

Copyright
by
Douglas L. Marvin
December, 2012

A STUDY OF THE BELIEFS OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL
ADMINISTRATORS: BELIEFS REGARDING THE PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT AND APPRAISAL SYSTEM TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

A Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Douglas L. Marvin

December 2012

A STUDY OF THE BELIEFS OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL
ADMINISTRATORS: BELIEFS REGARDING THE PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT AND APPRAISAL SYSTEM TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

A Dissertation for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Douglas L. Marvin

Approval by Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Lilia Ruban, Chairperson

Dr. M. Wayne Emerson, Committee Member

Dr. Laveria Hutchison, Committee Member

Dr. John Ramsey, Committee Member

Dr. Robert H. McPherson, Dean
College of Education

December 2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First...I would like to thank Dr. Lilia Ruban for allowing me to flesh out this idea during her research classes and be a part of her research. I would like also to thank Dr. Laveria Hutchison for helping complete the process and providing support. Without their initial belief and efforts in me, this research would not have existed.

In the middle...I to want whole-heartedly thank those whom spent their time editing this paper. Dr. Nichole Hertel (NDT Educational Services), Dr. Vickey Giles, Lyne Jordan, Hasiyet Keyim and Dr. Lilia Ruban helped tighten the language and offered suggestions for improving the paper. Thank you to all my Sheldon ISD family who has been a part of my research and life.

In the end...I graciously would like to thank the committee members whom have contributed to this dissertation: Dr. Lilia Ruban, committee chair and my doctoral advisor, Dr. Laveria Hutchison, department chair and committee member, Dr. John Ramsey committee member and Dr. Wayne Emerson, committee member. Without their continuous support, this dissertation would not have been possible. A special thank you to Dr. John Hoyle, who has been an Aggie inspiration for a lifetime. My appreciation to Dr. Irby and Dr. Brown for taking the time to meet with me at SHSU and Dr. Ovando as well, at that school in Austin.

And forever and always....I want to thank my family, Ms. Tammy, Jazlyn and Sean Michael. They are my world and the sole reason I am driven to complete this work. I wish for them not to want for much of anything materially. In addition, I would like to thank my family; Marlin and Gail Holm, my in-laws, my brothers, and most importantly my parents, Richard and Joyce Schmidt, for their continued support and understanding, being a model for marriage of forty years and believing in a broken little boy that they adopted. I would like to thank the Supreme Architect of the Universe, and hope that I might live life for his glory, in becoming a living stone, for that house not made with hands, eternal in the Heavens.

A STUDY OF THE BELIEFS OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL
ADMINISTRATORS: BELIEFS REGARDING THE PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT AND APPRAISAL SYSTEM TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

An Abstract
of A Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Douglas L. Marvin

December 2012

Marvin, D. (2012, October). A study of the beliefs of elementary and secondary school administrators: Beliefs regarding the Professional Development and Appraisal System teacher characteristics. *Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation*. Houston, TX.: University of Houston. December 2012.

ABSTRACT

This research study investigates how Texas school administrators perceive the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.) in Texas as a means of establishing specific essential teacher qualities. What is being measured in this study is the identification of what essential teacher qualities contained within this accepted instrument are considered most important by public school administrators. The P.D.A.S. is comprised of eight comprehensive domains that entail essential effective teaching qualities. The beliefs of school administrators toward effective teaching practices are examined to determine which qualities administrators deem most desirable in teacher appraisals. Quantitative survey data and qualitative interviews allow for examination of the specific qualities administrators look for in teachers and whether those characteristics vary across schools and administrators. The study identifies which specific P.D.A.S. domains administrators regard as most important. This study further examines which specific characteristics within each domain are identified as most important by school administrators.

Consequently, the results of this study could be utilized to ensure greater potential success for individuals in teacher preparation programs as well as for career teachers. It can provide further insight into recommended teacher training. Additionally, this study identifies the specific beliefs of current administrators regarding potential teacher candidates and currently employed teachers. These beliefs about teaching practices and

professional qualities are measured through the 2012 Texas Public Schools Principal Survey developed for this study.

The results of the statistical analyses indicate the survey has strong internal reliability. An analysis of the individual domains provides evidence that the results are in the acceptable range for internal reliability. The descriptive statistics were analyzed and referenced showing a need for more data in order to draw correlations through factor analysis.

The results indicate that “encouraging and supporting students who are reluctant or having difficulty”, scored the highest average mean of the characteristics listed in the instrument. Also among the highest means of items reported were; “Establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed learning as appropriate.”, and “Works collaboratively and constructively with colleagues and other professionals toward the overall improvement of student performance.” Domain VII reported the highest overall mean among administrators regarding “Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements”. Respondents reported that good teaching characteristics differ little across grade levels with the exception of content knowledge for advanced secondary course work. More data from school districts need to be collected to perform factor analysis in order to gain a more complete perspective of the current beliefs of K-12 administrators.

Keywords: Teacher Quality, P.D.A.S., K-12 Administrators, Evaluation, Texas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Overview..... | 1 |
| Need for the Study | 2 |
| Statement of the Problem | 3 |
| Research Questions | 4 |
| Research Hypotheses | 5 |
| Definition of Terms | 6 |
| II. LITERATURE REVIEW | 8 |
| Teacher Evaluation and Quality Record..... | 8 |
| History of the Teacher Appraisal Systems..... | 13 |
| Development of the Professional Development and Appraisal System..... | 20 |
| Improving Schools and Teachers through Evaluation Systems: The P.D.A.S. as a Lever for Instructional Improvement | 25 |
| Summary | 31 |
| III. METHODOLOGY | 33 |
| Introduction | 33 |
| Survey Instrument | 33 |
| Instrument Design | 37 |
| Participants | 39 |
| Pilot Test..... | 42 |
| Data Analysis | 44 |
| Internal Consistency Reliability | 44 |
| Data Analysis Procedures | 45 |
| IV. RESULTS | 48 |
| Research Question One | 48 |
| Research Question Two | 51 |
| Research Question Three | 56 |
| Research Question Four | 58 |
| V. CONCLUSION | 60 |
| Discussion and Conclusions | 60 |
| Limitations | 60 |
| Implication for Practice | 61 |
| Recommendations for Further Research | 63 |
| Conclusion | 65 |
| REFERENCES | 68 |

APPENDICES

| Appendix | Page |
|--|------|
| A Original Instrument Used in Pilot Study | 75 |
| B Revised Instrument After Pilot Study and Interviews | 82 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | Definition of Terms | 7 |
| 2 | The Eight Domains of the P.D.A.S. | 23 |
| 3 | The Rules of the Commissioner | 27 |
| 4 | Descriptive Analysis for Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Highest Degree Held and Title 1 Status ($N = 106$) | 41 |
| 5 | Descriptive Analysis for Respondents' Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Highest Degree Held and Title 1 Status ($N = 106$) | 50 |
| 6 | Mean and Standard Deviation for Each Item in the P.D.A.S.-Based Survey | 53 |
| 7 | Average Mean Score and Standard Deviation for Each Survey Domain ... | 57 |
| 8 | Number of Responses (N) and Percentage of Respondents (%) | 59 |

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Teachers matter. This fact has always been known by parents, students and school administrators, and current research supports this concept (Clotfelter, 2007). Teacher quality, coupled with student success is paramount in public schools today. Education researchers have empirically validated that teachers make a large contribution to the academic achievement of their students. Michael J. Schmoker (2006) states in his book, *Results Now*, that teachers and administrators may perhaps know what the best practices are, but they are not using them consistently. Schmoker goes on to state that instruction by a qualified teacher and a viable consistent curriculum are the two main focus areas for a school that wants to be evaluated as exemplary. This concept is reinforced further by research that links effective teaching practice and student achievement (Tucker, 2005; Fullan, 2001).

New requirements for teachers handed down by state governments and the Federal government have caused a demand for qualified teachers. Many states, including Texas, have vast amounts of alternative programs for teachers to become certified to meet the new demands and requirements for student graduation. At the Federal level, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which reauthorized the Educational Act of 1965, made effective teaching practices and increased student achievement the nationwide central focus for the media and the general public (Marzano, 2001). The "Highly Qualified" provision of NCLB calls for highly qualified teachers in core academic classrooms in all schools by 2007 (Smith, 2005). NCLB mandates raising the quality of teaching by requiring school districts to employ "Highly Qualified" teachers (Mosely,

2006). Within almost 50 years, public school teacher workforce in the United States during 1955 to 2003 has nearly tripled to 3.2 million from 1.4 million, which is almost 44,000 new teachers added to the system each year (Loeb & Beteille, 2008; National Board for Profesional Teaching Standards, 2011).

Need for the Study

Increased discontent with the public school system, a changing and diverse student body and a looming teacher shortage in high-needs areas reflect the frightening state of public education. New teachers must be prepared for the realities of the 21st Century classroom, which consists of a rapidly changing world filled with extraordinary new problems, as well as exciting new possibilities, for learning. Secondary teachers as well as elementary teachers are frustrated with not knowing what administration and school districts want in teachers. Recently, the Houston Independent School District suggested an accountability link between teachers and student assessment scores (Harris, 2011). Schools depend heavily on administrators and human resource personnel to get quality teachers in the classroom (Stronge, 2007). Developing more quality teachers will do little overall for effective schools if these teachers are not given positions in classrooms (DeArmond, 2005).

As demand for school improvement and increased student achievement continue to grow, administrators will need to recruit and retain teachers who have the knowledge, skills and commitment to excellence necessary to meet these demands. Given the realities of the current teacher employment market, it is of the utmost importance that school districts keep abreast of present research and solicit input from employment decision-makers as a way of improving the quality of teacher that is recruited and

retained. Administrators that understand the present teaching tactics, essential teacher qualities, theories and practices in the teacher selection/evaluation process will have an increased advantage in finding the high-quality teacher candidates that a school district desperately needs (Ovando, 2007). Almost all school districts in Texas have no specific research developed that is able to identify district administrator beliefs concerning ideal teacher practices or essential professional qualities as contained in the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.).

Statement of the Problem

This study will examine the qualities desired of teachers by exploring beliefs that administrators hold toward effective quality teaching as emphasized within the eight domains of the P.D.A.S. and described in Table 2. A deeper review of these individual domains will take place in Chapter 2.

Using an in-depth quantitative survey and a short qualitative survey of principals and other school district administrators, this study examines the essential teacher characteristics that administrators find most important and explore characteristics these effective teachers may have in common specifically.

Among scholars studying education and teacher labor markets, there has been a focus on understanding how individuals choose to become teachers and where they choose to teach (Ovando, 2007). There has also been research conducted on understanding the demand side, or how schools and districts hire teachers (Loeb & Reininger, 2004). While this has greatly improved the knowledge about teacher labor markets, the increase in information has been largely one-sided; focusing either on supply or on demand, but rarely both. There has been very little research on specific essential

teacher qualities in Texas and which qualities contained in P.D.A.S. administrators find most salient to effective teaching. The “best” teachers share essential qualities that help students achieve success in all facets of schooling, including state tests and meeting the requirements of Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB, 2001). Evidence suggests both; that teacher quality matters for successful academic outcomes of students and that principals might not hire the “best” teachers (Schmoker, 2006). Little is known about which essential characteristics principals actually value within the P.D.A.S. appraisal system. This information is crucial in decision making for teachers being retained or hired.

Purpose of the Study

In order to understand fully the conceptions of teacher qualities, both elementary and secondary schools must be explored. This study investigates the beliefs of administrators in southeast Texas toward teacher essential qualities based on characteristic P.D.A.S. evaluations. Additionally, it seeks to identify characteristics and qualities that might lead to high-quality classroom teachers, especially those with the knowledge and skills to make a positive academic difference in student learning. This research study examines the beliefs of K-12 administrators in f effective teaching practices as well as professional qualities that are viewed as the most desirable by school administrators when interviewing teachers for potential employment. A purpose of this study is to examine what administrators look for in potential or veteran teacher candidates. First, quantitative survey data coupled with the qualitative interviews allows for examination into what qualities principals look for in teachers and whether the essential characteristics believed to be important vary across schools districts and

individual principals. Second, the existing data collected from the quantitative survey data, coupled with the qualitative survey questions allows for examination into what essential qualities administrators in differentiated grade levels and districts desire in teacher candidates. Going further, it is meant to establish whether the characteristics determined to be important vary across schools in each district. Finally, this study examines the differences among the specific characteristics and qualities of high-quality teachers, how these can vary among the Campus-based Leadership Teams (CBLTs) and how administrators perceive each at the campus and central administration levels.

Research Questions

The results of this study could help promote greater success in schools by creating more insight into recommended teacher training, which would meet the demands of the 21st Century by specifically targeting the desired needs of school districts. It is designed to identify the specific beliefs of current administrators toward salient characteristics of potential teacher candidate as well as the views of the administrators on what desired teaching practices and professional qualities they seek when they make decisions about hiring new teachers or continuing employed teachers. This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- (1) *What three specific characteristics are perceived as most important in effective teachers by school district administrators as contained within the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.)?;*
- (2) *Which of these characteristics do administrators select as most important within each Domain of P.D.A.S.;*

(3) What specific Domain do administrators find as most important within the 2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey? and;

(4) How are these salient characteristics similar or different by subject and/or grade level?

Definition of Terms

A definition is provided in Table 1 for the terms used throughout this proposal. Definitions were garnered from the professional experience of the researcher with the P.D.A.S. method in the Texas public school system.

Table 1: Definition of Terms

| Term | Definition |
|---|--|
| P.D.A.S. | <i>Professional Development and Appraisal System; the Texas approved instrument for appraising its teachers and identifying areas that would benefit from staff development.</i> |
| Secondary School | <i>School that houses students from grade 6-12. This includes middle schools, ninth grade centers, etc.</i> |
| Primary/Elementary School | <i>School that houses students from grades PK- 5. Elementary level students that are the majority of the students served at a particular campus.</i> |
| District/Campus Size (1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A) | <i>is based upon student enrollment for each campus; 5A- 2065 & up, 4A- 990 to 2064, 3A- 430 to 989, 2A- 200 to 429, 1A- 199 & below (2010-2011 Cutoffs as published by the University Interscholastic League of Texas)</i> |
| Attitude | <i>refers to either a positive or a negative opinion, in this study, of a salient characteristic of an effective teacher practice.</i> |
| Domain | <i>Refers to one of the 8 sub-sections of the P.D.A.S. instrument including; Active Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process, Learner-Centered Instruction, Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress, Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time, and Materials, Professional Communication, Professional Development, Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements, Improvement of Academic Performance of all Students on the Campus</i> |
| Title 1 School | <i>A public school that receives deferral monies for having a qualifying enrolment of low socio economic students.</i> |
| TEA School Rating | <i>The school designation as given by the Texas Education Agency for the overall effectiveness of a school/district</i> |

In short, what is being measured in this study is the identification of what essential teacher qualities contained within this accepted instrument are considered most important by public school administrators.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An extensive review of research and related literature was conducted to provide a context and background for this study. Literature and research were reviewed in seven areas: (1) Teacher Evaluation and Quality Record; (2) History of Appraisal Systems; (3) Development of the Professional Development and Appraisal System; and (4) Improving Schools and Teachers Through Evaluations Systems. Each area serves as an informational guide adding to the need for and the significance of this study.

Teacher Evaluation and Quality Record

Teacher Evaluation Record.

For the past decade, the accountability movement in America public schools has gained impetus. This movement has prompted the creation and sustainability of a plethora of new structures within the walls of public school buildings, including teacher evaluation. However, teacher evaluation practices conducted by most school organizations often centered upon the accepted teacher evaluation practices of the past (Hughes, 2006; Peterson, 2000). Because of this accountability movement, scholars, practitioners and policy makers have recognized the importance of designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems that aim to improve learning and teaching (Arredondo, 2000). Nonetheless, a literature gap existed in the best practices to evaluate teacher quality, which suggests that administrators were absent from the pedagogical conversations (Torff, 2001). However, it is imperative to have input from administrators concerning their preconceptions of teacher quality concerning the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.). Little research directly correlates the

evaluation and/or instructional processes with improved student achievement (Cawelti, 1995).

The notion that instruction can be measured and improved is at the heart of many school reform initiatives. Effective teacher evaluations are viewed as a vehicle for driving school improvement and central to many school reform initiatives aimed at increasing student learning in low performing schools (Rowan, Correnti, Miller & Camburn, 2009). Yet, the idea of linking successful teaching, student academic achievement and teacher evaluation is hardly new. Scriven (1987) raised the issue of validity in teacher evaluation decades ago while challenging the assertion that research-based effective teaching techniques could be incorporated into teacher evaluation systems and used as a basis for judging performance. In essence, Scriven focused on the construct validity of such evaluation systems. This research study raises similar questions about the evaluation system in Texas with respects to critically important teacher qualities.

A Brief History of the Teacher Quality Nationally.

“The quality of teaching is the foundation that supports student success in schools” (Mitchell, 1998). The intense focus on improvement in the education community came because of several nation-wide events. One particular paramount occasion occurred in 1983 with the report of *A Nation at Risk*, which focused on vast improvements in the school system. These focuses on educational improvement lead to the Charlottesville Education Summit in September of 1989, which included governors discussing national goals in education. However, this improvement reached outside of the isolated field of education. It crossed boundaries into the American business world as well. Throughout the 1990s and into the 21st Century, businesses, government agencies

and educational institutions have analyzed, analyzed and designed processes for improvement within their organizations. As documented in Loeb and Beteille (2008), Olsen and Epstein writing for the *Pennsylvania Times* in 1997 analyzed case studies of changes in business and government because of focusing on performance management. The change in quality of education can be correlated to the same performance management issues in these case studies (Loeb & Beteille, 2008).

During the late 1980s, traditional forms of assessment dominated these plans. These practices often were designed as a quantitative checklist describing ideal teacher behaviors and practices, and the accepted standardized hierarchical syntax in a predetermined “lesson cycle.” Assessments, such as PRAXIS by the Educational Testing Service, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), were included in the evaluation process in many states nationwide (Texas Education Agency, 2009). A common theme among these assessments was the strong alignment with the instructional processes, often referred to as “best practices.” These are supported by the national standards of the time (Baker, 1998). The Goal 2000 Program developed by the Clinton Administration gave the states Federal money to write individual academic standards, but most were vague (Ravitch, 2010). The Professional Development and Appraisal System in Texas is based upon these “best practices” in each of its eight domains.

Teacher Quality in Texas.

Implemented statewide in Texas in 1997 the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.) were intended to embody the paramount research available at that time in the field of education. The most comprehensive instrument used in public

education in highlighting teacher qualities and expectations was implemented (Ovando, 2010). The state legislature required the Commissioner of Education Michael Moses and the Texas Education Agency to design and develop a system that would carry the state to a higher level of achievement than that specified in the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS). The TTAS was activated for evaluation in Texas during the 1986 school year. After a decade of use, it was time for a new instrument, according to the Texas Education Agency.

Administrators using the TTAS relied on evaluations to provide information needed for staffing decisions and implementation of teacher training. Texas educational leaders attempted to incorporate these "best practices" into their assessment instrument, in order to ensure increased student achievement and improve effective teaching behaviors, as teachers were required to use these strategies in their classrooms. Prior to the development of the current Texas P.D.A.S. teacher appraisal instrument, the Texas Education Agency participated in researching and evaluating a collection of qualitative and quantitative materials that demonstrated relationships between teacher behaviors and desired student outcomes (Texas Education Agency, 1998). Designers of the P.D.A.S. relied on this compilation of research as the descriptors of effective practices when creating the instrument. The Texas state legislation voted in 1995 on Senate Bill 1, which required the Commissioner of Education to develop an appraisal system to replace and improve the 1985 Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS). After two years of study and with much deliberation, Texas piloted the new teacher appraisal instrument, the Professional Development Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.) during the 1996-97 school year with mass implementation during the 1997-98 school year. Over 90% of the districts in

the state notified the Texas Education Agency they intended to implement the appraisal instrument during the 1997-98 school year (Pankonien, 2010). However, less than 50 districts opted to submit waivers for approval by the Texas Education Agency to develop their own teacher appraisal systems, which were required to include similar components to the P.D.A.S.. Currently, of the 1,266 public school districts in Texas, less than 100, or 10%, employ their own appraisal system rather than P.D.A.S. (Pankonien, 2012).

Pankonien went on writing that in the 2009-2010 school year districts were required to self-report the internal evaluation system they employ as a means of evaluating their classroom teachers.

The criterion elements in the P.D.A.S. support the instructional practices outlined by the National Standards and reflect the requirement of the legislature for a higher standard of performance. In order for a teacher to be ranked as “Proficient,” the quality of instruction must be such that it “exemplifies outstanding teacher behavior.” Numerous uncharacteristic criteria not found in teacher appraisal instruments, such as personal goal-setting, participation in continuing professional development activities, individual student achievement, professional communication, compliance with administrative policies and procedures, and administrative requirements, are included as part of the approvals used by the state for classroom teachers. The intent of the instrument is to affect classroom and professional practices, and to be more receptive to the needs of teachers and administrators (Texas Education Agency, 1998). This instrument is meant to promote improvement and growth in teachers leading to increased student achievement (Pankonien, 2010). Recent studies have found that higher levels of student achievement increasingly are associated with opportunities for teachers to participate in sustained

continuing professional development activities that are grounded in content-specific pedagogy (Cohen & Hill, 1997; Wiley, 1995; Hoyle, English & Steffy, 1998; Brown & Irby, 2012).

History of the Teacher Appraisal Systems

Teacher Appraisal Systems Nationwide.

The development of the P.D.A.S. in Texas represented efforts to capture much of what was known about teacher evaluation systems in general and teacher appraisal specifically. This effort in 1997 came after almost two decades of work on teacher appraisal and evaluation. A surge of legislative mandates in the past two decades can be attributed to three main events: (1) the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education; (2) changes in the politics of education due to conflicts between teachers, school boards, and administrators, particularly in the area of school finance; and (3) increased professional staffing in the legislature. Additionally, along with these the formation of legislative education committees increased the ability of the legislature to deal with larger numbers of educational issues (Rosenthal & Fuhrman, 1981). These developments, along with the 1986 publication of *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* by the Carnegie Forum and the joint 1986 publication *A Time for Results* between the Holmes Group and the National Governors' Association, focused on the act of teaching and specific responses by teacher meeting the needs of the student (Davis-Frost, 2000). These reports called for across-the-board educational restructuring.

Prior to *A Nation at Risk*, the general American population considered teacher evaluation as a process inclusive to the education forum. Due to increased public

concern, 45 states implemented teacher assessment or assistance programs between 1970 and 1990. Prior to 1970, only four states had such programs in place (Hoge & Coladarci, 1989). Increased legislation regarding reforms and additional policy requirements lead to increases in state funding between 1970 and 1993 for local schools to 50.7% from 40% (Fullan, 1993), which is an increase of 10.7%. The Center for Policy Research and Education reported in 1989 that every state addressed the concerns raised in *A Nation at Risk* (Firestone & Others, 1989).

The apprehension from the public concerning the well-being of the nation and its children as well as the authoritative status of the United States being a supreme world power expanded the anxiety of the general population for providing a quality education in the American public school system. It directed the spotlight on the quality of teaching and the curriculum employed within the walls of the American classroom. As a result, The Carnegie Forum established the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession in 1985. An overriding recommendation from this task force was the formation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) established in 1987 (National Board for Profesional Teaching Standards, 2011). The function of NBPTS was to set high standards for the teaching profession regarding what teachers should know and what areas they should be proficient in the classroom setting. These guidelines were designed to allow for stringent certification requirements and continuing education for teachers constantly to strive for excellence. These goals were established for increasing student achievement in the United States. The areas to be included in the certification system included: (1) standards for each teaching field; (2) commendable practices that measure the standards set forth; and (3) professional development activities that would lead to a

greater understanding of the standards for teaching and “best practices.” Field tests were proposed in 1993-94 and the system was to be partially in place in the United States by 1995-96. Before the end of 1997, the 30 specific certification areas were to be completed or were under development (Baratz-Snowden, 1993). The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards is supported broadly by educational researchers as a system that articulates the knowledge teachers must have in order to be effective in the classroom. Cawelti (1995) wrote that the work of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards gave direction to the creation of a knowledge base regarding effective teaching that all teachers will know and be able to utilize. The P.D.A.S. criteria in Texas are aligned directly with the NBPTS as well as other standards. This is represented in a table after the references (Texas Education Agency, 1998). The intent of this alignment is to give the Texas teacher evaluation system credibility at both national and state levels.

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support consortium (INTASC) is a performance-based process beginning in the 1980s when Connecticut and California began to jointly develop and validate assessments for state licensing of pre-service teachers (Standards I, 2004). In 1989, the project became known as INTASC and was sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers. Over 35 states and professional organizations, such as the National Education Association and the National Association of State Boards of Education, are members currently of INTASC. The standards represent a common core of teaching knowledge and skills designed to be compatible with the NTBS standards. Two states currently using this evaluation process are Indiana

and North Carolina, both of which have undergone significant restructuring efforts in recent years.

Since 1990, systems of teacher evaluation have moved into a new era. These attempts at more equitable means of evaluation outline new requirements regarding pre-service teacher preparation and certification, first year teachers, recertification of experienced teachers and performance evaluations of current classroom teachers. The main purposes of evaluations are to create legal documentation for possible dismissal actions, improved teaching quality and teacher accountability, along with incentives for reaching certain levels of students and/or teacher performance. Administrators often view the need for teacher evaluations as a means of providing evidence to parents and to the public that teachers are effective and are becoming even more effective. Teachers view evaluations primarily as a means of accountability (Vanhoof & Van Petegema, 2007).

Some strategies at the state level add extended hours or additional months to the teaching contract after they have reached an exemplary level of evaluation. Still others require performance of additional, non-academic duties. The commonality among states is a desire for excellence in the classroom, as defined by appraisal systems currently used. This excellence in the classroom includes evidence of content knowledge in subject areas taught and longevity in current position. The amount of teaching experience required before a teacher can achieve a longer contract or additional tenure varies from state to state. As the plans evolve, states began including student achievement as a factor in evaluating the job performance of a teacher. The current plan in place in Texas -- the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.) -- includes assessing student

achievement for the individual campus as one component of an overall evaluation of a teacher.

History of the Teacher Appraisal System in Texas.

In June 1984, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 72 in which The State Board of Education was directed to adopt an appraisal process and specific criteria with which to appraise the performance of teachers. Included in House Bill 72 was the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS) that included the Career Ladder Plan (Standards N. B., 1991). Texas Education Agency (TEA) conducted a review of literature on teaching effectiveness, surveyed other states that were conducting statewide appraisal systems and gathered information regarding teacher evaluation systems in place in 156 Texas school districts. Thirty thousand teachers were surveyed regarding the teacher evaluation methods currently in use in their districts. This information was used to derive a list of teaching behaviors that were later included in the instrument (Texas Education Agency, 1998). Ten states -- Arizona, Texas, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Nevada, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon and Utah -- now require teachers be included in determining the type of evaluations administered and the methods that will be used.

Experts on professional performance, such as David Cohen, Martha Ovando and Michael Fullan, stress that mutually respectful interaction and personal input into the continual professional development of teachers are the most effective means of increasing teacher growth and their professional development.

Implemented in the 1986-87 school year, TTAS was designed to be a “comprehensive and generic” system used as a vehicle to improve instruction (Texas Teacher Appraisal System Appraisers Manual, 1989). The instrument reflected the

assumption that there are common effective teaching behaviors that are observable (Texas Teacher Appraisal System Appraiser's Manual, 1989). These behaviors became the domain descriptors within the instrument. An expert panel of nationally recognized experts, including John Goodlad (University of Washington) and Richard Monatt (Iowa State University), joined forces with the State Board of Education Committee on Personnel to review the draft and direct revisions. A pilot was conducted using volunteer districts throughout the state. Following the pilot, further revisions were made and additional data gathered. This included adding such items as time requirements, teacher beliefs and usability of performance indicators. Following a public hearing, additional revisions were made that included suggestions from teachers, administrators, and other professional organizations.

A cadre of 270 individuals representing regional service centers, school districts and institutes of higher education delivered training to school districts. Approximately 13,000 appraisers received a 43-hour training session and the TTAS was implemented in Fall 1986 (Texas Education Agency, 1998). House Bill 173 further refined the evaluation instrument. Amendments included allowing grade level or department chairpersons to conduct appraisals, reduction in the number of required appraisals for eligible teachers and evaluation of non-degreed teachers (Texas Teacher Appraisal System Appraisers Manual, 1989).

Teacher Preparation Programs.

Demographic changes and new policies, such as class size reduction, are increasing both the need for new teachers and the need for a greater understanding of how to prepare effective teachers. In Texas, and in many other states across the United

States, personnel retirements and demands for new teachers are straining the ability of existing teacher preparation programs to produce sufficient numbers of high-quality teachers. In addition, innovative standards for high achievement by all students require newly entering teachers to be more skilled than in the past. In low-performing schools with high proportions of low socio-economic and minority students, the qualifications of teachers are already substantially below the standards than in better-performing urban and suburban schools (Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2002). As the demand for high-quality teachers increase, the disparities are likely to become greater as schools with superior working conditions and higher salaries tend to take the more highly qualified teachers from difficult-to-staff schools. In addition, there is evidence that a substantial majority of teachers take their first job very close to where they grew up. Urban areas hire more teachers than there are individuals who choose education as a profession from those areas, thus schools in urban areas have to hire teachers from other areas, which further disadvantages them (Boyd, et al. 2005).

Many urban districts have begun to rely on new teacher preparation programs that greatly reduce the requirements for coursework and experiences in schools prior to becoming a teacher, but they provide supports and additional coursework during the first years of teaching. Using data from administrators, this study assesses the qualities contained within P.D.A.S. that are most important for student achievement. Recent research has documented the importance of teachers to student achievement (Rivkin, Hanushek & Kain 2005; Rockoff, 2004; Sanders & Rivers 1996). Each of these studies documents the improvement of student achievement with increases in teacher experience during the first three to five years of experience with virtually no additional gains for

experience beyond five years. Many other factors, including the verbal ability of the teacher as well as subject matter preparation, contribute to teacher effectiveness (Ehrenberg & Brewer 1995; Monk 1994). Schools may also affect teacher effectiveness through, for example, resources, teacher training, evaluation, administrative leadership and/or curriculum. There is some evidence that professional education can improve the abilities of the teachers in the classroom (National Research Council 2001; Garet, et al. 2001; Loucks-Horsley & Matsumoto, 1999). This study focuses specifically on the beliefs of administrators toward the importance of essential teacher qualities contained within P.D.A.S. as measured by the 2012 Texas Principal Survey as described in detail in Chapter 3.

Development of the Professional Development and Appraisal System

Senate Bill 1 passed in 1995 by the Texas legislature and required the Commissioner of Education to develop a new appraisal system. Section 21.351 specified general characteristics for the appraisal system. The definitions of these characteristics grew from a study of practices in the field of education. The result is a model that incorporates the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) (Standards I. 2004; National Board for Profesional Teaching Standards, 2011). P.D.A.S. evaluators, therefore, were trained to seek out evidence of best classroom practices the developers believed positively affected and increased student learning.

In conjunction with publication of the P.D.A.S. instrument, the Texas Education Agency released the “Review of Literature Relating Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.) Criteria to Student Outcomes” (Texas Education Agency,

1998). This Review of Literature took place between 2008 and 2011 and included observations for every objective within each of the P.D.A.S. domains. Although intended to be a selected grouping of studies that “demonstrate a relationship between teacher behaviors and student outcomes” the majority of citations are qualitative studies, case studies, or descriptions of programs, rather than well-designed quantitative research (Davis-Frost, 2000). The review of literature contained information regarding methodologies and programs that enhance beliefs of the student and perceived behaviors of teachers (Texas Education Agency, 1998). This collection of resources represents a weakness that affects the entire profession of education. Moreover, there is no well-researched quantifiable body of knowledge that directly correlates specific teaching behaviors to student outcomes. This is a part of the very nature of flaws in any attempt to articulate effective teaching practices. Leading researchers, such as Linda Darling-Hammond, began the process by reviewing state policy initiatives (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). This review clearly identifies the need for quantitative research correlating teacher behaviors and student achievement. This leads to a question of finding a direct link between these items, if one even exists.

While developing and refining the plan, the TEA received input from an Appraisal Advisory Committee, as well as professional associations and focus groups comprised of teachers, principals, superintendents, personnel directors, and service center training personnel (Texas Education Agency, 2009). Refinements were made based on input from these groups. Along with suggestions from constituent groups, the criteria also incorporate the *Proficiencies for Learner-Centered Instruction* adopted in 1994 by the Texas State Board of Education and “Best Practices” as identified by the extensive

review of literature compiled by the agency. The four goals of the Professional Development and Appraisal System are as follows:

- (1) To devise a recommended system, which fulfills the requirements of law found in § 21.351, TEC;*
- (2) To develop a fair and practical appraisal process, which builds upon and makes improvements in the current TTAS;*
- (3) To develop a system which acknowledges and reinforces good teaching practices which are supported by research and evidenced by most Texas teachers; and*
- (4) To develop a system which promotes and supports quality professional development among teachers in the state of Texas.*

(Texas Education Agency, 1989).

The eight domains of the P.D.A.S. include 51 evaluation criteria. The basis of the criteria were comprised of three elements: (1) The Proficiencies for Learner Centered Instruction; (2) input from over 10,000 Texas teachers regarding their beliefs and experiences concerning teacher evaluation; and (3) the refined TTAS and other states objectives. The eight individual P.D.A.S. domains are described in Table 2 below:

Table 2: The Eight Domains of the P.D.A.S.

| P.D.A.S. Domain | Description |
|------------------------|---|
| Domain I | Active Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process |
| Domain II | Learner-Centered Instruction |
| Domain III | Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress |
| Domain IV | Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time, and Materials |
| Domain V | Professional Communication |
| Domain VI | Professional Development |
| Domain VII | Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements |
| Domain VIII | Improvement of Academic Performance of all Students on the Campus |

The primary means of evaluating teachers is through a minimum of a total of a 45-minute classroom observation either in an individual observation or in three 15-minute observations. However, cumulative data and observations made outside the classroom may also be included if the information is shared with the teacher prior to its inclusion (Texas Education Agency, 2005). Any domain not observed during the 45-minute session may be added with additional documentation. Each domain is scored independently as "Exceeds Expectations," "Proficient," "Below Expectations" or "Unsatisfactory." Teachers do not receive cumulative scores that encompass the entire instrument. Any teacher who has concerns about this score may request a second appraisal from a different appraiser, or may appeal the original appraisal with the district. If this is set in motion, then traditional district due process procedures are followed, including attempting to reach a mutual agreement (Texas Education Agency, 2005). For

the first time in Texas, teachers were given the opportunity to provide personal input into their evaluations in Domains VI and VIII. Furthermore, the Teacher Self-Report allowed them to include exemplars of their best work (Texas Education Agency, 2005). Thus, teachers were allowed to make decisions regarding their own learning and the needs of their classrooms.

Incorporating student achievement is one factor in determining the overall effectiveness of a teacher. This has been a topic of widespread debate for nationwide and several public school districts have attempted to include this measure. The P.D.A.S. includes student achievement as one of the 51 indicators that describe what the state desires from its teachers. The achievement measure is based upon school-wide performance rather than an individual teacher or student achievement in the classroom. Despite its apparent insignificance as one of 51 indicators, organizations of teachers strongly urged developers to omit this criterion due to the many aspects of student academic achievement over which they have no control. The Commissioner of Education explained this perspective in a letter to Texas educators:

The P.D.A.S. incorporates the student performance link required by law. It does so in the fairest way possible for student learning. We believe the system has the potential positively to affect student achievement. The performance link focuses on TAAS-related objectives, attendance and students in at risk situations, allowing the system to appraise all teachers on their contributions to the overall improvement of the school.

(Texas Education Agency, 1997, p. 3)

Research has supported the intent of Moses by describing strategies and techniques that teachers should use positively to influence their classroom performance (Cawelti, 1995). Another unique aspect of P.D.A.S. is the inclusion of continuous learning, professional growth and a sense of community. Fullan pointed out the need to ensure these provisions work together so that teachers continually seek out and strive to implement best practices (Fullan, 1993). The evaluative nature of P.D.A.S. places the building administrator in the role of keeping the process focused on improvement. In addition to the classroom components of the P.D.A.S. is the Teacher Self-Report in which teachers set professional goals they identify individually through reflective practice.

Part III of the Teacher Self Report component requires a summarization of the continuing professional education development activities of the teacher. These activities must be aligned with the need of students within the classroom of the teacher. The measure of appropriateness of the selected staff development is whether the professional development positively influences student success (Texas Education Agency, 2005). This new definition of effective teaching and learning is more complex than that contained in the past measures. Teacher evaluations now must focus on all the components that interact to positively impact education (Rockoff & Speroni, 2009).

Improving Schools and Teachers through Evaluations Systems: The P.D.A.S. as a Lever for Instructional Improvement

There is a need for identifying the essential characteristics of good teaching. The research shows a critical link between effective teaching and the academic achievement of the student (Mathers, Oliva & Laine, 2008). As pointed out by Mather, “Pinpointing

the skills that lead certain teachers to have a greater impact on student performance than others is a matter of great urgency in a country that struggles with educating all its children equally” (2008, p. 4). There is growing interest in identifying these characteristics and in Texas, the P.D.A.S. is the avenue through which evaluation is measured. As listed in the previous chapter, the development of P.D.A.S. was painstakingly planned and revised through many steps of scholarship and bureaucracy. More than 95% of the school districts in Texas use P.D.A.S. to evaluate teachers and *all* administrators that evaluate, are required by law to be trained (Pankonien, 2010) in 2010. In 2011 of the 1259 districts 86% of all schools used P.D.A.S.. This means that out of the 1,259 Texas public school districts, that a reported 1,086 districts employ the P.D.A.S. system as a evaluatative measure for their clasrooom teachers (Pankonien L. , 2012). Unfortunately, in 2012 school distruicts were not required to report their evaluation systems and therefore no data exists at this time (Brown & Irby, 2012). Each district is required by Texas law to undergo training in order to utilize the P.D.A.S., specifically Instrunctional Leadership Training and Professional development and Appraisal Training as well.. The specific laws are described in Table 3 below:

Table 3: The Rules of the Commissioner

| Rule | Guideline |
|---|---|
| Commissioner's Rule 19 TAC §150.1006(b) | <i>The teacher's supervisor shall conduct the teacher's appraisal and must hold a superintendent, mid-management (principal), or supervisor certification, or must hold comparable certificates established by the State Board for Educator Certification. An appraiser other than the teacher's supervisor must be approved by the school district board of trustees, hold a valid teaching certificate, and have at least three years of prekindergarten, elementary, or secondary teaching experience.</i> |
| Commissioner's Rule 19 TAC §150.1006(d)(3) | <i>Educators seeking certification as an appraiser for the P.D.A.S. after June 1, 2002, shall be required to complete ILD training and the P.D.A.S. training with successful completion of ILD training as a prerequisite to the P.D.A.S. training.</i> |

When used appropriately, teacher evaluations should measure and identify the instructional strategies, professional behaviors, and delivery of content knowledge that affect student learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). P.D.A.S. experts Martha Ovando (The University of Texas) and Laurelee Pankonien (Region 13) point out that the P.D.A.S. system in Texas is designed to be formative and summative in evaluating teachers and measures exactly what Danielson and McGreal outline previously (personal communication, July 22, 2010; personal communication, April 26, 2010).. With this in mind, both stated that P.D.A.S. would be an exceptional avenue to identify essential teacher qualities as identified by administrators, pre-service teachers and Professors alike. Both formative and summative evaluations can be powerful tools for informing decisions about professional development opportunities for teachers (Nolan & Hoover, 2005) as well as continued employment (Brandt, Mathers, Oliva, Brown-Sims & Hess, 2007).

A few of the major findings contained in the REL Midwest study (Brandt, Mathers, Oliva, Brown-Sims & Hess, 2007) provide further insight into evaluation policies listing the following four conclusions:

- (1.) Administrators (e.g. principals, vice principals) were most commonly charged with conducting evaluations;*
- (2.) One half of the policies required specific evaluation methods. The most common method was classroom observations (both scheduled and unannounced);*
- (3.) Just over one third of the policies identified teacher behaviors and characteristics to be evaluated. Most required the evaluation to measure content and pedagogical knowledge, classroom management skills, ability to effectively prepare a lesson, and the extent to which teachers fulfill their professional responsibilities. Only one half of the policies required an assessment of how well teachers use student progress to inform their teaching; and*
- (4.) Fewer than 1 out of 10 policies required evaluator training.*

(Mathers, Oliva, & Laine, 2008)

The P.D.A.S. system in Texas provides for all of the areas mentioned above and more. Ovando stated that P.D.A.S. is the most comprehensive evaluation tool used in schools, particularly when it comes to identifying essential teacher qualities that she has observed in her 35 years in evaluation (Marvin, 2010). Evaluation tools, specifically the P.D.A.S., can be a powerful tool to identify essential teacher qualities leading to

improved student performance. The improvement of teacher and administrator operation hinges on effective staff evaluation (Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1998).

Instructional Leadership Development.

Another important aspect of P.D.A.S. and the instrument developed for this research is Instructional Leadership Development (ILD) and its requirement for administrators to be trained in it to perform evaluations using P.D.A.S.. This 36-hour training is a prerequisite to the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.) training and is foundational in regards to administrator evaluations in Texas (Brown & Irby, 2012). The training is focused on the following concepts: (1.) Data-driven Decision Making; (2.) Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment; (3.) Supervision ; (4.) Professional Development; (5.) Organizational Management; and (6.) Community Partnerships. Each of these areas is paramount for understanding when evaluating teachers and Instruction (Brown & Irby, 2012). The ILD training provides each administrator the same training and each person instructing the course is professionally trained at a regional service center in Texas or at an accredited University (Brown & Irby, 2012).

The Instructional Leadership Development (ILD) binder contains six components to assist administrators in becoming more effective instructional leaders and in improving the quality of student performance in schools. It is the accompanying material for the 36-hour Instructional Leadership Development (ILD) training, the prerequisite required for administrators seeking certification as P.D.A.S. appraisers. The binder is the required text for all participants taking the ILD training (Texas Education Agency, 2005). As school

administrator responsibilities continue to increase worldwide, development of effective school leadership is requisite (Hughes, 2006).

Reliability and Validity of P.D.A.S. as an Instrument for Evaluating Teachers.

The reliability and validity of an instrument used in research has importance in that the data collected is worthwhile and conclusions can be made. An evaluation instrument is considered *reliable* in several ways. If two or more evaluators use the same evaluation instrument and come to the same conclusions, then the instrument is considered to have inter-rater reliability. In this study, reliability comes from “Internal Consistency Reliability” evaluated through statistics in the case of this study (Mathers, Oliva, & Laine, 2008). In this study the questions arises wondering if the P.D.A.S. is a reliable instrument to gain insight into the essential teacher qualities contained within as identified by administrators. One important way that P.D.A.S. goes to increase reliability among evaluators is to ensure that the domains contained within P.D.A.S. have clearly defined, non-subjective criteria that require minimal interpretation. These clearly defined criteria for ratings within the P.D.A.S. system are clearly defined in the rubric of the evaluator during P.D.A.S. training.

Besides having a carefully designed instrument (such as P.D.A.S.), it is also important to have observers trained in using the instrument (Mujis, 2006). In this study, the goal is accomplished by carefully developing the modified P.D.A.S. survey to measure the beliefs of the beliefs of administrators toward essential teacher qualities. Another very important aspect of reliability in this study is being conscious that each evaluator is carefully trained in the state standards, as mentioned previously. While

P.D.A.S. inherently has discretion and attitude built into its structure, it can and should be used to identify essential teacher qualities as outlined in the domains of P.D.A.S. (Marvin, 2010).

In the case of using P.D.A.S. as a valid instrument, the following questions must be asked: *What truths prove the P.D.A.S. measures and/or contains essential teacher qualities*, and *How can these truths be identified using a Likert type scale?* While P.D.A.S. is designed to evaluate teacher performance, it has outlined in each domain essential teacher qualities that are crucial to effective teaching practice (Texas Education Agency, 2005). The Professional Development and Appraisal System of Texas has a consensus among state officials as a valid instrument and is based upon research nationwide to identify these essential qualities that teachers are to be appraised upon (Ovando M., 2010; Texas Education Agency, 2009). What is being measured in this study is the identification of what essential teacher qualities contained within this accepted instrument are considered most important by public school administrators. Almost every public school administrator in Texas is certified in Instructional Leadership Development and in the Professional Development and Appraisal System (Brown & Irby, 2012) These facts provides situational power to the study and the instrument.

Summary

Perhaps the greatest argument for using this instrument as a basis for developing this instrument for this study, 2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey, is P.D.A.S.'s widespread usage in Texas. In education, we must continually search out information that can improve teacher preparation programs. Through these

improvements and identification of critical areas for teacher preparation, we can produce more effective teachers leading to improving student achievement.

A recent overview of several national, state and local evaluation systems conducted by Education Sector (Toch & Rothman, 2008) further emphasizes the urgent need for education policymakers to address the inadequate implementation of teacher evaluations and to emphasize their potential for teacher and school improvement (Mathers, Oliva, & Laine, 2008). The literature provides basis for the importance in identifying what essential teacher qualities as outlined in the P.D.A.S. evaluation used in Texas public schools administrators find most important.

Chapter Three describes the methodology used when the initial research study was conducted as a pilot study for this dissertation. Data from several additional school districts have been collected and incorporated into this final dissertation research study.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology in the following sections: (a) survey instrument; (b) instrument design; (c) participants; (d) pilot test; (e) data analysis; (f) internal consistency reliability; and (g) data analysis procedures. A quantitative method approach will be used to collect and analyze data using descriptive statistics that will be utilized to identify items that are deemed most important. Descriptive statistics utilize variables whose values are measured on different types of scales (SPSS, 2009). For this study, the items will be measured by examining responses of the participants.

For the purposes of this study the data will be used in identifying specific items in P.D.A.S. as well as determining which domains of the survey the administrators rated as more important than other domains. Additionally, the demographic characteristics of the participants will be described. Finally, open-ended responses will be analyzed for dominant patterns and themes to answer Research Question Four.

The Survey Instrument

No survey instrument is currently in place to measure perceptions of effective teaching practice and desired professional qualities by Texas school administrators. Therefore, the initial survey instrument was adapted based on the Domain Objectives stated in the P.D.A.S. instrument. However, only the first 50 competency-based statements (clustered under eight domains) in the P.D.A.S. were incorporated. The last item was excluded because it merely requires indication of the campus performance rating, which is not strongly relevant to the competency of the individual teachers. To ensure that the adapted survey adhered closely to the P.D.A.S. only minimal changes for

syntactic coherence were made. For example, on the P.D.A.S. form, the first appraisal criterion to evaluate teacher performance is “Students are actively engaged in learning.”

Each domain contained within P.D.A.S. has several stem or lead statements for which teachers are evaluated. These lead statements are designed to provide specific criteria or essential characteristics to be evaluated. The participant is asked to rate each item contained within the domain using a Likert type scale in which “1” represented “strongly disagree” and “5” represented “strongly agree” in regard to the essential teacher quality. Each item contained within the instrument was converted in this manner to fit the instrument.

Participants were asked to rank these items importance using a Likert scale. The 50-item P.D.A.S. factor structure described by the Texas State Board for Educator Certification (1997) included eight domains are found in Table 2 below, which also was presented previously in Chapter 2:

Table 2: The Eight Domains of the P.D.A.S.

| Domain | Description |
|---------------|---|
| Domain I | Active Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process |
| Domain II | Learner-Centered Instruction |
| Domain III | Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress |
| Domain IV | Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time, and Materials |
| Domain V | Professional Communication |
| Domain VI | Professional Development |
| Domain VII | Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements |
| Domain VIII | Improvement of Academic Performance of all Students on the Campus |

They are exogenous latent variables hypothesized to be correlated with each other.

Several experts in the area of P.D.A.S. and teacher evaluation were interviewed to solidify content validity and instrument robustness. Ovando (The University of Texas) has been involved in evaluation for over 35 years and teaches a course at the university titled “Systems for Observing/Analyzing Instruction.” Her critique of the original/pilot instrument has been implemented and will be used in further research. Also, the study researcher interviewed P.D.A.S. expert Lauralee Pankonien as of 2010 the Senior Certification Specialist at Region 13 service center in Texas. Pankonien pointed to a need to use the data we can collect from such a study to help develop teacher preparatory programs and identify clinically the essential teacher qualities as contained within P.D.A.S. (Marvin, 2010). Professors Brown and Irby also were interviewed from Sam Houston State University and provided expertise into the required trainings for administrators to use P.D.A.S. in Texas (Brown & Irby, 2012).

The survey was divided into three major parts. Part A of the questionnaire was designed to collect descriptive data from the surveyed samples of school administrators and school district level administrators. Respondents were asked to place check marks next to the choices that would indicate their demographic and educational backgrounds. They were also asked to provide some demographic and educational data for their school campus. Part B of the survey consisted of items constructed based on the P.D.A.S.. These question stems are specific to P.D.A.S. and include specific direction for a Likert scale marking. And Part C included open-ended responses for administrators to report essential teacher qualities to effective practice.

Part C could be divided further into two tasks. The first one was a common rating task. On a Likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), participants were requested to indicate the essential teacher quality as contained within each of the 50 P.D.A.S. standards. This Likert scale survey was tested for internal consistency and a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.94 was obtained for this study. In the second task, participants were asked to choose one survey item (from each domain) representative of the most important competency that a classroom teacher should demonstrate. The selected competencies were believed to represent a set of knowledge and skills that defined an effective teacher from the perspective of the respondents. For example: "On the scale of 1 to 5, how important do you think each of the following teacher qualities are?" If a participant rated item Question Number 1 as a "5," then this item ("students are actively engaged in learning") was rated as "very important" by the participant/administrator. If the respondent marked the same question with a 2 ("ensure students are being successful in learning"), then it was perceived as "least important" by the participant/administrator.

The third portion of the instrument provides an opportunity for the respondents to answer four open-ended questions, which relate to essential characteristics of teachers that they perceived as exceptional. For example, the respondents were asked to state whether they perceive differences by subject or grade level. They had an opportunity to describe a characteristic that was not listed on the instrument and that they find vital to student and teacher success. Each participant was asked to comment on any other factors that they deemed imperative to the importance of successful teaching. These open-ended responses were designed to let the respondent share information that may not be contained within the P.D.A.S. instrument.

Instrument Design

The survey asked administrators to both select and rank their preferences from a list of 50 teacher qualities under eight domains. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each characteristic on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = “least important” to 5 = “most important”). Administrators were also asked to rank their top three characteristics from the list of eight domains (i.e., assign 1 = top rating; 2 = second rating, 3 = third rating). For example, within Domain I Active, Successful Student Participation in Learning, the survey respondent might have rated all 5 items highly, i.e. a “4” or “5”, and chose the first item as the most important ranking, the second item as second most important and the third item as third most important within this domain. As part of the analysis for this study, the administrator characteristics included as independent variables in these exploratory regression models include the age of the administrator, gender, race/ethnicity, academic degrees, position and years of experience. In addition to the demographic of the administrator, a number of school-level variables to

predict administrator survey responses including the socio-economic status of the school, achievement composition of the school, level (elementary or secondary) and academic rating according to the state Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) in Texas. Since the survey instrument was designed based on the Domain Objectives stated in the P.D.A.S. instrument, a response option “not sure” was not included on this survey because all the administrators who were surveyed have been trained in P.D.A.S..

A panel of four experts in the areas of personnel management and education reviewed the instrument the pilot instrument. Members of this panel were selected in order to establish the content validity of the document. A professor in Education Evaluation, a school principal, a school assistant principal and the director of the human resource responsible for data collection served as members of the expert panel. There was some confusion for members in relation to the ranking part of the survey. Experts suggested changing the wording from “Please rank top three items according to importance” to “In each domain, please rank top three according to importance; 1 = top ranking; 2 = 2nd ranking; 3 = 3rd ranking.”

The 50 items on the survey are extracted from the objectives in the original P.D.A.S. instrument in which the designers focused on effective schools research and included elements within the instrument to support knowledge of effective practices by teachers and then were reformatted for the final survey using a 5-point Likert scale. There was no need to include any “validation scales” for this instrument design. Each of the items contained on the original P.D.A.S. instrument were reformatted to meet the needs of this study by providing directions and clarifying statements. This survey aims to identify the teacher qualities perceived to be essential by Texas public school

administrators. In other words, this survey measures the *beliefs or perceptions* of public school administrators of the essential teacher qualities as originally developed as part of the P.D.A.S. assessment system. Each participant was informed that all of the responses and information on the survey were completely anonymous. No one, including the researcher, would be able to associate responses with a specific respondent. Each administrator was also informed that participation was voluntary.

In Part A, respondents were asked to complete background information for statistical analysis including demographics, age, degrees held and other pertinent data. Part B the survey measures the perceptions or beliefs of the administrators of the essential teacher qualities. They were asked to give a ranking of each item using a Likert scale of 1 through 5 that describes a certain essential quality that a classroom teacher is expected to exhibit. In Part C, each participant is asked to answer open-ended questions that relates to the characteristics that are essential for a teacher that may not have been included in Part B. For each stem statement, every participant was asked “On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is?”

Participants

The participants taking part in this initial pilot study were active administrators in their current school district. Some participants in the pilot study also were graduate students at the University of Houston College of Education as a convenience sample. All administrators ($N=42$) serving in the pilot study were invited to complete the P.D.A.S.-based survey. The original pilot data was coupled with 64 more respondents from districts in Texas to provide the final 106 participants ($N=106$). The administrative sample consisted of 60 women (57%) and 46 men (43%). The majority of the

respondents fell within the age range of 46 to 55 years old (33%), closely followed by the age group of 31 to 37 years of age (28%). These two age groups consisted of nearly 60% of the participants in this research as shown in Table 4 below.

White/Caucasian and Black constituted to 71% and 17% respectively of the sample with Hispanic (11%) and other (1%) comprising up the rest of the ethnic composition of the group. As for their campus status qualifying for Title 1 status, 85 of the 106 respondent campuses had qualified for Title 1 funds (80%). The distribution of highest academic degree held was as follows: Bachelor (9%), Master (86%) and Doctorate (5%). Details about their demographic characteristics are illustrated in Table 4. The font size was changed from 12-point Times New Roman to 10 Times New Roman in order to allow it to fit on one page.

Table 4: Descriptive Analysis for Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Highest Degree Held and Title 1 Status ($N=106$)

| Category | Administrator Descriptive Statistics | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| | <i>N</i> | (%) |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 46 | (43) |
| Female | 60 | (57) |
| Age | | |
| 30 and under | 6 | (5.7) |
| 31-37 | 30 | (28.3) |
| 38-45 | 29 | (27.4) |
| 46-55 | 33 | (31.1) |
| 56-62 | 8 | (7.5) |
| Over 63 | 0 | (0) |
| Ethnicity | | |
| White/Caucasian | 75 | (70.8) |
| Black | 18 | (17.0) |
| Hispanic | 12 | (11.3) |
| Other | 1 | (0.9) |
| Highest Degree Held | | |
| Bachelor | 10 | (9.4) |
| Master | 91 | (85.8) |
| Doctorate | 5 | (4.7) |
| Position | | |
| Principal | 28 | (26.4) |
| Asst. Principal | 46 | (43.4) |
| Human Resource | 1 | (0.9) |
| Other (Hiring Personnel) | 31 | (29.2) |
| Type of School | | |
| Elementary | 41 | (38.1) |
| Secondary | 64 | (60.4) |
| Other | 1 | (0.9) |
| Title 1 Status | | |
| Yes | 85 | (80.2) |
| No | 21 | (19.8) |
| School Rating TEA | | |
| Exemplary | 16 | (15.4) |
| Recognized | 18 | (17.3) |
| Acceptable | 68 | (65.4) |
| Unacceptable | 2 | (0.9) |

Pilot Test

The instrument was pilot tested to assess the reliability and validity of the new instrument, since the instrument intended to measure the perceptions or beliefs of administrators toward the essential teacher qualities, as well as the internal consistency of the items. The Professional Development and Appraisal instrument is comprised of 51 objectives on which teachers are evaluated. These were reviewed prior to the initiation of the survey construction in order to determine which of the objectives were appropriate for analysis through a study of this type. This resulted in identification of the 50 statements, which were included on the pilot survey.

To establish the reliability coefficient, the instrument was administered to a group of 42 principals and school administrators who were enrolled at the University of Houston College of Education in the doctoral programs for Educational Leadership. Additionally, other employees in public schools in Texas also acted as respondents. Additional respondents in the survey were employed by school districts selected within the Southeast Texas area to represent a variety of sizes concerning student population and to represent diverse student population characteristics and socioeconomic levels. Care was taken to ensure that the representatives of elementary and secondary administrators were surveyed from each district. The school districts are very diverse, representing a variety of student populations, socio-economic categories and average daily school attendance.

The survey was conducted face-to-face during a class session as well as individually at Administrative Leadership meetings. It took the respondents between 12 to 19 minutes to complete the survey. One individual had a question about the directions

for the survey that related to the ranking of statements within each domain. The question was whether it was needed to rank each domain or just the top three out of all 50 items included on the survey. Clarification was provided in the directions to address this question for the final survey.

This survey was comprised of 50 questions. All surveyed administrators who evaluated teachers under the P.D.A.S. system are trained in these components and processes, which include the objectives used in the survey. This training increases the knowledge level of the respondents in regard to the statements and objectives on the instrument (Pankonien, 2012; Brown & Irby, 2012). Questions were extracted from the objectives in original P.D.A.S. instrument for the pilot study and then reformatted for the final survey to represent an attitude Likert scale. The pilot group was very familiar with the items and responded accordingly. It is important to note that what was of critical interest in this study is not the traditional use of the P.D.A.S. instrument (for teacher performance evaluation), but the beliefs and perceptions of administrators pertaining to the essential teacher qualities contained within the eight domains of P.D.A.S. across 50 Likert-type items.

As an example, examine the stem statement, “Help students connect learning to work and life applications, both within the discipline and with other disciplines.” A particular administrator ranked this essential characteristic with a “5,” which means that they found this characteristic to be “very important” in effective teaching. The administrator would continue to rank each stem statement in each domain until all were assigned a number value ranging from 1 (least important) to 5 (very important). Then, after each stem was answered for the domain the participant was asked to select a single

stem as most important for that domain.

Data Analysis

All the data collected from the survey was inputted into SPSS. Descriptive statistics and internal consistency reliability were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 18.0 (SPSS, 2009). Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess internal consistency reliability for the survey. All statistical tests were interpreted at an alpha level of 0.05. Data from the Likert survey was analyzed using exploratory factor analysis to identify common factors in the data. Unfortunately, there was not enough data to complete the factor analysis for this study. Therefore, only the descriptive statistics and Cronbach alpha reliabilities are reported in this study, which serves as the foundation for further research.

Internal Consistency Reliability

Cronbach's Alphas were performed to assess internal consistency reliability. Internal consistency reliability for the entire 50-item P.D.A.S. survey was 0.96. Internal consistency reliability for each of the following eight domains was as follows:

- Domain I: Active Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process, 0.76
- Domain II: Learner-Centered Instruction, 0.77
- Domain III: Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress, 0.60
- Domain IV: Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time, and Materials, 0.78
- Domain V: Professional Communication, 0.75
- Domain VI: Professional Development 0.62

- Domain VII: Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements 0.68
- Domain VIII: Improvement of Academic Performance of all Students on the Campus was 0..85

To reveal underlying constructs, a factor analysis data reduction technique was attempted. Factor analysis was selected in order to provide an empirical basis for reducing many variables to a few factors by combining variables with moderate (above .50) to high correlations (Borg, 1989). For further study, when more data are collected these analyses will help answer some additional research questions, as described in the Introduction. In the final survey, the domains will be labeled and the questions reorganized to reflect the components identified by the loadings. The designers of the P.D.A.S. instrument intended to support classroom implementation as stated in the objectives of the instrument (Texas Education Agency, 1998). Using analysis of the content of the surveys completed with the experts, it was determined that the major areas of focus during the design process were represented in the survey document.

Data Analysis Procedures

This section describes the following methods that were used to analyze data for the study: (1) descriptive statistics in which percentages, means and standard deviations were calculated for each item; (2) Mean scale scores were computed for each of the scales on the *2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey*; and (3) descriptive statistics outlining the gender of the participants, demographics, education, age, the Title One status of the school and the school ranking per the TEA .

Exploratory Principal Axis Factor Analysis.

A factor analysis is an established means by which the complexity of data is collected into a small number of variables to answer research questions (Stevens, 2002). Using the data that were collected using *2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey*, a principal axis factor analysis was employed as the extraction method with Varimax and Kaiser normalization rotation method used to find the underlying factors in the scale. SPSS 18.0 software was used for this process. For the study not enough data was present to complete this analysis. When more data are collected they will be used to conduct this analysis for further study.

Eigenvalues.

Eigenvalues indicated the quantity of information that was contained within each factor and the total number of eigenvalues or information was equal to the number of items. For *2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey*, 50 items were developed. According to the eigenvalue rule, factors less than 1 do not contain enough information to be retained. In this study, eigenvalues of less than 1 were not considered.

Cronbach's Alpha.

The reliability of the *2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey* sub-scales was calculated by using Cronbach's Alpha to test for internal consistency reliability. Devellis (2003) described Cronbach's Alpha as "an indication of the proportion of variance in the scale scores that is attributable to the true score" (p. 95). Cronbach's Alpha measures the latent variable and should be greater than .60. The *2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey* was tested for internal consistency and reliability using SPSS 18.0 reliability analysis.

Descriptive Statistics.

In order to address research questions that dealt with demographics, frequencies, percentages, item means, factor means and standard deviations were calculated. Table 4 describes the demographic data collected.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of this research study are presented. This research study serves as the foundation for further research. Moreover, as with any foundational experimentation, more data is needed for further expansion of this study as well as to confirm these results. Detailed below are the descriptive results of the new instrument 2012 Public School Administrator Survey, as well as the underlying themes from the open-ended response portion of the survey. Procedures data entry and violations of statistical assumptions are reported for each analysis. The quantitative and qualitative results for Research Questions One through Four are presented.

Research Question One

What three specific characteristics are perceived as most important in effective teachers by school district administrators as contained within the Professional Development and Appraisal System (P.D.A.S.)?

The SPSS statistical software program was employed to address Research Question One using the descriptive statistics procedure by item, i.e., means and standard deviations of each item. Descriptive statistics were reported including frequencies and percentages for the demographic and item variables. The demographic variables included gender (dummy coded as 0 = males, and 1 = females), age, ethnicity, highest degree held, Title 1 status, position (campus or other administrator), type of school (secondary or elementary) and TEA assigned school ranking. The item variables are assigned a Likert scale value of 1 through 5, with “1” representing “least important” and “5” representing

“very important.” The major patterns of the descriptive data contained in Table 5, 6 and 7 are reported by research question.

The descriptive statistics show that question 31, which is “Encourage and support students who are reluctant or having difficulty,” has the highest mean of all 50 items with a mean of 4.78 on a 5-point scale of importance. The majority of the survey responded selected 4 or 5 for this question. Furthermore, scoring among the highest means was item 22 with a mean of 4.76, which reads: “Establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed learning as appropriate.” A common theme among the qualities chosen is encouragement. When statistics were analyzed the third highest mean of 4.77 was correlated with item 38. This item reads, “Works collaboratively and constructively with colleagues and other professionals toward the overall improvement of student performance.” With these three items being the highest, some evidence is provided in answering Research Question 1.

The lowest means were for item 12 and 14 with means of 3.91 and 3.86, respectively. Item 12 reads: “Emphasize the value and importance of the activity/content.” This item relates to making the topic relative for the students. Item 14 reads: “Make appropriate and effective use of available technology as a part of the instructional process.” This is a quality not especially mentioned in any of the qualitative data during any of the interview answers. The third lowest mean for any of the items was item #44 that reads: “Adjust the sequencing of classroom instruction to appropriately incorporate TEKS/TAKS objectives.” The font size was changed from 12-point Times New Roman to 10 Times New Roman in order to allow it to fit on one page.

Table 5: Descriptive Analysis for Respondents' Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Highest Degree Held and Title 1 Status ($N=106$)

| Category | Administrator Descriptive Statistics | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| | <i>N</i> | (%) |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 43 | (57) |
| Female | 60 | (55) |
| Age | | |
| 30 and under | 6 | (7.1) |
| 31-37 | 30 | (28.3) |
| 38-45 | 29 | (27.4) |
| 46-55 | 33 | (31.1) |
| 56-62 | 8 | (7.5) |
| Over 63 | 0 | (0) |
| Ethnicity | | |
| White/Caucasian | 75 | (70.8) |
| Black | 18 | (17.0) |
| Hispanic | 12 | (11.3) |
| Other | 1 | (0.9) |
| Highest Degree Held | | |
| Bachelor | 10 | (9.4) |
| Master | 91 | (85.8) |
| Doctorate | 5 | (4.7) |
| Position | | |
| Principal | 28 | (26.4) |
| Asst. Principal | 46 | (60.4) |
| Human Resource | 1 | (0.9) |
| Other(Hiring Personnel) | 31 | (29.2) |
| Type of School | | |
| Elementary | 41 | (38.1) |
| Secondary | 64 | (60.4) |
| Other | 1 | (0.9) |
| Title 1 Status | | |
| Yes | 85 | (80.2) |
| No | 21 | (19.8) |
| School Rating TEA | | |
| Exemplary | 16 | (15.4) |
| Recognized | 18 | (17.3) |
| Acceptable | 68 | (65.4) |
| Unacceptable | 2 | (1.9) |

Research Question Two

Which of these characteristics do administrators select as most important within each Domain of P.D.A.S.?

The SPSS statistical software program was employed to address Research Question Two using the descriptive statistics procedure by item, i.e., means of each item. Descriptive statistics were reported including the number of responses (*N*), mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) for each item on the instrument. The item variables are assigned a Likert scale value of 1 through 5, with “1” representing “least important” and “5” representing “very important.” The major patterns of the descriptive data contained in Tables 6 and 7 are used to answer this research question.

In Domain I: Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process, Item 2: “Ensure students are being successful in learning” had the highest mean of 4.71. Within Domain II: Learner-centered Instruction, Item 8: “Use appropriate instructional strategies to promote critical thinking and problem solving” had the highest mean of 4.52. Within Domain III: Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress, Item 16: “Align assessment and feedback with goals and objectives and instructional strategies” had the highest mean of 4.62. Within Domain IV: Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time / Materials, Item 22: “Establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed learning as appropriate” had the highest mean of 4.81. Within Domain V: Professional Communication, Item 31: “Encourage and support students who are reluctant or having difficulty had the highest mean of 4.83. Within Domain VI: Professional Development, Item 38: “Work collaboratively and constructively with colleagues and other professionals toward the

overall improvement of student performance” had the highest mean of 4.79. Within Domain VII: Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements, Item 39: “Comply with all policies, operating procedures, and legal requirements (national, rate, district, and campus)” had the highest mean of 4.76. Within Domain VIII: Improvement of All Students' Academic Performance, Item 49: “Meet with parents and/or other teachers of students who are failing or in danger of failing to develop an appropriate plan for intervention” had a high mean of 4.74. Table 6 shows these results.

Table 6: Mean and Standard Deviation for Each Item in the P.D.A.S.-based Survey

| Item | <i>N</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|
| Domain I: Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process | | | |
| Item 1: make sure students are actively engaged in learning | 106 | 4.46 | 0.93 |
| Item 2: ensure students are being successful in learning | 106 | 4.71 | 0.77 |
| Item 3: promote students' learning at a high cognitive level (e.g., critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving, etc.) | 106 | 4.50 | 0.71 |
| Item 4: help students become a self-directed/self-initiated learner, as appropriate to the lesson objectives | 106 | 4.29 | 0.97 |
| Item 5: help students connect learning to work and life applications, both within the discipline and with other disciplines | 106 | 4.55 | 0.63 |
| Domain II: Learner-centered Instruction | | | |
| Item 6: ensure that the instructional content is based on appropriate goals and objectives | 106 | 4.33 | 0.69 |
| Item 7: ensure that instructional content is learner centered (e.g., relates to the interests and varied characteristics of students) | 106 | 4.33 | 0.69 |
| Item 8: use appropriate instructional strategies to promote critical thinking and problem solving | 106 | 4.52 | 0.63 |
| Item 9: ensure that instructional strategies include motivational techniques to successfully and actively engage students in the learning process | 106 | 4.50 | 0.67 |
| Item 10: ensure instructional strategies are aligned with the objectives, activities, student characteristics, prior learning, and work and life applications, both within the discipline and with other disciplines | 106 | 4.50 | 0.67 |
| Item 11: use varied activities appropriately and maintain appropriate pacing and sequencing | 106 | 4.31 | 0.64 |
| Item 12: emphasize the value and importance of the activity/content | 106 | 3.95 | 0.83 |
| Item 13: use appropriate questioning and inquiry techniques to challenge students | 106 | 4.43 | 0.70 |
| Item 14: make appropriate and effective use of available technology as a part of the instructional process | 106 | 3.98 | 0.87 |

Domain III: Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress

| | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|
| Item 15: monitor and assess students' academic progress | 106 | 4.57 | 0.70 |
| Item 16: align assessment and feedback with goals and objectives and instructional strategies | 106 | 4.62 | 0.62 |
| Item 17: use appropriate assessment strategies to the varied characteristics of students | 106 | 4.45 | 0.71 |
| Item 18: reinforce student learning | 106 | 4.52 | 0.59 |
| Item 19: give students specific constructive feedback | 106 | 4.55 | 0.50 |
| Item 20: provide opportunities for all students for relearning and re-evaluation of material | 106 | 4.38 | 0.83 |

Domain IV: Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time / Materials

| | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|
| Item 21: effectively implement the discipline-management procedures approved by the campus | 106 | 4.29 | 0.84 |
| Item 22: establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed learning as appropriate | 106 | 4.81 | 0.46 |
| Item 23: interact with students in an equitable manner, including the fair application of rules | 106 | 4.64 | 0.58 |
| Item 24: specify expectations for desired behavior | 106 | 4.67 | 0.53 |
| Item 25: intervene and re-direct off-task, inappropriate or disruptive behavior as needed | 106 | 4.57 | 0.59 |
| Item 26: reinforce desired behavior when appropriate | 106 | 4.33 | 0.82 |
| Item 27: select the instructional materials that are equitable and acknowledge the varied characteristics of all students | 106 | 4.31 | 0.75 |
| Item 28: effectively and efficiently manage time and materials | 106 | 4.60 | 0.67 |

Domain V: Professional Communication

| | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|
| Item 29: use appropriate and accurate written communication with students | 106 | 4.38 | 0.66 |
| Item 30: use appropriate and accurate verbal and non-verbal communication with students | 106 | 4.60 | 0.54 |
| Item 31: encourage and support students who are reluctant or having difficulty | 106 | 4.83 | 0.38 |
| Item 32: use appropriate and accurate written communication with parents, staff, community members, and other professionals | 106 | 4.64 | 0.53 |
| Item 33: use appropriate and accurate verbal and non-verbal communication with parents, staff, community members, and other professionals | 106 | 4.67 | 0.53 |
| Item 34: ensure that interactions are supportive, courteous, and respectful with students, parents, staff, community members, and other professionals | 106 | 4.67 | 0.57 |

Domain VI: Professional Development

| | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|
| Item 35: successfully seek out and engage in professional development activities that positively correlate with the goals of the campus and district | 106 | 4.31 | 0.68 |
| Item 36: successfully correlate professional development activities with assigned subject content and the varied needs of students | 106 | 4.45 | 0.67 |
| Item 37: successfully engage in professional development activities that positively correlate with the prior performance appraisal | 106 | 4.33 | 0.72 |
| Item 38: work collaboratively and constructively with colleagues and other professionals toward the overall improvement of student performance | 106 | 4.79 | 0.42 |

Domain VII: Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements

| | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|
| Item 39: comply with all policies, operating procedures, and legal requirements (national, state, district, and campus) | 106 | 4.76 | 0.53 |
| Item 40: comply with all verbal and written directives, participate in the development of operating procedures, and offer suggestions for improvement | 106 | 4.62 | 0.62 |
| Item 41: consistently contribute to making the whole school safe and orderly, and contribute to a stimulating learning environment for all students, apart from classroom responsibilities | 106 | 4.69 | 0.60 |

Domain VIII: Improvement of All Students' Academic Performance

| | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|
| Item 42: align instruction to include appropriate TEKS/TAKS objectives to support student achievement in all assigned classes | 106 | 4.52 | 0.92 |
| Item 43: work with colleagues to analyze TAKS performance data relevant to all students in assigned classes prior to beginning instruction | 106 | 4.33 | 0.87 |
| Item 44: adjust the sequencing of classroom instruction to appropriately incorporate TEKS/TAKS objectives | 106 | 4.29 | 0.89 |
| Item 45: collaborate with others within and outside the teacher's discipline to select/adapt instructional materials and activities which are correlated with appropriate TEKS/TAKS objectives | 106 | 4.26 | 0.99 |
| Item 46: provide feedback to all students regarding their learning progress on appropriate TEKS/TAKS objectives | 106 | 4.29 | 0.92 |
| Item 47: monitor attendance of all students in assigned classes and contacts parents, counselors, or other school officials regarding an intervention plan for students with serious attendance problems | 106 | 4.36 | 0.76 |
| Item 48: identify and assess the needs of assigned students in at-risk situations | 106 | 4.57 | 0.70 |
| Item 49: meet with parents and/or other teachers of students who are failing or in danger of failing to develop an appropriate plan for intervention | 106 | 4.74 | 0.45 |
| Item 50: modify and adapt classroom materials and/or instruction for students in at-risk situations | 106 | 4.55 | 0.83 |

Note: A total of 50 items contributed to a coefficient of .96 and indicated a highly reliable instrument (Bartz, 1999).

Research Question Three

What specific Domain do administrators find as most important within the 2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey?

The SPSS statistical software program was employed to address Research Question Three using the descriptive statistics procedure by item, i.e., means of each

item. Descriptive statistics were reported including the number of responses (*N*), the overall mean (*M*) for each domain and the standard deviation (*SD*) for each domain, as contained within the instrument. The item variables are assigned a Likert scale value of 1 through 5, with “1” representing “least important” and “5” representing “very important.” The major patterns of the descriptive data contained in Table 7 are used to answer this research question.

Domain VII: Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements had the highest average of all the domains, with a mean of 4.69 and a standard deviation of 0.57.

Table 7: Average Mean Score and Standard Deviation for Each Survey Domain

| Domain | <i>N</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|
| Domain I: Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process | 106 | 4.50 | 0.79 |
| Domain II: Learner-centered Instruction | 106 | 4.32 | 0.71 |
| Domain III: Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress | 106 | 4.52 | 0.66 |
| Domain IV: Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time / Materials | 106 | 4.02 | 0.67 |
| Domain V: Professional Communication | 106 | 4.63 | 0.77 |
| Domain VI: Professional Development | 106 | 4.47 | 0.62 |
| Domain VII: Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements | 106 | 4.69 | 0.57 |
| Domain VIII: Professional Communication | 106 | 4.43 | 0.81 |

Note: A total of 50 items contributed to a coefficient of .96 and indicated a highly reliable instrument (Bartz, 1999).

Research Question Four

How are these salient characteristics perceived as similar or different by subject and/or grade level?

Respondents from study were given an opportunity to answer the open-ended question of whether these salient characteristics in good teachers differed across grade levels and/or subject matter. Table 8 shows the coding for each response and an analysis for prevalent themes from the responses. Responses were coded into three separate categories: (1) no answer; (2) salient characteristics are similar across subject and/or grade level; and (3) salient characteristics are different across grade levels and/or subject. Of the 106 respondents eight did not respond to this question.

Of the 98 administrators responding to the question in written format 84 responded that the salient characteristics of great teaching do not differ across grade level and/or subject matter. Some of the responses that were representative of this category were as follows:

“You do these good things at any grade level”

“They are the same, teachers have a way of influencing at any grade level”

“Being positive can happen at any grade level and should”

Of those 98 administrators that responded, 12 responded that salient characteristics are different across grade and/or subject matter. Each respondent in this category responded that teachers must have more content knowledge at the secondary level. An example of a response coded into this category is:

“Some secondary teachers require a greater breadth of knowledge in their specific content area, such as an advanced placement class.”

While 81% of the administrators responded that these salient characteristics of good teaching remained constant across grade levels 11% stated there was a difference and in each case pointed to content knowledge being more important at the secondary level. Table 8 shows the results of this portion of the survey.

Table 8: Number of Responses (*N*) and Percentage of Respondents (%)

| Category | <i>N</i> | % |
|---|----------|------|
| 1: No response | 8 | 7.5 |
| 2: Salient characteristics are similar across subject matter and/or grade level | 86 | 81.1 |
| 3: Salient characteristics are different across grade levels and/or subject | 12 | 11.4 |

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

While performing the research several limitations presented themselves through design and participation. Please find below a brief summary of the most prevailing limitations presented to the researcher.

Limitations

The purpose of this research study was to analyze data collected by the *2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey*. First, the instrument itself was checked for reliability and validity. When using a new survey instrument it is important to collect preliminary data to see if the instrument is valid. Next, a series of questions were addressed using the analysis from the data on *2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey*. Limitations to this endeavor presented themselves.

The initial pilot sample was a sample of convenience. Further data was collected to curb this limitation. There is no guaranteed way to ensure that administrators as a population were represented in the sample collected. Additionally, an accurate response rate could not be calculated. Participants were asked to fill out the survey with special care in reporting demographic information but the researcher was unable to verify due to the anonymity of the research.

Administrators who chose not to participate were replaced by administrators who volunteered. All selected participants should have a direct impact on hiring and retention of teachers but this could not be identified with the anonymity provided to participants. The number of administrators who chose not to participate was not reported. More data needs collected to conduct additional statistical analyses and to expand the generalization

of the initial results of the study to more diverse school districts in Texas. A threat to validity to this study may be selection in that all participants were indeed administrators in public school.

The data collection is limited to surveys completed by voluntary public school administrators. The instrument is utilized in the eastern region of Texas. This instrument records the following data: age, gender, educational level, school size and several other descriptive statistics. This survey does not provide clear definitions of completion and provides participant with autonomy of identification. The data collection will be collected and interpreted by the researcher (Loeb & Beteille, 2008).

This study will be limited to the generalized perception of currently employed public school administrator and will not include the impact of number, type and frequency of the remaining public school administrators in Texas. The study will also not take into consideration the preconceptions that administrators may have before taking the survey. Participants may have completed the survey with mental health disorders, educational issues, health issues, and legal issues. All other characteristics not contained within the instrument cannot be considered in the study unless mentioned in the open ended responses (Rowan, Correnti, Miller, & Camburn, 2009).

Implications for Practice

Aligning teacher preparation and professional development in Texas and the P.D.A.S. salient characteristics is important because this is one way to ensure that teachers could meet or even exceed the relevant standards during a future appraisals or teaching practice. Overall, results indicated the respondents had a very positive perception of the teacher characteristics contained within P.D.A.S. Given that all survey

items were adapted from the P.D.A.S., we could reasonably argue that the training provided by ILD and P.D.A.S. certification adhered closely to the P.D.A.S. framework. This training provides power to the identified salient characteristics and sharing the results with every administrator in Texas should occur.

The research points to insights into perceived teacher effectiveness that can be developed partially by examining the levels of important characteristics within each domain, with a particular focus on the alignment of professional development and the current performance appraisal system for classroom teachers. Several major implications can be taken from the research to include;

- Teacher preparation programs designed to address crucial characteristics identified by administrator.
- Staff Development programs designed to train and continually improve salient teacher characteristics outlined in the finding.
- Pre-service teachers can identify areas of concentration to focus on while building self-efficacy in specific teacher domains.
- Professors and educational pedagogies can be designed to address major characteristics outlined in this research

(Brown & Irby, 2012)

The teacher preparation faculty can use the data obtained to better equip new teachers. Additionally, hope is that the results of this study will have practical implications for other teacher education programs in Texas, at institutions preparing future educators. For any educator to be held accountable for student learning, it is imperative to promote training in compliance with the performance appraisal

requirements enacted in the educational realm (Marzano, 2001). It is anticipated that this study will motivate teacher preparation faculty to take into consideration the identified characteristics of administrators to meet the needs of future teachers and students alike. Adapting this understanding to the local contexts in schools can form a critical step to success (Mujis, 2006). Additionally, critical evaluation of proposed professional development in school districts can promote the process of program evaluation (Rowan, Correnti, Miller, & Camburn, 2009).

Recommendation for Further Research

This research provides insight into what administrators identify as important factors of high-quality teaching. Several characteristics are outlined from the tables above including how teachers encourage reluctant students. With the collection of the identified characteristics we can tailor preparation programs and staff development to provide training into these areas to improve overall student performance. Another important factor outlined in Research Question Four is that most of the administrators responded that good teaching characteristics were accurate across grade levels but the ones that responded differently referenced content knowledge as important.

There is body of research that shows that content knowledge for teachers is important to have. As indicated by Hochberg and Desimone (2010), in order to help teachers meet the increasing demands of accountability, professional development should focus on subject matter, address content standards, promote active learning, emphasize coherence with teachers' work, involve sustained duration, encourage collective participation and take into consideration other contextual factors. As the theme in question four suggests teacher content knowledge is important. Even though great

teachers generally seek out in-service professional development opportunities, they should be made aware of the resources available and the need to improve themselves through life-long learning (Haberman, 1995).

Haberman describes the behaviors and undergirding ideologies that distinguish exemplary teachers in his research. Specifically, Haberman outlines these suggestions:

“I have four specific recommendations:

- (a) University-based teacher education needs to continue to expand the trend of making its programs more available to older adults;*
- (b) In addition to the traditional criteria, entry into university-based programs of teacher preparation needs to include validated interviews of candidates’ values and predispositions to ascertain their level of development;*
- (c) School districts need to use validated interviewing instruments to determine the likelihood that the young adults they hire will be effective and remain in teaching for 5 or more years; and*
- (d) A career ladder needs to be developed for young, newly certified teachers who have not yet reached the level of mature adulthood so that they may be hired as paraprofessionals and work toward becoming regular teachers after they have attained an appropriate level of development”* (Haberman, 2011).

While the above suggestions seem unlikely for actual practice, they do provide suggestions and insight into further research possibilities. Further survey data needs to be compiled to address factor analysis and provide more power to the study. Also suggested for future study is a three-tiered research. Gather more data from administrators as in this study will help provide statistical strength to correlations. Adapting the instrument for

pre-service teacher attitudes of preparedness as related to the accepted P.D.A.S. instrument would also provide more insight into teacher effectiveness for students. Lastly, it would be important to poll professors in how they perceive important characteristics of the developed instrument. With these data collected and shared among educators teaching effectiveness potentially could be increased for students in classrooms.

Conclusion

Texas, like other states, is prone to move from program to program with changes in the state legislature. In order to evaluate the success of programs, sustained evaluation and research must be considered. Before initiating modifications in the evaluation system and teacher qualities held important in pre-service programs, state officials should carefully design studies based on theoretically and statistically sound research practices to determine the effectiveness of the current system, particularly in the area of teacher quality and its impact on student achievement. Furthermore, published research must be reviewed regularly for quality of design, implementation procedures and overall investigation prior to its acceptance as a worthwhile contribution to the body of literature describing effective classroom “best practices.”

Studies in the field of educational “best practices” and “teacher quality” range in effectiveness from those properly designed, accurately investigated, peer reviewed and with empirical evidence to those filled with experiences that have little or no scholarship merit in practice. Both theoretically and in practice, good policy must be based on the definitive results of well-designed and implemented research (Onwuegbuzie, Bustamante, & Nel, 2010). In their analysis of the practices used in the United States in the field of

educational research, Mosteller, Light and Sachs (1996) write that education does not lack innovations; rather it lacks careful, continuing evaluations of teacher performance (Mosteller, Light, & Sachs, 1996).

In order to identify teacher qualities with P.D.A.S., a proposal must be implemented in enough depth so that it is well defined, and administrators and teachers must have sufficient experience actually to implement the instrument consistently. The districts surveyed for this research, like many other districts, must continue to correlate teacher qualities, hiring practices and evaluation measures to produce the greatest increase in student achievement on standardized assessments.

This study is a step toward analyzing the effectiveness of administrative preconceptions related to the Professional Development and Appraisal System and in identifying the key teacher qualities that administrators look for when evaluating teachers at their campuses. It reveals that administrators perceive a high level of impact upon the classroom practice because of teacher qualities that promote student achievement. In addition, the instrument corresponds to the preconceptions of administrators and the qualitative themes that arise through an open-ended survey of teacher quality.

Furthermore, additional research studies should focus initially on pre-service teacher preconceptions, as well as pre-conceptions by professors in teacher qualities according to P.D.A.S. The next step would be to correlate these three preconceptions of these groups to organize and evaluate current teacher preparation programs and current certification requirements.

If the "best practices" research with preconceptions can be quantitatively linked with improved student achievement, then the use of this survey should improve the level

of learning for students in Texas though improved evaluation. However, the evaluation system is simply one component of an effective system. With this in mind, the state of Texas, the 1,266 public school districts and the tens-of-thousands of individual campuses should continue to identify what creates a "high-quality" teacher and incorporate these qualities regularly in order to improve the overall pedagogical processes of teaching and to increase student academic learning (Texas Education Agency, 2009). To borrow a quote from Mark Twain: "To do good things is noble. To advise others to do good things is even nobler - and a lot easier." As administrators and leaders in education we must advise each other of what we perceive as most important in effective teaching, but effective teaching is what makes education a noble profession (Haberman, 1995).

References

- Arredondo, D. E. (2000). Teacher perceptions of the effects of changes in teacher evaluation policy. New Orleans, LA.: American Educational Research.
- Baker, P. (1998). Let's make a wise use of new teacher assessments. WCER Highlights.
- Baratz-Snowden, J. (1993). Assessment of teachers: A view from The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards . *Theory into Practice*, 82-85.
- Brandt, C., Mathers, C., Oliva, M., Brown-Sims, M., & Hess, J. (2007, November). Examining district guidance to schools on teacher evaluation policies in the Midwest Region. Retrieved October 11, 2010, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/REL_2007030.pdf
- Cawelti, G. (1995). Handbook of research on improving student achievement. Arlington, VA.: Educational Research Service.
- Clotfelter, C. L. (2007). Teacher credentials and student achievement: Longitudinal analysis with student fixed effects. *Economics of Education Review*, 673-682.
- Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (1997). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California. Chicago, IL.: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development & Educational Testing Service.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do. San Francisco, CA.: John Wiley & Sons.

- Davis-Frost, D. (2000, September). Intentions and implementation of the Professional Development and Appraisal System in Texas. Retrieved April 10, 2010, from University of North Texas Digital Library:
<http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc2721/>
- DeArmond, M. A. (2005). The back office: The neglected side of teacher quality. *EdWeek*, 31-32.
- Firestone, W. A., & Others, A. (1989). The progress of reform: An appraisal of state education initiatives. New Brunswick, NJ.: Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics.
- Flakus-Mosqueda, P. (1986). Teacher testing and performance standards: A survey of selected state policies. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 8-27.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. Levittown, PA.: The Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). Leading in a culture of change. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.
- Haberman, M. (1995, June). Selecting 'Star' teachers for children and youth in urban poverty. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 777-781.
- Haberman, M. (2011, July). The myth of the "Fully Qualified" bright young teacher. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 926-940.
- Harris, P. (2011). Board Agenda.
<http://www.houstonisd.org/HISDConnectDS/v/index.jsp?vnextoid=092e9df4ce87f210VgnVCM10000028147fa6RCRD&vnextchannel=0636b14a0eebe010VgnVCM10000028147fa6RCRD&vnextrefresh=1> . Houston, TX.

- Hochberg, E. D. & Desimore, L.M., (2010). Professional development in the accountability context: Building capacity to achieve standards. *Educational Psychologist*, 89-106.
- Hoge, R. D., & Coladarci, T. (1989). Teacher-based judgments of academic achievement: A review of literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 297-313.
- Hoyle, J., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1998). Skills for successful 21st century school leaders: Standards for peak performers. Arlington, VA.: American Association of School Administrators.
- Hughes, V. M. (2006, December). Teacher evaluation practices. Columbia, MO.: University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Loeb, S., & Beteille, T. (2008). Teacher quality and teacher labor markets. *Handbook of Education Policy*, 22-30.
- Loeb, S., & Reininger, M. (2004). Public policy and teacher labor markets. What we know and why it matters. East Lansing, MI.: Michigan State University - East Lansing: Education Policy Center.
- Marzano, R. J. (2001). A handbook for classroom instruction that works. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mathers, C., Oliva, M., & Laine, S. (2008, February). Improving instruction through effective teacher evaluation: Options for states and districts. Washington, D.C.
- Mitchell, R. (1998). World class teachers. *Journal of Staff Development*, 48-53.
- Mosely, S. (2006). Assignment: Define 'highly qualified,' outline school board role. *The Illinois School Board Journal*, 10-13, 29.

- Mosteller, F., Light, R. J., & Sachs, J. A. (1996). Sustained inquiry in education: Lessons from skill grouping and class size. *Harvard Educational Review*, 797-843.
- Mujis, D. (2006). Measuring teacher effectiveness: Some methodological reflections. *Educational Research & Evaluation*, 12 (1), 53-74.
- National Board for Profesional Teaching Standards. (2010, May). The standards. Retrieved April 15, 2011, from NBPTS: http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards
- Nolan, J. F., & Hoover, L. A. (2005). Teacher supervision & evaluation: Theory into practice. New York, NY.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bustamante, R. M., & Nel, J. A. (2010). Mixed research as a tool for developing quantitative instruments. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 56-78.
- Ovando, M. A. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 85-110.
- Peterson, K. D. (2000). Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education. New York, NY.: Basic Books.
- Rockoff, J. E., & Speroni, C. (2009). Subjective and objective evaluations of teacher effectiveness. American Economics Association Meetings. New York, NY.: Smith Richardson Foundation.
- Rosenthal, A., & Fuhrman, S. (1981). Legislative education leadership in the states. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

- Schmoker, M. J. (2006). Results now: How we can achieve unprecedented improvements in teaching and learning. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smith, T. D. (2005). Educational evaluation and policy analysis. 75-109.
- SPSS. (2009, March 5). PASW Statistics GradPack 18. Chicago, IL.,
- Standards, I. (2004, April 27). Retrieved from <http://www.ofps.dpi.state.nc.us/OFPS/hm/sp/pblintasc.htm>
- Standards, N. B. (1991). Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession. Washington, D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching.
- Stronge, J. H. (2007). Qualities of effective teachers (2nd Edition). Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Texas Education Agency. (1989). Teacher manual: Professional Development and Appraisal System. Austin, TX.: Texas Education Agency.
- Texas Education Agency. (1997). Letter to Texas educators from the Commission of Education. Austin, TX.: Texas Education Agency.
- Texas Education Agency. (1998). Professional Development and Appraisal System: Teacher renewal packet. Austin, TX.: Texas Education Agency.
- Texas Education Agency. (2005). P.D.A.S. Manual. Retrieved May 3, 2010, from <http://www5.esc13.net/P.D.A.S./docs/P.D.A.S.TeacherManual.pdf>
- Texas Education Agency. (2009, May). Educator initiatives and performance. Retrieved April 20, 2010, from Educator Initiatives and Performance: <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/edex/>

- Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education. Washington D.C.: Education Sector.
- Torff, B. (2001). Understanding and teaching the intuitive mind: Student and teacher learning. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tucker, P. &. (2005). Linking teacher evaluation and student learning. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Vanhoof, J., & Van Petegema, P. (2007). Matching internal and external evaluation in an era of accountability and school development: Lessons from a Flemish perspective. *Studies In Educational Evaluation*, 101-119.
- Wiley, D. A. (1995). Educational evaluation and policy analysis.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

SURVEY INSTRUMENT CONCERNING THE PARTICIPANT'S BELIEFS
REGARDING THE IMPORTANT QUALITIES WHEN HIRING A NEW TEACHER

The questions below ask you to describe which qualities are important to you in hiring a new teacher. We realize that you might consider different qualities when hiring different teachers. In answering the questions below, please consider hiring a core subject area teacher (e.g., math, science, history, English or foreign language) for a “typical” class in your school.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you consider each of the following characteristics in hiring a teacher? (Please check one box) | | | | |
| | | Not at all important | | Moderately important | | Extremely important |
| | Teacher Characteristic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | The candidate's classroom management skills | | | | | |
| 2 | The candidate's ability to relate well with parents | | | | | |
| 3 | The extent to which the candidate's philosophy of learning is a good fit with the school's | | | | | |
| 4 | The candidate's ability to raise student test scores | | | | | |
| 5 | The candidate's gender | | | | | |
| 6 | The candidate's ability to create a fun and stimulating classroom environment for students | | | | | |
| 7 | The candidate's prior teaching experience | | | | | |
| 8 | The candidate's ability to relate well with colleagues (i.e. other teachers and administrators in the school) | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 9 | The candidate's ability to provide a positive role model for students | | | | | |
| 10 | The quality of the college or graduate program the candidate attended | | | | | |
| 11 | Whether the candidate has a MA or other advanced degree in Education | | | | | |
| 12 | The candidate's ability to increase student achievement in ways that will not necessarily show up on standardized test scores | | | | | |
| 13 | Whether the candidate has a traditional versus alternative certification | | | | | |
| 14 | How far the candidate lives from the school | | | | | |
| 15 | The candidate's enthusiasm for teaching | | | | | |

1. What is the 1st most important thing that you consider when hiring a teacher?
(check 1 box below)

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| The candidate's classroom management skills | The candidate's ability to create a fun and stimulating classroom environment for students | Whether the candidate has a MA or other advanced degree in Education |
| The candidate's ability to relate well with parents | The candidate's prior teaching experience | The candidate's ability to increase student achievement in ways that will not necessarily show up on standardized test scores |
| The extent to which the candidate's philosophy of learning is a good fit with the school's | The candidate's ability to relate well with colleagues (i.e. other teachers and administrators in the school) | Whether the candidate has a traditional versus alternative certification |
| The candidate's ability to raise student test scores | The candidate's ability to provide a positive role model for students | How far the candidate lives from the school |
| The candidate's gender | The quality of the college or graduate program the candidate attended | The candidate's enthusiasm for teaching |

1. What is the 2nd most important thing that you consider when hiring a teacher?
(check 1 box below)

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| The candidate's classroom management skills | The candidate's ability to create a fun and stimulating classroom environment for students | Whether the candidate has a MA or other advanced degree in Education |
| The candidate's ability to relate well with parents | The candidate's prior teaching experience | The candidate's ability to increase student achievement in ways that will not necessarily show up on standardized test scores |
| The extent to which the candidate's philosophy of learning is a good fit with the school's | The candidate's ability to relate well with colleagues (i.e. other teachers and administrators in the school) | Whether the candidate has a traditional versus alternative certification |
| The candidate's ability to raise student test scores | The candidate's ability to provide a positive role model for students | How far the candidate lives from the school |
| The candidate's gender | The quality of the college or graduate program the candidate attended | The candidate's enthusiasm for teaching |

1. What is the 3rd most important thing that you consider when hiring a teacher? (check 1 box below)

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| The candidate's classroom management skills | The candidate's ability to create a fun and stimulating classroom environment for students | Whether the candidate has a MA or other advanced degree in Education |
| The candidate's ability to relate well with parents | The candidate's prior teaching experience | The candidate's ability to increase student achievement in ways that will not necessarily show up on standardized test scores |
| The extent to which the candidate's philosophy of learning is a good fit with the school's | The candidate's ability to relate well with colleagues (i.e. other teachers and administrators in the school) | Whether the candidate has a traditional versus alternative certification |
| The candidate's ability to raise student test scores | The candidate's ability to provide a positive role model for students | How far the candidate lives from the school |
| The candidate's gender | The quality of the college or graduate program the candidate attended | The candidate's enthusiasm for teaching |

Conference Cutoff Numbers**2010-2011 & 2011-2012**

5A 2065 & up

4A 990 to 2064

3A 430 to 989

2A 200 to 429

1A 199 & below

99.9 & below Enrollment cutoff for 6-man football and for
basketball and spring meet for large and small
schools

Division I and Division II Break Numbers**for 2A, 1A 11-Man and 1A 6-Man Football:**

2A 293.5

1A 11-Man 150.5

1A 6-Man 50.5

APPENDIX B:

2012 TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

2012 Texas Public School Administrator Survey

This survey aims to identify the teacher qualities perceived to be essential by Texas public school administrators. All of your responses and information on this survey is anonymous. No one, including the researcher, will be able to associate your responses with your identity. Your participation is voluntary. In Part A, please complete the background information for statistical analysis. In Part B, each item describes a certain qualities that a classroom teacher is expected to have. In Part C, each question relates to the characteristics that are essential for a teacher to actually possess.

Part A: Background Information

1. Age in Years: ☐ 30 and under ☐ 31-37 ☐ 38-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56-62
☐ over 63
2. Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male
3. Ethnicity: ☐ White/Caucasian ☐ Black ☐ Hispanic ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ American Indian ☐ Other _____
3. Degrees held: ☐ Bachelor's ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate
4. Position: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Human Resources ☐ Other _____
5. Years of experience in your most current position: _____ Years in Education: _____
6. Level of school: ☐ Elementary ☐ Secondary ☐ Others _____
7. Is your school/district a Title I school? ☐ Yes ☐ No
8. Number of teachers: _____ Number of Students: _____
9. Percentage of Students on free or reduced lunch: _____
10. TEA Rating: ☐ Exemplary ☐ Recognized ☐ Academically Acceptable ☐ Academically Unacceptable

Part B. The teacher qualities which you perceive to be essential in a teacher
Domain I: Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process

The teacher's ability to:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 1 | Make sure students are actively engaged in learning | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ensure students are being successful in learning | | | | | | |
| 3 | Promote students' learning at a high cognitive level (e.g., critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving, etc.) | | | | | | |
| 4 | Help students become a self-directed/self-initiated learner, as appropriate to the lesson objectives | | | | | | |
| 5 | Help students connect learning to work and life applications, both within the discipline and with other disciplines | | | | | | |

Domain II: Learner-Centered Instruction

The teacher's ability to:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 6 | Ensure that the instructional content is based on appropriate goals and objectives | | | | | | |
| 7 | Ensure that instructional content is learner centered (e.g., relates to the interests and varied characteristics of students) | | | | | | |
| 8 | Use appropriate instructional strategies to promote critical thinking and problem solving | | | | | | |
| 9 | Ensure that instructional strategies include motivational techniques to successfully and actively engage students in the learning process | | | | | | |
| 10 | Ensure instructional strategies are aligned with the objectives, activities, student characteristics, prior learning, and work and life applications, both within the discipline and with other disciplines | | | | | | |
| 11 | Use varied activities appropriately and maintains appropriate pacing and sequencing | | | | | | |
| 12 | Emphasize the value and importance of the | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | activity/content | | | | | | |
| 13 | Use appropriate questioning and inquiry techniques to challenge students | | | | | | |
| 14 | Make appropriate and effective use of available technology as a part of the instructional process | | | | | | |

Domain III: Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress

The teacher's ability to:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 15 | Monitor and assess students' academic progress | | | | | | |
| 16 | Align assessment and feedback with goals and objectives and instructional strategies | | | | | | |
| 17 | Use appropriate assessment strategies to the varied characteristics of students | | | | | | |
| 18 | Reinforce student learning | | | | | | |
| 19 | Give students specific constructive feedback | | | | | | |
| 20 | Provide opportunities for all students for relearning and re-evaluation of material | | | | | | |

Domain IV: Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time, and Materials

The teacher's ability to:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 21 | Effectively implement the discipline-management procedures approved by the campus | | | | | | |
| 22 | Establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed learning as appropriate | | | | | | |
| 23 | Interact with students in an equitable manner, including the fair application of rules | | | | | | |
| 24 | Specify expectations for desired behavior | | | | | | |
| 25 | Intervene and re-direct off-task, inappropriate or disruptive behavior as needed | | | | | | |
| 26 | Reinforce desired behavior when appropriate | | | | | | |
| 27 | Select the instructional materials that are equitable and acknowledge | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 28 | Effectively and efficiently manage time and materials | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Domain V: Professional Communication

The teacher's ability to:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 29 | Use appropriate and accurate written communication with students | | | | | | |
| 30 | Use appropriate and accurate verbal and non-verbal communication with students | | | | | | |
| 31 | Encourage and support students who are reluctant or having difficulty | | | | | | |
| 32 | Use appropriate and accurate written communication with parents, staff, community members, and other professionals | | | | | | |
| 33 | Use appropriate and accurate verbal and non-verbal communication with parents, staff, community members, and other professionals | | | | | | |
| 34 | Ensure that interactions are supportive, courteous, and respectful with students, parents, staff, community members, and other professionals | | | | | | |

Domain VI: Professional Development

The teacher:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 35 | Successfully seeks out and engages in professional development activities that positively correlate with the goals of the campus and district | | | | | | |
| 36 | Successfully correlates professional development activities With assigned subject content and the varied needs of students | | | | | | |
| 37 | Successfully engages in professional development activities that positively correlate with the prior performance appraisal | | | | | | |
| 38 | Works collaboratively and constructively with colleagues and other professionals toward the overall improvement of student performance | | | | | | |

Domain VII: Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements

The teacher:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 39 | Complies with all policies, operating procedures, and legal requirements (national, state, district, and campus) | | | | | | |
| 40 | Complies with all verbal and written directives, participates in the development of operating procedures, and offers suggestions for improvement | | | | | | |
| 41 | Apart from classroom responsibilities, the teacher consistently contributes to making the whole school safe and orderly, and contributes to a stimulating learning environment for all students | | | | | | |

Domain VIII: Improvement of Academic Performance of All Students on the Campus

The teacher's ability to:

| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| 42 | Align instruction to include appropriate TEKS/TAKS objectives to support student achievement in all assigned classes | | | | | | |
| 43 | Work with colleagues to analyze TAKS performance data relevant to all students in assigned classes prior to beginning instruction | | | | | | |
| 44 | Adjust the sequencing of classroom instruction to appropriately incorporate TEKS/TAKS objectives | | | | | | |
| 45 | Collaborate with others within and outside the teacher's discipline to select/adapt instructional materials and activities which are correlated with appropriate TEKS/TAKS objectives | | | | | | |
| 46 | Provide feedback to all students regarding their learning progress | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------|---|
| | | On a scale of 1-5, how important do you think each of the following teacher quality is? | | | | | In each domain, please rank top three according to importance |
| | Teacher Qualities | 1 Least important | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Most Important | 1 = top ranking 2 = 2 nd ranking 3 = 3 rd ranking |
| | on appropriate TEKS/TAKS objectives | | | | | | |
| 47 | Monitors attendance of all students in assigned classes and contacts parents, counselors, or other school officials regarding an intervention plan for students with serious attendance problems | | | | | | |
| 48 | Identify and assess the needs of assigned students in at-risk situations | | | | | | |
| 49 | Meet with parents and/or other teachers of students who are failing or in danger of failing to develop an appropriate plan for intervention | | | | | | |
| 50 | Modify and adapt classroom materials and/or instruction for students in at-risk | | | | | | |

Part C. Teacher Characteristics:

Take a minute to think about the two best teachers you've known/worked with, please answer the following questions:

1. What characteristics did they have that made them good teachers?

2. How are these characteristics similar or different by subject and/or grade level?

3. Are there any characteristics that you consider essential that are not listed above you would like to list?

4. Is there anything else you will like to add in terms of the desired teacher qualities at your school or in your school district in general?

THANKS SO MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY!

