounced observation, I will quickly pull them aside and tell them what we had done just so they're aware, because I don't want to seem incompetent and they say, "Well, she didn't do this or she didn't do that". But, this way I can say* <u>*that*</u> *was done; it's just you were not here to see that.*

Teacher 3: *No.* [Would you prefer that she considered other sources of evidence?] *I would, but I think that she does at the end of the year, but not during the observations.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *I think so, if you mean lesson plans, assessments, instructional activities, student work, posted objectives, etc. I have to submit certain things with my lesson plans. And, when we have the pre-observation conference, he will note if I have the required materials. So, yes, I think he considers other sources when he evaluates me. Some of these are in Domains 2 and 3; I usually get proficient ratings for these.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *No, no. I think it has generally been my experience whoever is doing the evaluation is very much within their own position, not really considering other perspectives.* [Well, in your postobservation, do you ever bring that up? Do you get a chance to discuss that?] *I believe yes. Consistently, there's been opportunities that if I found something to be misguided, or, well you walked in five minutes late, so you missed this part kind of thing, or the day before we did this and you missed that. There is opportunity to explain it; but, I think that doesn't change anybody's mind. So it doesn't even matter. [Laughter & humor]*

4. M2

Teacher 1: *I think the evaluator tries to do that. However, I have been the one, in many instances, to point out additional sources of evidence that were overlooked by the evaluator. Once pointed out, my supervisor usually agrees with my views and usually changes the evaluation area in question.*

c. Does the evaluator know and understand the standards and the rubrics?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1

Teacher 1: *I believe the evaluator understands the standards, although, I don't necessarily know if they understand all of the rubrics. We have a supervisor who does multiple subjects. So he may not be an expert in all subjects, not that he would not understand what a rubric is. But, rubrics are different according to content. So, if you're not a content specific supervisor, you may have, just like us as teachers have preferences and strengths in one area.*

(I refocused the question here: The question is referring to the rubric within the evaluation tool.)

Oh, okay, I don't know. I think it's a new tool for a new evaluator. That's the best I can say. I think he is getting comfortable with the process trying to determine if... I didn't have a pre-evaluation conference. I don't know that the domains were clear on the ones that he was going to observe. I think in a preobservation conference that's where that takes place where you are discussing, because you do not have to do all four domains every time you do a lesson observation. If you don't have that pre-observation conference, are we both on the same page on what domains you are coming in to observe? Or, when you come to observe then you determine what you think is the best domain? I don't know necessarily if that's always the way to go. You may focus and look at things a different way if you have already discussed the types of things that you are going to observe. Especially with a tool that we are using, the domains are very clear. How do you know what ratings to give if you're not sure at the time the domains you're observing. You're also scripting. There's a lot going on during the observation. You need to focus prior to coming in the observation. I think that would take place in the pre-observation conference.

Teacher 2: *Yes. I believe that my DC understands the standards.*

Teacher 3: *No.* [So you believe that the DC does not know or understand the evaluation standards?] *Well, I guess she does. I don't think she necessarily uses her knowledge of the standards with me.* [What does she use?] *I suppose her own opinion and interpretation.* [Does she use the language of the standards in her verbal or written feedback?] *Yes.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *I believe so. He refers to the standards in the written feedback that he gives. Now, he could just be copying the language and not know what the standards really mean. (Laughter) Seriously, I think he knows and understands them. I also think he understands the evaluation rubric as well.*

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1
Teacher 1: *Yes, yeah, I think they're pretty well defined. Even me, as a teacher who doesn't do any evaluations, if I just look at the tool, it's very self-explanatory. You can just read it and you get the idea.*

4. M2
Teacher 1: *I think my supervisor does for the most part. However, it seems that the standards and rubrics can be open to slightly different interpretations leading to a subjective viewpoint and disagreement upon whether or not the standards apply to the lesson and whether or not the standards have been met.*

9. Do administrative recommendations have an effect on your teaching practice; if so, how? If not, why?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1
Teacher 1: *I believe so. I mean, they're instructional experts. They're also resource people. It would be beneficial to any teacher to tap into any resource that he or she has. And, so, obviously, you're in the middle of it and if anyone on the outside can look in, anything that they could recommend to improve your instruction would definitely improve student achievement in your course, in your class. So, absolutely, as I said before, I try to implement the recommendations that I usually get in the written narrative after an observation.*

Teacher 2: *Yes and no. If the recommendations are coherent and current with what I've also learned in terms of what best practices are from current research. I'm also doing graduate work and I'm also looking at what's current. So, yes, if the recommendations are not contradictive to what I've learned, I use them. I always take everything with a grain of salt. (Laughter)*

Teacher 3: *No. Recommendations usually don't fit my program, or I am already including practices in my planning. The recommendations sometimes appear to be nitpicking and trivial.* [Would you explain what you mean about your program?] *I mean that when I plan a lesson, I am focusing on a specific area of content in the academy where I teach.* [Does your DC not understand this?] *She does not act like she does.* [Have you discussed this?] *Not really. I just get it over with and move on.*

2. C2
Teacher 1: *Yes, I listen and reflect on the recommendations made by any of the administrators who evaluate me. Sometimes I am able to use the recommendations in my classes. But, because I teach special needs students, I am not always able to incorporate some of the recommendations as given. When I can, I do. I am not always sure that all of the administrators who come in from time to time understand that things may look unstructured because of the differentiation of instruction that I use to address the needs*

of individual students. Sometimes I have to spend more time with some students, while other more capable students can work independently. The administrators' comments do not always indicate that they fully understand the nature of my classes. My DC understands, but I am not so sure about the others [administrators].

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1
Teacher 1: *I'm a little fuzzy on that question. What kinds of recommendation would there be?* [As a result of having observed you and just given you feedback, do they make recommendations or suggest some strategies of some sort? So, that question is asking if and when that occurs, how, and if it affects what you do.] *Okay, I thought you meant like recommendations like for tenure or non-tenure, or something like that.* [No, this is strictly as a result of the evaluation process.] *Yes, it does occur and I've been given specific tools, measures, approaches that have worked in the past, or the administrators who have observed me...I've been blessed to have administrators who have all been classroom teachers before. So, it's very nice to have that. It's always been delivered in a constructive way, so, yes.*

4. M2
Teacher 1: *I personally view recommendations as an opportunity to improve my practice and seriously reflect on how I can incorporate these recommendations into my lessons and teaching.*

10. How would you improve the evaluation process used in your school so that it would be more effective in strengthening your instruction?

Language Arts Teachers

1. C1
Teacher 1: *I think there needs to be more training on the use of the tool at all levels so that we're all on the same page and understand the purpose and how it would be used most effectively in our school. I also think it would be more helpful if it was a more transparent process. It seems to be a very secretive thing. It's like you come in, you get it done; and then it's like, okay, what about it? Why isn't this something we talk about? Not that we have to talk about teachers' personal evaluation. But, why isn't that a discussion in PLC? If you do well with questioning and you're good at that Higher Order questioning, then why shouldn't we share that? If someone is better at structuring their class and you can see movement and different types of learning styles going on, and differentiated instruction going on, why shouldn't we know that you're good at that area? Why aren't we talking about that more in our PLC. Yes, we can talk about student achievement, but student achievement is only as good as instruction. Instruction is not something we talk about in PLC. We talk a lot about student achievement, student work samples. We evaluate all of those things, but why is this teacher able to get this wonderful work sample out of student A, and student A is also in other teachers' classes, but they cannot get a work sample, period. So we tend to shy away from our strengths and weaknesses as teachers in those discussions. I think it needs to be a more open and*

transparent process. Supervisors should know strengths and weaknesses. You observe everyone. So, as the supervisor, without putting labels on, you say, you know what, I have a teacher who is really good at developing Higher Order questions. I have another teacher who's really good in setting up his/her classroom that fosters good classroom environment. There're teachers who are having a hard time with classroom management. I can say there are some teachers who have excellent management. What do they do? And, not putting numbers, I can't say you're distinguished in classroom management, but I can say we all have our strengths and weaknesses. We should be each others' resources as a direct result of what you learn from your observations. What else do you use the tool for? Researcher: [I think I hear the idea of collaboration in terms of skills and sharing. And, you believe that this would definitely happen or could happen as a result of how the evaluation process could be used.] *Absolutely, yes!*

Teacher 2: *That's a difficult question because the evaluation forms, I know they were changed this year and looking at what the domains are this year, it seems that they are worse than the ones before. I don't think they say too much. I think the older ones kinda said a little bit more about what the lesson was; what the objective is, and what the kids are doing. The newer ones do not really allow that much. When you start adding "needs improvement", "satisfactory", that doesn't add too much. I think more feedback seems to be more helpful than just numbers.* [How has the evaluation form changed?] *It's on a 100% scale and you just add up the points per domain. But, if you're evaluating a lesson where one of the components is not within that lesson, but maybe was, again, in a previous one, it's not shown on that evaluation form. I think they're not designed too well to focus on one lesson. I think it's too general. I like the old one better because I like to read what I did and then what I can do better, what the recommendations are. I don't see that in the newer one.* [So, you're saying there's no written feedback on this form; it's just numbers?] *Correct; it's numbers, but very little written feedback; at least not enough written feedback in my opinion.* [So, your recommendation is?] *More feedback in the written form; because it's one thing to tell someone what didn't go well, but it's another thing to give them a recommendation on how to make it better. If you don't give the recommendation, then it's kinda, okay, well I don't know what else to do which is why I did what I did. So, what can I do to make it better? My DC usually gives me something that I can make it better.*

Teacher 3: *Evaluations should be conducted by a principal, vice principal or other person. To ensure fairness and accuracy, someone other than the immediate supervisors should also observe and evaluate teachers.*

2. C2

Teacher 1: *I would change the fact that when the evaluation tool is used, it should be used during an entire observation. I realize that the evaluator can complete only certain areas of the tool, but that has not been my experience. Each time I am formally evaluated, whether it's for the entire block or less, the entire document is completed. If the purpose is to help me grow then I think it should be used for that and not as an obligation that has to get done. I would also ask teachers what areas they would want me to focus on. Most of us know what we need to improve in, so I think this would be a helpful change to the process. And most of all, I think the evaluator should take the time*

to give constructive feedback that gives the teacher an idea of what needs to be improved. I am hoping that I will get the feedback I need as I go through NBPTS certification. I would also include the NBPTS standards as part of the evaluation process.

Mathematics Teachers

3. M1

Teacher 1: *That is such a hard question. I would not want to be the person sitting there writing this thing down. I mean, whoever came up with the tool that we have now, of course there's flaws* [sic], *but I couldn't do any better. There's been recent adjustments [sic] to this tool. Now, they're adding like a number system, which I like because I'm a math person, and that makes sense to me. But, I can see people arguing that you can't really put a number on the type of quality of teaching like it's not, it's complicated, it's too complicated. I can't even wrap my head around how to improve it. I think there's several issues (sic), but being that my experience has not been one where it's worked against me in any way and I've generally had an open mind to it, I don't think that I can off the top of my head come up with one way that would be better than what's already in place. I'm not that creative. [Humor and laughter]*

4. M2

Teacher 1: *I think it is important for evaluators to know and understand that this process is put in place to assist and support teachers, not to degrade and catch teachers. I think if the tone surrounding the evaluation process were different and teachers truly believed that it was in place to support them and to help them grow as educators, then improvement would be seen across the board from instruction to student achievement to school climate.*

Appendix B

INTERVIEW SCRIPT

ADMINISTRATORS

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is Princess Towe; I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University. Thank you for consenting to spend a few minutes of your time to answer some questions regarding your ideas and perceptions about your role in the teacher evaluation process in your school.

My purpose is to gather information that will assist me in completing my dissertation. With your permission, I would like to record your responses as this will allow me to accurately maintain your actually words. I welcome and encourage your candid, straight forward and honest answers. I assure you that your responses will be kept confidential, so please answer the questions to the best of your ability. I am most interested in what you have to say.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

AFTER THE INTERVIEW

Again, thank you for your time. I greatly appreciate your cooperation and willingness to assist me in this endeavor.

Interview Questions For Administrators

A1. What do you perceive as the major purpose/s of the teacher evaluation process in your school?

A2. What is your role in the teacher evaluation process in your school?

A3. Have you received training regarding how to evaluate teachers?

A4. Do you feel that you have the necessary knowledge to properly evaluate teachers?

A5. What is the nature of the feedback teachers receive from you post-evaluation?

A6. How is the evaluation process implemented in your school?

A7. How has instruction been affected by the teacher evaluation process?

A8. What effect has the teacher evaluation process had on teacher professional growth in your school?

A9. How have your recommendations for professional development activities been influenced by the teacher evaluation process?

A10. What changes, if any, would you make to the teacher evaluation process in order to make it more effective in strengthening teacher instruction and teacher professional growth in your school?

Administrators' Responses to Interview Questions

A1. What do you perceive as the major purpose/s of the teacher evaluation process in your school?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

To provide several snapshots of teaching in order to provide teachers with areas of strengths and weaknesses.

2. M1

If you mean the formative evaluation process, I'd like to think of it as a means to assist teachers in improving their practices as cited in the NPS domain referenced Formative Evaluation tool (Planning Classroom environment and Management, instruction, and Professional Practices); and, based upon data collected via observations, this assistance takes place in a variety of processes, e.g. formal coaching, something as simple as informal advice grounded in theory or based on knowledge/empirical, modeling a lesson, offering professional development that may best service teachers in improving targeted practices, etc.

Now the summative evaluation (teachers' Annual Evaluation), akin to that used in the classroom that indicates students mastery, I see that process as using all data collected via formative evaluations too summarize teachers' overall performance, i.e., citing areas delineating growth, proficiency, mastery or areas that remain challenges.

3. M2

To monitor and modify instruction if necessary as well as document and celebrate effective teaching strategies to improve teaching strategies of those new to teaching at University High School, so that they reflect the level of rigor expected at a magnet school.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

I believe the purpose is to be able to provide teachers constructive feedback that will allow the opportunity to develop professionally.

5. C2

At my school, the teacher evaluation process assists teachers to not only recognize their strengths and weaknesses, but work collaboratively with me to help them become more effective teachers.

6. M1

The major purpose of the teacher evaluation process in my school is to provide on-going *feedback, along with formal opportunities for reflection. Through reflective practice it is expected that all teachers will constantly strive for continuous improvement. School administrators facilitate opportunities for reflection and then provide the coaching, mentoring and resources necessary to ensure ongoing improvement of instruction.*

A2. What is your role in the teacher evaluation process in your school?

<u>Language Arts Department Chairpersons</u>

1. C2

As the Department Chairperson, I observe and evaluate teachers. The process provides both the teacher and administrator with a snapshot of what/how the teacher is teaching/performing.

2. M1

I set up preobservation conferences with teachers, observe the teachers, in which I collect data based on teaching behavior (focusing on the four domains), I study, label and organize the data (using domains and components of NPS Evaluation Rubric), then share the findings in postobservation conferences with the teachers.

3. M2

I see my role as a coach and colleague who gives the teacher feedback and suggestions for moving from Proficient to Distinguished; I meet with my teachers, many times informally, to discuss ways to enhance instruction with measureable outcomes such as identifying students' strengths and creating lessons to further strengthen the skill sets, whether it's writing an argumentative essay, a synthesis paper, or other area. At other times, we target students' areas of weakness, and I observe the teachers implementing the strategies we discussed to improve these areas. There are times when my role is instructional leader and I have to devise an action plan with specific teaching strategies that must be used, observed, and evaluated to determine if the teacher has been effective with the implementation of these strategies as evidenced by students' academic growth or lack thereof.

<u>Mathematics Department Chairpersons</u>

4. C1

I am the department chairperson of the math department. I am responsible for observing and evaluating the teachers in my department.

5. C2

As the Department Chairperson of Mathematics, I am responsible for conducting a number of formal observations, informal observations, walkthroughs, directed rounds, as well as review lesson plans and common planning periods to evaluate a teacher's

performance each school year. By evaluating teaching practices in my teachers, it helps drive mathematics instruction.

6. M1

Generally, my role as Vice Principal at this school is to conduct both formal and informal observations and walkthroughs to provide teachers with feedback that provides opportunities for growth in ways that are effective in improving student achievement.

A3. Have you received training regarding how to evaluate teachers?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

Yes. I received training through a series of district sponsored training sessions. I also participated in simulated sessions with my mentor when I cam to this school as the department chairperson.

2. M1

Yes, in using the District's Evaluation tool (although none with the amended tool). However, I was trained on the Danielson Model at Montclair State University.

3. **M2**

I received training in college, and when I was hired as a department chairperson I was coached by my former department chair. The two of us would observe a teacher, take notes, and review what we saw in the lesson; then I would get feedback for areas that I might not have observed. I was on the first committee to write the current teacher observation document used in NPS. I received training along with all other administrators on how to use the evaluation tool and, I would in-service each new teacher on how the document is used.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

Yes, I have received training. I first received training in evaluating teachers when I worked on my master's degree in order to get supervision certification. I also received training once I was hired as a department chairperson. All new administrators were required to participate in district sponsored workshops in order to learn how to use the district's evaluation tool.

5. C2

Yes, a two day workshop was given during my first year as an administrator, last year. This year, the evaluation forms have changed somewhat and I have not received formal training in using these new forms.

6. M1

Yes. When I first became an administrator, I received training and have had at least two refresher workshops.

A4. Do you feel that you have the necessary knowledge to properly evaluate teachers?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

Yes. My experience in being evaluated using the model provided more "training" than the actual training that I received.

2. M1-S

Yes. Perhaps I have an advantage over some of my colleagues, since I am a doctoral candidate receiving a doctoral degree in pedagogy.

3. M2

Absolutely. As evidenced by my earlier comments, I have received the necessary knowledge to properly evaluate teachers.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

Yes, I do. I was a math teacher in another district before coming here, and I currently work as an adjunct professor at Rutgers where one of my responsibilities is supervision of TA's. So, I feel my mathematical knowledge, background and training have equipped me to be able to properly evaluate teachers.

5. C2

I do feel I have the necessary knowledge to properly evaluate teachers. However, I feel experience may be the best teacher. Being a relatively new administrator, I understand that, because of a lack of experience in evaluating teachers, there is more to be learned.

6. M1

Yes, before becoming an administrator, I was a mathematics teacher. So, I feel I have the knowledge to adequately and effectively evaluate teachers. I also believe that as a clinical supervisor, I recognize good teaching practices in the different disciplines, not just in the math classroom.

A5. What is the nature of feedback teachers receive from you postevaluation?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

The feedback has revolved around the observed strengths and challenges. Often times, recommendations are made to address the observed challenges.

2. M1

Are we talking about nature, as in the disposition of the feedback, or nature, as in the kind/sort of feedback? If nature, as in disposition, I make sure that I have no less than 3 positive things to say before discussing the challenges. If nature, as in the sort of feedback, I offer feedback about all components of each domain of the formative rubric.

3. M2

Based on teachers' need or areas of strength, I have given different types of feedback. One-[To] A seasoned teacher with no change in format: reduce or eliminate a teacher-centered classroom by incorporating a true Socratic Seminar or other various student-centered activities; prepare scaffold questions that reflect rigor and lead students to discover the answer instead of telling the students the answers. Two-For seasoned teachers who have come to understand that they have to constantly improve and modify their teaching style in order to increase the number of students who excel in their classroom, I give them encouragement and support as feedback. Prior to the observation, these seasoned teachers are sharing their ideas with me constantly on how to challenge their students and themselves by introducing new strategies and texts. Two key points I need to make: Being in a magnet school after being in a comprehensive school in NJ, I had to gain my teachers' respect and confidence that I had something to contribute to their growth and I had done that by the end of my first year; I am now in my fourth year at the magnet school. As of January 2011, I will begin working on my doctorate, and I have informed my staff that my area of specialty, Instructional Design in Online Learning, reflects many of the ideas and strategies that we have put in place. Therefore, we are on the right track. Not a day or two go by without the seasoned and not so seasoned teachers stopping me to share some of the new strategies they are trying in their classroom. I had to earn their respect and confidence, and it has been well worth it. And three-My new teachers, to the district and to University, I visit them informally to give them constant feedback on classroom management techniques if needed, how to write a 3-part instructional objective, and using time management in the block effectively.

<u>Mathematics Department Chairpersons</u>

4. C1

Teachers meet with me for post formal observation meetings where we discuss the observation of their classes. They receive written feedback from formal and informal observations.

5. C2

In the postevaluation, teachers receive much feedback from me. There is, of course, the written document that follows an observation or evaluation. However, more meaningful than the written document, is the verbal conversation where feedback is presented to the teacher. I first ask the teacher what he/she feels in the evaluation process. I will compliment the teacher on what went well and provide suggestions on how to improve in areas that were challenging.

6. M1

During my post-evaluation conferences, teachers are given the opportunity to accurately reflect on their lesson and I suggest alternative strategies. I offer suggestions, when necessary that I deem effective in instructional practice.

A6. How is the evaluation process implemented in your school?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

The school follows the NPS timeline for observations: three for non-tenured teachers before mid March and two for tenured teachers by April.

2. M1

I follow the guidelines of NPS.

3. **M2**

As per the district, administrators are given a calendar of due dates, when the evaluations must be completed, and a reminder that a minimum of three evaluations for non-tenured teachers, and a minimum of two for tenured teachers. We have a three-part process: preobservation, observation, and postobservation.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

The district determines what observation tools are used and has school administration explain its purpose and use to the entire faculty. The entire process includes informal and formal observations, a midyear evaluation for nontenured teachers, walkthroughs, and an annual summative evaluation for all teachers.

5. C2

At my school, the evaluation process involves minimally three formal observations for non-tenured teachers and two formal observations for tenured teachers during the course of the year. These observations can be announced or unannounced. With announced observations, a preconference takes place where the teacher describes to the observer what will be seen during the observation. After the observation, a post conference is held to discuss what occurred during the observation and suggestions for improvement are made. Along with these formal observations, informal observations, walkthroughs, and directed rounds are conducted to observe the teacher in action. A midyear evaluation is now given to non-tenured teachers to help them gauge their performance midway through the year.

6. M1

Each department is supervised by a Department Chairperson who is responsible for observing and evaluating the teachers in their department. The district has set the minimum times that both non-tenured and tenured teachers are to be evaluated within a given time frame. Nontenured teachers are evaluated a minimum of three times by

March of each year and tenured teachers are evaluated a minimum of two times by April of each year. An annual summative evaluation is done on all teachers, for non-tenured, by April and for tenured by June of each year. Also, the teacher's Professional Development Plan (PDP) is collaboratively developed between the teacher and the administrator. It's then reviewed during the annual evaluation conference.

A7. How has instruction been affected by the teacher evaluation process?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

Unfortunately, there hasn't been a clear connection. A few teachers view it as a formality and continue the same ineffective practice. There is more of a connection with new, non-tenured teachers, where suggestions are taken into serious consideration and practices altered if need be.

2. M1

The formative evaluation enables me to give substantive feedback as how to improve the teacher's practices. Based on the data collected during observation, teachers use feedback to shape performances and hone those areas cited as challenges.

3. M2

I have noted an improvement in instruction, because I tailor the feedback based on what the teacher and I agreed upon to examine or observe during either the pre-observation conference or an informal observation that I had done.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

It depends on the teacher. Some have responded by using the rubric as a means to set long and short term goals. Some do not change or react to evaluation responses, especially when they are tenured. Some react only when given negative feedback and then put on show for observations.

5. C2

I believe, for some teachers, instruction has improved through the evaluation process, mainly through the suggestions given to the teacher in how to better teaching practices. However, many teachers, unfortunately, have the mindset that the evaluation process is simply a gotcha method that administrators use to go after teachers.

6. M1

The evaluation process has helped create and maintain a climate where high expectations for learning exist in an environment of respect and appropriate rapport, where students of various cultural backgrounds strive within the school's culture, where instructional goals, activities, and assessment strategies are carefully tailored as a result of the teachers' knowledge of the cognitive development of their children.

A8. What effect has the teacher evaluation process had on the teacher professional growth in your school?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

Very little; my teachers do not appear to make the connection between the evaluation process, including my informal and formal feedback to their professional growth. Basically, they appear to think the evaluation is a necessary requirement and not something that could benefit them. However, I have observed one or two of my teachers attempting to implement or change something that we had discussed at some point.

2. M1

It has increased teacher awareness of the need to consistently engage in critical praxis and critical pedagogy. They demonstrate a willingness to participate in activities that focus on professional growth via PLCs, common planning, workshops, and conferences.

3. M2

Although many of our professional development opportunities are borne from our department meetings, the teacher evaluations from Directed Rounds, Walkthroughs, Informal Observations, and Formal Observations lay the groundwork for most of the professional growth opportunities in our school; for example, when our school went from single periods of 40 minutes per subject class to a modified block, A/B day of 80 minute block for major subjects such as math and language arts, we administrators noticed that teachers were still doing a 40 minute lesson in an 80 minute block and they weren't able to maximize effectively teaching and learning. Therefore, we had a consultant come in to train our teachers on how to teach in an 80-minute block.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

It has some motivational effect; however, budgets and time tend to limit the amount of workshops that teachers can attend.

5. C2

I have not had enough experience seeing the effect of the teacher evaluation process on teacher professional growth opportunities. However, there are times that teachers have used the feedback given in post conferences to develop future lessons.

6. M1

I think the evaluation process has impacted professional development and growth in several ways in our school. Many teachers here are enrolled in graduate programs. Teachers are encouraged to use data to guide instruction. They participate in formal PLCs (professional learning communities) and regularly view, log, and reflect on various

PD 360 videos selected as in house professional development activities. Teachers are encouraged to select specific videos that meet their individual needs as well. The district has purchased this on-line Internet professional development product. All schools have access and the web site can be visited from anywhere. So, teachers can continue to collect Professional Development hours from home.

A9. How have your recommendations for professional development activities been influenced by the teacher evaluation process?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

I would say that recommendations for professional development activities are influenced by the teacher evaluation process. I often recommend a workshop or suggest that teachers observe other teachers to further develop in weaker areas that were observed in an observation.

2. M1

Little. Much PD remains under NPS control.

3. M2

Basically professional development is done within the dept in two ways. For teachers who are basic to proficient, I work one on one with my teachers to develop a lesson plan or write a 3-part objective. I do a demonstration lesson for them, and I do informals. For teachers who are proficient to distinguished, I highlight an effective technique strategy, and I have the teachers plan a presentation along with handouts, and discuss the strategy at the next department meeting.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

I have not made many recommendations for professional development beyond suggesting that teachers observe other teachers or by having teachers develop a personal growth plan with timelines that include attention to areas of challenge observed.

5. C2

The evaluations of teachers help identify various needs teachers have in making themselves better professionals. Knowing what will further develop teachers, helps in finding appropriate professional development workshops for teachers.

6. M1

My recommendations for professional development activities have been aligned to the domains within the teacher evaluation tool. Emphasis has been placed on Planning and Preparation with attention to Designing Coherent Instruction and Assessing Professional Development, on Instruction with attention to Using questioning and discussion techniques with flexibility and responsiveness and Engaging students in learning.

A10. What changes, if any, would you make to the teacher evaluation process in order to make it more effective in strengthening teacher instruction and teacher professional growth in your school?

Language Arts Department Chairpersons

1. C2

I think more frequent formal evaluations would be a start. There are 181 days in a school year and a teacher is essentially evaluated on the "goings on" of 2-3 of those days. Of course, it is the responsibility of the administrator to visit classrooms and converse with his/her staff regularly. I would also revisit the point scale and its effectiveness.

2. M1

One change would be training, not just for administrators, but training for teachers as well. The process is cumbersome, whether lack of teacher training, I am not certain, but I spend too much time explaining components of each domain of the formative evaluation rubric to the teachers.

3. M2

I would add a component for teachers who have earned distinguish at least two years in a row, so they will have to do workshops, put together a series of lesson plans that reflect best practices for teaching a specific skill set such as a synthesis essay, research paper, or HSPA/SAT/AP strategies, or team teach.

Mathematics Department Chairpersons

4. C1

I am not certain what areas, if any, need improvement in the evaluation process. If I had to pick an area, I would choose the point values assigned to each domain. It appears that the value given to each domain is skewed. It is extremely difficult to accurately measure a teacher's performance based on the numeric values on the evaluation tool.

5. C2

First and foremost, the teacher evaluation tool needs to be viewed as an instrument to improve instruction in the eyes of the teachers and administrators that use it. If everyone is on the same page regarding its purpose, it will take away the uneasy feelings teachers have about being evaluated. Regarding the new evaluation tool we are using this year, the point system used in the tool is incorrectly weighted. If the point system is to stay, I would make certain that the points work correctly, not only for the overall rating of the teacher or the overall rating of each domain. Instead, I would assure that the points assessed are correctly weighted for each and every individual component.

6. M1

Well, let me think about that for a minute. The changes I would make apply not so much to the teacher evaluation process, but more to how the results of the evaluation are used. High-performing teachers would be encouraged to continue to grow professionally by continuing education and attending various workshops, while low performing teachers would be required to seek additional training with the expectation that they would undergo rigorous scrutiny prior to returning to the classroom. [Are you suggesting that teachers who are low performing be removed from the classroom?] *Yes. I think that teachers who consistently demonstrate poor performance should not be allowed to remain in the class until they can demonstrate that they have the necessary skills to be effective and accurately teach children. I think for far too long ineffective, and even inept teachers have been allowed to remain in the classroom after many unsatisfactory or below acceptable standards of performance. The teacher evaluation process should be used as one way to strengthen teachers' skills and not just a requirement.*

Appendix C

TEACHER EVALUATION PROFILE (TEP)

TEACHER EVALUATION PROFILE (TEP)

A Study of the Implementation of the *Achievement Through Teaching Excellence: A System of Teacher Observation and Performance Evaluation*

This fall, a doctoral student from Seton Hall University will be conducting a study to measure the perceptions of teachers and administrators in the implementation of the evaluation process in this school district. The results from the study will help to inform policy and to improve the evaluation system currently used in the district.

Overview

This form has been designed to allow you to describe your experience with teacher evaluation in some detail. Your responses will be combined with those of other teachers to yield a clearer picture of the key ingredients in an effective teacher evaluation experience. The goal of this research is to determine if and how the evaluation process can be revised to help it serve relevant and useful purposes. If we are to reach this goal it will be important for you to provide frank and honest responses. This is why your answers will remain anonymous.

While this questionnaire is designed to be comprehensive in scope, it will take only a short time to complete. Please follow the instructions carefully and provide thoughtful responses.

The Definition of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation takes different forms in different programs. For the purpose of this study, teacher evaluation procedures may include all or some of the following:

- Goal setting
- Formal and informal classroom observations
- Pre/post meetings with teacher evaluators
- Examination of lesson plans, materials or other artifacts
- Final written summative evaluation
- Self-evaluation

When reference is made in this questionnaire to teacher evaluation, it should be understood to encompass any of these procedures that are followed in the evaluation program within your school district.

Specific Instructions

Please use the scales provided on the following pages to describe your self and the nature of your most recent teacher evaluation experience in your school district. Do this by:

- Considering each of the items carefully
- Studying the scale to be used to describe each,
- **Circling the number** on the scale that best represents your response.

Thank you for your participation

Section 1: Demographic Information

1. What is your gender?	1. Female 2. Male
2. Including the current year, how many years of teaching experience?	1. 1 year 2. 2 to 5 years 3. 6 to 10 years 4. 11 to 15 years 5. 16 or more years
3. What is your degree level?	1. Bachelors Degree 2. Masters Degree 3. Doctorate Degree
4. Did your school meet AYP in 2008?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't Know
5. Your current teaching assignment	1. Language Arts Literacy 2. Mathematics

Section 2: Overall Rating

Please reflect on your most recent experience with the evaluation process in your school district. Consider the entire evaluation process including goal-setting, meetings with evaluator, planning for evaluation, formal and informal observations, or other procedures and feedback.

1. Rate the overall quality of the evaluation:

Very poor quality 1 2 3 4 5 Very high quality

2. Rate the overall impact of the evaluation on your professional practices. (Note: A rating of 5 would reflect a strong impact leading to profound changes in your teaching practices, attitudes about teaching, and/or understanding of the teaching profession. A rating of 1 would reflect no impact at all and no changes in your practices, attitudes, and/or understanding.)

No impact 1 2 3 4 5 Strong impact

3. **Rate the overall impact of the evaluation process on your professional growth as an educator. (Note: A rating of 5 would reflect a strong impact on your professional growth. A rating of 1 would reflect no impact at all on your professional growth.**

No impact 1 2 3 4 5 Strong impact

Section 3: Rating Attributes of Evaluation

A. Describe yourself in relation to the following attributes:

4. The strength of your professional expectations of yourself

I demand little	1	2	3	4	5	I demand a great deal

5. Orientation to risk taking

I avoid risks	1	2	3	4	5	I take risks

6. Orientation to change

I am relatively slow to change	1	2	3	4	5	I am relatively flexible

7. Orientation to experimentation in your classroom

I don't experiment	1	2	3	4	5	I experiment frequently

8. Openness to criticism

I am relatively closed	1	2	3	4	5	I am relatively open

9. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching

I know a little	1	2	3	4	5	I know a great deal

10. Knowledge of curriculum content

I know a little	1	2	3	4	5	I know a great deal

11. Experience with teacher evaluation prior to most recent experience

Waste of time	1	2	3	4	5	Very helpful

B. Describe your perceptions of the person who most recently evaluated your performance:

12. Credibility as a source of feedback

Not credible	1	2	3	4	5	Very credible

13. Working relationship with you

Adversary	1	2	3	4	5	Helper

14. Level of trust

Not trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	Trustworthy

15. Interpersonal manner

Threatening	1	2	3	4	5	Not threatening

16. Temperament

Impatient	1	2	3	4	5	Patient

17. Flexibility

Rigid	1	2	3	4	5	Flexible

18. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching

Not knowledgeable	1	2	3	4	5	Very knowledgeable

19. Capacity to model or demonstrate needed improvements

Low	1	2	3	4	5	High

20. Familiarity with your particular teaching assignment

Unfamiliar	1	2	3	4	5	Very familiar

21. Usefulness of suggestions for improvement

Useless	1	2	3	4	5	Very useful

22. Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestion

Not persuasive	1	2	3	4	5	Very persuasive

C. Describe the attributes of the procedures used during your most recent evaluation:

Standards are the criteria used to evaluate your teaching. Describe the procedures related to standards in the items below:

23. Were standards communicated to you?

Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	In great detail

24. Were the standards clear to you?

Vague	1	2	3	4	5	Very clear

25. Were the standards endorsed by you as appropriate for your teaching assignment?

Not endorsed	1	2	3	4	5	Highly endorsed

26. Were the standards…

The same for all teachers?	1	2	3	4	5	Tailored for your unique needs?

To what extent were the following sources of performance information considered as part of the evaluation?

27. Observation of your classroom performance

Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively

28. Meetings with evaluator

Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively

29. Examination of artifacts (lesson plans, materials, home/school communication)

Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively

30. Examination of student performance

Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively

31. Self evaluations

Not considered	1	2	3	4	5	Used extensively

Describe the extent of the observations of your classroom, based on your most recent evaluation experience in your school district. (Note: In these items, <u>formal</u> refers to observations that were pre-announced and/or were accompanied by a pre- or post-conference with the evaluator; <u>informal</u> refers to unannounced drop-in visits.)

32. Number of <u>formal</u> observations per year

1. 0 Observations
2. 1 Observation
3. 2 Observations
4. 3 Observations
5. 4 Observations

33. Approximate frequency of informal observations per year

1. None
2. Less than 1 per month
3. Once per month
4. Once per week
5. Daily

34. Average length of formal observations

Brief (few minutes)	1	2	3	4	5	Extended (40 minutes or more)

35. Average length of informal observations

Brief (few minutes)	1	2	3	4	5	Extended (40 minutes or more)

D. Please describe the attributes of the feedback you received during your last evaluation experience:

36. Amount of information received

None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal

37. Frequency of formal feedback

Infrequent	1	2	3	4	5	Frequent

38. Frequency of informal feedback

Infrequent	1	2	3	4	5	Frequent

39. Depth of information provided

Shallow	1	2	3	4	5	In-depth

40. Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback

Low	1	2	3	4	5	High

41. Specificity of information provided

General	1	2	3	4	5	Specific

42. Nature of information provided

Judgmental	1	2	3	4	5	Descriptive

43. Timing of feedback

Delayed	1	2	3	4	5	Immediate

44. Feedback focused on

Ignored the standards	1	2	3	4	5	Reflected the teaching standards

E. Please describe these attributes of the evaluation context:

Resources available for evaluation:

45. Amount of time spent on the evaluation process, including your time and that of all other participants.

None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal

46. Time allotted during the semester for professional development

None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal

47. Availability of training programs and models of good practices

None	1	2	3	4	5	Great deal

District Values and policies in evaluation:

48. Clarity of policy statements regarding purpose of evaluation

Vague	1	2	3	4	5	Very clear

49. Intended role of evaluation

Teacher accountability	1	2	3	4	5	Teacher growth

Appendix D

Teacher Observation/Evaluation Forms

Achievement Through Excellence: A System of Teacher Observation and Performance Evaluation

*District observation tool modeled from *Framework for Teaching* developed by Charlotte Danielson (1996).

APPENDIX C-1

FORMATIVE TEACHER OBSERVATION (FORMAL OBSERVATION)

Teacher Name:
Subject Area: **ID #**
School/Department: **Grade:**
Principal:
Tenured: **Non-Tenured:**
Announced: **Unannounced:**

PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE DATE:
DATE OF OBSERVATION: **TIME:**
POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE DATE:

LESSON SUMMARY

Objective:

Summary:

TEACHER'S COMMENTS

ASSESSMENT

OVERALL ASSESSMENT FOR THIS OBSERVATION _____PTS / _____ POSSIBLE PTS = _____ %

UNSATISFACTORY _____ (0 – 62%) **PROFICIENT _____ (76 – 89%)**

BASIC _____ (63 – 75%) **DISTINGUISHED _____ (90 – 100%)**

SIGNATURES:

PRINT: OBSERVER/TITLE	SIGNATURE: OBSERVER/TITLE	DATE
PRINT: TEACHER	SIGNATURE: TEACHER	DATE
PRINT: PRINCIPAL/DESIGNEE*	SIGNATURE: PRINCIPAL/DESIGNEE*	DATE

PRINT: WITNESS*	SIGNATURE: WITNESS*	DATE

*This cover sheet will be attached to all observation summaries of teacher performance. Domains 1through 4 sheets will be attached and additional pages may be added as needed. *Principal and witness signatures may need to be added in particular circumstances.*

APPENDIX C-2

OBSERVATION SCORING SUMMARY FORM

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION	COMPONENT	PERFORMANCE (CIRCLE ONE)				SCORE
		UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED	
	1(a) Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy	0	7	8	9	
	1(b) Demonstrating knowledge of students	0	4	5	6	
	1(c) Implementing curricular goals and objective(s)	0	4	5	6	
	1(d) Designing coherent instruction	0	7	8	9	
	1(e) Assessing student learning	0	4	5	6	
	DOMAIN 1 TOTAL (36 PTS POSSIBLE)					

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING & PREPARATION COMMENTS:

Strengths:

Challenges:

DOMAIN 2: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	COMPONENT	PERFORMANCE (CIRCLE ONE)				SCORE
		UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED	
	2(a) Creating an environment of respect and rapport	0	4	5	6	
	2(b) Managing student behavior	0	4	5	6	
	2(c) Managing classroom procedures	0	4	5	6	
	2(d) Establishing a culture for learning	0	4	5	6	
	2(e) Organizing physical space	0	1	2	3	
	DOMAIN 2 TOTAL (27 PTS POSSIBLE)					

DOMAIN 2: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT COMMENTS:
Strengths:
Challenges:

APPENDIX - C-3

Domain 3: Instruction	Component	Performance (circle one)				Score
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
	3(a) Communicating clearly and accurately	0	7	8	9	
	3(b) Using questioning and discussion techniques with flexibility and responsiveness	0	7	8	9	
	3(c) Engaging students in learning	0	7	8	9	
	3(d) Providing feedback to students	0	7	8	9	
	3(e) Attaining student achievement that meets or exceeds performance benchmarks	0	7	8	9	
	Domain 3 Total (45 pts possible)					

Domain 3: Instruction Comments:

Strengths:

Challenges:

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	Component	Performance (circle one)				Score
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
	4(a) Reflecting on Teaching	0	1	2	3	
	4(b) Maintaining Accurate Records	0	1	2	3	
	4(c) Communicating with Families	0	1	2	3	
	4(d) Contributing to the School and District	0	1	2	3	
	4(e) Growing and Developing Professionally	0	1	2	3	
	4(f) Demonstrating Promptness/Attendance	0	4	5	6	
	4(g) Implementing District Policies (Discipline, Dress Code, Homelessness, Child Abuse Prevention, Student Attendance, Fire Drill, PRC/504, etc.)	0	1	2	3	
	Domain 4 Total (24 pts possible)					

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities Comments:

Strengths:

Challenges:

Grand Total of All Domains Assessed	

APPENDIX G-1

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ANNUAL TEACHER EVALUATION REPORT

District Public Schools

TEACHER'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Teacher: _____

POSITION: _____ **LOCATION:** ___

TENURED: _____ **NON-TENURED:** _____ **DISTRICT ID#:** _____

DATE: _____ **SUPERVISOR:** ___

From the data gathered over the course of this academic year through observations, teacher and student artifacts, and professional portfolio entries, the following report summarizes an evaluation of teacher performance.

Directions: Place an "X" in the category that best summarizes the teacher's performance for each of the components in all four domains of teaching.

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	Levels of Performance	Score
Component 1(A): Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(7)___Proficient(8)___Distinguished(9)___	
Component1 (B): Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(4)___Proficient(5)___Distinguished(6)___	
Component 1(C): Implementing Curricular Goals and Objective(s)	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(4)___Proficient(5)___Distinguished(6)___	
Component 1(D): Designing Coherent Instruction	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(7)___Proficient(8)__Distinguished(9)___	
Component 1 (E): Assessing Student Learning	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(4)___Proficient(5)___Distinguished(6)___	
Domain 1 Total(36 PTS Possible)		

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

Domain 2: Classroom Environment	Levels of Performance	Score
Component 2(A): Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(4)___Proficient(5)___Distinguished(6)___	
Component 2(B): Managing Student Behavior	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(4)___Proficient(5)___Distinguished(6)___	
Component 2(C): Managing Classroom Procedures	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(4)___Proficient(5)___Distinguished(6)___	
Component 2(D): Establishing a Culture for Learning	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(4)___Proficient(5)___Distinguished(6)___	
Component 2(E): Organizing Physical Space	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(1)___Proficient(2)___Distinguished(3)___	
Domain 2 Total(27 PTS Possible)		

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

Domain 3: Instruction	Levels of Performance	Score
Component 3(A): Communicating Clearly and Accurately	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(7)___Proficient(8)___Distinguished(9)___	
Component 3(B): Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques with Flexibility and Responsiveness	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(7)___Proficient(8)___Distinguished(9)___	
Component 3(C): Engaging Students in Learning	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(7)___Proficient(8)___Distinguished(9)___	
Component 3(D):Providing Feedback to Students	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(7)___Proficient(8)___Distinguished(9)___	
Component 3(E): Attaining Student Achievement that Meets or Exceeds Performance Benchmarks	Unsatisfactory(0)___Basic(7)___Proficient(8)___Distinguished(9)___	

Domain 3 Total(45 PTS Possible)		

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

APPENDIX G -2

NEWARK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ANNUAL TEACHER EVALUATION REPORT

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	Levels of Performance	Score
Component 4(A): Reflecting on Teaching	Unsatisfactory (0)___ Basic (1)___Proficient (2)___ Distinguished (3)___	
Component 4(B): Maintaining Accurate Records	Unsatisfactory (0)___ Basic (1)___ Proficient (2)___Distinguished (3)___	
Component 4(C): Communicating with Families	Unsatisfactory(0)___ Basic(1)___ Proficient(2)___ Distinguished(3)___	
Component 4(D): Contributing to the School and District	Unsatisfactory(0)___ Basic(1)___ Proficient(2)___ Distinguished(3)___	
Component 4(E): Growing and Developing Professionally	Unsatisfactory(0)___ Basic(1)___ Proficient(2)___ Distinguished(3)___	
Component 4(F): Demonstrating Promptness/Attendance	Unsatisfactory(0)___ Basic(4)___ Proficient(5)___ Distinguished(6)___	
Component 4(G): Implementing District Policies(Discipline, Dress Code, Homelessness, Child Abuse Prevention, Student Attendance, Fire Drill, I&RS/504, etc.	Unsatisfactory(0)___ Basic(1)___ Proficient(2)___ Distinguished(3)___	
Domain 4 Total (24 PTS Possible)		

SUPERVISOR'S SUMMARY COMMENTS:

EVALUATEE COMMENTS:

Summative Performance Evaluation: (Check One)

Unsatisfactory__ (0-62%) Basic __ (63-75%) Proficient __ (76-89%) Distinguished __ (90-100%)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: SEE ATTACHED

RECOMMENDATION FOR NEXT SCHOOL YEAR: (CHECK ONE)

GRANT TENURE (IF APPLICABLE) ___ CONTINUE EMPLOYMENT _____

OTHER RECOMMENDATION(S):

DATE OF EVALUATION CONFERENCE:

SIGNATURES:

PRINCIPAL DATE

TEACHER DATE

WITNESS DATE

Appendix E

Frequency Tables

Table 41

Overall Quality of Evaluation

	f	%	M	SD
			3.43	.817
Very Poor Quality				
1	1	3.3		
2	0	0.0		
3	17	56.7		
4	9	30.0		
5	3	10.0		
Very High Quality				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 42

Clarity of Policy Purpose Regarding Evaluation

	f	%	M	SD
			3.37	1.129
Vague				
1	2	6.7		
2	4	13.3		
3	10	33.3		
4	9	30.0		
5	5	16.7		
Very Clear				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 43

Intended Role of Evaluation

	f	%	M	SD
			2.47	1.358
Teacher Accountability				
1	10	33.3		
2	6	20.0		
3	7	23.3		
4	4	13.3		
5	3	10.0		
Teacher Growth				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 44

Participants' Perception of the Impact of Evaluation Process on Professional Practice

	f	%	M	SD
			3.33	.844
No Impact				
1	1	3.3		
2	3	10.0		
3	12	40.0		
4	13	43.3		
5	1	3.3		
Strong Impact				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 45

Participants' Perception of the Impact of Evaluation Process on Professional Growth

	f	%	M	SD
			3.00	.817
No Impact				
1	2	6.7		
2	5	16.7		
3	15	50.0		
4	7	23.3		
5	1	3.3		
Strong Impact				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 46

Perceptions of the Evaluator

	f	%	M	SD
			3.80	1.157
Not Credible				
1	1	3.3		
2	3	10.0		
3	8	26.7		
4	7	23.3		
5	11	36.7		
Very Credible				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 47
Working Relationship

	f	%	M	SD
			4.10	1.094
Adversary				
1	2	6.7		
2	0	0		
3	4	13.3		
4	11	36.7		
5	13	43.3		
Helper				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 48
Level of Trust

	f	%	M	SD
			3.97	1.299
Not Trustworthy				
1	3	10.0		
2	1	3.3		
3	4	13.3		
4	8	26.7		
5	14	46.7		
Trustworthy				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 49
Interpersonal Manner

	f	%	M	SD
			4.13	1.137
Threatening				
1	2	6.7		
2	1	3.3		
3	2	6.7		
4	11	36.7		
5	14	46.7		
Not Threatening				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 50
Temperament

	f	%	M	SD
			4.17	1.147
Impatient				
1	2	6.7		
2	1	3.3		
3	2	6.7		
4	10	33.3		
5	15	50.0		
Patient				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 51
Flexibility

	f	%	M	SD
			4.23	1.006
Rigid				
1	1	3.3		
2	1	3.3		
3	3	10.0		
4	10	33.3		
5	15	50.0		
Flexible				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 52
Knowledge of Technical Aspects of Teaching

	f	%	M	SD
			4.17	.834
Not knowledgeable				
1	0	0		
2	1	3.3		
3	5	16.7		
4	12	40.0		
5	12	40.0		
Very knowledgeable				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 53
Capacity to Model or Demonstrate Needed Improvements

	f	%	M	SD
			3.43	1.194
Low				
1	3	10.0		
2	3	10.0		
3	7	23.3		
4	12	40.0		
5	5	16.7		
High				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 54
Familiarity with Particular Teaching Assignment

	f	%	M	SD
			3.80	1.126
Unfamiliar				
1	2	6.7		
2	0	0		
3	10	33.3		
4	8	26.7		
5	10	33.3		
Very Familiar				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 55
Usefulness of Suggestions for Improvement

	f	%	M	SD
			3.70	1.149
Useless				
1	2	6.7		
2	1	3.3		
3	10	33.3		
4	8	26.7		
5	9	30.0		
Very Useful				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 56
Persuasiveness of Rationale for Suggestion

	f	%	M	SD
			3.67	1.155
Not Persuasive				
1	1	3.3		
2	4	13.3		
3	8	26.7		
4	8	26.7		
5	9	30.0		
Very Persuasive				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 57
Amount of Feedback Received

	f	%	M	SD
			3.30	1.119
None				
1	2	6.7		
2	5	16.7		
3	9	30.0		
4	10	33.3		
5	4	13.3		
Great Deal				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 58
Frequency of Formal Feedback

	f	%	M	SD
			2.87	1.432
Infrequent				
1	7	23.3		
2	6	20.0		
3	6	20.0		
4	6	20.0		
5	5	17.7		
Frequent				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 59
Frequency of Informal Feedback

	f	%	M	SD
			2.45	1.378
Infrequent				
1	9	30.0		
2	8	26.7		
3	6	20.0		
4	2	6.7		
5	4	13.3		
Frequent				
Missing	1	3.3		
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 60
Depth of Information Provided

	f	%	M	SD
			3.00	1.114
Shallow				
1	3	10.0		
2	7	23.3		
3	9	30.0		
4	9	30.0		
5	2	6.7		
In-depth				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 61
Quality of Feedback

	f	%	M	SD
			3.16	1.242
Low				
1	4	13.3		
2	5	16.7		
3	9	30.0		
4	8	26.7		
5	4	13.7		
High				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 62
Specificity of Feedback

	f	%	M	SD
			3.27	1.143
General				
1	2	6.7		
2	6	20.0		
3	8	26.7		
4	10	33.3		
5	4	13.3		
Specific				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 63
Nature of Feedback

	f	%	M	SD
			3.50	.938
Judgmental				
1	1	3.3		
2	2	6.7		
3	12	40.0		
4	11	36.7		
5	4	13.3		
Descriptive				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 64
Timing of Feedback

	f	%	M	SD
			3.37	1.189
Delayed				
1	2	6.7		
2	6	20.0		
3	6	20.0		
4	11	36.7		
5	5	16.7		
Immediate				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 65
Focus of Feedback

	f	%	M	SD
			3.67	1.061
Ignored Standards				
1	1	3.3		
2	2	6.7		
3	11	36.7		
4	8	26.7		
5	8	26.7		
Reflected the Teaching Standards				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 66
Communication of Standards

	f	%	M	SD
			3.83	.986
Not At All				
1	1	3.3		
2	1	3.3		
3	8	26.7		
4	2	40.0		
5	8	26.7		
In Great Detail				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 67
Clarity of Standards

	f	%	M	SD
			3.80	.887
Vague				
1	1	3.3		
2	1	3.3		
3	6	20.0		
4	17	56.7		
5	5	16.7		
Very Clear				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 68
Endorsement of Standards

	f	%	M	SD
			3.59	.906
Not Endorsed				
1	1	3.3		
2	1	3.3		
3	11	36.7		
4	12	40.0		
5	4	13.3		
Highly Endorsed				
Missing	1	3.3		
Totals	30	100.0		

Note. Total of n=1 teacher respondent (3.3%) did not respond to question 25.

Table 69
Were the Standards…

	f	%	M	SD
			2.27	1.337
The Same for All Teachers				
1	14	46.7		
2	1	3.3		
3	10	33.3		
4	3	10.0		
5	2	6.7		
Tailored to Individual Needs				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 70
Observation of Classroom Performance

	f	%	M	SD
			4.30	.750
Not Considered				
1	0	0		
2	1	3.3		
3	2	6.7		
4	14	46.7		
5	13	43.3		
Used Extensively				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 71
Meeting With Evaluator

	f	%	M	SD
			3.13	1.332
Not Considered				
1	5	16.7		
2	5	16.7		
3	5	16.7		
4	11	36.7		
5	4	13.3		
Used Extensively				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 72
Examination of Artifacts

	f	%	M	SD
			3.47	1.196
Not Considered				
1	2	6.7		
2	4	13.3		
3	9	30.0		
4	8	26.7		
5	7	23.3		
Used Extensively				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 73
Examination of Student Performance

	f	%	M	SD
			3.41	1.268
Not Considered				
1	3	10.0		
2	4	13.3		
3	6	20.0		
4	10	33.3		
5	6	20.0		
Used Extensively				
Missing	1	3.3		
Totals	30	100.0		

Note. Total of n=1 teacher respondent (3.3%) did not respond to question 30.

Table 74
Self Evaluation

	f	%	M	SD
			2.53	1.383
Not Considered				
1	8	26.7		
2	10	33.3		
3	4	13.3		
4	4	13.3		
5	4	13.3		
Used Extensively				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 75
Number of Yearly Formal Observations

	f	%	M	SD
			3.20	.714
1= 0 Observations	0	0		
2= 1 Observation	5	16.7		
3= 2 Observations	14	46.7		
4= 3 Observations	11	36.7		
5= 4 Observations	0	0		
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 76
Number/Frequency of Informal Observations

	f	%	M	SD
			3.37	1.299
1=None	3	10.0		
2=Less than 1 per month	5	16.7		
3=Once per month	7	23.3		
4=Once per week	8	26.7		
5=Daily	7	23.7		
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 77
Length of Formal Observations

	f	%	M	SD
			4.73	.691
Brief (few Minutes)				
1= 5 Minutes	3	10.0		
2=10 Minutes	5	16.7		
3=20 minutes	7	23.7		
4=30 Minutes	8	26.7		
5=40+Minutes	7	23.7		
Extended (40 Minutes or More)				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 78
Length of Informal Observations

	f	%	M	SD
			2.36	1.062
Brief (few Minutes)				
1= 5 Minutes	6	20.0		
2=10 Minutes	11	36.7		
3=20 Minutes	7	23.3		
4=30 Minutes	3	10.0		
5=40+ Minutes	1	3.3		
Extended (40 Minutes or More)				
Missing	2	6.7		
Totals	30	100.0		

Note. Total of n=2 teacher respondents (6.7 %) did not respond to question 35.

Table 79
Amount of time spent on Evaluation Process

	f	%	*M*	*SD*
			3.33	1.028
None				
1	1	3.3		
2	5	16.7		
3	11	36.7		
4	9	30.0		
5	4	13.3		
Great Deal				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 80
Time Allotted for Professional Development

	f	%	*M*	*SD*
			3.07	.944
None				
1	1	3.3		
2	7	23.3		
3	13	43.3		
4	7	23.3		
5	2	6.7		
Great Deal				
Totals	30	100.0		

Table 81
Availability of Training Programs

	f	%	*M*	*SD*
			2.79	1.114
None				
1	1	3.3		
2	14	46.7		
3	8	26.7		
4	2	6.7		
5				
Great Deal	4	13.3		
Missing	1	3.3		
Totals	30	100.0		

Note. Total of n=1 teacher respondent (3.3%) did not respond to question 47.

APPENDIX F

IRB Approval

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY

November 23, 2009

Princess B. Towe
239 Dorer Avenue
Hillside, NJ 07205

Dear Ms Towe,

The Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board has reviewed the information you have submitted addressing the concerns for your proposal entitled "An Investigation of the Role of a Teacher Evaluation System and its Influence on Teacher Professional Growth in Four Urban High Schools". Your research protocol is hereby approved as revised through expedited review. The IRB reserves the right to recall the proposal at any time for full review.

Enclosed for your records are the signed Request for Approval form, and the stamped original Consent Form. Make copies only of these stamped forms.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

According to federal regulations, continuing review of already approved research is mandated to take place at least 12 months after this initial approval. You will receive communication from the IRB Office for this several months before the anniversary date of your initial approval.

Thank you for your cooperation.

In harmony with federal regulations, none of the investigators or research staff involved in the study took part in the final decision.

Sincerely,

Mary F. Ruzicka, Ph.D.

Mary F. Ruzicka, Ph.D.
Professor
Director, Institutional Review Board

cc: Dr. Elaine Walker

Presidents Hall • 400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2641 • Tel: 973.313.6314 • Fax: 973.275.2361

APPENDIX G

Informed Consent

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
1856

Informed Consent Form

Researcher's Affiliation: The researcher is a doctoral candidate in the Executive Ed. D. Program at Seton Hall University, College of Education and Human Services, Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy.

Purpose of the Study: This study entitled: *An investigation of the Role of a Teacher Evaluation System and Its Influence on Teacher Professional Growth in Four Urban High Schools* is to find out to what extent the formative evaluation process impacts teachers' professional growth and instructional practices in two comprehensive high schools and two magnet high schools. Teacher participants will take between 30 to 40 minutes to complete a questionnaire within a two week time frame in December 2009. Invited interview participants, Language Arts teachers, mathematics teachers, and administrators, who agree to participate, will complete the individual interview in approximately one hour sessions. Permission to conduct this study in the targeted schools has been granted through the district's IRB and written permission from the schools' principals.

Procedures: Teachers and administrators will be invited to participate in this study via a letter of solicitation. Teachers who agree to participate will complete The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) and one-on-one individual interviews. Packets containing all pertinent information addressed to each of the prospective participants (teachers and administrators) will be hand-delivered by the researcher to each of the participating schools and placed in the individuals' mailboxes. Participants will be asked to return the completed survey and signed Informed Consent Form in a self-addressed, stamped envelope supplied by the researcher. Interviews will be conducted by the researcher in one-on-one, approximately 1 hour sessions, with those teachers and administrators who volunteer to participate. Prospective participates will receive an additional self-addressed, stamped envelope to return the completed checklist indicating their willingness to be interviewed. The checklist will include contact information. Those agreeing to participate will be contacted by the researcher to schedule dates, times, and convenient locations for the individual interviews. With the consent of the participants, the interview sessions will be recorded. Transcription will be done by the researcher.

Expiration Date
NOV 23 2010

Instrumentation: The main source of data collection used in this study will be a teacher questionnaire (TEP) (quantitative); interviews (qualitative) will be conducted with invited, volunteering Language Arts and mathematics teachers and administrators who evaluate teachers in their schools.

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

NOV 23 2009

Approval Date

College of Education and Human Services
Executive Ed.D. Program
Tel. 973.275.2728
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
1856

Voluntary Nature: All participation will be voluntary. There will be no penalty to participants who do not agree to participate or who wish to discontinue participation. A signature on this informed consent form indicates agreement to participate in this study.

Informed Consent: Participants will receive an Informed Consent Form. By signing the form, participants consent to participate in the study and are made aware that their interview responses will be audio-taped for accuracy and later transcribed by the researcher in written form. Participants may discontinue participation at any time without penalty of any kind. The Informed Consent Form will be included with the questionnaire. Signed consent forms will remain with the researcher for a period of not more than three years.

Anonymity: The researcher will assign numbers to each participant. Aggregate data will be reported in the dissertation. No identifying names or schools will be used on any forms or transcripts. The researcher alone will analyze both quantitative and qualitative data.

Confidentiality: Participants are assured of their confidentiality. The researcher and the researcher's university mentor, Dr. Elaine Walker, will be the only individuals to have access to the information on the participants and their schools. The information gleaned through the questionnaire and the interviews will be used for this dissertation study only. No identifying references to individuals or their schools will be included in the final dissertation results.

Security Measures: All data and information will remain with the researcher. No data will be stored electronically on hard drives of laptops or desktop computers. Data will be stored electronically on a USB memory key and kept in a locked, secure cabinet. Data will remain with the researcher for a period of not more than three years. All data, including recordings and transcribed data will be destroyed after a period of three years.

Risks, Discomforts, Benefits: There are no risks, discomforts, or benefits of any kind to the participants.

Expiration Date
NOV 23 2010

Researcher's Contact Information: The researcher, Princess Towe, may be contacted for further information at Arts High School, 550 Martin Luther King Blvd, Newark, New Jersey 07102, 973-733-8209, ptowe@nps.k12.nj.us

University Contacts: Advisor, Dr. Elaine Walker, Seton Hall University, Executive Ed. D Program, (JH 422), 400 S. Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079, 973-275-2307, Elaine.Walker@shu.edu. For information regarding answers to pertinent questions about the research and research subjects' rights, contact the Institutional Review Board Chairperson at 973-313-6314.

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board
NOV 23 2009
Approval Date

College of Education and Human Services
Executive Ed.D. Program
Tel. 973.275.2728
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
1856

Statement of Consent: I have read the information in this consent form and agree to participate in this research study. I understand that there are no risks or benefits to me and that I may withdraw at any time without penalty of any kind.

Print Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

NOV 23 2009

Approval Date

Expiration Date

NOV 23 2010

College of Education and Human Services
Executive Ed.D. Program
Tel. 973.275.2728
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685

APPENDIX H

Permission Granted

Re: Stiggins/The Case for a Commitment in Teacher.../dissertation

South Orange, NJ 07079

-----Original Message-----
From: Doling, Jennie <jennie.doling@sunypress.edu>
To: PBTowe@aol.com
Sent: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 5:29 pm
Subject: Stiggins/The Case for a Commitment in Teacher.../dissertation

25 March 2009

Ms. Princess B. Towe
Seton Hall University
Address Unknown

Dear Ms. Towe,

Thank you for requesting to use materi al (excerpts, pages not stated) from the SUNY Press book The Case for Commitment to Teacher Growth: Research on Teacher Evaluation by Richard J. Stiggins and Daniel L. Duke. It is our policy to not require permission for t he use of our material in an unpublished thesis.

If the thesis is later published in any format using this material you will need to seek permission. Please feel free to review our guidelines for requesting reprint permission that is available on our website: http://www.sunypress.edu/rights.asp

The material may be photocopied by your dissertation committee for internal display/review purposes only.

We appreciate the standard source citation such as the following:

> "Reproduced from The Case for Commitment to Teacher Growth: Research on Teacher Evaluation by Richard J. Stiggins and Daniel L. Duke, by permission of the State University of New York Press. ©1988 State University of New York. All Rights Reserved."

&n bsp;
Best wishes with your thesis defense.

Sincerely,

Jennie R. Doling
Rights and Permissions Manager

Jennie R. Doling
Rights and Permissions Manager

When responding, please include my original message to you. Thank you.
SUNY Press
194 Washington Avenue, Ste. 305
Albany, NY 12210-2384
Phone: 518-472-5024; Fax: 518-472-5038 http://www.sunypress.edu

From: Dave Wilson <wilsond@nwrel.org>
To: PBTowe <PBTowe@aol.com>
Cc: Jean DeYoung <deyoungj@nwrel.org>
Subject: RE: Permission to Use Teacher Evaluation Profile
Date: Mon, Aug 3, 2009 12:04 pm

Ms. Towe-

You have pointed out that this is murky territory. I believe that the TEP revision is our intellectual property, as it was developed here and not published elsewhere under any transfer of copyright that I am aware of. Given that slightly ambiguous claim of authority, this letter is to provide the permission you seek in your email reproduced below. You may use the revised TEP in your research and cite it in any dissertation or publications resulting from it. Any other use will require separate permission.

Dave Wilson
Director, Development & Communications
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 SW Main St., Suite 500
Portland, OR 97204
503-275-9517 (v)
503-275-0458 (f)
wilsond@nwrel.org
http://www.nwrel.org

From: PBTowe@aol.com [mailto:PBTowe@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 01, 2009 11:37 AM
To: Dave Wilson
Subject: Permission to Use Teacher Evaluation Profile

Good Afternoon Mr. Wilson:

I am Princess Towe, a current doctoral candidate in the Ed.D Program at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey. My dissertation title is *An Examination of the Role of a Teacher Evaluation System and It's Influence on Teacher Professional Growth in Four Urban High Schools.* I would like to use the revised "Teacher Evaluation Profile" (TEP) as an instrument in my research.

When I attempted to contact Dr. Richard Stiggins at ETS in Portland, Oregon, in his absence, I was directed to Dr. Steve Chappuis of the same office, who suggested that I contact Suny Press for permission to use the original TEP (Stiggins and Duke, 1988). Permission was granted. However, subsequent to this, through additional research and review of related studies, I realized that the TEP had been revised and, on different occasions, permission had been granted by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. The revised version of TEP would serve my purposes well.

Are you able to grant permission for my use of the revised TEP? If you are unable to grant permission, would you be so kind to direct me to the correct individual/s who would be able to do so?

Thank you in advance for any guidance and assistance that you may offer.

Sincerely,
Princess B. Towe
Doctoral Student
pbtowe@aol.com - Home
973-926-4721

ptowe@nps.k12.nj.us - Work
973-733-8209