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Abstract

This dissertation analyzes instructional leadership and evaluation protocols from a large, diverse district in the Southeastern United States in order to investigate layers of accountability and tensions created when principals are asked to fill the dual roles of both instructional leader and supervisor in a newly implemented teacher evaluation system reform. For this dissertation I investigate the role of the principal as a colleague and mentor and compare this with the role of the principal as supervisor and evaluator in hierarchical systems. I include the role of the peer evaluator, a new position, in my analysis. Critical discourse analysis is utilized, primarily informed by Fairclough’s Three Dimensional Framework for investigating discourses of instructional leadership and attendant Foucauldian notions of governability. The analysis shows that district administrators, principals, peer evaluators, and teachers employ nuanced definitions of instructional leadership. These definitions are impacted by deeply entrenched norms of what it means to be a principal and a teacher within the hierarchy of the school district of interest. Principals in this study were able to navigate the dual roles of instructional leadership and supervision largely due to how they and teachers defined the role of instructional leadership. The teacher evaluation reform has brought with it a new perspective on the hierarchy coinciding with new power dynamics. The results of this study have implications for our understanding of the role of the principal and how that role is constructed by principals and teachers as well as district administrators and peer evaluators.
Chapter One
Introduction

While taking a doctoral class on teacher evaluation I was assigned a chapter from *The Three-Minute Walk Through* by Downey, Steffy, English, Frase, & Poston (2004). The chapter was Chapter Nine: Understanding the Walk-Through as a Discursive Practice. My assignment was to read the chapter, and then present it to the class. I brought my own experience to the reading, that of being a twenty seven year veteran employee of public education, most years as a teacher but also several years as an elementary school assistant principal and district administrator. Having been observed as a teacher by my superiors, and also having been in a position to do the observing, my reading promised to be framed by that knowledge and experience. In the chapter, the authors contend that “the theoretical framework is that of discourse theory” (p. 174). Early in the chapter the name Norman Fairclough comes up, and then, on the last page of the chapter, the authors mention Michel Foucault. The concept of discourse theory and the names Fairclough and Foucault were all new to me, so a bit of research ensued. Within a short time it became clear that the authors of *The Three-Minute Walk Through* (TMWT) gave discourse theory only a glancing blow and that discourse theory could have been more fully developed. My continued research would bring a more complete appreciation of Fairclough and Foucault, whose theories illuminated my experiences both in the classroom and in the front office. The guiding questions for my research are what tensions, if any, are created when principals are asked to perform duties as evaluators and at the same time act collegially as mentors and coaches, and how do
principals navigate these roles within the enactment of a new teacher evaluation reform? How does the school district maintain control of this new teacher evaluation reform? Peer evaluators are a newly instated position resulting from the teacher evaluation reform. How are the peer evaluators perceived by others and what role do they play?

The large, urban school district in the Southeast (The District) that is the subject of my research has recently received a large grant, part of which requires a new teacher evaluation system which, for the purposes of this dissertation, will be referred to as the Teacher Evaluation System (TES). This system has been in place from the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, with mandatory trainings for teachers and administrators provided intensely by The District during the summer of 2010, just prior to the opening of the new school year. This reform provided a unique opportunity to observe and analyze how a new evaluation system is implemented, and how teachers and principals come to understand the new system and their roles within it. The new system also utilizes peer evaluators, a new dynamic for this school district. Peer evaluators were included in the research, with interest in how their roles are perceived by themselves and other teachers and principals.

My intention with this dissertation was to investigate what tensions, if any, are created when principals, in a traditional sense, maintain evaluative status and at the same time are also expected to be instructional leaders who develop collegial relationships with teachers? How do principals navigate these roles? How does The District maintain control of TES? What role do the peer evaluators play? English (2005) writes of the lingering contradiction between issues of management and issues of leadership in education. He goes on to write that administrative positions exist within organizations
and are connected to larger organizational boundaries and that “the dichotomy between leaders and managers has become a point of contestation” (p. xi). The literature review traces the history of supervision in education.

By tracing the role of principals historically, I place the role of principal as educational leader in historical context. What emerges is a tradition that continues to impact how principals and teachers view the role of the principal and how that role is enacted. This history is presented in Chapter Two: Literature Review. The chapter ends with a discussion of contemporary leadership practices and instructional leadership.

Chapter Three: Methodological Framework will define the methodological framework utilized in the analysis, critical discourse analysis, and establish what it can bring to a critical look at the dual roles of the principal. The methodological framework is based on an analytical outline presented by Fairclough, who used a “three-dimensional framework” (1995, p. 133). This framework includes the examination of “a spoken or written language text as an instance of discourse practice involving the production and interpretation of text, and as a piece of social practice” (p. 133). My methods were also informed by Gee (2005), who lays out what he considers to be an ideal linguistic discourse analysis. Gee, cited by Fairclough as a source for linguistic analysis, presents a method for organizing transcripts into lines and stanzas that guided my initial linguistic analysis of transcripts.

Fairclough’s framework and Gee’s linguistic analysis, then, form the basis for my research design which is outlined in Chapter Four: Methods. The method of collecting and analyzing data is described. My research included interview texts of district administrators, principals, peer evaluators, and teachers, and observations of
conversations between principals and teachers. For this study, two elementary schools were examined, including two principals, three teachers, and two peer evaluators. Two district level supervisors were also included in this study. District training documents pertaining to the new evaluation system, and previously utilized observation and evaluation tools will help to provide historical context.

The initial analysis began with transcribing the texts in a system of lines and stanzas described by Gee (2005). After this initial analysis, I utilized a method of coding as described by Auerbach and Silverstein (2003). This method of coding began with a thorough reading of the texts and an initial edit for text relevant to my research questions and methodological framework. The relevant text was then sorted by participant into repeating ideas. These repeating ideas were then sorted into themes by participant. All of the participant themes were then used to construct theoretical frameworks.

In Chapter Five: Instructional Leadership and Evaluation as Conflicting Text I outline the major themes revealed by the texts. Instructional leadership was revealed as a major theme, revealing that each of the participant groups had nuanced understandings of the principal’s role as instructional leader. A second major theme emerging from this research is the impact of TES - on district administrators, peers, principals, teachers, and on teaching practices. This caused tensions, and these tensions had to be negotiated. While The District message permeated throughout the participant groups and illustrated how much success The District had in branding the message, each of the participants felt the impact of TES differently. As the texts were analyzed, The District’s ability to maintain control of its message emerged as another major theme. Certain phrases and
words permeated the texts, an indication of The District’s capacity to manage the implementation of TES.

Chapter Six: To See and Be Seen contains a discourse analysis. The themes, as they emerged from the texts, exposed how firmly entrenched the hierarchy of schooling remains, even in the face of new dynamics. Teachers expect principals to evaluate and supervise, and look toward others in the school for instructional leadership. Principals, while labeling themselves as instructional leaders, continually reinforce their positions within the hierarchy, and rely on others to deliver instructional support to teachers. The texts also bring to light the surveillance necessary to implement TES, the sheer amount of which is a recent development. District administrators, principals, peer evaluators, and teachers are all caught up in this surveillance, all of which forms what Foucault describes metaphorically as a panopticon. This serves to normalize and discipline, resulting in self-regulation.

A critical discourse analysis on the roles expected of principals within the context of this newly implemented teacher evaluation system reveals tensions created when principals are expected to act as instructional leaders who coach teachers while retaining evaluative control over those same teachers. While this new teacher evaluation system proclaims an end to the traditional view of principal as primary power holder, the structure of school-level organization perpetuates the belief that the principal is ultimately responsible. The goal of moving teacher practice through reflection can also be regarded as a new and more subtle exercise of power, of controlling teacher behavior through consent. Controlling through consent is a classical liberal ideal, based on the doctrine that the government acts with the consent of the governed. It could be argued
that the structure of schools, established by elected governing bodies, has been agreed upon by the public. The structure of schools remains fundamentally unchanged; the principal retains evaluative control over teachers. This structure has been normalized, and teachers and principals have been socialized in what it is to be a teacher and a principal within this structure. Teachers and principals continue to understand the role of principal as a position within the hierarchy, a position that allows evaluation and supervision of teachers.

This study is significant because of the highly visible position of principals in the era of high-stakes testing and accountability. Principals are expected to lead their schools to success based on measures of student achievement through effective supervisory and leadership skills. My dissertation investigated how principals and teachers, within the context of this study, navigated their way between supervisory and leadership functions of the principal. The results of this study have implications for our understanding of the role of the principal and how that role is constructed by principals and teachers. This study also highlights ways in which The District attempted to maintain control over the implementation of TES and what role peer evaluators played.

It is recognized that this study has several limitations. All of the participants in this study were female. This represented the majority of principals and teachers in the school district of interest. Participant motives are also recognized as a limitation. Participants may have been self-serving in their selections or may have been impacted by my presence in conferences. An additional limitation is my own subjectivity. This limitation is addressed through transparency. A final limitation involves the limited generalizability of this study, a limitation inherent in qualitative research of this nature.
Chapter Two
Literature Review

Introduction

In this chapter I provide a brief history of school supervision, investigating that history by examining different historical periods of school supervision. A critical discourse analysis requires historical context. Understanding supervisory practices of today requires an investigation of school supervision traditions, how they have developed through time, and how these traditions continue to inform the production of discourses and roles today. I end with a discussion of contemporary approaches to supervision, including instructional leadership. This history frames our understanding of the new teacher evaluation reform and the expectations for how principals enact their roles within that reform.

Shifting Definitions of Supervision: From Inspection to Instructional Leadership

In the United States, historically, supervision has involved inspection of teachers and is usually viewed as an instrument for controlling teachers (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2009, p. 7). “The history of supervision is the history of the interaction of broad social and intellectual movements affecting all aspects of education. The field of supervision and supervisors as educators were certainly influenced by these societal developments” (Glanz, 2005, p.8). Glanz stresses the importance of understanding the history of supervision and the value of a continued historical analysis (2005, pp. 20-21). “The meaning of the term supervision and the role played by educational supervisors in
school settings have evolved over time” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 4). This evolution impacts contemporary practices.

**Setting the Stage for TES.**

In the large, urban school district (The District) that is the focus of my research a new Teacher Evaluation System (TES) was initiated in the Fall of 2010. Inherent in this new system, which utilizes the 2007 book written by Charlotte Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, are both summative and formative observations of teachers with corresponding rubrics/protocols. This new teacher evaluation system, funded by a large grant, will be referred to in this proposal as TES. The information gathered is intended to provide school administrators with a tool for supervising their schools and improving instructional practices, ultimately positively affecting student learning outcomes. This evaluation system originated and developed within a framework of school supervision. This is of particular interest to this dissertation because the field of school supervision seems to have undergone a shift over the last several decades and more recent shifts have been influenced heavily by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislated school reform efforts. These shifts include the movement toward the inclusion of student performance as a measurement of teacher effectiveness.

In more traditional times, supervisors were expected to visit classrooms and observe what the teacher was doing, often noting whether the teacher’s actions conformed to a list of activities assumed to be related to superior or good teaching. Currently, supervisors need to attend at least as much to what students are doing as to what teachers are doing. (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 87)
Any definition of school supervision is bound by time and place. The previous quote is from the college textbook, “Supervision: A Redefinition.” The title of the book, along with the opening phrase in the above quote, indicates that school supervision has undergone an adjustment. School supervision originally referred to one’s responsibility of oversight.

School supervision exists nearly everywhere. Its origins date back to the birth of public education, when young nations used education to forge a common language and culture. Supervision was a key tool to ensure that all education staff respected the same rules and regulations and followed a similar programme.

(DuGrauwe, 2007, p. 709)

The main role of supervisors has traditionally been to monitor teachers and in particular their classroom performance (DeGrauwe, 2007, p. 710). Current school supervisory practices are placed in purposeful contrast to a newer understanding of school supervision which includes a specific interest in guiding increased student performance outcomes. Given this context, exactly what are traditional views of school supervision, and how have traditional views been changed? Providing historical categories will help us to understand what school supervision means for schools now and how school administrators and their perceived role in the evaluation of teachers has been shaped. This historical perspective provides context for current practices, and lays the foundation for a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the texts produced in certain instructional leadership practices. CDA relies on a thorough understanding of historical context, as discourses of contemporary school supervision are impacted by all that has come before. In the next section I examine historical categories of school supervision.
A Brief History of School Supervision

In this section I integrate the work of several others to establish major historical categories of school supervision. These historical categories provide a foundation for identifying practices that are still impacting school leaders today. As a means of understanding the historical progression, I start with Wiles & Bondi who list seven stages in the evolution of school supervision. These are inspection and enforcement, scientific, bureaucratic, cooperative, supervision as curriculum development, clinical supervision, and supervision as management (1980). Tracy (1995) also outlines seven stages of supervision. These seven are community accountability, professionalism, scientific, human relations, second-wave scientific, second-wave human relations, and human development. Burke & Krey, and Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon also offer historical timelines describing the development of school supervision. Brown (2005) defines five pivotal points in the development of the principalship and highlights gender equity issues in relation to the principalship. This perspective will also be included. Table 1 is a chart comparing various authors’ stages of school supervision. I compare these various timelines, and will describe them in more detail below. The table illustrates the overall commonalities in how the various authors characterize general periods of time with regards to school supervision expectations.

**Inspection: 1870 – 1910.**

**Judgment of teachers.**

While there are some differences in the description of the various historical stages of supervision, several commonalities exist. The earliest period of school supervision was one defined by inspection, or formal observation, to assure that rules were being
followed. During this time period schools were supervised by boards or laypersons. Teachers were the sole educational professionals in an unsophisticated educational organization (Tracy, 1995, p. 320). “Early schools in America utilized appointed boards of laypersons or citizens to oversee school operations….The relationship of the inspectors with the teachers was often stern and punitive” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 5). During this era, supervision often implied “a rather stern and forbidding relationship between the supervisor and the supervised” (Burke & Krey, 2005, p. 9). While this period of supervision was marked by inspection of teachers, the improvement of instruction was also a part of the role of lay supervisors (p. 320). However, “early definitions of supervision clearly indicate that the major purpose of the supervisor was to make judgments about the teacher rather than about the instruction or the students’ learning” with “the nature of the remedy…to be that of displacing or replacing the teacher” (Burke & Krey, 2005, pp. 8-9).

**Emergence of the principal.**

Tracy (1995) includes professionalism in this period, asserting that it lasted through the 1800’s with a shift away from community leadership over schools to leadership provided by professional educators (p. 221). Rousmaniere points to this era as one in which the informal role of a teacher who performed administrative tasks began to be replaced by an administrator whose chief purpose was to supervise teachers. This was manifested in the creation of the position of school principal (2007, p. 3) and the role of the principalship began to grow in importance. Principals in the early 1800’s were responsible for teaching as well as keeping records, monitoring discipline, and helping teachers (Tanner & Tanner, 1987, p. 24). As the 1800’s came to an end, the role of the
Table 1

*Comparison of Various Historical Timelines of Supervision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Time Frame</th>
<th>Wiles &amp; Bondi</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
<th>Burke &amp; Krey</th>
<th>Glickman, Gordon, &amp; Ross-Gordon</th>
<th>Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750-1910</td>
<td>Inspection &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>Community Accountability (Inspection)</td>
<td>Administrative Inspection (through 1875)</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Efficiency Orientation (1876-1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1920</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Scientific (Efficiency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1930</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1955</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>Cooperative Group Effort (1937-1959)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1970</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>Second-wave Human Relations (Clinical)</td>
<td>Early effective schools research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constancy and Change (1960-1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–Present</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990-Consolidation</td>
<td>School improvement research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

principalship began to separate from teaching. The status of principals continued to rise, and by the early 1900’s principals began to be seen as “teachers of teachers” (Kafka, 2009, pp. 322-3). The ‘principal teacher’ lost almost all teaching responsibilities. “The principal took attendance but also gained authority over the other teachers in the school. He worked with the broader community, but also personally maintained school grounds” (Kafka, 2009, p. 321). This meant that there was now someone assigned to manage a specific school.

**Growing role for principals.**

School bureaucracies were growing, so the role of the principal grew during these years (Kafka, 2009, p. 321). “Serving as an adjunct of the superintendent and working in the school, this individual freed the board of lay advisors to deal with more global concerns such as constructing buildings and raising money” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 5). Tracy (1995) lays out several assumptions of this period as follows:

First, it was assumed that supervisors had a right to intervene directly in the classroom; local and state legislation reinforced this assumption. Second, it was assumed that the teacher was the servant of the community and, as such, should be expected to respond to the community’s directives. Third, the criteria for effective instruction were established by the community…. The power vested in
the committee to immediately dismiss the teacher meant that the observers’ suggestions were meant to be taken seriously. (p. 321)

The early days of the school principalship, defined by inspection, were associated with punitive actions. Towards the end of the nineteenth century this began to shift and the relationships between principals and teachers began to thaw (Burke & Krey, 2005, p. 10). Burke & Krey caution, however, that cooperation was “more apt to be found in the literature than in practice” (p. 10).

**Developing bureaucracy.**

Set off by rapid population growth, it was during this period that Brown (2005) points to as the era in which the school bureaucracy and hierarchy were developed, including the position of the principal. Schools during this era became an institution of government and were brought into the realm of public policy. Remnants of this period of supervision are still visible today. Loveless (1998), writes that “the 19th-century school system struggled into existence by gaining authority over its core activities” and that even today “virtually all schools in the United States…attend to the institutional forms established and maintained by the public school system” (p. 1). Loveless points to this era as one in which “the signature elements of education’s institutionalization first took shape” (p. 3).

**Principals as supervisors.**

The separation between school principal and teacher began during this era. “The most important gain from separating the principalship from teaching was the opportunity that it provided for the improvement of instruction” (Tanner & Tanner, 1987, p. 25). Indeed, the principal, since that era, has remained the primary supervisor of teachers
whose main task is to improve instruction. This was an important new aspect of the principal’s position. Brown (2005) asserts that gender impacted the separation of these roles as well. According to Brown, the growing number of women teachers in the mid-1800’s “led directly to the birth of a new profession, created solely for men, called the ‘principalship’” (p. 113). Stereotypes operating at the time supported the notion that men were rational and objective and the women were too emotional and therefore ill equipped to be effective managers (Brown, 2005, p. 114). “Let the Principal or Superintendent have the general supervision and control of the whole, and let him have one male assistant or sub-principal, and ten female assistants, one for each room” (From Brown, 2005, In Cubberley, 1934, p. 312). Kafka (2009) refers to the principal as “he,” reinforcing the gender stereotype often associated with the principalship.

**Implications for TES.**

Male or female, the improvement of instruction continues to be a focus for school supervisors, and is a focus for TES as well, although the focus now is on the effects of improved instruction on students. School bureaucracy and hierarchy put into place during this era remain in place even today, and have impacted how power is distributed., with Rousmaniere pointing to the creation of the school principal as “realigning the source of authority from the classroom to the principal’s office” (2007, p. 2). School principals today remain in a position of authority situated firmly within the school bureaucracy and hierarchy.

Influence of Taylor.

The next phase of supervision, scientific/bureaucratic, began at the beginning of the twentieth century. During this period the school supervisor became a specialist. It was also at this time that education began to be affected by industrial mechanization.

“Scientific management supervision…emerged from the thinking and work of Frederick Taylor and his followers” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 14). Danielson (2009) writes that throughout the 1900’s “the assembly line model held sway, in which it was assumed that knowledge was poured into passive students as they progressed through the days and years” (p. 21). The assembly line model shifted the focus of education to efficiency and economy which “led to divisions of labor, technical specialization, high organizational discipline, specific procedures for work situations, and a reliance on written communication” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, pp. 5-6). Efficiency became paramount, and toward this end, supervision began to be concerned with measuring teaching methods with the aim of improving instruction (Tracy, 1995, p. 323). “Control, accountability, and efficiency are emphasized in scientific management within an atmosphere of clear-cut manager-subordinate relationships” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 14). The ideas of Taylor deeply influenced this period in supervision, and resulted in the desire for teachers who would follow directions compliantly with minimal thought (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 14). The desire for improved instruction remained, only now the focus was shifted toward efficiency.

Lay inspection of the school gave way to professional inspection, and as this occurred, the nature of supervision assumed new characteristics. A full-time
supervisory position meant time and advisement with teachers for the improvement of instruction that had been advocated but not realized in earlier decades. Practically every definition generated in this period included the point that supervision existed for the purpose of the improvement of instruction. (Burke & Krey, 2005, p. 10)

**Male claim to the principalship.**

The shift toward efficiency continued to reinforce gender stereotypes with regards to the principalship. Scientific management implied rational thought and logic, attributes assigned by stereotype to men. This helped seal “the qualities of nurturance and caring as feminine and barred women from leadership roles in the school systems” (Brown, 2005, p. 119). As the division between teaching and administration became more solidified, men’s claims to the principalship seemed to become more secure (Brown). Women made some temporary gains in attaining principal positions, mostly in elementary schools, but these gains were short lived. The focus on efficiency meant that the principalship was seen more as administrative and managerial, and therefore men were simply more suited. “Married men were particularly targeted to resolve a perceived masculinity crisis caused by too many women in teaching. The athletic, married male principal offered school districts a vision of stability, heteronormativity, and professionalism (Rousmaniere, 2007, p. 17). Exacerbating the lack of women in principalships, the scientific management movement placed emphasis on management and efficiency, therefore principals did not have to possess educational experience, and that educational “supervision and administration required no background in teaching” (Brown, p. 120). By the end of this era, there were virtually no women in administrative positions in schools.
**Importance of research.**

During this era, research became an important tool to drive improvement. Supervisors could use the data collected to make decisions regarding appropriate instruction. It was an assumption of this time period that the supervisor would guide teachers toward the most effective and efficient instructional practices.

Research and measurement could provide supervisors with a firm base on which to judge the quality of instruction and that teachers were best assisted by direction from those who knew the best procedures to use for any given educational task, namely, supervisors. (Tracy, 1995, p. 323)

The newfound emphasis on research “accompanied the emphasis on rules and regulations, stratified authority, and lead to the generation of comprehensive policy documents” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 6). Sergiovanni and Starratt remark that “control, accountability, and efficiency are emphasized in scientific management within an atmosphere of clear-cut manager-subordinate relationships” (2002, p. 14). According to Sergiovanni and Starratt, “within traditional scientific management, teachers are heavily supervised in a face-to-face setting in an effort to ensure that good teaching will take place” (2002, p. 16).

**Principal’s role solidified.**

During this time period the role of the principal became solidified. Managerial and executive functions became centralized and hierarchical models to aid efficiency were formed (Brown, 2006). According to Kafka (2009):
By the 1920’s, the modern school principalship had been established and looked markedly similar to the position today: Principals had bureaucratic, managerial, instructional, and community responsibilities. They were expected to lead and instruct teachers, to monitor students, to communicate with the district, and to work with parents and members of the wider community. Moreover, they were seen as pivotal figures in any school reform effort. For many observers at the time, the principal was the school. (p. 324)

Toward the end of this period, Wiles and Bondi (1995) remark that supervisors were often referred to as “snoopervisors” (p. 6), implying that the autocratic relationships that developed between supervisors and teachers were unpleasant for teachers. This period of supervision lasted through the 1930’s, with a gradual movement toward less domineering relationships between principals and teachers (Burke & Krey, 2005, p. 10).

**Implications for TES.**

It is interesting to note that “vestiges of this brand of supervision can still be found in schools…Its basic premises…are still thought to be attractive by many policymakers, administrators, and supervisors” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 14). This can be seen in the increased number of observations by supervisors of teachers that are the current practice, and a heavy reliance on rubrics and protocols in evaluating teaching, all with an emphasis on accountability now established by law. The TES teacher observation protocol is a rubric, with fourteen observable teacher/student behaviors and four levels of proficiency delineated. This rubric, often referred to in TES as the framework, has been solidly supported as part of the TES program by the school board, district supervisors, and the teacher’s union. Teachers, under TES, are observed
formally at least three times per year, with a suggested fifteen pop-ins of four to seven minutes each. This increase in the number of observations requires oversight, driving the need for new forms of organizational control (Brown, 2005). This type of organization means that “the instructional leadership role became submerged under the roles of manager and bureaucrat….Principals realized their precarious status in the hierarchy” (Brown, 2005, p. 117). Here one can see the beginnings of the tensions I investigate, when managerial functions of the principalship become tangled with leadership functions. As The District moves toward a more comprehensive review of teaching practices with implementation of TES, school principals are forced to reconcile their function as leaders of teachers with their role in TES as evenhanded evaluators of teacher behaviors.


A period of cooperation.

The cooperative, or human relations, period in supervision is discernible by its focus on individual motivation, with supervisors responsible for helping teachers. During this era there was a shift toward a more democratic and supportive philosophy of management, focused on group efforts. “In this period, there was generous use of words such as coordinating, integrative, creativity, stimulation, and democratic relationships” (Burke & Krey, 2005, p. 11). Wiles & Bondi (1980) write that research on group dynamics supported the existence of human elements in organizations, elements previously ignored by administrators (p. 6). This period was marked by the influence of Mayo and his study at the Western Electric Hawthorne plant. “Mayo believed that the productivity of workers could be increased by meeting their social needs at work,
providing them with opportunities to interact with each other, treating them decently, and involving them in the decision-making process” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, pp. 14-15). During this time the social and psychological needs of teachers began to be acknowledged, and these started to be addressed in an effort to improve the effectiveness of teaching. Supervisors focused on building positive relationships (Tracy, 1995, p. 323).

When it was applied to schooling, teachers were viewed as whole persons in their own right rather than as packages of needed energy, skills, and aptitudes to be used by administrators and supervisors. Supervisors needed to work to create a feeling of satisfaction among teachers by showing interest in them as people. It was assumed that a satisfied staff would work harder and would be easier to work with, to lead, and to control. (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 15)

This period can be summed up with the notion that “oversight of instruction became conceived of as for guidance rather than direction of instruction” (Tracy, 1995, p. 323). Brown (2005) asserts that principals during this era focused on staff morale and began to act as facilitators and counselors, focused on assisting the teachers.

**Laissez faire supervision.**

This period of supervisors focused on guidance also had limitations, however. As Tracy (1995) writes:

Unfortunately, an outcome of this relational emphasis was that supervisors sometimes feared upsetting the relationship by conducting direct classroom observation. Thus, in practice, human relations supervision all too often equated with hands-off supervision, where little actual assistance was provided. (p. 323-324)
Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) concur with this appraisal, writing that “the movement actually resulted in widespread neglect of teachers. Participatory supervision became permissive supervision, which in practice was laissez-faire supervision” (p. 15). Concerns about permissive evaluation remain, and is tied to teacher conceptions that the best that can be expected from the principal is to simply be left alone. However, Sergiovanni and Starratt find a more sinister effect of this in that the supervisor’s attempt at “winning friends” was a slick tactic that made the movement seem manipulative and inauthentic, even dishonest (2002, p. 15). In this view, “teachers are provided with conditions that enhance their morale and are involved in efforts to increase their job satisfaction so that they might be more pliable in the hands of management, thus ensuring that good teaching will take place” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 16). Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) remark that both human relations supervision and scientific management assume that administrators are much more interested in the welfare of the school than the teachers, reflecting a lack of trust in teachers (p. 16).

Effects of compulsory education.

Other important features of this time period were the effect of compulsory school attendance laws and WWII. More students attended school, thus elevating the position of teachers and the principal in the local community. As more and more families moved into urban areas, schools became the central site for “Americanization, and this social project lifted education’s – and principals’ – importance even further. School leaders gained prominence in American communities in tandem with the rise of education itself” (Kafka, 2009, pp. 324-5). Theoretical literature began to expand, and it was recognized that
preparing educational administrators required more than simply management training (Brown, 2005).

**Impact of WWII.**

WWII also had an impact on gender equity issues in school administration. During the war, many married women were hired to fill the vacancies left when men were drafted for combat. However, as soon as the war was over, men were home and looking for work. Married women left the field to return to the home and to begin raising their families. “Returning veterans, who were initially reluctant to consider teaching because of its being perceived as ‘woman’s work,’ were enticed into classrooms with promises of rapid promotion to administration after they taught a few years” (Brown, 2005, p. 124). After being attracted to the field of teaching, many men quickly became administrators, often replacing women who were already serving in those roles. Women were also moved out of principalships as smaller schools were consolidated and replaced with “large schools that were, in the words of one school reformer ‘large enough to be of interest to a man’” (Rousmaniere, 2007, p. 18). Between 1930 and 1950 this resulted in severe losses in numbers of female principals. Rousmaniere writes that the number of women principals were double that of men in 1930, but were reduced to one quarter by 1950 (p. 18).

**Implications for TES.**

While during this period direct classroom observations may have been a secondary concern, they are a main piece of TES. This era, though, highlights some of the difficulties that can arise when principals are negotiating cordial relationships and evaluations. The success of TES relies on both of these skills. Cordial, and even collegial,
relationships are necessary when principals engage teachers in the reflective dialogue that is at the core of TES pre and post-observation conferences. Yet a main task of TES remains evaluation of teachers, a responsibility which also lies with the principal. Sergiovanni and Starratt’s contention that some manipulation may have been at the core of this movement speaks to issues of consent and control, issues that will be addressed in Chapter Three.


Curriculum development and supervision.

Following the human relations phase of supervision was the period of curriculum development. It was during this period that Sputnik was launched, altering the course of American education. “Overnight, old programs and goals were scrapped, and new educational plans and programs were designed” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 6). This helped to drive what Burke & Krey (2005) refer to as an era as that of a research orientation, and hold that:

A combination of technological advancements, competition with foreign nations in space research, and a public awakening to the necessity for financial contributions to intellectual enterprises are among the factors that encouraged the development of an environment in which problems were solved more through study than compromise. (pp. 11-12)

Curriculum development dominated the educational scene, and such development influenced the role of educational supervisors” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 6). The roles of curriculum development and supervision, which prior to this period had been separate
roles, began to meld into one. “The supervisor was required to be highly skilled in data collection, providing feedback, and relating to people” (Tracy, 1995, p. 324).

**Return to efficiency.**

This era is also known as second-wave scientific, or as Sergiovanni & Starratt (2002) describe it, a neoscientific management, which was again interested in control and efficiency and was a reaction against the human relations movement (p. 15). Administrators had a renewed interest in assessment and performance, infused with theoretical knowledge from the behavioral and social sciences (Brown, 2005).

Characteristics of this second-wave scientific phase are the use of complex observation systems to measure effective and ineffective teacher behaviors, increased reliance on standardized testing of students, and emphasis on a behavioral objective basis for instruction that strove to achieve measurable and observable outcomes. (Tracy, 1995, p. 324)

During this period, once more, observations of teaching provided data that drove instructional practices. However, this was now tempered by the human relations research of previous years, such that “many of the observation systems centered on interaction patterns between students and teachers” (Tracy, 1996, p. 324). “Here it is assumed that if visible standards of performance, objectives, or competencies can be identified, the work of teachers can be controlled by holding them accountable to these standards, thus ensuring better teaching” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 16). Principals were not immune from such competencies either. “In the 1950’s, efficient administration was emphasized so much that principals were instructed on minute and even trivial duties”
(Kafka, 2009, p. 325). These trivial duties included instruction on how to address staff members or how to introduce staff members to students (Kafka, 2009, p. 325).

**Positioning of males.**

Once again, during this era war had an impact on gender representation in the field of education and educational administration. Draft evasion caused many men to enter teaching. Still, teaching continued to suffer from the perception of it as women’s work, “teaching was acceptable for men only if they were on their way up the ladder to success. Thus, male teachers quickly positioned themselves for moves into administration” (Brown, 2005, p. 128). Rousmaniere (2007) holds that by the 1960’s the role of the principalship had been “culturally reconstructed to align with gendered norms. Institutional and personal definitions of manhood and womanhood played out in school staffs with the woman in the classroom and the man in the principal’s office” (Rousmaniere, p. 19).

**Initial federal role.**

The immediate effects of the civil rights movement also made an impact on this era. One result of the civil rights movement was an expanded role for the federal government and principals became responsible for monitoring the new federally funded programs. “Reformers in the 1960s challenged organizational structures…The very idea of a meritocracy came under severe attack” (Brown, 2005, p. 126).

**Implications for TES.**

This era, marked by standardized testing and observable outcomes, could just as easily define the current era of NCLB, standardized testing, and the desire for measurable outcomes. The contemporary TES Framework for observation focuses on the interactions
between teachers and students, complete with complex observation systems. Modern principals are held to standards as well, with documents espousing competencies and expectations for principals published by, for example, the National Association of Elementary School Principals.

**Clinical supervision: 1965 – 1970.**

*A new focus for supervision.*

Clinical supervision followed the neoscientific era. Just the use of the expression “clinical” denotes a new focus for supervision. The term clinical refers to “objective” observations of teachers with the intent of providing feedback that will improve teaching practices. It was during this era that the broad concepts from scientific supervision and human relations supervision seemed to come together. “Supervisors following this lead became proficient in the uses of videotaping and in assessing interaction between teachers and learners” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 7). Teachers and supervisors engaged in a cycle of supervision that included a pre-conference, an observation, interpreting the observation, a post-conference, and a critique of the process (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2009, p. 228).

**Introducing formative ideas of supervision.**

Stronge and Tucker (2003) note that before 1970 teacher evaluations were mainly summative with principals making teacher retention or dismissal decisions while providing very little, if any, feedback to teachers (p. 12). “The assumptions were that a sustained cycle of assistance is necessary for teaching to improve and that the analysis of teaching behavior patterns can lead to useful insights” (Tracy, 1995, p. 324). This type of supervision is classified as “direct, centered in the classroom, focused on teachers’ issues,
aimed primarily to helping teachers understand and improve their teaching, and collaborative” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 221).

This new era of clinical supervision was marked by the work of Cogan, among others. “Morris Cogan and colleagues…initiated a study of supervision that led to the process of clinical supervision” (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, p. 110). Supervisors, usually principals, worked with teachers to develop their capacity for professional growth. “In short, clinical supervision refers to face-to-face contact with teachers with the intent of improving instruction and increasing professional growth” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 222). According to Stronge and Tucker (2003), by the beginning of the 1970’s teacher evaluations were beginning to be more formative in nature. These more formative assessments would include teachers in the evaluation process as participants as opposed to subjects by providing direction on how they could improve their practice (Stronge & Tucker, 2003, p. 13). By engaging teachers in the process it was thought that any inherent threats would be minimized and teachers would become more actively engaged in professional development and improvement. While efforts were made to include teachers, the principal was still the primary collector and interpreter of data. ”The supervisor was required to be highly skilled in data collection, providing feedback, and relating to people” (Tracy, 1995, p. 324)

**Implications for TES.**

An emphasis on clinical supervision is still present. TES focuses on the clinical aspect of supervision with the inclusion of a pre and post-conference. Engaging the teacher in reflective conversation regarding the observation during the post-conference is heralded as one way to engage teachers in their own professional development. “Post-
conferences are a time for reflection, review, constructive feedback, and reinforcement” (Danielson & McGreal, 2000, p. 86). This clinical cycle of teaching and evaluation is designed to increase the capacity of teachers. TES pre and post-conferences are billed as one method of drawing teachers into the process. By drawing teachers into the process through reflective dialogue it is believed that teachers will be less intimidated and threatened by the process of evaluation. Teachers, then, can rely on the evaluator for guidance toward professional growth.

**Into the era of effective schools research: 1970 – 1990.**

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2010) identify two different periods of research on effective schools. Beginning in the 1970s, research on schools yielded several indicators that helped to discern those deemed as effective schools. This research “began to focus on individual schools that are exceptional, that consistently achieve results far superior to those of schools in general” (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 38). The indicators listed were strong leadership, a climate of expectation, an orderly but not rigid atmosphere, communication of priorities to students, maintaining priorities, and monitoring student achievement (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 38). This research was continued in the 1980s, yielding yet further indicators of effective schools. Some of these additional indicators included site management, maximized learning time, parental involvement, collaborative planning, and clear goals and expectations (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 29). Additionally, collegial relationships between principals and teachers were now coming to the fore. Collegiality suggests a new kind of relationship between principals and teachers, a relationship on more equal footing.
Although agreeing with the early effective schools research on the need for such things as strong leadership, order, and agreed-upon priorities, the second wave of research introduced new correlates such as site-based management, professional development, parental involvement, and teacher collaboration and collegiality. (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 39)

Efforts at monitoring and supporting the development of teachers began to move toward student results even as supervising teacher behavior remained central. Beginning in the 1970’s with Madeline Hunter’s work, student achievement began to be tied directly to teacher behaviors that could be measured, taught, and refined.

*Developing checklists.*

Eventually this led to checklists of observable teacher behaviors that could be used during observations, ostensibly for the purposes of evaluating teaching. “Developers of these evaluation instruments often provided rating scales and checklists to accompany evaluation criteria. These rating scales and checklists explicitly encouraged a single view of teaching” (Danielson & McGreal, 2000, p. 14). This single view meant to define what it was to be an effective teacher and what behaviors were to be expected from teachers. Administrators would take the results of those observations, formulate an evaluation, and impart that information to teachers in the form of a summative evaluation. According to Danielson and McGreal (2000), the use of these systems of evaluation presented “a clear misrepresentation of the research and provided a simplistic, summative orientation toward evaluation that persisted into the 1990’s (p. 14). This type of system was in place in The District until the implementation of TES in the 2010-2011 school year. The performance measurement system in place prior to TES listed teacher behaviors and an
observer tallied how many times those behaviors were observed during the designated observation time.

**Movement toward standards.**

Supervisory practices from this time period through the present become a bit more difficult to lump into single categories. Sergiovanni and Starratt point to this era as one again interested in scientific management. This style of management “shares with traditional management an interest in control, accountability, and efficiency, but the means by which it achieves these ends is far more impersonal” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 15). Burke and Krey refer to the period around the 1980’s as one of unification, driven by legislative demands to do more and more with less and less (2005, p. 12). For Burke and Krey, the 1990’s are marked by emerging patterns of participation, where a move toward decentralization placed decisions with those more directly responsible for implementing those decisions (2005, p. 13). This moved some of the decision making to the individual school sites, becoming known as site-based decision making. All of this occurred in unison with insipient efforts toward the standards movement that did not consolidate until the 1990’s.

Tracy refers to the period around the 1980’s as a human development phase. “The development phase combines the concern for a teacher’s personal needs with the concern for the productivity of the organization. Classroom observation and face-to-face interaction are elements common to almost all of the current respected models of this phase” (Tracy, 1995, p. 324). Attention was also given to adult learners and meeting their needs in relation to staff development. During this period we see a focus on adult learners which is fundamental to capacity building.
Gender stereotypes.

This era was also marked by gender stereotypes, and as late as 1980, gender stereotypes around education persisted. Brown (2005) reports that there were fewer female principals in 1980 than in 1905 (p. 134). Data reported by Brown indicates that women did not see themselves as possessing the appropriate attributes for assuming administrative roles, instead seeing themselves as too feminine (p. 134). “Researchers examining barriers women perceive…named a lack of interest in administration, an unwillingness to relocate, and family/personal constraints as internal barriers. External barriers included politics, the ‘good old boy’ network, lack of support from colleagues and mentors, and sexual discrimination” (p. 134).

Critiques of effective schools research.

There remain several nagging criticisms of effective schools research. One is its overwhelming reliance on standardized test scores. Another criticism is that the indicators show a purely correlative relationship, not a causal relationship. While the factors may be present in effective schools, little is known about whether these indicators actually cause one school to be more high performing than another. Yet, while socioeconomic status may influence student achievement, the research has “disproven the earlier conclusions…that socioeconomic status determines student achievement and that schools and teachers have little effect on student learning” (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 41). These indicators have been criticized as failing to bring about any substantial changes in achievement for language minority students, poor students, and minority students. This criticism was followed by research on the context of change, yielding yet further indicators which included a culture of caring, respect, basic skills, professional
development for teachers, and active community involvement (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 40).

**Enduring legacy of this era and implications for TES.**

The correlative aspect of effective schools research has been answered, in part, through contemporary school improvement research. “In short, school improvement research is concerned with the how of successful schools” (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 42). This research also produced indicators, which included characteristics of improving schools such as varied sources of leadership, parent involvement, instructional dialogue, continuous improvement, action research, data-based feedback, and the consideration of school context and culture. Glickman, et al., (2010) find that effective schools research and improving schools research overlapped, and were closely related.

After reviewing both the effective schools and the school improvement research, it becomes clear that these are not entirely separate types of research. Rather, effects research has informed and provided a foundation for school improvement research. Together, the two types of studies provide us with a knowledge base for developing successful schools. (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 42)

The enduring legacy of this period of supervision is the idea that student achievement is tied to teacher behaviors that can be measured and refined. During this period teacher behavior began to be linked to student achievement, along with many other factors that could be controlled by schools. Schools and teachers now had lists of strategies and elements tied, through research, to student achievement. Aspects of TES can be seen as emerging from this era. In one respect, the rubric that is at the heart of TES is a checklist of things to be observed. This checklist, however, is designed to monitor the effects of
teaching, namely its impact on student achievement, and not the behaviors of teaching. Indicators on this rubric also consider aspects reflected in effective schools and school improvement research, including classroom culture, teacher relationships with students, teacher professional development, and basic skills.

**Consolidation and standards: 1990 – present.**

*Tightening standards and increasing accountability.*

The period of effective schools research and school improvement research more or less ends with what Burke and Krey call a consolidation period. Boyd and Crowson (2002) identify this period as one marked by a “huge shift” in education driven by standards-based reforms and accountability (p. 522). During this period legislators placed increasing demands on schools to educate more and better with less while “providing meaningful educational experiences” (2005, p. 12). This led to decentralization, site-based management, and a strong concern for accountability. “This combination of events caused a reevaluation of the roles of teachers, administrators, supervisors, and students” (Burke & Krey, 2005, p. 13). Burke and Krey go on to write that:

> These emerging patterns of participation were accompanied by the beginnings of the standards movement in education through federal legislation entitled *Goals 2000*. Schools were required to have curriculum standards for students that were established by the states and were to be used for testing in the basic curriculum content areas. (p. 13)

The publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983) spawned an unparalleled period of school reforms. “Mandated by the states and boards to make schools more efficient and effective while retaining their basic
features, policies were enacted to tighten educational standards…and increase accountability” (Brown, 2005, p. 129). The resulting reforms were mainly top-down and called for increased academic achievement and principal leadership. These reforms were based on the belief reflected in the report that educators had become lazy and that increased supervision would increase achievement (Brown, 2005). Glickman, et al., (2009) also view this era as driven by *A Nation at Risk* and this report “intensified a tendency …to blame educators for the low academic achievement of many K-12 students” (p. 26). The solution, according to Glickman, et al., was “legislation designed to control and monitor the work of educators and the curriculum taught to students” (p. 26). One of the results of the legislation of this period was the development of state-mandated curriculums, high-stakes testing, and statewide evaluation systems for teachers (p. 26).

*Increasing role of the state.*

This period was marked by a legislative agenda directed at public schooling. Loveless (1998) writes that “founded as an institution independent from state and federal control, the school has been transformed into an institution wedded to multiple layers of government – local, state, and federal” (p. 1). It was as a result of legislation that school supervision began a new period in its evolution, with school supervision becoming central to school reform efforts. The period from the 1990s to the present can be loosely held together by describing it as a period of school reform and high-stakes testing. This era is marked by what Boyd and Crowson (2002) see as a shift away from management of schools through loose coupling, as reformers since 1990 have moved toward “believing instead that organizational efficiency and effectiveness can be achieved
through rationalistic plans for curriculum standards aligned with tests and tight accountability” (p. 524).

While discussing the period from the early 1990s, Sergiovanni and Starratt write that:

…the federal and state governments of the United States and many industrialized nations around the world have focused significant attention on their schools and their improvement….Governments have passed legislation and policy initiatives demanding improved academic achievement by all students, achievement within more rigorous and complex curriculum guidelines, achievement that is measurable and meets increased standards of learning on state-mandated tests….The attitude of the policy community is that if the students are not learning, it is the teacher’s fault…The failure of students to learn in any given classroom is considered the failure of the teacher to find a way to enable the students to learn. (2002, p. 3)

This represented a shift in what school supervisors do and how the role is defined in relationship to the official and highly visible role of curriculum standards. “Supervisors are likewise challenged by the new policy emphasis on school renewal. They are obliged to concentrate on what students are learning in relationship to what curriculum standards and state tests indicate they are supposed to be learning…” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 4).

**Principals’ loss of positional power.**

Brown (2005) sees this as an era marked by the principal’s loss of positional power as state and local bureaucracies gained control over education policies. Here we
see a movement back toward external control of schools, where curriculum standards are driven by legislation that dictates what students are to be learning in school. To ensure that students are being taught these mandated standards they are often accompanied by high-stakes testing. These test results are publicly reported as measures of student and school progress. As a result, these policies push supervisors to measure teacher success by their students’ performance on these tests.

Loveless (1998) argues the point a bit differently. Loveless believes that schools were very effective at gaining authority over their own core activities, so successful that they monopolized the set of experiences defined as schooling. “Schools won this remarkable position in society through an alliance with the state: They became public schools” (Loveless, p. 1). This alliance with the state was mutually beneficial. Schools provided education for wealthy and poor alike, and as a result, the state was provided a steady work force and educated voters. Loveless goes on to argue that contemporary school reforms “could profoundly affect the character of public education by eroding the schools’ relationship with the state” (p. 4). According to Loveless, “the historically close partnership of school and government may be evolving into a wary, perhaps even antagonistic relationship” (p. 6) which may result in people working in schools having hostile relationships with government officials and education policymakers. Loveless believes that the historically supportive alliance between the State and education has come under stress due to accountability efforts of the federal government.
Contemporary Approaches to Supervision

NCLB and policy push towards instructional leadership.

A review of the literature reveals that a movement toward viewing administrators as instructional leaders has been going on for several decades. However, much of the language of instructional leadership beginning in the 1990’s is knotted up with the language of school reform efforts, standards, accountability, and the NCLB legislation. This legislation, among other things, mandates that all students meet annual achievement standards. “Conceived to offer the best of education to all children, this law depends entirely on annual standardized tests to measure student progress” (Levitt, 2008, p. 52). Levitt goes on to denounce many of NCLB’s provisions as controversial and dependent upon “punishment and sanctions for poor performance” (2008, p. 52). The punitive portions of NCLB are clear, and are well documented. Vinson and Ross argue that “education today must be understood according to a setting in which spectacle and surveillance come together, a state of affairs in which discipline is established and maintained as individuals and groups are monitored” (2000, p. 2). Hazi and Racinski contend that NCLB legislation has effectively resulted in the “‘renaming’ of supervision as instructional leadership, and resulting interpretations of instructional leadership as teacher evaluation” (2009, p. 14). NCLB has permanently altered the politics of education, and has given rise to new groups that have “arisen to challenge established patterns of influence” (DeBray-Pelot & McGuinn, 2009, p. 16). As a result, these legislated efforts should be viewed in tandem with other external forces pushing for school reforms, such as the Federal Race to the Top incentives, and foundations like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, who influence school reforms. DeBray-Pelot &
McGuinn refer to this as the new era of school politics, an era in which NCLB has “spurred the mobility of established interest groups, and induced the creation of new entrants” (2009, p. 38). In the case of TES, the reforms are a direct result of a large, private grant and include tying teacher pay to student outcomes.

**The standards movement and its effect on supervision.**

As an example of the impact of NCLB and the standards movement and their effect on supervision, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) holds that “increasing pressure for student performance is pushing principals into bearing primary responsibility for school and instructional improvement. This role of instructional leadership in service to increased student learning is new to many principals” (2004, p. 29). NAESP, an association comprised of school principals, has developed standards for their own performance as principals. The third standard states that “effective principals demand content and instruction that ensure student achievement of agreed-upon academic standards” (p. 29). The standard goes on to define more specifically what this means.

Successful schools are organized around student learning. The ability of the principal to guide instructional improvement is a key to creating standards-based change. Increasing pressure for student performance is pushing principals into bearing primary responsibility for school and instructional improvement….Student effort is supported by rigorous content and instruction, which are continually monitored through multiple forms of assessment, regular observations and evaluations. (p. 29)
There are several clues in this excerpt alone which help to frame the definition of instructional leadership, including references to standards, continuous improvement, student performance, and assessment. In fact, the NAESP is quite explicit about this connection:

Our collective experience has led us to believe that the most effective way to get all students to perform at higher levels in a short period of time requires agreed-upon standards…The concept of standards – academic standards for students and professional standards for what constitutes quality in teaching – has broad appeal. Educators, policymakers, parents, business leaders and others seem to like the notion of making public our expectations for students and adults, and then holding people accountable for those expectations. The atmosphere of high-stakes accountability and testing has created significant political pressure to deliver on the standards movement’s promise of improved student achievement. (p. 1)

Sergiovanni & Starratt, in their 2002 textbook on school supervision, further emphasize this point. They frame their definition in terms of “today’s climate of reform” and state that principals “visit classrooms to help teachers improve their practice…providing helpful comments, helping teachers reflect…and conducting formal evaluations of teaching as required by district or state policy” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 4).

Fullan also recognizes this view of principals as instructional leaders, and writes that “no other sector experiences the barrage of externally imposed accountability demands, along with imposed, fragmented innovations” (2008, p. 2). In a study conducted about superintendents and their attitudes toward NCLB, researchers found that “a focus on accountability required schools and districts to train their teachers, especially around
data-driven decision-making. One superintendent mentioned, ‘It’s making instructional leaders out of my principals’” (Johnstone, Dikkers, & Luedeke, 2009, p. 17). The study goes on to conclude that “challenging accountability requirements (including success on statewide assessments…) have forced school districts to examine their day-to-day activities in order to avoid sanctions laid out as part of NCLB” (p. 17).

This move toward outcomes-based education shifts the focus of the evaluation of teachers to the academic achievement of students. The following quote sums up succinctly what this means for principals and teachers.

Building principals are charged with helping teachers improve instruction and learning while holding teachers accountable for student achievement. The challenge is how to measure good or bad teaching based on student achievement. Teachers and building administrators must work together to reflect on and make important decisions about their own practice based on student achievement data. Supervision for evaluation will have to be about engaging teachers and building administrators in instructional dialogue for the purpose of improving teaching and increasing student achievement. (Berube & Dexter, 2006, p. 12)

In a study published in 2009, Hazi and Rucinski found that most states had adopted some sort of policy as a result of recent school reform legislation that “asserted more oversight and involvement in local evaluation practices…and increased the data used in evaluation. While the effects of these policy actions on student learning remain unclear at this point, it is evident that states have moved forward in their adoption” (p. 14).

Kafka (2009) writes that “the No Child Left Behind Act, and similar measures from states and cities, demands that educators be held accountable for student
achievement at a school and classroom level. Principals experience that accountability pressure in deeply personal ways” (p. 328). Kafka goes on to argue that this pressure may be greatest in areas where there is high administrator and teacher turnover, such as in large urban districts. However, Kafka argues that NCLB is not alone responsible for much of this pressure and that “what is new is the degree to which schools are expected to resolve society’s social and educational inequities in a market-based environment” (p. 328). A market-based society is, at its core, uninterested in equality. It is “dominated by the imperatives of profit and domination rather than by human need” (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 54). Ball (2008) writes that education has become dominated by an economic perspective and that “education is now regarded primarily from an economic point of view” (p. 11). This influences the role of school administrators and what is expected from their leadership.

Contemporary approaches to supervision have been profoundly affected by the accountability context within which supervisors enact their roles as both supervisors and leaders. “In addition to being first-rate instructional leaders, principals are being exhorted to be highly skilled building managers, outstanding human resource directors, and competent negotiators” (Brown, 2005, p. 136). This expansion is, in part, due to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. The influence of this legislation and the accompanying standards movement has been profound. Ingersoll writes that “by definition, most federal legislative initiatives, whether it is intended or not, have a centralizing influence and result in an increase in external control of schools and districts” (2003, p. 69). At times it seems as if we have come full circle, back to our earliest vision of school supervision by lay persons. Once again, lay persons (this time in
the form of legislators) are having a powerful influence over the supervision of public school employees. Danielson and McGreal (2000) hold that as content standards are developed and higher standards become the norm, it becomes increasingly important to ensure that teachers can assist students in meeting these standards (p. 8). Standardized curriculum can be viewed as a bureaucratic control intended to guarantee accountability and consistency (Ingersoll, 2003, p. 103).

There is a renewed interest in closely monitoring what it is that teachers do….But checking daily lesson plans and visiting classes daily to inspect teaching often breeds resentment and results in tension between teachers and supervisors. A more impersonal way to control what it is that teachers do is to introduce standardized criterion-referenced testing and to make public the scores by class and school. Since it is accepted that what gets measured gets taught, tests serve as an impersonal method of controlling the teacher’s work. (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 15)

Toward an impersonal method of controlling teacher work.

Teachers are under more pressure than ever before to prepare their students to be successful in an atmosphere guided by externally imposed, mandated high-stakes testing. “School managers need mechanisms to learn if their teaching employees are actually complying with the policies, rules, routines, and standard operating procedures….and the most common mode is…usually referred to as classroom performance assessment” (Ingersoll, 2003, p. 110). It is in this context that the evaluation system being initiated in The District developed.
**Principal as instructional leader.**

Berube and Dexter write that the move toward school reform legislation has raised the importance of teacher supervision and evaluation (2006, p. 15). “Effective principals engage in work that supports teachers in improving their instructional practices…Effective principals are instructional leaders” (Zepeda, 2007, p. 11). Glanz (2005) holds that “principals today are ultimately responsible for providing top-quality instructional leadership that aims to promote best practices in teaching…for the chief purpose of ensuring student achievement” (p. 1).

The view of principal as instructional leader is a commonly accepted vision of current supervisory practice. This view of the principal’s role is related to the effective schools research, which determined that the teacher was the most important factor in student success. Good teachers, the research discovered, felt part of a cause beyond themselves and felt morally obligated to succeed (Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 43). It then becomes part of the principal’s work to guide these teachers as they collaborate and work toward greater student achievement, a role now referred to as instructional leadership. Burke & Krey (2006) specifically include instructional leadership in their definition of supervision. In fact, many contemporary books and journal articles on school supervision actually reference instructional leadership in their titles (Burke & Krey, 2006; Glanz, 2005; Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2009; Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2010; Holland, 2006; Ovando & Ramirez, 2007; Zepeda, 2007; Zepeda, 2009). Steffy and English (2005) go so far as to describe instructional leadership as the paramount survival skill for the contemporary school administrator faced with increased accountability. “Principals and other administrators must come to view their primary role
as one of an instructional leader promoting improved student achievement (Downey, et al. 2004, p. 7).

Glanz (2005) writes that “principals today are ultimately responsible for providing top-quality instructional leadership that aims to promote best practices in teaching and related instructional areas for the chief purpose of ensuring student achievement” (p. 1). Glanz (2005) explicitly points out that the three most important elements of successful instructional leadership are conducting instructional conferences with teachers which include modeling, providing feedback, and inquiry; providing staff development; and guiding teacher reflection. Beyond these three elements, Glanz stresses that instructional leaders emphasize academics and can establish clearly defined goals, collaborate with others, honor standards, and monitor data. Additionally, good principals hire the best teachers, retain the best teachers, and understand the research on best teaching practices.

These attributes of instructional leadership are echoed throughout the literature. Zepeda (2007) lists similar characteristics, writing that “the principal as supervisor is able to link supervision, professional development, and teacher evaluation” (p. 11). Zepeda goes a bit further than Glanz and also includes the need for “a command of the tools needed to conduct classroom observations and support the talk about teaching that occurs before and after classroom observations” (2007, p. 11). Zepeda is emphatic that “principals need to exert their instructional leadership to assist teachers’ further development as professionals while meeting the needs of students. No other activity can take priority over instructional leadership” (p. 181).

Fullan addresses the issue of instructional leadership somewhat differently, and lists six guidelines for principals. These guidelines include: de-privatizing teaching
(undoing the norm of autonomy); modeling instructional leadership; building capacity; growing leaders; diverting distracters; and being a systems leader (Fullan, 2008, p. 51). His explanations of these six guidelines include words and phrases which reiterate the ideas of Glanz and Zepeda. Included among these words and phrases used by Fullan are, for example, evidence-informed, continuous improvement, modeling, mission, and teacher competencies (2008).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2004) list six standards “for what principals should know and be able to do” (p. 6) which also reflect the model of principal as instructional leader. These standards include placing learning at the center, setting high expectations, demanding that content address standards, creating a culture of continuous learning, using various sources of data to inform instruction, and actively engaging the community. The difference here is the inclusion of the community, although the rest of the standards fall in line with what has already been addressed above.

Burke & Krey (2005) offer a definition of school supervision which alludes to much of the previously referred to aspects of instructional leadership. In their text, Burke and Krey write that “supervision is instructional leadership that focuses on purposes, relates perspectives to behavior, contributes to and supports organizational actions, coordinates interactions, provides for improvement and maintenance of the instructional program, and assesses goal achievements” (p. 395). In explaining their concept for a supervisory program, the authors continue that:

The supervisory program is a program of people, behaviors and situations. The definition of supervision gives recognition to the fact that supervision’s intent is to influence all three factors. People, behaviors and situations should affect the
teaching-learning activities so that student development shall be at its maximum.

(Burke & Krey, p. 396)

Blase and Blase (1999), after researching principal leadership and teacher development, write that effective instructional leaders “integrate reflection and growth to build a school culture of individual and shared critical examination for improvement” (p. 370). In a study regarding the instructional leadership activities of principals, Ovando and Ramirez (2007) found that the principals they researched did take on many instructional leadership measures. “These include setting clear expectations, monitoring instruction by conducting walk-through observations, and connecting staff development to the appraisal system” (p. 97). This definition includes classroom walk-throughs specifically, reinforcing the importance of evaluating teaching. Ovando & Ramirez found in their study of principal instructional leadership activities, that “monitoring instruction through walk-through observations emerged as another instructional leadership action” (p. 107).

Taken together, the previous indicators begin to create an image of what is meant when defining the principal’s role as encompassing instructional leadership. While stated in a variety of ways, monitoring the instruction in the school is exposed as an important element of instructional leadership. This has always been an important aspect of school supervision, but by defining the role of principal as instructional leader, this function of supervision becomes subtly new. For instance, as instructional leader, the principal is expected to provide feedback to teachers regarding their instruction. What is new is that the principal is now expected to model for teachers, match staff development to observed teacher needs, implement a continuous improvement cycle, provide and interpret data, and keep the school focused on collaboratively established goals and legally mandated
standards. For this study, the focus is on the evaluation activities as they pertain to the instructional leadership practices of the principal. I focus on the monitoring of instruction, and specifically, the newly implemented teacher evaluation system, with any pre and post-conferences that may be included.

**Classroom walk-throughs in the context of this study.**

Because principals are now held responsible for the academic achievement of students in their buildings, principals must know what is going on in each classroom of the building. This necessarily requires more, and more frequent, visits to classrooms. The District implemented two different walk-through models prior to TES, and TES continues this trend (although TES refers to them as pop-ins).

**Purpose and definition of walk-throughs.**

According to Whitaker (1997) principals “must make it a point to visit classrooms daily…They validate the idea that the classrooms are where the truly important activities in a school occur and that instructional leadership is the most critical responsibility of the school principal” (p. 156). It is now an expectation that administrators will walk through all classrooms frequently and regularly. This is to provide information on both quality of instruction and the quality of the curriculum, and is central to contemporary supervisory practice. Frequent visits to classrooms help the administrator know what is going on in classrooms. Classroom walk-throughs are one specific tool that administrators can use when adopting this model. The walk-through is “a short visit in the classroom, the specific focus of which is to improve instruction and student learning, promote the use of reflective dialogue...increase the visibility of the principal…and increase teacher collegiality” (Berube & Dexter, 2006, p. 14). Downey, et al. (2004), write that “through
frequent, short observations, you become familiar with the teaching patterns and decisions teachers are making on a daily basis. Over time, you will obtain far more information about teachers and the school when you stay in each classroom for just a few minutes per visit” (pg. 2). The focus is “to take a ‘snapshot’ of what is happening in the classroom” and that “school leaders should make every effort to be in classrooms conducting walks every day…in order to see trends and patterns” (teachscape, 2009, p. 49).

As a practice of supervision, walk-throughs are aimed at giving school administrators a way to quickly take an inventory of the instructional practices in their schools and to engage teachers in reflective dialogue aimed at improving teacher practice resulting in increased student achievement. The TMWT’s ultimate goal is to support teachers in becoming self-reflective and capable of improving their practice (Downey, et al., 2004, p. 13). The 2010 version of the TMWT is emphatic. “The aim is to move the supervisory approach from a hierarchical inspection approach to one that is collaborative in motivating and promoting growth” (p. 1). The intent to shift supervisory practice voiced by Downey, et al. (2004) is of significant importance to this research.

Zepeda (2007) lists walk-throughs as one form of information observation. “The informal classroom observation has evolved in the literature and in practice. Recently, there has been resurgence in attention to the informal classroom observation…sometimes referred to as pop-ins, walk-ins, or crop-ins” (p. 70). Zepeda sums up the importance of informal observations, or walk-through observations, as follows:

Informal observations are one way for principals to get to know their teachers. By taking the time to observe the work teachers do on a daily basis in their
classrooms, principals can exert informed effort and energy to assist teachers beyond formally observations. (2007, p. 70)

**Walk-throughs as “accurate” data.**

The main idea of classroom walk-throughs is that the principal, or school administrator, is frequently visiting classrooms. This provides information to the principal in the form of empirical data. “The short observation allows you to frequent all the classrooms on a regular basis... The principal will have a more accurate picture of what is going on in the school when...able to visit all of the classrooms regularly” (Downey, et al., 2004, p. 3). The CWT intends for walk-throughs to produce ‘snapshots’ and “the more snapshots in the album, the better sense we have of what is happening” (teachscape, 2009, p. 49). Walk-throughs, in any form, get the administrators out into the school building, visiting classes more, and more often, then was typical even ten years ago. The result is more data with which to engage the faculty in order to drive student achievement to a higher level. This data is intended to provide the impetus for reflective dialogue between the administrators and the staff, with this dialogue opening communication and allowing for true staff development to occur.

**Three-Minute Walk Through.**

The District, over the past decade, has adopted three versions of classroom walk-throughs. The first was the Three-Minute Walk Through (TMWT). The authors of this particular protocol for observing classroom teachers explicitly state that their model began to develop in the 1960s and has continued to develop since that time. One can distinguish the relationship to school improvement research and the reform era in the authors’ contention that the TMWT’s “ultimate purpose is to support teachers in
becoming responsible and self-analytical individuals who are continuously improving their practice” (Downey, et al., 2004, p. 13), and that “our goal is to help each teacher be committed to teaching the standards at the right level of difficulty for the students” (Downey, et al., 2010, p. 7). This particular walk-through was the first formal walk-through protocol adopted in The District. After the TMWT, this particular district moved to adopt teachscape’s version, called the Classroom Walkthrough: A Process for Outcomes-Based Instructional Improvement (CWT) in an effort to provide more easily accessed data for principals. This protocol, expressly written for the State, is designed “to drive instructional improvement” and is “designed to serve instructional leaders, including principals” (teachscape, 2009, p. 3). Walk-throughs are also endorsed by TES, but are referred to as pop-ins. They are a staple of the new system. My experiences with trainings at district-wide meetings of elementary assistant principals indicate The District’s firm endorsement of administrative walk-throughs, which are presented to administrators as a way to monitor student learning with an emphasis on the instructional leadership capacity of school administrators.

Walk-throughs are an important feature in understanding the climate surrounding the adoption of the new teacher evaluation system. Prior to The District’s adoption of these two walk-through protocols, teacher evaluation consisted solely of the State Teacher Performance Measurement System (STPMS). The STPMS was required to be completed at least twice during the first year of teaching, once per year until tenure, and then once every three years. The STPMS summative evaluation consisted of one classroom visit for at least thirty minutes, usually by the principal or assistant principal. The STPMS grew out of the work of Madeline Hunter in the 1970’s, and was a checklist
consisting of desired teacher behaviors on one side and corresponding undesirable teacher behaviors on the other. Tally marks indicated how many times each teacher behavior was observed. With the introduction of the walk-throughs, principals began going into classrooms much more frequently. Marshall (2009) describes this phenomenon as “supervising the heck out of teachers” (p. 39). The teachers’ union accepted the use of these walk-through protocols, and thus frequent administrative visits into classrooms have become the norm. The acceptable frequency of visits has shifted from once or twice per year, or once every three years for tenured teachers, to 15-20 times per year.

**Tensions Between Instructional Leadership and Supervision.**

Tensions are created when principals are expected to evaluate teachers on the one hand, and mentor teachers on the other. This study is interested in examining these tensions. Danielson acknowledges that now principals are faced with two distinct roles: that of providing accountability measures to ensure good teaching and that of providing professional development. In an earlier book (2000) by Danielson and McGreal, this fact is acknowledged in the statement that “…we can design evaluation systems in which educators can not only achieve the dual purposes of accountability and professional development, but can merge them” (2000, p. 10).

Berube and Dexter (2006) address this duality and caution that “the expected outcomes of supervision and evaluation are different. Separating supervision from evaluation is difficult for the principal charged with the responsibility of helping teachers grow professionally while also being held responsible for recommending continued employment or dismissal” (p. 11). Ovando and Ramirez (2007) warn that “essentially, the fact that the evaluator is performing dual functions – formative evaluation and summative
evaluation may, at times, create conflicts in the development of effective teaching through collaboration, staff development, and training” (p. 89). Berube and Dexter (2006) acknowledge the complexity of the principal’s role in that they are expected to act in their role as instructional leader and also act as an evaluator (p. 15). Berube and Dexter also acknowledge the complexity of the teacher’s role, in that they have to deal with the apprehension of the evaluation process.

Ingersoll, in writing about power and accountability in schools, acknowledges this conflict. “As with all employee evaluation and control mechanisms, there are two often-conflicting purposes underlying teacher evaluations – staff development and staff accountability” (2003, p. 111). Ingersoll, as a result of his research, concludes that formal evaluations do, indeed, primarily serve the purpose of control and accountability and as a result, “teachers view visits by the school administrators as events to be taken seriously” (2003, p. 112). However, Ingersoll’s research also found that less than half of the teachers he polled actually believed their evaluations to be useful tools in their own development and improvement (2003).

The District’s adoption of walk-throughs is important to note again here, in that the responsibilities of the principal became a now more complex role. Because both walk-through protocols previously adopted by The District inherently contain a post-conference opportunity for the principal to provide feedback, with the plainly stated goal of increasing professional dialogue between teachers and administrators, the principal now explicitly becomes the instructional leader who mentors, coaches, and provides professional development activities for teachers. Yet the bureaucratic hierarchy requires that principals retain their evaluative status. The tensions created are included in what this
study will investigate, and are the foundation over which the adoption of a new teacher evaluation system occurs.

**Reconciling tensions: Working together.**

Danielson acknowledges concerns over the tensions created and counters them by insisting that teachers become part of the method. The TES framework is specifically designed to draw teachers into the process, encourage teacher reflection, and promote professional growth. With the framework:

…participants can conduct conversations about where to focus improvement efforts within the context of shared definitions and understandings. When a teacher is struggling in the classroom, when a lesson is ineffective, or when students are not engaged, a comprehensive framework is useful in identifying the source of the difficulty and therefore in guiding improvement efforts. These conversations focus on means, not ends, and they are conducted in an environment of professional respect. (Danielson, 2007, p. 12)

This is reflected in the conclusions drawn by Ingersoll (2003) in his examination of teachers’ work. Ingersoll holds that “increasing the control wielded by teachers has a positive effect on relations between teachers and administrators” (p. 245), and that teachers are more apt to increase communication with administrators if they feel empowered. Ingersoll’s conclusions demand that principals find that balance between “organizational control and employee autonomy” (p. 246). Organizational control is also of interest to this study.
Instructional leadership and reflective dialogue.

This solution is also echoed by Berube and Dexter (2006) who write that “teachers and building administrators must work together to reflect on and make important decisions about their own practice based on student achievement data. Supervision for evaluation will have to be about engaging teachers and building administrators in instructional dialogue…” (p. 12). Berube and Dexter do not completely dismiss the complexity of this task, however, and still acknowledge some separation of tasks when suggesting that principals “be clear and specific when moving from the supervision mode into the evaluation mode, especially when identifying the need to develop a plan of assistance” (2006, p. 16). One solution they offer further demonstrates the difficulty in finding a solution. Berube and Dexter write that “supervision is not about judging a teacher; it is an opportunity to facilitate dialogue around what is working and what is not working in the classroom” (2006, p. 16). And yet, as our historical perspective on supervision revealed, principals are expected to judge teachers, for the most basic purpose of disposing of those judged to be ineffective.

Instructional leadership and collegiality.

The focus of the various walk-through models, and an important element of TES, is the cultivation of reflective dialogue between teachers and administrators. The focus for the TMWT (Downey, et al., 2004, 2010) is to create collegial relationships between school administrators and teachers, where authentic dialogue about teaching practice becomes the norm. Downey, et al. (2010) frame instructional leadership within the context of professional learning communities, where “all members voluntarily join collaboratively in order to accomplish a mutually desirable or sought-after product of
greater student success in learning” (pp. 169-170). “Everyone has a vested interest in
getting teachers and others to look for answers to issues and problems confronting
schools, particularly the need to maximize pupil achievement” (Downey, et al., 2010, p.
173). The CWT has a similar goal. “The centerpiece of CWT is the process of engaging
school communities in reflective dialogue about improvement in the instructional
program” with its power coming from “thoughtful reflection on that information”
teachscape, 2009, p. 44). This does represent a new vision for school supervision.

Like schools, supervision can be conventional, congenial, or collegial.

Throughout most of its history supervision has operated from within a
conventional paradigm…attempting to control teachers’ instructional behaviors.
Based on what we know about successful schools, the time has come to move
from conventional schools…and congenial schools…toward collegial schools.

(Glickman, et al., 2010, p. 6-7)

Collegial supervision and instructional leadership seem to go hand in hand, for it is
thought that through the use of collegial supervision schools will see an increase in
student achievement. Downey, et al. (2004, 2010) promote this explicitly, making a
connection between the reflective conversations of principals and teachers and increased
student achievement. Downey, et al. (2010) believe their model “greatly enhances the
chances for school improvement and for closing the achievement gap between student
groups” (p. 175). Again, in a related manner, the CWT intends to build the principal’s
capacity in “leading reflective discussions and building action plans with faculty and
staff” (teachscape, 2009, p. 38).
The Danielson Framework

The Danielson Framework, based on the work of Charlotte Danielson (2007), is the newly adopted method for summative and formative evaluations in The District. In an effort to support new forms of classroom performance management, The Danielson Framework was adopted as a part of the re-conceptualization of teacher evaluation and teacher pay that was a result of The District’s adoption of TES. The grant which funds TES was awarded to The District in the spring of 2010, with implementation of the new evaluation system beginning immediately in the upcoming school year. This grant allowed for The District to choose a method for teacher evaluation. The District hired a consulting firm which conducted a nationwide survey of various methods of teacher evaluation. This consulting firm presented their findings to a special committee set up by The District. The two main methods selected included work by Danielson and Marzano. In the end, this committee that consisted of district administrators, principals, teachers, parents, and teacher union representatives chose Danielson’s work. It was believed, at that point, that Danielson’s rubric would be easily adapted for use by all teachers and therefore represented some stability. As a result, Charlotte Danielson has been retained as a consultant to The District, and has visited with district personnel.

The Danielson framework is based on several assumptions, all of which are clearly delineated in her book that has been widely distributed to district administrators titled *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching (2nd ed.)* (2007). This book, with the second edition being published in 2007, forms the foundation for the Danielson framework. The framework is a rubric, which “can be used for a wide range of purposes, from meeting novices’ needs to enhancing veterans’ skills. Because teaching is
complex, it is helpful to have a road map through the territory, structured around a shared understanding of teaching” (2007, Danielson, p. 2). Danielson bases her work on a firm foundation on research, documentation of which is cited throughout the book, and is also addressed specifically as an appendix at the end of the book entitled “The Research Foundation.” The Praxis III criteria developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) is listed as the basis for the Framework. In the area of planning and preparation, Danielson quotes Skowron (2001), Schulman (1987), and Brooks and Brooks (1993) among others. In the area of classroom environment, Whitaker (2004), Evertson and Harris (1992), and Shalaway (2005) are prominent sources. Skowron (2001), Tomlinson (1999), and Moore (2004) are all cited as sources for instruction. For professional responsibilities, Danielson cites Colton and SparksLanger (1992, 1993), Ellwein, Graue, and Comfort (1990), Ross and Regan (1993) Tabachnick and Zeichner (1991), and Tucker and Stronge (2005).

One major departure for the Danielson framework from older methods of evaluating teachers is the focus on student learning. Danielson’s framework moves beyond a checklist of observable teacher behaviors to inclusion of student behaviors and student understanding. Additionally, the framework professes to be for more than just accountability; it is also to guide professional development. However, providing for accountability and also guiding professional development presents some difficulties for principals, as have been discussed earlier.

**Danielson’s framework designed to support teacher growth.**

Danielson’s framework was designed to “support teacher growth and development through an emphasis on formative evaluation techniques” (2000, p. 15)
which would allow for more teacher satisfaction and reflection on practice. As such, it was never designed to be utilized in teacher evaluations as a table complete with numerical values for each rating. Danielson believes that her framework provides information regarding good teaching practices and what those look like, and that these can guide evaluators and teachers alike in evaluating and reflecting on those practices. The District, however, does attach numerical values in the final evaluation stage, something not condoned by Danielson. This practice results in score averaging, which she questions. “If a teacher were found to be deficient in a particular aspect of teaching, or in an entire domain, could this poor performance be compensated by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching?” (Danielson & McGreel, 2000, p. 37).

**An explanation of the framework.**

Danielson’s Framework, utilized by TES, consists of four domains, each consisting of several sub-components. The four domains are, as adopted by The District: planning and preparation; classroom environment; instruction; and professional responsibilities. Within each domain, the sub-components are clearly delineated with four performance ratings of requires action, developing, accomplished, and exemplary. As an example, under the domain of classroom environment there are five sub-components. In looking at just one component in Table 2 one can see the difference between the four performance ratings. Excerpts from the rubric are contained in Appendix A.

This rubric assumes that accomplished and exemplary characteristics are “characteristic of experienced educators….In particular, exemplary performance reflects highly accomplished teaching, a level a novice teacher would rarely attain” (Danielson,
The District expects that exemplary teaching is not a permanent station, but that accomplished teachers may move in and out of, or visit, the exemplary category.

Table 2

Excerpt from TES Evaluation Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requires Action</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much instructional time is lost because of inefficient classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties.</td>
<td>Some instructional time is lost because classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties are only partially effective.</td>
<td>Little instructional time is lost because of classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties, which occur smoothly.</td>
<td>Students contribute to the seamless operation of classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Additionally, it is intended that performance will drive staff development individually.

An administrator, after having a pre-conference with the teacher, is to observe an entire lesson, regardless of the time that takes. Sometime after that observation there will be a follow-up conference. It is during this follow-up conference that staff development opportunities are introduced and discussed with the teacher. At the trainings offered to administrators within The District, this follow-up conference has been described as presenting an opportunity to “coach ‘em up” or mentor teachers. This is a clear example of the complex role now assumed by principals. The performance observation, a practice of accountability, is combined with an opportunity for the principal to mentor or practice instructional leadership.
The Danielson framework that is the basis for TES seeks to remedy this by asking why, not just how, and shifting the focus to purpose. An “important assumption underlying the framework for teaching is that instructional decisions are purposeful. The focus on purpose sets this Framework apart from many other teaching frameworks” (Danielson, 2007, p. 18). Additionally, Danielson stresses that teaching requires such a framework in order to become truly professional. “The work of teachers, as described in the framework for teaching, operates on the assumption that teaching is indeed professional work, with both the privileges and obligations conferred by that status” (Danielson, 2007, p. 18). Teachers make hundreds of consequential decisions every day, decisions that require professional judgment. These decisions “require familiarity with the context and sophisticated judgments about the likely consequences of different courses of action” (p. 19). Thus, according to Danielson, teaching is a profession that just as any other profession must be guided by clear standards for performance, such as the standards set forth in the framework.

**Peer evaluators.**

One new aspect of TES is the inclusion of a peer evaluator. Peer evaluators have been hired, and act in an evaluative capacity to help with classroom observations. Peer evaluators, formerly classroom teachers, have been removed from teaching duty in order to serve this function. Evaluations by peer evaluators add additional data to the final evaluations that are completed for each teacher. Peer evaluation is a new dynamic for this school district. However, peer evaluation itself is nothing new.

Evaluation by peers is seen as one way of adding professional accountability to the profession of teaching. The peer evaluator adds another layer of accountability, and
for teachers, “the influence on and assessment of their instructional practice flows through these multiple accountability relationships” (Goldstein, 2007, p. 525). Peers add additional opportunities for engaging in the instructional leadership activities of reflection and collegial dialogue. “Peer review of teaching becomes a way for collegial exchange and open reflection to take place” (Carter, 2008, p. 87). Carter continues that:

> Whether faculty become engaged in formative or summative peer review, the underlying goal of the process is to facilitate and champion excellence in teaching. Reviewers are tasked with providing a fair, compassionate, and mutually respectful experience. By creating this kind of experience, the collective wisdom of teachers in all phases of their professional development can be gathered, examined, and put to use. (p. 87)

In a study of California schools implementing a peer evaluation system, Goldstein (2004) found that those involved highlight the support of the system as most significant. However, this same study found that peer evaluations challenge the norms of school culture, and the entrenched school hierarchy that traditionally places the principal in the role of evaluator. “Charging teachers with formal responsibility for the evaluation of other teachers in particular creates the potential for a struggle between teachers and administrators over occupational boundaries” (Goldstein, 2004, p. 176). The program in California differed from TES in that peer evaluators involved in TES act as an additional evaluator, whereas in California the peer evaluators were intended to supplant principals as evaluators. Ultimately, Goldstein (2004) found that ambiguity in the application of the peer evaluator program in California led many to revert to old norms, again relying on the
principal as the regulator of teacher evaluation. This speaks to the strength of hierarchical norms that exist in schools.

Research conducted on university professors found that all participants in the peer evaluation programs have found them to be “valid and useful” (Kohut, Burnap & Yan, 2007, p. 19). Kohut, et al. stress the importance of a pre- and post-conference and write that “the pre-observation interview allows the observer to put the observed class into a broader context, while the post-observation interview allows an exchange of ideas between observer and observed” (p. 21). Overall, their research supported the use of peer observations as a way of improving teaching practice.

Schiller, Taylor, and Gates (2004) carried out research in hopes of forming a collegial group of college professors to engage in peer observation. They hoped that the resulting observations would inform their own practice as teachers. The three researchers tried to recruit other faculty members, but their efforts were thwarted. While some faculty members declined to join their group because of outstanding obligations, several also declined due to “political worries of retaliation by administrators…it was pointed out to us that our administrators could claim our teaching was weaker than desirable because we were seeking ways to improve it” (Schiller, et al., 2004, p. 170). These faculty members were also leery of the observation data being used in a punitive manner by administrators.

The data on peer evaluations seems to be a bit of a mixed bag. While teachers do find the process useful, important questions remain. It seems vital that all involved understand the process, and agree to the process. It is also important to include both pre- and post-observation conferences. The literature reviewed suggests that peer evaluators,
if utilized, should be utilized in an auxiliary role, and not left to be the sole evaluator. Teachers can be skeptical and suspicious of the process. TES includes peer evaluators, but as an additional evaluator and not the sole evaluator. The teachers’ union and The District have come to terms over the role of peer evaluators, and both groups have agreed on their role. Pre and post-observations are a part of TES as well. What remains to be answered are questions about how the role of peer evaluator is understood by teachers and principals as well as the peer evaluators themselves.

**Conclusion**

School supervision has evolved since the inception of schooling. School supervision, while once the responsibility of lay persons, evolved by the twentieth century to become the main responsibility of school principals. Much more recently, the role of school principal has been impacted by legislation, the standards movement, high-stakes testing, and public scrutiny. The principal is now expected to hire highly qualified teachers, maintain a highly effective teaching cadre, hold teachers accountable for student achievement, and simultaneously act as a coach, mentor, and provider of professional development. Principals maintain their evaluative status within the hierarchy while also seeking to engage teachers in professional reflective dialogue in a collegial setting. This duality of roles creates tension, which leads me to ask several questions. For this study, what tensions, if any, are created when principals, in a traditional sense, maintain evaluative status and at the same time are also expected to be instructional leaders who develop collegial relationships with teachers? How do principals navigate these roles? How does The District maintain control of the implementation of TES? How are peer evaluators perceived and what role do they play?
In this chapter I provided a brief history of school supervision, investigating that history by examining different historical periods of school supervision. This historical context frames our understanding of the teacher evaluation reform and expectations for how principals enact their roles as both supervisors and instructional leaders. In Chapter Four I describe the context where these roles are negotiated. I will investigate the roles of power and context in how individuals come to understand their roles. Critical discourse analysis will be presented as one method of examining the potential tensions within and between those roles. The next chapter provides a theoretical Framework around language and power that will guide the analysis.
Chapter Three
Methodological Framework

Introduction

Investigating the roles of the principal as instructional leader and as hierarchical supervisor, the tensions this creates, and how principals navigate between the roles is the focus for my research. I am also interested in how The District maintains control over this new teacher evaluation reform and what role peers play. There is a seemingly endless variety of ways in which this topic could be investigated. My interest in tension and control, and the method chosen for this research, arose organically from my readings, and specifically from one of the walk-through protocols previously adopted by The District. In this chapter I will discuss the methodological framework which, as described below, informs my research design, including my choice of methods, discussed in Chapter Four.

Tensions in Instructional Leadership as a Discursive Practice.

Downey, et al., (2004) make the following claim regarding their walk-through model. “Our walk-through model may be described as a discursive practice. This term comes from postmodern analytical thinking in which all forms of communication are examined critically” (p. 159). Downey, et al., (2004) endorse a change in the “language of exchange between principals and teachers” (p. 161). The language supported is a type of contemporary instructional leadership, and is that of normal conversation, meaning that “discussions with the principal are held in informal and unscheduled places and times…” (p. 164). This quote is continued in a way that illustrates the difficulty with this position, that these discussions are informal, yet “may later become formal if necessary”
These informal discussions and conversations are placed in contrast to “evaluations becoming part of the ‘permanent file’” (p. 164). The permanent file is related to the supervisory function of the principal, with the observation that lead up to the permanent file as part of the coaching or collegial function of the principal. The Classroom Walkthrough model (CWT) stresses that “the process focuses on understanding and supporting the improvement of classroom practice, not evaluation of the performance of specific teachers…” (teachscape, 2009, p. 54). While the process focuses on the coaching capacity of a principal, this may be quite different from the actual outcome. A principal, adhering to the protocol of the TMWT or CWT, can decide at a later time if the observations need to be followed by the formal conversation of a summative observation conference, so the underlying structure of power and control has gone unchanged in that principals maintain the ability to resort to the ‘permanent file’ if necessary. The subject of my study, TES, contains formal observations, as well as its own version of a walk-through called a pop-in, complete with a written documentation protocol that aligns TES with the Danielson Framework. Danielson and McGreal write in 2000 that “in interactions focused on learning, the supervisor’s role is more of coach and mentor, rather than one of judge” (p. 9). Yet well-meaning principals, and teachers of all sorts, may be unaware of “the ideological dimensions of their own practice. Ideologies built into conventions may be more or less naturalized and automatized, and people may find it difficult to comprehend that their normal practices could have specific ideological investments” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 90).

From the critical perspective, a statement of the conditions under which interactions of a particular type may occur is a necessary element of an account of
such interactions, and I have suggested that such a statement cannot be made without reference to the distribution and exercise of power in the institution and, ultimately, in the social formation. (Fairclough, 1995, p. 48)

What appears to be needed is an investigation which reveals the conditions under which the conversations between principals and teachers take place.

It is an age in which the production and reproduction of the social order depend increasingly upon practices and processes of a broadly cultural nature. Part of this development is an enhanced role for language in the exercise of power; it is mainly through discourse that consent is achieved, ideologies are transmitted, and practices, meanings, values, and identities are taught and learnt. (Fairclough, 1995, p. 219)

Critical Discourse Analysis

Downey, et al (2004), specifically mention discourse analysis as an important underlying factor considered in the writing of their walk-through protocol. So just what is the role of a critical discourse analysis? “For Foucault, the agent that could transform one system of knowledge and power into another was thought and critique” (Jardine, 2005, p. 117). Fairclough has a similar view: “critical language work can lead to reflexive analysis of practices of domination implicit in the transmission and learning of academic discourse and the management of learners in the struggle to contest and change such practices” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 221). Only by critically examining the language, texts, and discourses in and around education can we begin to see effects of power and domination. “A critical awareness of language is a prerequisite for effective citizenship and a democratic entitlement” (Fairclough, p. 264). Therefore, I chose CDA as a
methodological framework for my analysis. In the next section I work toward a definition of CDA.

**Toward a definition of critical discourse analysis.**

Central to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is analysis aimed at uncovering occurrences of inequality and domination, as analysis in this vein is primarily interested in social power. By carefully examining language, texts, and discourses the researcher using CDA can expose social power and occurrences of inequality and domination in hopes of bringing about social change. CDA is constructivist and assumes that reality is constructed through language.

The researcher employing techniques of CDA seeks to question what appears wholly apparent. “Critical discourse analysts take an explicit sociopolitical stance; they spell out their point of view, perspective, principles and aims, both within their discipline and within society at large…Their hope, if occasionally illusory, is change through critical understanding” (vanDijk, 1993, p. 252). Critical discourse analysts wish to change the world by providing “an account of intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society, and culture” (vanDijk, 1993, p. 253). “In the type of inquiry spawned by the critical spirit, researchers find themselves interrogating commonly held values and assumptions, challenging conventional social structures, and engaging in social action” (Crotty, 2003, p. 157).

Foucault’s more subjectivist stances serve to inform critical notions of discourse analysis. “Foucault has given us many helpful insights and analytic tools to help us remember that those things which we most take for granted in our society and educational spaces as utterly obvious…are not necessarily so, but are rather the result of human
decisions that could have been made otherwise” (Jardine, 2005, p. 9). While Fairclough’s views of critical discourse analysis serve as inspiration for my methods, Foucault’s views add depth to the more constructivist views of discourse analysis espoused by Fairclough and vanDijk.

**Exposing the effects of neoliberalism.**

Within the context of CDA, exposure to the effects of neoliberal social policies are particularly troubling. “(Neoliberal) constructions and their rationales privilege particular social goals and human qualities and currently give overwhelming emphasis to the economic role of education” (Ball, 2008, p. 13). According to Apple (2000), “rather than taking neoliberal claims at face value, we should want to ask about their hidden effects that are too-often invisible in the rhetoric and metaphors of their proponents” (p. 234).

If, as Corson claims, “much of the problem these days is that education almost everywhere is set firmly within capitalist social relations whose discourses limit the freedom of action that schools need to reform themselves” (2000, p. 116), then it is the job of the critical discourse analyst to expose these discourses. What CDA offers is a unique focus on social power. “Social power is based on privileged access to socially valued resources, such as wealth, income, position, status, force, group membership, education or knowledge” (vanDijk, 1993, p. 254).

**TES and CDA.**

Classroom walk-throughs and TES assume that all participants are aware of the social context within which they are operating, and have some measure of control over it. It is assumed, for example, that teachers can, and will be permitted to, engage in
reflective dialogue with principals on equal footing. TES is offered as a solution to the complex problem of teacher evaluation. This is a traditional view, which holds that “solving educational problems requires finding the one likely solution on which to base policy…it relies excessively on the assumptions of rationality…” (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, p. 153). “Invisibility is achieved when ideologies are brought to discourse not as explicit elements of the text, but as the background assumptions which on the one hand lead the text producer to ‘textualize’ the world in a particular way, and on the other hand lead the interpreter to interpret the text in a particular way” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 70). A certain unified set of background assumptions about how to go about the process of teacher evaluations allows TES to sound like common sense and seem like a rationale way to approach the issue.

The central methodological Framework for this research that exposes these background assumptions is a Critical Discourse Analysis, or CDA, to include the texts, discourses, and social practices of specific instances of the use of TES. It is only by examining individual instances of the use of these TES, and the accompanying protocols, that we can hope to understand how they function. “If we wish to unearth those regimes of power existing in our schools, for example, it is the cases of its actual operation that are of importance, not a general argument over its general unacceptability” (Jardine, 2005, p. 45). Yet even when examining small and individual instances of classroom observations and teacher evaluations, the task of knowing where to begin seems daunting. I used the three-dimensional Framework for CDA described by Fairclough. Fairclough’s three-dimensional approach to CDA includes examining: 1. language text; 2. discourse practice, and 3. socio-cultural practice (1995). “The method of discourse analysis
includes linguistic description of the language text, interpretation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the text, and explanation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the social processes” (p. 97). This three-pronged approach to CDA is quite useful when the researcher is examining a piece of text and trying to uncover hidden power, ideology, and dominance. It is through the use of Fairclough’s three-dimensional analytical Framework that I came to re-examine TES and its protocols, and challenge the assumptions surrounding them.

**Fairclough’s Three-Dimensional Framework for CDA**

Every instance of discourse has three dimensions: a spoken or written text; discourse practice; and social practice” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 262). These three dimensions of discourse will be analyzed in Chapters Five and Six.

This three-dimensional conception of discourse is...an attempt to bring together three analytical traditions, each of which is indispensable for discourse analysis. These are the tradition of close textual and linguistic analysis within linguistics, the macrosociological tradition of analyzing social practice in relation to social structures, and the interpretivist or microsociological tradition of seeing social practice as something which people actively produce and make sense of on the basis of shared commonsense procedures. (Fairclough, 1992, p. 72)

In the context of this study, each incidence of a teacher evaluation is at once a singular incidence and a part of a larger social practice. How TES comes to be established depends upon the individuals involved and how those individuals have come to know and understand TES. The historical context provided in the literature review serves as a
foundation for understanding how individuals come to experience and utilize TES, and the three-dimensional framework for CDA serves to inform my choice of method.

Text.

Discourse analysts refer to instances of language as text. “Text may be either written or spoken discourse, so that, for example, the words used in a conversation (or their written transcription) constitute a text” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 4). Gee (2008) refers to text as “any stretch of oral or written language such as a conversation, story, argument, report, and so forth” (p. 119). While Fairclough allows that text may also define such things as television, art, and even objects, I will limit the scope of this proposal to the definition of text as written or spoken discourse.

“Texts are social spaces in which two fundamental social processes simultaneously occur: cognition and representation of the world, and social interaction. A multifunctional view of text is therefore essential” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 6). This multifunctional view looks at texts as living organisms which, by definition, are not stagnant. Derrida (1991b) has a similar view of texts, writing that texts are “no longer a finished corpus of writing, some content enclosed in a book or its margins, but a differential network, a fabric of traces referring endlessly to something other than itself, of other differential spaces” (p. 257). Texts are spoken or written, and those texts are then heard or read, a process that can be sloppy, complicated, and ambiguous.

It is natural that people exploit the expectations necessary for successful conversation as a way of slipping their real intentions into covert layers of meaning. Human communication is not just a transfer of information like two fax machines connected with a wire; it is a series of alternating displays of behavior
by sensitive, scheming, second-guessing, social animals. When we put our words into people’s ears we are impinging on them and revealing our own intentions, honorable-or-not, just as surely as if we were touching them. (Pinker, 1994, p. 230)

TES provides many opportunities to evaluate and analyze text. Initially, there were several books and manuals to examine, including the two books that Downey, et al. (2004, 2010) use to lay out their vision of walk-throughs and the teachscape manual which lays out a similar vision, both of which were the immediate predecessors of TES. The vision of instructional leadership created by the use of these protocols impacted how roles were shaped, and created lenses through which TES was viewed. Included also are the two books by Danielson that spell out the framework for teacher evaluation adopted by The District as the foundation for TES. Those texts provide much information, but they exist as living texts that individuals use when carrying out or experiencing teacher evaluation. These interpretations, then, create further texts. My study also seek captured other texts, through observations of conversations between principals and teachers, protocol documents (the rubric), staff development around TES, and conversations with teachers, peer evaluators, and administrators. All of these texts form a web which begins to create a picture of how TES is defined by the various players involved. Fairclough believes that the “analysis of discourse practice involves attention to processes of text production, distribution, and consumption” (1995, p. 9). Fairclough continues, with a bit of warning, that “analysis of texts should not be artificially isolated from analysis of institutional and discoursal practices within which texts are embedded” (p. 9).
Linguistic analysis.

In order to expose the text, Fairclough (1995) completes “two complimentary types of analysis: linguistic analysis and intertextual analysis” (p. 188). Linguistic analysis busies itself with analysis at the level of grammar, words, sentences, and vocabulary. Instead of delineating linguistic analysis himself, Fairclough allows the definition and process to be articulated by linguists in the field.

Linguistic Systems.

Linguistic analysis, according to Gee (2008), is made up of the five systems: prosody, cohesion, overall discourse organization, contextualization signals, and thematic organization. These systems are applied to “actual instances of people ‘making sense’ using particular social languages” (p. 119) to create texts. The five systems are defined by Gee as follows: 1. Prosody – How the words and sentences sound as they are being said, including pitch, tone, volume, duration; 2. Cohesion – How the words and sentences are linked together; 3. Overall discourse organization – How are smaller units, like words and sentences, organized into bigger segments. How are smaller ideas linked together to form arguments; 4. Contextualization signals – What clues does the speaker give us that allow us to create a context for the text; 5. Thematic organization – How are themes indicated? How are they developed? “These five systems are interrelated: for instance, the devices in the first three systems are used to accomplish the functions of the last two systems” (Gee, 2008, p. 120). Gee’s five systems help us to unlock the linguistic properties of what Fairclough defines as text.

Words and meanings are contested, making simply looking at words within a text insufficient for any thorough analysis. According to Friere (2009),
As we attempt to analyze dialogue as a human phenomenon, we discover something which is the essence of dialogue itself: the word. But the word is more than just an instrument which makes dialogue possible; accordingly we must seek its constitutive elements….There is no true word that is not at the same time a praxis. Thus, to speak a true word is to transform the world. (p. 87)

Friere’s words are echoed by Lakoff who writes that “there is a paradox latent here. Language is just air after all – it is not a gun, it has no power on its own. Yet it changes reality” (2000, p. 21).

**Signs and signifiers.**

“What’s in a name is that everyone in a language community tacitly agrees to use a particular sound to convey a particular idea” (Pinker, 2000, p. 2). Pinker goes on to write that early in the 1900’s Saussure, “a founder of modern linguistics, called such a pairing the arbitrary sign and made it a cornerstone of the study of language….The arbitrary sign works because a speaker and a listener can call on identical entries in their mental dictionaries. (p. 2). The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy (1994) includes this about Saussure and signs:

Signs, which for Saussure are combinations of signifier and signified (something like a concept or element of thought, rather than a thing that is represented), are the product of ‘systems of differences’: a sign has the value that it does in virtue of its place in a network of other possible choices. (p. 326-7)

Belsey, in a way that clarifies this, writes that “if objects or ideas were knowable outside the signifiers that distinguished them from each other…meaning must depend on difference, and not on reference to things or concepts” (2002, p. 13). According to
Belsey, “there is nothing doggy about the word ‘dog’. There can’t be, since the French recognize much the same characteristics in ‘un chien’…To use a term appropriately is to know what it means” (2002, p. 11). Derrida wrote extensively about language and language structures. Derrida (1991a) writes that:

It is certain that there corresponds to the word *communication* a unique, univocal concept, a concept that can be rigorously grasped and transmitted: a communicable concept? Following a strange figure of discourse, one first must ask whether the word or signifier ‘communication’ communicates a determined content, an identifiable meaning, a describable value. But in order to articulate and to propose this question, I already had to anticipate the meaning of the word *communication*: I have had to predetermine communication as the vehicle, transport, or site of passage of a *meaning*, and of a meaning that is *one*. (p. 82)

Pinker has studied how language works within the human brain. His theory maintains that language is an instinct, not merely an invention of man. Words are more than simple, sterile, groups of letters.

The word dog does not look like a dog, walk like a dog, or woof like a dog, but it means “dog” just the same. It does so because every English speaker has undergone an identical act of rote learning in childhood that links the sound to the meaning. For the price of this standardized memorization, the members of a language community receive an enormous benefit: the ability to convey a concept from mind to mind virtually instantaneously. (Pinker, 1994, p. 75)

Pinker describes this as efficiency, which depends on “the participants’ sharing a lot of background knowledge” (1994, p. 227) such that a context is created. Pinker continues:
“when a series of facts comes in succession, as in a dialogue or text, the language must be structured so that the listener can place each fact into an existing Framework” (1994, p. 227). Pinker holds that each individual brain contains a virtual dictionary of words and a set of rules that dictate how the words should combine to convey relationships between concepts. What matters, though, is how everyone else understands what is being heard. Understanding, maintains Pinker, “requires integrating the fragments gleaned from a sentence into a vast mental database” (1994, p. 227). Pinker refers to this vast mental database as mentalese.

Gee has a similar idea to Pinker’s mentalese in mind when stating that “meanings are ultimately rooted in negotiation between different social practices with different interests by people who share or seek to share some common ground” (2008, p. 12). Gee uses the phrase discourse models in the same way that Pinker uses the term mentalese. Discourse models are frameworks “that people hold, often unconsciously, and use to make sense of the world and their experiences in it” (Gee, 2005, p. 61). What we come to recognize is that meanings are fluid, not at all fixed, and that while “many words at many points in their histories (have) meanings (that are) relatively stabilized, (this is) thanks to the fact that many people accept and share a convention” (Gee, 2008, p. 15). Meanings are contested and regulated socially, and meanings shift and change.

**TES and linguistic analysis.**

TES promotes a new vision for school supervision in an attempt to shift the definition of supervision itself, and of both observation and evaluation. This study will investigate how supervision for coaching and supervision for evaluation exist in the same space, and how individuals reconcile them. Downey, et al. (2004) view the term
supervision as “a polyvalent term…it contains many meanings and the secondary ones may have eclipsed the one intended” (p. ix).

Language is an important element in an analysis of teacher evaluation practices, including TES. “Language has become an increasingly salient element of contemporary social practices…” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. i). TES encourages a certain type of language between administrators and teachers – specific forms of questions and plans for conversation are laid out as models for administrators, thus providing the text for these conversations. There are question starters, transitions, and even phrases to avoid, all presented in Danielson’s books and documents written by The District to support TES. Included are rubrics and documents for collecting data and questions designed to encourage reflective dialogue on the part of the teacher. Downey, et al.’s walk-through model offers specific advice for supervisors. One table presented by Downey, et al. (2004) lists the “Five Elements of the Reflective Question” and provides space for “Your Reflective Question for the Mathematics Teacher” (p. 74). Pieces of advice provided in the narrative provided include “make positive statements about the person’s reflections, but exclude judgmental words about the practice itself,” and “if you find the teacher shifting to a defensive posture, insert in your statement a reminder regarding the type of conversation you wish this to be – a professional, nonjudgmental conversation that is to be interactive and thought-provoking in nature” (p. 78-79). This type of advice is continued in the Downey, et al. 2010 text, with statements like “it is helpful for individuals using the Downey approach to remember the attributes to be incorporated into the reflective question” (p. 54).
The teachscape manual includes two pages of “examples of reflective question prompts” (teachscape, 2009, p. 92-3). Danielson’s Framework also includes advice and charts for guiding conversations with teachers during the pre and post conferences. This can be considered a highly technologized use of language. Fairclough defines technologies as being “designed and refined on the basis of the anticipated effects of even the finest details of linguistic choices in vocabulary, grammar, intonation, organization of dialogue, and so forth” (1992, p. 216). The interest in language is prompted by “the wider contemporary preoccupation with design…it is increasingly seen as another material to which social technologies can be applied” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. i). Technologized language has moved beyond public language and has moved into more private arenas, including conversation. “This reflects in part the appropriation of conversation by institutions, and its investment with specific political and ideological content” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 217).

Under Fairclough’s Framework, there is another portion of the text to be revealed with what is referred to as intertextual analysis. This intertextual analysis, according to Fairclough, depends upon the linguistic features of the text, and uses those features to look beyond the immediate text into the surrounding context. Linguistics alone is not enough to form a clear picture of what is represented in the text.

**Intertextual analysis.**

Fairclough has written at great length about intertextuality. He writes that “intertextuality is basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 84). In making the point
that both linguistic and textual analysis are important, Fairclough argues that a “detailed textual analysis will always strengthen discourse analysis... Closer attention to texts sometimes helps to give firmer grounding to the conclusions arrived at without it, sometimes suggests how they might be elaborated or modified, and occasionally suggests that they are misguided” (1995, p. 187-8). Yet for Fairclough the idea of intertextual analysis goes even further, and is absolutely crucial to any thorough discourse analysis.

“Intertextual analysis crucially mediates the connection between language and social context, and facilitates more satisfactory bridging of the gap between texts and contexts, referring to my three-dimensional Framework for discourse analysis...” (p. 189). This gap between “more linguistically oriented studies of text and talk and the various approaches in the social” (vanDijk, 2001, p. 363) is acknowledged as a failing of discourse analysis. It is important to apply both a linguistic analysis and an intertextual analysis to develop a more complete image of any given text. “Integration of various approaches is therefore very important to arrive at a satisfactory form of... CDA” (vanDijk, 2001, p. 363).

Context is absolutely vital to any thorough CDA. “It should be stressed that talk and text do not always and directly enact or embody the overall power relations between groups; it is always the context that may interfere with, reinforce, or otherwise transform such relationships” (vanDijk, 2001, p. 357). vanDijk goes on to state that “given a specific context, certain meanings and forms of discourse have more influence on people’s minds than others” (p. 357). Building a picture of the context of TES, begun with the literature review, had implications on choices made regarding the research design. It was central to this study to determine how the context interacted with and
impacted the text provided by, and resulting from, TES documents and protocols. It was important, then, to include texts that exposed this context.

Critical discourse analysis, then, begins with an inspection of the words - which words are chosen, how they are placed in sequence, how they build upon one another to form larger ideas, how they provide clues as to context, and how that context is socially constructed. Fairclough’s three-dimensional Framework for CDA begs us for a complete description of the text.

**Discourse practice.**

The second dimension of Fairclough’s three-dimensional Framework involves the interpretation of the discourse practice. Fairclough (1995) places texts within the larger practice of discourse which involves the interpretation of the discourse practice and its relationship to the text, including the production, dissemination, and utilization of the text. Fairclough specifies that “in the interpretation phase of analysis, the aim is to specify what conventions are being drawn on and how” (1995, p. 263). One can begin to look beyond the immediate text into broader discourse. According to Foucault, “the question posed by language analysis of some discursive fact or other is always: according to what rules has a particular statement been made, and consequently according to what rules could other similar statements be made” (1972, p. 27). These rules, with regards to TES, are illuminated through the literature review on school supervision. An analysis of discourse is searching to understand exactly how statements come to be formed, how specific statements become possible at all, and how these statements rule out the possibility of other statements. Foucault’s work included the examination of discourses.

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault speaks to the analysis of discourse:
We must grasp the statement in the exact specificity of its occurrence; determine its conditions of existence, fix at least its limits, establish its correlations with other statements that may be connected with it, and show what other forms of statement it excludes. We do not seek below what is manifest the half silent murmur of another discourse; we must show why it could not be other than it was, in what respect it is exclusive of any other, how it assumes, in the midst of others and in relation to them, a place that no other could occupy. (1972, p. 28)

**What is discourse?**

And yet what, exactly, is a discourse? Foucault writes at length about several discourses, one of which is the discourse of doctors. “Qualitative descriptions, biographical accounts, the location, interpretation, and cross-checking of signs, reasonings by analogy, deduction…and many other forms of statement are to be found in the discourse of nineteenth-century doctors” (1972, p. 50). What Foucault questions is how statements are linked together, what binds them together, and why these statements are chosen over others. The answers to these questions come after discovering “the law operating behind all these diverse statements, and the place from which they come” (p. 50). For example, discourse, then, is the broad construct that allows doctors to make certain statements and allows others to understand these statements as coming from doctors. “Medical statements cannot come from anybody; their value, efficacy, even their therapeutic powers, and, generally speaking, their existence as medical statements cannot be dissociated from the statutorily defined person who has the right to make them” (Foucault, p. 51). Doctors make certain statements. In other words, they use a particular language. When a person speaks using this language we recognize that person as a
doctor. If a person claiming to be a doctor used a different language then that person’s status as a doctor might be questioned. The discourse surrounding doctors is unique to doctors, and yet remains familiar enough to be recognizable by others. The same is true of other professionals, including educators. Downey, et al. (2010) acknowledge that a unique language is reserved for school principals. “The language school administrators typically use at the juncture of their relationship with teachers reveals assumptions about their role as the ‘boss’” (p. xx).

Gee defines discourses by seeking to answer the questions of what your position is when you are speaking and what it is you are doing. “When you speak or write anything, you…project yourself as a certain kind of person, a different kind in different circumstances. You also project yourself as engaged in a certain kind of activity” (2005, p. 22). This is the extension of the mentalese that Pinker refers to, the human mind’s ability to draw inferences quickly based upon what we see and hear. The human mind seeks to sort and classify. “Lumping things into categories – giving them a category label in mentalese – allows one, when viewing an entity, to infer some of the properties one cannot directly observe, using the properties one can observe” (Pinker, 1994, p. 149). This helps to create a more efficient atmosphere for communication.

**Discourse and social practice.**

No discourse takes place within a vacuum, but is instead situated within a vast social context. This social context molds the discourse, even while the discourse is helping to mold the social context. According to Corson (1995):

This means that in any context the prevailing constraints of social structure interact with the social behavior and social location of individuals in such a way
as to add or subtract shades of meaning or significance, so that what is said and
the way in which it is said is heavily influenced by factors external to the
individual…the meaning of any item of discourse cannot be disentangled from its
social context. (p. 10)

There are, of course, many different social contexts in play simultaneously, several of
which may be in direct competition. This serves to complicate any unveiling of the
surrounding context. “Analysis of a particular discourse as a piece of discursive practice
focuses upon processes of text production, distribution, and consumption…these
processes are social and require reference to the particular economic, political and
institutional settings within which discourse is generated” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 71). In
later writing, Fairclough (1995) addresses the implication of this statement.

From the critical perspective, a statement of the conditions under which
interactions of a particular type may occur is a necessary element of an account of
such interactions, and I have suggested that such a statement cannot be made
without reference to the distribution and exercise of power in the institution and,
ultimately, in the social formation. (p. 48)

Discourse is the place where power comes to be played out. vanDijk (2008b)
writes that power is enacted and reproduced through discourse. “Without communication
– text and talk – power in society can hardly be exercised and legitimized…Discourse
structurally shows and communicates these crucial conditions of reproduction for all
societal levels, dimensions and contexts” (p. 64). The control of discourse allows for
social control.
**TES as a discursive practice.**

New discourses surrounding educational supervision and leadership practice have emerged around the practice of instructional leadership. The TMWT explicitly defines itself as a discourse practice, very deliberately emphasizing the relationship between principals and teachers as it is defined through their protocol for observations, including the reflective question that is at the core of the TMWT. In their 2004 text, Downey, et al., devote an entire chapter to understanding the TMWT as a discursive practice. They continue this in the 2010 text:

The term discursive practice…means attention to how language and linguistic practices embedded in social contexts involving subordination and domination are used to produce and reproduce those forms in the larger society. And schools are time-honored social mechanisms for the reproduction of the social order…(Downey, et al., p. xviii)

In a similar fashion, TES relies on teacher reflection and reflective dialogue between teachers and supervisors. Analyzing TES as a discursive practice should reveal the relationship between teachers and principals. Principals participate in a distinct discourse. They say and do certain things that result in their identification as principals. The same can be said for teachers, who also have a unique discourse which defines them as teachers. Principals and teachers do not necessarily have access to the same discourses, thereby impeding any efforts at true collegial relationships. In the case of TES, a CDA would investigate various discourses and who has access to those discourses. Because discourses are so instrumental in defining individuals, they are privileged. “An analysis of the various modes of discourse access reveals a rather surprising parallelism between
social power and discourse access: the more discourse genres…they may actively control or influence, the more powerful social groups are” (vanDijk, 1993, p. 256).

**Power.**

Any CDA concerns itself with questions of power - who yields power, how power is used, who feels disempowered, and how power ultimately shapes discourses. Arriving at a definition of power is no straightforward task. Power is complicated, can be conceived as both positive and negative, and manifests itself in numerous ways through language, which is why it is such an important feature of CDA.

**Discursive power.**

For most everyday human purposes, power is exerted through verbal channels: Language is the vehicle for identifying, manipulating, and changing power relations between people (Corson, 1995, p. 3). “Power is not a substance, nor a mysterious property, but a certain type of relation between individuals” (Olssen, Codd & O’Neill, 2006, p. 24). In general, two views of power stand out in the literature.

Two conceptions of power have dominated Western political thought in the modern period. One…is the idea of power as a simple quantitative phenomenon. The second, more complex, understanding is that of power as involving not only a capacity but also a right to act, with both capacity and right being seen to rest on the consent of those over whom the power is exercised. (Hindess, 1996, p. 1)

These two types of power have been described by Fairclough as the power within discourse and the power behind discourse. The first type of power, a quantitative phenomenon, aligns with Fairclough’s definition of power within discourse. Hindess’ second concept of power is similar to what Fairclough terms the power behind discourse.
It is at this point that the concept of power becomes dense and multi-faceted with far reaching effects. “Our identities and actions are multiple and complicated; we are positioned in different ways among various axes of power and within a nexus of shifting relations and contexts” (Buras & Apple, 2006, p. 9). Foucault underscores the concept of power behind discourse by asking several questions.

Who, among the totality of speaking individuals, is accorded the right to use this sort of language? Who is qualified to do so? Who derives from it his own special quality, his prestige, and from whom, in return, does he receive if not the assurance, at least the presumption that what he says is true? (Foucault, 1972, p. 50)

Much of the poststructuralist view of power has been informed by Foucault. One of Foucault’s thoughts on power is that it is “co-extensive with the social body; there are no spaces of primal liberty between the meshes of its network” (1980b, p. 142). What Foucault stresses here is that power is ubiquitous. Simply put, power is. Foucault would have us understand that power is circulated within systems, including those such as TES. Power “needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 61). It is important to note that power is seen as productive.

What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weight on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse… (and is)…much more than a negative instance whose function is repressive. (Foucault, 1972, p. 119)
“In Foucault’s analysis, power is exercised rather than possessed, and incorporated into practices rather than in agents or interests” (Olssen, et al., 2004, p. 23).

TES is intended to disrupt the traditional exercise of power that results from bureaucracy and hierarchy in schools, primarily through the use of the reflective dialogue during the post conference. The reflective question promotes, according to Downey, et al. (2004), a genuine conversation which “de-bureaucratizes schools by changing the anchor for the superior/subordinate relationship. By abolishing the axis of control as the primary locus for evaluation…a new dialogic model of professional work is created” (p. 162). By focusing on the reflective question “the positional base of both the teacher and principal is equalized and becomes collegial” (p. 162).

Foucault might argue that the relationship has not been equalized at all, but instead that an environment of informality has only made more subtle the unequal relationship that remains. Further, Foucault may interpret the observations inherent in the walk-throughs as surveillance of teachers, the frequency of which ensures increased surveillance of teachers. Power, in that case, is put into practice more than being possessed. Foucault writes about surveillance in terms of an inspectorial gaze. “An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorizing to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself” (Foucault, 1980a, p. 155). The result of the frequency of walk-throughs is that teachers internalize the behaviors being observed. “This message might be difficult to hear, and even more difficult to accept: that our very desire to make things better for…our students may be itself caught under ‘the gaze’ and in the disciplining techniques we are attempting to outrun” (Jardine, 2005, p. 75). Getting to the
root of surveillance with regards to TES was the driving force in designing this research. Towards this end, the selection of texts will be critical. The texts selected need to assist with exposing the underlying ideology of TES.

**Ideology.**

Robinson defines ideology as “any system of ideas, expressed in discursive practices, that distorts reality in order to serve the interests of a privileged individual or group” (1995, p. 89). vanDijk (2008b) establishes ideology as central to understanding “discourse in the enactment or legitimisation of power” (p. 33). His view of ideology stresses the social context and resulting norms and values that allow one group to remain favored. “An ideology according to this analysis is a complex cognitive framework that controls the formation, transformation and application of other social cognitions, such as knowledge, opinions and attitudes, and social representations” (vanDijk, 2008b, p. 34).

Ideology is the social construct which allows some to be advantaged while others are disadvantaged. This affects the flow of power. “This means that power is described as a relational process that is embodied in context-specific situations and is partially identifiable through its ideological effects on the lives of people” (Powers, 2007, p. 28). Those groups advantaged by existing ideologies can use their advantage to exercise power through consent. “The prevailing matrix of power (is) sustained ideologically as elites (build) on existing forms of common sense…and (compromise) with subordinate groups to secure their assent” (Buras & Apple, 2006, p. 4). In this way, subaltern groups become complicit in their own domination.

Ideology is often inscribed as common sense and social truths that come to be accepted without question. These truths so permeate our thinking that they are often
nearly invisible. Ideologies frequently privilege one group of people over another, and can allow for domination masked as common practice.

The power to make language and through it meaning has been vested in one powerful group for so long and so totally that that perception became a transparent lens through which we viewed “reality”: the view of that group seemed to all of us the plain, undistorted, normal and natural view, of the only view imaginable. (Lakoff, 2000, p. 19)

Fairclough clarifies the term common sense to mean “common sense in the service of sustaining unequal relations of power” (2001, p. 70). Fairclough further suggests that “discursive practices are ideologically invested in so far as they incorporate significations which contribute to sustaining or restructuring power relations” (1992, p. 91). Ideologies serve to maintain unequal power relations and can be used by those with power for the purpose of preserving their power. Ideologies are effective because they are pervasive and invisible, an unspoken truth. “Ideology is seen as something that somehow makes its effects felt on people in the economy, in politics, in culture and education, and in the home, without too much effort. It is simply there” (Apple, 1993, p. 15).

The idea that ideological saturation permeates our lived experience enables one to see how people can employ frameworks which both assist them in organizing their world and enable them to believe they are neutral participants in the neutral instrumentation of schooling…while at the same time, these frameworks serve particular economic and ideological interests which are hidden from them. (Apple, 2009, p. 20)
And yet, as Foucault would remind us, these ideologies have been put in place by the actions of humans. “Foucault has given us many helpful insights and analytic tools to help us remember that those things which we most take for granted in our society and educational spaces as utterly obvious…are not necessarily so, but are rather the result of human decisions that could have been made otherwise” (Jardine, 2005, p. 9). Critical discourse analysts seek to uncover instances of ideologies providing an unfair advantage to the powerful in order to provide respite for those groups of people disadvantaged by prevailing ideologies. Gee (2008) believes that ideology creates an “upside down” reality, and that “things are not really the way the elite and powerful believe them to be, rather their beliefs invert reality to make it appear the way they would like it to be, the way it ‘needs’ to be if their power is to be enhanced and sustained” (p. 28).

Such constraints impose limitations which have become so intimately a part of the way that people experience their lives that they no longer experience these systems as limitations but embrace them as the very structure of normal and natural human behaviour. (Olssen, et al., 2006, p. 39)

Piazza is a bit more generous in providing a definition of ideology, including an “upside” as well as a “downside.” She writes that “the upside of common sense knowledge is that it enables humans to predict everyday social activity and taken-for-granted routines that organize society….The downside is that people may no longer question a statement’s validity” (2007, p. 12). Like Pinker, Piazza sees some utility in being able to quickly predict, but emphasizes that this comes at a cost - the invisibility of the underlying ideology.
Coercion/Consent.

Related to the discussion of ideology are the concepts of power gained through coercion and consent. Power can be accumulated through coercion and power can be accumulated through consent. “The coercive power of the military…will rather be based on force, the rich will have power because of their money, the…persuasive power of parents, professors, or journalists may be based on knowledge, information, or authority” (vanDijk, 2001, p. 335). Power is directly connected to control. “Groups have (more or less) power if they are able to (more or less) control the acts and minds of members of other groups” (p. 355).

Control gained through coercion is a relatively simple concept to grasp. One is coerced, due to some overt threat, to comply. Watching a recent uprising in Iran be squelched through brute physical force is just one example of this kind of power and control. However, “Foucault recommended that we direct our attention away from our understanding of power as the advantage that comes from superior brute strength and the willingness to exert it” (Jardine, 2005, p. 39). “In developed modern societies, control is exercised in a modern way that gives stability by basing power on wide-ranging consent and agreement…noncoercive ‘force’ is said to penetrate consciousness itself so that the dominated become accomplices in their own domination” (Corson, 1995, p. 11). Apple (2009) writes that “institutions of cultural preservation and distribution like schools create and recreate forms of consciousness that enable social control to be maintained without the necessity of dominant groups having to resort to overt mechanisms of domination” (p. 2). This type of control can be defined as social power, where actions and communication are controlled. “Such control is pervasive in society. Few people
have the total freedom to say and write what they want, where and when they want and to whom they want. There are social constraints of laws…or of norms of appropriateness” (vanDijk, 2008b, p. 9).

Gramsci, having developed his ideas in the Marxist tradition, “describes the organization of consent through invisible cultural dominance rather than through visible political power” (Corson, 1995, p. 11). Gramsci believed that “more obvious forms of the exercise of power are not always the most effective instruments” (Hindess, 1996, p. 6).

The “spontaneous” consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is “historically” caused by the prestige…which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production. (Gramsci, 1972, p. 12)

Power through consent depended on what Gramsci termed ideological hegemony, and he believed it was “an ‘implicit philosophy’ in the practical activities of social life, backgrounded and taken for granted” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 70).

*Disciplinariness*

Foucault wrote extensively about this phenomenon, and often framed it within the context of discipline. Disciplining is a monitoring technique that serves to normalize modern behavior, “Disciplinary power becomes a replacement for coercive forms of power” (Anderson, 2001, p. 208).

Foucault describes discipline as a specific form of power…It is a power exercised over one or more individuals in order to provide them with particular skills and attributes, to develop their capacity for self-control, to promote their ability to act
in concert, to render them amenable to instruction, or to mould their character in
other ways. (Hindess, 1996, p. 113)

Foucault believed that our society had become a disciplinary society as a result of the
desire for efficiency that required a controllable work force. “Power is no longer
substantially identified with an individual who possesses or exercises it by right of birth;
it becomes a machinery that no one owns” (Foucault, 1972, p. 156). The machinery of
organization, the classifying, differentiating, categorizing, excluding, individualizing,
hierarchizing, or identifying (Olssen, Codd, & O’Neill, 2004, p. 31) needed to
accomplish this leads us “to see ourselves and others as mere collections of objective
traits and pressures us to feel obliged to either exercise or curtail each trait, by rewarding
or punishing it, depending on its social usefulness” (Jardine, 2005, p. 39). This machinery
is described by Foucault as “quite different from and more complicated, dense and
pervasive than a set of laws or a state apparatus” (1972, p. 158).

To be able to control/prescribe/punish/reward every action of every person one
must be able to classify everything in order to know about it. These activities
constantly and mutually feed one upon the other in a vicious vortex which has the
objectified individual as its product, target, and premise…Foucault identified the
gaze, panopticism, the examination, and the imperative to speak as the
disciplinary techniques used to cause every act and every person to become
known. They are the monitoring techniques. (Jardine, 2005, p. 57-8)

Through monitoring techniques individuals are normalized to conformity with their own
consent. “It’s impossible to get the development of productive forces characteristic of
capitalism if you don’t at the same time have apparatuses of power” (Foucault, 1980a, p. 158).

Traditionally, power was what was seen, what was shown, and what was manifested and, paradoxically, found the principle of its force in the movement by which it deployed that force…Disciplinary power…is exercised through its invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility. In discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection. (Foucault, 1972, p. 199)

It is the normalization this causes that “becomes one of the great instruments of power at the end of the classical age…the power of normality imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps…to render differences useful by fitting them one to another” (Foucault, 1972, p 196-7).

Disciplinary power relies on seeing and being seen. As a result, surveillance becomes integrated into the fiber of society. Foucault believed that surveillance was superior to force and that being seen was so pervasive and seemed such a natural state of affairs that individuals internalized the behaviors desirable and thus governed themselves. He used the example of prisons to make this point, describing a particular type of architecture used in prison design – the panopticon. In simple terms, this architectural device allowed each inmate to be seen on a constant basis. Of course, not everyone can actually be seen at one time, but “because those being observed in any panopticon do not see their central overseer, they do not know whether or not they are being observed at any
particular time” (Jardine, 2005, p. 61). This is a distinct advantage of the panopticon, which comes by “instilling into the observed the belief that, at any moment, they might be observed – that, in effect, they are observed at all times” (Jardine, p. 61). With the design of panopticon, “the principle of the dungeon is reversed; daylight and the overseer’s gaze capture the inmate more effectively than darkness, which afforded after all a sort of protection” (Foucault, 1972, p. 147). The panopticon became a metaphor for Foucault, one used to demonstrate the effects of the institutional gaze. The effects of the panopticon are not solely felt by those being observed. “The controlled and the controllers all get caught up in the supervising gaze” (Jardine, 2005, p. 61). The result of the panoptic gaze is that prisoners will self-regulate their own behavior. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005), write that “much of the power of this model lies in the fact that prisoners do not know when they are being watched and thus must self-regulate themselves. They thus sustain…the panoptic regime, making it seem ever so natural and normal” (p. 118).

 Discipline and TES.

 Part of a critical discourse analysis of TES involves describing it as a form of control, whether through consent or coercion. Teachers’ work is controlled, in part, by increased administrative walk-throughs and TES. Teacher complicity with the use of additional observations may indicate that they are being controlled with their consent. The views of Foucault are worthy of note here.

 Foucault focuses on those forms of knowledge and techniques of power that serve to discipline and train human beings and, in doing so, turns them into the sorts of objects which society needs. To the extent that disciplining power is successful,
we become (wittingly or not) complicit in its continuance and maintenance. This disciplining occurs through the exercise of classification, surveillance, normalization, reward, and punishment – all terms which are desperately familiar to educators. (Jardine, 2005, p. 24)

**Social Practice.**

Power allows for control of language and meanings, or discourse. This brings us full circle, back to language and discourse. “In using the term ‘discourse’, I am proposing to regard language use as a form of social practice, rather than a purely individual activity or a reflex of situational variables” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 63). This is the third prong of Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework. “A cornerstone of poststructuralist ideas about language is that the meaning of any item of discourse cannot be disentangled from its social context” (Corson, 1995, p. 10).

The social practice provides the broad umbrella for understanding. “Concepts do not remain still very long. They have wings, so to speak, and can be induced to fly from place to place. It is this context that defines their meaning” (Apple, 1993, p. 16). As you may recall from earlier in this chapter, Gee explains discourse models and how they help us understand and give context to the words around us. To expand on the earlier definition, discourse models are:

- the largely unconscious theories we hold that help us make sense of texts and the world. Discourse models are simplified, often unconscious and taken-for-granted, theories about how the world works that we use to get on efficiently with our daily lives. We learn them from experiences we have had, but crucially, as these
experiences are shaped and normed by the social and cultural groups to which we belong. (Gee, 2005, p. 71)

Gee points to the discourse models as an important tool for discourse analysts. They mediate between the micro and macro levels of institutional discourse (Gee, 2005, p. 71). An important part of understanding discourse models is appreciating what they exclude as well as what they include. Gee (2005) gives, as an example, the word bachelor. This word is meant to include unmarried males, but its lived meaning also excludes gay males and priests, among others.

vanDijk devotes an entire book to the development of a theory of context. He defines contexts, in brief, as “subjective mental models – context models – of participants. Such a theory avoids the determinism of direct social influences…offering a much more sophisticated analysis of the complex structures of contextual influence on text and talk” (vanDijk, 2008a, p. 217). Foucault frames this discussion as truth and regimes of truth. Power produces truth and regimes of truth. “Each society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 72-3). What counts as true is “enforceable, efficient, monitorable, and controllable in ways that are accepted” (Jardine, 2005, p. 47). Truth, according to Foucault, “is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extends it. A ‘regime’ of truth” (1984a, p. 74). Foucault viewed this as a cautionary tale. “We need to become aware of the rules that explain and support the claim of our knowledge as truth as well as those that disqualify other knowledge(s) from being true” (p. 48).
The essential political problem for the intellectual is not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology, but that of ascertaining the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth. The problem is not changing people’s consciousness – or what’s in their heads – but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. It’s not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power (which would be a chimera, for truth is already power), but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic, and cultural, within which it operates at the present time. (Foucault, 1984a, p. 74-5)

It is possible to view TES as a regime of truth, having emerged from a politics of truth. TES has been presented as a rational solution for teacher evaluation, based on accepted norms and accepted knowledge of what it means to supervise and teach.

Apple writes about this as official knowledge, that knowledge which is accepted as true. “The meanings, interests, and languages we construct are bound up in the unequal relations of power that do exist” and that this allows the setting of “limits on what appears rational and reasonable, indeed on what appears sayable and thinkable” (Apple, 1993, p. 31). What counts as knowledge, what counts as true, is inseparable from relations of power. Truth, in these terms, is not permanent or static. Truth is fluid and contested, a result of the continuing circulation of power.

Conclusion

My research involves completing a critical discourse analysis on a current method of teacher evaluation. This investigative technique is underpinned by a thorough
knowledge of the epistemological and axiological orientations of discourse analysis and critical theory. While Chapter Two laid out the historical context for supervision, this chapter presented a framework for analysis of TES. Utilizing Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework for CDA, supported by Gee’s concepts of linguistic analysis, provides a structure for this research. In Chapter Four I present my research design for completing a critical discourse analysis.
Chapter Four
Research Design

Introduction

This research is designed to analyze the practice of the new teacher evaluation system recently enacted in The District of my study. For this study I investigated what tensions, if any, were created when principals, in a traditional sense, maintain evaluative status and at the same time are also expected to be instructional leaders who develop collegial relationships with teachers? How do principals navigate these roles? How did The District control the reform? What role did peers play? This new evaluation system has been implemented, due in large part to a private grant, allowing investigation from the onset of social practices and how roles are defined and negotiated as power is produced and distributed. The participants in this research included district administrators, principals, teachers, and peer evaluators. The process and organization of language began with a linguistic analysis and continued with a search for themes related to my methodological framework.

Research Questions

TES has been implemented with the express purpose of evaluating teachers. The language within TES asks that principals engage in collegial dialogue with teachers during post-conferences. What tensions, if any, are created when the principal, in a traditional, hierarchical function, maintains evaluative status while at the same time is expected to be the instructional leader and develop collegial relationships with teachers? How are these roles navigated within the enactment of TES? What is the social practice
of the new teacher evaluation system recently enacted in The District? How did The District maintain control of this new teacher evaluation reform? How were peer evaluators perceived by others and what role did they play?

**The District**

The large, urban school district in the Southeast (The District) that is the subject of my research has recently received a large grant, part of which requires a new teacher evaluation system which, for the purposes of this dissertation, will be referred to as the Teacher Evaluation System (TES). This system has been in place from the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, with mandatory trainings for teachers and administrators provided intensely by The District during the summer of 2010, just prior to the opening of the new school year. The new system also utilizes peer evaluators, a new dynamic for this school district.

The District lies in a state that has historically attempted to maintain control over public schools and teaching. The District has, historically, reflected this attitude in its own attempts at controlling teaching, teachers, and the curriculum. TES represents a new method of controlling the work of teachers, a method that represents a more complete effort at control.

**Participants**

Participants for this research were selected to represent various levels in the bureaucratic hierarchy of The District. Nine participants were included in this research, representing district level administrators, school principals, peer evaluators, and teachers. The school principals, peer evaluators, and teachers represented two different elementary schools. My experiences within The District are also part of the research, and these were
described in Chapter One. Participants had the research described to them, and each signed an informed consent prior to any interview or observation. Additionally, participants were given a copy of The District’s permission for the research to be conducted (see Appendix B), and a letter from me fully explaining the research (see Appendix C). The participants could choose to drop out at any time. Although one dropped out before the onset of her involvement, all other participants remained in the study throughout. All participants will be referred to in the analysis by pseudonyms selected by me and contained in Table 3.

Table 3

*Participant Pseudonyms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Administrator A</th>
<th>Dawn</th>
<th>Key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Administrator B</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>District Administrators names begin with D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal names contain an L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher names contain a T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer names contain “ee”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Those associated with Jefferson all begin with J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Those associated with Southern Pine all begin with S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>Southern Pine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A</td>
<td>Jamalia</td>
<td>Principal B</td>
<td>Sally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Teacher B1</td>
<td>Stefanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher B2</td>
<td>Stacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluator A</td>
<td>Jeenie</td>
<td>Peer Evaluator B</td>
<td>Seelie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the participants included in this study were a part of the implementation of TES from the start. All participated in trainings required by The District related to TES. In this respect, they were all experiencing the implementation simultaneously.
Gender.

All participants in this study were female. My intention was to represent the majority of elementary principals in The District. While my literature review reported that females remain under-represented in administrative roles in schools that is not the case in The District, especially within elementary education. It is to be noted that in The District elementary school teachers and principals are overwhelmingly female, as are the elementary district level administrators and administrators associated specifically with TES. As of July 7, 2011, at least 82% of elementary principals were female. This number came from a published list of principal names, where I counted as female all female names, excluding Jaime, Lynn, Terry, and Terri. The 82% could be as large as 84% if those names represent females.

The race of the participants was not a guiding factor in their selection, and no formal method of collecting that information was utilized. It appeared to this investigator that all participants were Caucasian.

District level administrators.

The two district administrators included in the study, Dawn and Debbie, are directly responsible for some aspect of TES. Dawn is one of three administrators directly involved as a supervisor of the TES Program. In her current role she is responsible for district implementation of TES and is a spokesperson for The District on TES issues with parents, teachers, and school administrators. Dawn taught for several years, was an assistant principal, and was a principal, all within The District prior to being assigned as an administrator for the TES program. The other district administrator, Debbie, also taught for several years, was an assistant principal, and a principal all within The District.
In her role in The District, Debbie has coordinated all of the training for administrators and teachers regarding TES and has been involved in district meetings with Charlotte Danielson. The two district-level administrators are the key informants for this research. Dawn and Debbie are both known to me personally and although I have worked with both of them in different capacities, my current position is in a different division altogether and my duties are unrelated to theirs. I have developed professional working relationships with both of these women, and their selection was also a result of my trust in their ability to communicate with me honestly. Their willingness to participate in this research as key informants was a result of their trust in me as well. My access to these two administrators may have been facilitated because of my relationships with them.

**Principals.**

Two principals, Jamalia and Sally, were selected as participants for this study. Neither principal had any prior working relationship with me. These two principals were selected purposefully, and were selected with assistance from the district level administrators. My intent was to identify two principals operating in school cultures which would allow for collegial relationships to develop between themselves and teachers. Purposively selected sites, identified as collegial settings, helped to provide information on principals that seemed to the district administrators as more adept at creating collegial relationships with teachers. These principals were also viewed as capable of beginning the work of TES without major issues with regards to implementation. It was an expectation that this would allow for a rich source of data on the enactment of principal instructional leadership and evaluation within the context of TES, as these principals were viewed by Dawn and Debbie as successfully enacting both
instructional leadership and supervision. The type of sampling utilized for the purpose of selecting principal participants is “based on assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). Because Dawn and Debbie, the district administrators, are known to me, I trusted them to help me locate rich sources of data. I acknowledge, however, the possibility that their choices may have been self serving.

Jamalia had been at Jefferson Elementary for five years. She began as the assistant principal, and was just finishing up her first full year as principal. Jamalia spent her entire career in The District, having started as a teacher. Sally was completing her first year in any capacity at Southern Pine Elementary having previously been an assistant principal in The District at a different elementary school. Sally was a teacher in The District, but came to The District after holding a series of jobs related to education in various locations due to her husband’s military career.

Schools.

The selection of schools was directly connected to the selection of principals, which dictated which schools were selected. Both of these schools were described as exhibiting collegial relationships between the principal and teachers by Dawn and Debbie, my key informants. Jefferson and Southern Pine elementary schools were quite different schools. Jefferson Elementary was an urban, high-poverty, high-minority school. The minority population at this school was mainly Black students. Southern Pine Elementary was a rural school. The minority population at this school was mainly Hispanic students. School statistics and demographics are listed in Table 4. While Jefferson had fewer students than Southern Pine, they both had the same number of
teachers. This is explained by Jefferson’s Title I status which was responsible for funding additional teacher units.

Table 4

*School Statistics and Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jefferson Elementary</th>
<th>Southern Pine Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free and Reduced Lunch rate</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers.**

My purpose was to search for teachers that were open and interested in sharing their experiences with the new evaluation process. It was also important that these teachers be tenured. Tenure, in The District, implies at least three years of experience, and provides some contractual safety for teachers that may have positively affected their willingness to participate.

These teachers were selected by the principals, who were asked to invite teachers to participate in this study based on this criterion. Both principals selected two teachers. Jamalia from Jefferson Elementary initially selected two teachers, but only one participated in this study. Due to the time of the school year, it was not possible to include another teacher. By the time the one teacher decided not to participate there would not have been enough time left in the school year to include a different teacher. Sally from Southern Pine Elementary selected two teachers who both participated in the study. I did not know any of these teachers, or have any prior experiences with them. All
teacher participants were tenured and had been at their current school sites at least five years. These teachers were also deemed by their principals to be effective teachers and while this may have been a determining factor for principals this was not one of my original criteria. I did not ask the principals for any specific type of teacher, just ones that they thought would agree to participate. Once the principals agreed to participate they selected the teachers that they thought might be willing to participate. I met with each of these teachers individually to explain my research. Each had the opportunity to ask questions, ask for clarification, and decline participation. One teacher did decline. Having the principals select the participants is acknowledged as a limitation of the study. It is possible that these teachers felt somehow obligated to comply with the assumed wishes of their principals. I was sensitive to this, however all three teachers seemed open and at ease during our interviews and observations. None asked for anything to be off the record, and all three seemed eager to comply by returning my phone calls and making arrangements to meet me. All three remained engaged in the interviews as long as I was willing to engage them. None of the teachers cut me off or attempted to leave early.

Janet was from Jefferson Elementary, and had been there for seven years. While originally getting a degree in education she stayed away from the field, returning only later in life. Janet expressed that her love for the children was the determining factor in choosing to return to her original career.

Stephanie was from Southern Pine Elementary, where she had been a teacher for several years. Stephanie was a special education teacher and had a special needs child of her own. Stacy, also from Southern Pine Elementary, started her career as an educator, but then left the profession to work in another field. Stacy returned to education eight
years ago, and spent a few years in a private religious school prior to her arrival at Southern Pine Elementary.

**Peer evaluators.**

Peer evaluators are assigned to specific schools, so the choice was forced based on the schools chosen. Schools are assigned various numbers of peer evaluators, based on the projected number of observations necessary. Dawn was able to provide the names of all peers working at Jefferson and Southern Pine Elementary Schools. I contacted these peers through my private email and arranged to meet them to describe my research and seek their assistance. My initial request was met with acceptance from two peers from Jefferson and one peer from Southern Pine. The two peers from Jefferson were both concerned that the supervisor for the peer evaluators was unaware of this research and was concerned about their participation. The two stated that this particular supervisor was concerned about who might be asking about TES. Dawn was able to clear up this matter quickly, with an email to the supervisor for the peer evaluators and the original peers considered for this research, reaffirming that permission had been granted by The District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Level Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dawn, Debbie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Type</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeenie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and that their involvement would be acceptable. One peer from Jefferson chose to remain in my study, as did the peer from Southern Pine. Although Dawn knows the names of the pool of peers, the two peers that were included in this study will remain confidential. This resulted in my inclusion of one peer from each of the two school sites, which was my goal. The position of peer evaluator was new this year. The numbers and types of participants included in this study are listed in Table 5 and are described in more detail below.

**Protections.**

In order to provide protections for the participants, all individuals and schools are referred to by pseudonyms. In addition, the school district, the state, and the new evaluation system are also referred to by pseudonyms. The school district is referred to as The District, the state as The State, and the new Teacher Evaluation System as TES. This particular school district is so large that this should provide ample protection for those involved. As of the 2010-11 school year, there were over 120 elementary schools, ranging in demographics from urban to suburban to rural, which included every conceivable mix of financial status and race. Including middle and high schools, The District reported on their website that in the school year 2010-11 they had over 12,000 teachers, 200 principals, 350 assistant principals, 200 district level administrators, and 175,000 students.

**Gathering of Texts**

**Written text.**

Important to this research is the analysis of texts. Texts form the foundation of a critical discourse analysis, and are central to any understanding of language. Texts are the
initial focus for Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework for analysis. Analysis begins with texts, and were selected purposefully to support my research questions. The selection of texts was absolutely critical to my analysis, as these texts would inform the analysis of discourse practice and social practice, the other two areas of Fairclough’s Framework.

Written texts, or documents, exist as artifacts and provide a view of what the new teacher evaluation system intended to be and to become. These documents allow a glimpse into what The District proposed and what the author of the system actually proposed. Analysis of these documents reveals underlying assumptions as well as allowing for what is actually enacted to be compared with what was intended. In selecting documents for inclusion in the analysis, they must have been useful in either establishing a historical perspective of evaluation and educational leadership within The District, or have spoken directly to the new evaluation system. Texts analyzed included written documents, interview transcripts, observation transcripts, and notes. These will be described below.

**Historical texts specific to The District.**

Several documents are included for the purpose of understanding the historical context and social practice specific to The District. These documents include *The Three-Minute Classroom Walk-Through: Changing School Supervisory Practice One Teacher at a Time*, (2004) written by Downey, Steffy, English, Frase and Poston, Jr. This was the first text utilized by The District as it began to expand what was meant by teacher evaluation as it began to expand beyond the teacher behavior checklist. Also examined will be the follow-up book by Downey, Steffy, Poston, English (2010) entitled *Advancing*
the Three-Minute Walk-Through: Mastering Reflective Practice. This text was also widely disseminated throughout The District. After several years of implementation, a new principal walk-through, supported by the text Classroom Walkthrough: A Process for Outcomes-Based Instructional Improvement Participant Guide K-12 by teachscape (2009), was implemented. This text is also important to the historical foundation.

District training documents.

When The District first began the application process for the grant that funded TES, a consultant group was hired to research teacher evaluation instruments. Dawn and Debbie both indicated that, in the end, this consulting group presented two primary contenders, including work by Marzano and Danielson. Danielson’s work was ultimately selected because it was felt that the rubric that she created could be used across grade levels. Key among TES training documents utilized by The District is the text by Charlotte Danielson that was widely distributed to school principals and assistant principals in trainings regarding the new evaluation system held at the end of the 2009-2010 school year, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching (2007).

This text was used, and continues to be used, as the basis for TES and contains The Framework. In this text, Danielson provides a rationale for The Framework and guides the reader in understanding how to implement The Framework in engaging in collegial dialogue with teachers. This Framework is a rubric, one which has been tweaked and edited a bit to reflect specific needs of The District which is using this rubric in the teacher’s final evaluation process, a process which results in averaging of scores. The practice of averaging scores is a practice questioned by Danielson, one she vocally opposed during her keynote address at the National Association of Elementary School
Principals (NAESP) on April 9, 2011 in Tampa, Florida. Many administrators from The District were in attendance at this address. This was an opportunity that was publicized throughout The District, and over 40 district administrators were present at this speech, including myself, and a group photo was taken with Danielson. Both district administrator participants in this research, however, have expressed that any changes that have been made have been done so with Danielson’s input, and Dawn reported that Danielson was revising her rubric to reflect some of these changes. Appendix A contains a sample of The District’s rubric based on this work. While The Framework is a derivative of the Danielson text, The District has made some modifications which personalize its usage.

Two district versions of the rubric are included for analysis. Danielson’s original framework is included in the analysis of her book *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2007). The two district versions of this framework included here have been adapted by The District. The District began with a rubric very closely mimicking Danielson’s work (see Appendix A), and the second version that will be utilized during the 2011-2012 school year that includes portions that have been re-worked and re-worded (see Appendix I).

Additionally, materials collected at district sponsored staff development opportunities with TES as their subject since the summer prior to the 2010-2011 school year were analyzed. These materials include written materials that I received as an attendant at mandatory trainings specific to school-level administrators and my accompanying notes, This time frame for collection of district documents coincides with the beginning of the implementation of the new evaluation system in the 2010-2011
school year. The written materials selected from the district are all publicly available based on State statute. The documents included are a script I was given as part of my one-on-one coached observations cycles with trainers that I attended October 11-15, 2010 (See Appendix D), an Administrator’s Reading Walk-through Checklist I received at a leadership training on March 28, 2011 (see Appendix E), notes taken during a keynote address given by Charlotte Danielson at the NAESP on April 9, 2011 in Tampa, Florida (see Appendix F), Pop-In Descriptors (see Appendix G) and an Observation Chart (see Appendix H) both received at a meeting for supervisors and principals on August 11, 2011.

Table 6

*Text Categories and Sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Category</th>
<th>Source of Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Historical Context            | • *The Three-Minute Classroom Walk-Through: Changing School Supervisory Practice One Teacher at a Time*, (2004), Downey, Steffy, English, Frase and Poston, Jr.  
                                 | • *Advancing the Three-Minute Walk-Through: Mastering Reflective Practice*. Downey, Steffy, Poston, , English (2010)  
                                 | • Training documents utilized by The District  
                                 | • Researcher notes taken during trainings offered by The District |
| Discourse between principals and teachers | • Observations of pre and post conferences and evaluation conferences |
| Participant Discourse around TES | • Interviews with all participants, at least one interview with option for follow-up interview  
                                 | • Participant Reflections on initial analysis |
| Researcher as Instrument      | • Reflective Journal                                                           |
Taken together, these documents contribute to understanding how discourse and social practice around TES was guided and framed. Analysis of these documents help to paint a picture of the expectations held by The District. These documents, and the trainings themselves, are the arenas from which principals began to develop their understandings of TES and their roles. All documents included in this research are listed in Table 6.

**Interviews.**

The collection of texts also included interviews of all participants. These interviews were a method of collecting information from the participants about their experiences with TES. Interviewing individuals residing at various levels in the hierarchy allowed for analysis of relations “between the level of social practices and the level of events” (Fairclough, 2010, p. 238). Interviews from various hierarchical levels contributed to an understanding of the social practices which were constructed and interpreted differently by each interviewee. In addition, the interviewees held differing viewpoints on the meanings of the events. This provided an important source of text necessary for comparing the social practices.

All principal, teacher, and peer evaluator interviews took place within two weeks of the end of the 2010-2011 school year, the end of the first year of implementation. Each principal, teacher, and peer evaluator participant had the same length of knowledge and experience with TES, as all were involved in the implementation process from its inception at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year. District administrator interviews took place in June, just prior to the end of the school year. Both Dawn and Debbie had the same amount of exposure to TES.
This study included a total of nine interviews. Each participant was interviewed once, for between 29 and 49 minutes, and I had one follow-up interview with Dawn. I requested via email that participants to respond to some follow-up questions and asked for a follow-up interview. I received two responses regarding follow-ups only, from Jamalia and Sally, both of which were written answers to three clarification and between four and five follow-up questions. These responses provided minimal information. One district administrator, Dawn, requested that three lines be removed from her initial interview transcript, lines which she felt might be linked to an identification of a particular individual or that she felt were inaccurate. All three lines were removed. The line which could have identified a particular individual I would not have utilized for that same reason, and the other two removals I deemed to be inconsequential.

*Interview protocols.*

Interview protocols are contained in Appendix J. A review of documents pertinent to TES, conducted in August and September of 2010, and concentrating on the textbooks listed previously in this section, served to inform my interview protocol. The interview protocol was also informed by conducting a pilot interview with a principal known to me and analyzing her responses to determine if my questions were eliciting the types of responses that would be useful. My pilot with the principal resulted in short answers with little details. Her answers lacked depth. According to Richards (2009), “your first interview will teach you much about the topic, people’s experiences and the way that can be helped to explain and describe what they see and do” (p. 43). This experience was no different for me. My questioning lacked probing, so I worked on follow-up questions that would allow me to probe for further information. My interview protocol was then
reviewed by a member of my doctoral cohort, and input from that individual helped me further refine my questions.

All of these interviews were semi-structured, providing some consistency in questioning, allowing common themes, domains, and factors to be isolated (Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte, 1999, p. 151). This was important, because “the domains yield factors that are identified because they appear repeatedly in the text data” (p. 153). However, while providing some consistency in questioning, the semi-structured format allows for further questioning as the opportunity presents itself. “While the general structure is the same for all individuals being interviewed, the interviewer can vary the questions as the situation demands” (Lichtman, 2006, p. 118). Participants were not given the interview protocol prior to their interview because I was interested in intuitive responses, as opposed to more composed responses. Participants were, however, offered a verbal synopsis of my research project prior to the interviews.

**Interview locations.**

All interviews were conducted in locations chosen by the interviewee. Dawn and Debbie both had me come to their offices for the interviews. Jamalia also chose her office at Jefferson Elementary. The teacher from Jefferson, Janet, chose the conference room in the office at Jefferson. Sally chose to be interviewed in her office at Southern Pine Elementary. Both teachers from Southern Pine, Stephanie and Stacy, both chose to have me come to their classrooms. The peer evaluator from Jefferson, Jeenie, was interviewed at a school site she recommended. This school site is one where she did not work, but provided a convenient location for Jeenie to meet. We were given access to a small office. The peer evaluator from Southern Pine, Seelie, chose to meet me at a restaurant in
a convenient location for her. Both of these peer evaluator interviews took place during the week just following the end of the school year. Regardless of the location, the interviews were all conducted after the working hours of the participant. Many of the interviews took place during my working hours, all reported and accounted for through personal leave. Each interview took between twenty-five and fifty minutes.

**Interview transcription and notes.**

Interviews provide “a rich source of data….To the extent possible, the interview should be recorded” (Lichtman, 2006, p. 120). All interviews were digitally audio recorded and were transcribed by me verbatim to allow for a detailed analysis. I took notes during the interview, jotting down follow-up questions for use during the interview as well as notes for myself. All of these notes are kept together, in a secure location. Merriam (1998) writes that taking notes while recording an interview allows the interviewer to record reactions to what is being said, indicates to the participant that what they are saying is important, and allows for pacing of the interview (p. 87). The recordings, paired with the transcription, provided examples of words, language, and discourse models. This data helped reveal the social structures and norms of the school, as well as individual events that informed those structures and norms.

**Observations.**

Observations of the production of text between principals and teachers were an important text gathering opportunity for this research. For this study, I included an observation of a pre and post-conference and observations of two final evaluation conferences. The pre-conference was scheduled, according to protocol, two days prior to the observation, with the post-conference occurring four days after the observation. These
observations took place at Jefferson Elementary and included Jamalia and Janet. The two final evaluation conferences were held after the principal had completed her observation cycles on the two teachers for the year. These two observations took place at Southern Pine Elementary and included Sally and Stephanie, and Sally and Stacy. All of these observations occurred during the last two weeks of the school year. Reflective notes were taken after each interview.

Observations of these conferences provided texts from interactions between principals and teachers occurring within the new teacher evaluation system. Texts collected from these events were digitally audio recorded and transcribed verbatim by myself. This was an important source of text allowing for analysis of the lived experience at the level of social structures and the level of events, and allowing for this to be compared with what was intended and what was perceived based on what the participants discussed in their interviews. These observations are seen as a vital source of data, a source that allows for observations of the interface between principals and teachers that can be compared with what was voiced in individual interviews with these same participants. The number of interviews, follow-up questioning, and observations conducted are shown in Table 7. Once transcribed, the interviews were between 17 and 33 pages in length, and observations ranged from 22 to 38 8 pages in length.

Limitations on observations.

It was recognized that during these times the participants were keenly aware of their being observed. Merriam (1998) acknowledges several effects of being observed, including participants regulating their behavior to be more socially acceptable, participants regulating their behavior based on even subtle hints from the observer, and
changing the overall climate of the situation (p. 103). Merriam points out that the observer will have an impact on the situation being observed, but that it is left to the observer to “identify those effects and account for them in interpreting the data” (p. 103). My presence, and the presence of a recording device, may have affected the

Table 7

*Interviews and Observations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Follow Up Interview</th>
<th>Feedback from Initial Analysis</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Level Administrator Dawn, Debbie</td>
<td>1 Each</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluator Jeenie, Seelie</td>
<td>1 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Jamalia, Sally</td>
<td>1 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamalia, Sally</td>
<td>4 One pre and post-observation cycle (Janet), two evaluation conferences (Stephanie, Stacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Janet, Stephanie, Stacy</td>
<td>1 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

conversations, emphasizing the selection of tenured, experienced teachers as an important element for minimizing this effect. In order to minimize my presence, I chose to sit in a location away from the principal and teacher, and did not make eye contact with any of the participants during the observations. This was an effort to exclude myself as a participant in the discussions.

**Researcher notes.**

My own notes, taken during district trainings, became an important source of text as well. My notes reflect my own understanding, complementing the written documents in order to present a more thorough representation. These notes are included in this research because they act as quasi-transcriptions of actual language used in the trainings.
It was my intention to capture variations and subtleties in order to contrast what was said with what was written. Recording these trainings was impractical due to the large numbers of people involved.

My reflective notes also helped to establish my route to analysis. The vast amount of text produced as a result of the interviews and observations became a point of struggle for me, and my journal allowed me to track my thinking while making decisions about how to proceed. I struggled to find a place to begin, and even how to begin. As written by Auerbach & Silverstein (2003):

Good qualitative research gets much of its claim to validity from the researcher’s ability to show convincingly how they got there, and how they built confidence that this was the best account possible. This is why qualitative research has a special need for project history, in the form of a diary or log of processes. (p. 152).

My notes also allowed me to monitor my impact on the study. I held some biases about TES, biases which I needed to continually confront and acknowledge. It was important that I understand this and allow the participants to speak through their words without imposing my own. I found my notes useful in helping me to keep this study based on the words of the participants only. Because of my position in The District I was privy to several conversations during the course of this research regarding TES which put me in direct contact with information that further endorsed my biases. It was important to keep this information separated from the texts that were part of this research.
Participant reflections on my initial analysis.

My initial analysis of the texts was presented to all interviewees, with a time-sensitive, yet open-ended opportunity for them to react and provide feedback. This information was emailed via private email to participants on August 18, 2011, with a requested due date of September 3, 2011. The participants were asked to respond via email, respond in writing via mail, or respond via phone to my private number. Participant reactions were included in the final reporting of the analysis. Participants were given the option to respond in person or in writing.

Lens of the Researcher

Richards (2009) writes that “researchers don’t have empty minds, and are likely to have strong values and commitment to their topic. So good research design will always take into account what’s known already” (p. 23). My own experiences within The District, my own attendance at trainings, and my own participation in the new teacher evaluation system served to inform my research questions, research design, and my understanding of the discourse and social practices.

My experiences include twenty seven years of employment in this District (my entire adult working career), including eleven years as an elementary music specialist, ten years as an elementary teacher of students identified as emotionally handicapped, half a school year as an elementary reading specialist, four and one half years as an elementary assistant principal, and over the last year as a district level administrator. In my role as assistant principal I attended one district-wide assistant principal meeting per month, one additional meeting per month with twenty two other assistant principals in the same geographic area, and other trainings offered by The District which were mandatory for
assistant principals. Mandatory trainings include those regarding TES, as well as those providing information about other district initiatives. In my role as district administrator I continue to attend district trainings regarding TES, and remain in a position to utilize the TES protocols with teachers when requested by a school site.

I have been in The District long enough to have experienced several previously adopted methods of teacher evaluation, and those are included in this research. I was observed, as a teacher, with the State Teacher Performance Measurement System (STPMS). The STPMS was a check list of teacher behaviors, and this is how I was rated during my entire teaching career. This STPMS was still in place when I became a school administrator. I utilized the STPMS as a part of my assistant principal duties, an estimated twenty-five times. I was trained, and subsequently re-trained, by The District on how to utilize this instrument. As The District moved toward walk-throughs, I attended District training on the Three-Minute Walk-Through advocated by Downey, et al. (2004, 2010). I utilized this protocol, which was put in place on top of the STPMS. Then, as The District moved toward TES I was included in all of the start-up trainings for administrators which included sessions with mentors.

These are the experiences with teacher evaluation that I bring to my research. For this study, I am the instrument of research. As such, I brought a great amount of insider knowledge to the table, and was a source of text on the social practice surrounding teacher evaluation in The District. I shared my background with all of the participants.

While not a participant observer in the classic sense, I was not an outsider either. My experiences within The District make me more of a participant than an outsider. Merriam (1998) refers to my role in terms of being an observer as participant. By this,
Merriam means that I have access to people and information, but the individuals being observed still have some control over the information being imparted. “The researchers’ observer activities are known to the group; participation in the group is definitely secondary to the role of information gatherer” (Merriam, 1998, p. 101). This has several advantages. As Glesne (1999) puts it,

You learn firsthand how the actions of research participants correspond to their words; see patterns of behavior; experience the unexpected, as well as the expected; and develop a quality of trust with your others that motivates them to tell you what otherwise they might not. (p. 43)

Glesne (1999) cautions that as observers and participants we need to allow ourselves to see things in new ways, providing “new vantage points, new ways of thinking about some aspect of social interaction” (p. 46). One advantage is that this type of observation, as a research technique, helps to support later language analysis (Wolcott, 2009).

My career with The District and my own experiences with the implementation of TES help to define my role as that of participant. My status within The District gave me a unique perspective, and a unique understanding of the social context. Principals, teachers, and peer evaluators were all told of my experiences within The District, which also helped to define my role as participant. However, I was not directly engaged with any of the participants in the actual implementation of TES, so I therefore retained some of my researcher status. Because of my direct contact with participants, they retained control over the information they were imparting.

My reflective journal also helped to maximize the advantages and minimize the disadvantages of being a participant and observer. When asked why it is necessary to
keep a reflective journal, Lichtman (2006) responded that “by keeping a journal, you will be able to examine your own thinking and motivations and how they influence and are influenced by the work you do” (p. 85). This proved to be the case for this study, as my own assumptions and experiences were a constant companion.

**Analysis: Thinking Through the Texts**

In this section I discuss the analysis of the texts collected. This plan included coding for the themes, organizing those themes into categories outlined in Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework, a discussion of validity and reliability concerns, and the significance and limitations of this study. The first prong of Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework is text, and this section focuses on my efforts at finding a way into the texts. These texts, then, inform my analysis of discourse practice and social practice. My design for analysis is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Design for Analysis](image-url)
Processing and organizing language.

Step one: Transcription.

The first step in my analysis was to transcribe all of the interviews and observations. I chose to complete this task for myself, as opposed to sending it out to a professional transcriber, believing that it was vitally important for me to be as engaged with the texts as possible. I ended up with over 60,000 words across over 300 pages. Determining a method for beginning the analysis was more difficult. There was so much text that the task was daunting. Initially I tried grouping the texts into categories, but this was forced and proved to be very frustrating. I tried marking my transcriptions up with ideas for themes, but my thoughts were continually shifting. When Auerbach & Silverstein (2003) write that “theories do no emerge spontaneously, and students who expect them to do so can wait for a very long time” (p. 73), they adequately explain the reason for my frustration. I decided to leave this task for later and concentrate on an initial linguistic analysis. This was a vital decision. As Gee (2005) writes, “a second listening or a second reading is, in many cases, a matter of competence…and, in many cases, too, a matter of ethics” (p. xii). In order to do the work of critical analysis we much “think more deeply about the meanings we give people’s words so as to make ourselves better” (Gee, 2005, p. xii). Leaving the coding for later proved to be an important step in my analysis.

Step two: Lines and stanzas.

Gee writes about processing and organizing language as an initial step in critical discourse analysis (2005). He is concerned about ways in which the research can begin to consider the grand task of analyzing the data, and “initial ways into a text” (p. 118). Gee
describes in great detail in *an introduction to Discourse Analysis: theory and method* (2005) his method of dividing transcribed spoken text into lines and stanzas. These “are important because they represent how speakers marry structure and meaning. They show us how speakers carve up or organize their meanings” (p. 135). What Gee stresses is that the analyst look “for patterns and links within and across utterances in order to form hypotheses about how meaning is being constructed and organized” (p. 118). This is a reciprocal and cyclical process in which the analyst considers a piece of language, situated meanings, and relationships in a specific context (p. 118). By dividing the text into lines and stanzas we are representing patterns as expressed by the speaker while simultaneously representing patterns which the analyst believes to be present.

The analysis began with arranging the typed transcript into lines and stanzas as defined by Gee. These lines and stanzas depict “our analysis of the patterning of meaning in the text” (Gee, 2005, p. 136). Lines, according to Gee, are small spurts of language and composed, usually, of one salient piece of new information “as the focus of the intonation contour” (Gee, 2005, p. 124). Each spurt of language is isolated by “a pause, slight hesitation, or slight break in tempo” (p. 124). Stanzas are collections of lines with a specific focus, such as time, event, idea, or character. The larger body of information is “composed of stanzas, each one of which takes a single perspective on an event, state of affairs, or character” (p. 128).

I completed the transcripts and arranged them into lines and stanzas and sought to continually re-listen for accuracy. I found that marking each answer with a time stamp helped me to rewind to the correct place. I simply marked the time as shown on my digital recorder. For example, a response might begin at (10:04), indicating the ten
minute, four second mark. This was immensely helpful. Additionally, each word emphasized was put into bold print. Emphasized words, according to Gee, help the speaker to introduce new information. This was a tedious process, but one which was infinitely useful in simply listening to the text repeatedly. I estimate that I listened to each text ten times in order to accomplish the initial transcription, turning that into lines and stanzas, and bolding the emphasized words. What became obvious to me early on in this process was how ill equipped a listener I was. Transcription became a powerful learning experience for me in understanding how language is processed. Often I had to listen several times to even short passages just to be able to repeat through typing precisely what it was that was being said. It was typical, initially, for me to not even hear some words. Many times I would type what I heard verbatim only to find through another listening that I had moved words around in the phrase, changed the words, or omitted words entirely. I used wide margins when printing out these transcripts. This was intended to allow plenty of room to add notes from various readings. This proved to be a helpful step, and allowed for every manner of written notes, arrows, boxes, and collection of written thoughts. A sample of my transcriptions is contained in Appendix K. These samples are in black, and use standard margins, but will give you an idea of what they looked like. Included is a sample of an interview and an observation.

**Step three: Read and take notes.**

The first step after arranging the text as outlined by Gee was to read each text. Dey (1993) stresses the importance of this seemingly simple step. According to Dey, “we cannot analyse our data unless we read it….The aim of reading through our data is to prepare the ground for analysis” (1993, p. 83). I started this step with a clean copy of the
transcripts, and took notes as I read. I was careful to write down ideas that came to me, and to keep the process as fluid as possible. Armed with a general linguistic analysis, a thorough reading of the texts, and my initial written comments on the transcripts my analysis proceeded.

**Step four: Finding a place to begin.**

With transcriptions laid out neatly, my analysis continued with coding in a method prescribed by Auerbach and Silverstein (2003). Their method advocates looking at data by moving “from raw text to research questions in small steps, each step building on the previous one” (2003, p. 25). Raw text in word processing format is edited and moved into ever more specific groups. Auerbach and Silverstein start with editing all of the raw text into folders of relevant text, then into folders containing repeating ideas. Those repeating ideas are organized into folders containing larger themes, and finally into folders for theoretical frameworks. It was important that all of this coding, while relying on the power of word processing, was analyzed by hand and did not utilize any type of data sorting software. “Don’t think of automating it!” (Richards, 2009, p.96). Richards goes on to explain that the computer is a useful tool, giving “far more flexibility to this central interpretive task, helping you to read and think about the coded data, and keep coding” (2009, p. 96). However, the analysis, or interpretation, must be done by the researcher. “A computer can help us to analyze our data, but it cannot analyze our data. This is not a pedantic distinction: we must do the analysis” (Dey, 1993, p. 55). While word processing tools have made the work of analysis and the organization of language much easier, the analyst must still provide the actual analysis.
It was during this process that my repeated listening and reading began to pay off. My intimate connection with the texts impacted my ability to find themes across texts. I was so familiar with all of the words, phrases, and participants that finding repeated words, phrases, and ideas was more deliberate. Coding began, however, with a review of my theoretical framework as laid out by Fairclough, and my research questions. My method for coding, informed by Auerbach and Silverstein (2003), began with the recommendation that research concerns and the theoretical framework be present visually while editing text, in order to be continually attentive to those themes. “Your theoretical framework determines your biases. Stating it explicitly will force you to acknowledge your lack of ‘objectivity’ and will help you read the text in a more focused way” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 46). This process, as laid out by Auerbach and Silverstein (2003), allowed me to find a starting place into the texts, yet allowed them to find their own spaces. Faced with hours of transcript texts I needed a place to begin, and that starting place was my own research concerns.

*Step five: Editing for relevant text.*

As laid out by Auerbach and Silverstein, my analysis began with reducing the transcript texts to relevant text, text related to “specific research concerns” (2003, p. 37). Again, detailed knowledge of the transcript texts was critical in determining what pieces of the text were relevant. Cutting down the text into manageable, relevant pieces required having my research questions and Fairclough’s framework in mind, and editing for pieces of text that would be helpful in examining language text, discourse practice, or social practice.
Some text spoke to the social practice surrounding TES, such as perceived district goals. Some text excerpts were examples of discourse practice, such as that of the principal’s place within the bureaucratic hierarchy. Some pieces of text were examples of identical phrases being used by various participants, and other pieces of text showed how teachers and principals interacted with each other. I was also editing for examples that spoke to instructional leadership, evaluation, or roles. Particular pieces of text addressed these topics specifically, and they were included in this search for relevant text. For instance, participants were provided an opportunity to specify where they thought teachers should turn for help and their responses helped to define what it was to be an instructional leader in The District. These pieces of text were included. Some pieces of text revealed underlying tensions, and these were included. This was an iterative process, one predicated on my substantial knowledge of the texts. If a specific piece of text seemed unrelated to these themes then it was edited out, such as comments about The District’s website, the air conditioning, or personal information.

After the initial edits, which seemed relatively simple, what remained was virtually the same text I began with and not much edited out. As I read and re-read with the goal of editing I had to continually remind myself of what I was looking for, finding that the early advice to have those things written down and present was a valuable piece of advice. My goal became to reduce the texts into something more manageable, and I ended up with less than what I started with by about one third. Each transcript was left as an individual word document, with the original left untouched and the new one saved as “RT” (for relevant text). All of the edited transcript files were moved to a folder labeled “relevant text”
**Step six: Finding repeating ideas.**

I then progressed into editing for repeating ideas. “It is progressive in that you first develop, out of the data, major code clumps by which to sort the data. Then you code the contents of each major code clump, thereby breaking down the major code into numerous subcodes” (Glesne, 1999, p. 135). Auerbach and Silverstein refer to this as sorting into repeating ideas, and they do this by describing how to move each entry in the relevant text transcripts files into individual files that match each repeating idea.

This process first began with re-looking at my hand written notes on the original transcripts. This helped me review what I had written with regards to ideas and themes that seemed to be repeating. I then began with the first entry on Dawn’s first interview in the relevant text folder. This entry was moved into a new file specific to that idea for that participant. The transcript was searched for other entries related to that idea and then these were included in that file. The next entry was then moved into another file specific to that idea for that participant, the remaining transcript was searched for other bits of text related to this idea, and all were moved into a file. This continued, with each entry being moved to a new or already formed file relating to specific ideas. Then I moved on to each transcript in turn, finding repeating ideas in individual transcripts. These files were saved as repeating idea files (ex. RI Administrator A, district’s need to keep principals in-line) and placed in a folder labeled “repeating ideas.” I addressed observations with this same routine. When individuals had repeating ideas across transcripts these were saved together in one file. These files were then all saved into a folder which I labeled “repeating ideas.”
Orphan files, as described by Auerbach & Silverstein (2003), are those bits of text that were deemed to be relevant but that were not repeated. “If the data is at all voluminous, then we cannot consider every bit of data, we have to consider how far they apply. To do this, we have to consider frequency as well as content” (Dey, 1993, p. 256). Auerbach & Silverstein point to choices, writing that “you can discard the text as unimportant, you can search your transcripts again to try to find text that goes with your solitary text; or you can decide the text is important even if you cannot find other text with which to group it” (2003, p. 59). I chose to save all bits of text because I knew that I was going to search for repeated ideas across participants, and that these orphans might be matched up in this step. These orphans were useful in looking at what Dey (1993) calls singularities, which did not fit into emerging patterns but were important enough to stand on their own.

This was an iterative process. Since I had already edited for text relevant to Fairclough’s framework and my research questions, I assumed that all of the data was useful somehow. That allowed me to form repeating ideas more organically without forcing the data into preconceived categories, and this method allowed the words of the participants to shape the categories. This step finished with the creation of a master list of repeating ideas. This was simply a list of the file names that were created to express repeating ideas. This list was saved as “master list of repeating ideas.”

**Step seven: Moving ideas into themes.**

The master list of repeating ideas was used as a tool in the creation of major themes. For this process, Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) advise researchers to create a folder for each theme. As I analyzed the list of repeating ideas and assigned them to a
theme I moved the repeating ideas folders into the correct theme folders. This process looked much like the process used to develop repeating ideas. I constructed themes by participant group as follows: district participant interviews; Jefferson Elementary interviews; Southern Pine Elementary interviews; Jefferson Elementary observations; and Southern Pine observations. Constructing themes by school allowed me to investigate relationships across participants within the schools. This also allowed me to compare themes emerging from the two school sites and to compare those emerging from school sites with those emerging from the district administrators.

This process left me with several orphans, and although I named them as themes they did not really constitute themes. I kept all of these, believing that somehow they were important. This was useful, because my themes became a bit fluid and new themes were developed and added. Some of the orphan themes were folded into newly emerging themes. In the end I was still left with some orphan themes which were kept in the mix for the next step of the analysis.

Repeating ideas and themes are contained in Appendix L. These are listed by participant group. The repeating ideas are listed on their own, and then again as I placed them into themes.

**Step eight: Forming theoretical constructs.**

The next step involved developing theoretical constructs from the themes. “A theoretical construct is an abstract concept that organizes a group of themes by fitting them into a theoretical framework” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 67). This began with the creation of a master list of themes. This then allowed for themes to be grouped together into theoretical constructs, which brought me back full-circle to my original
criteria for including relevant text – Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework, instructional leadership, tensions, and how principals navigate between leadership and supervisory roles. The process for developing theoretical frameworks from the texts utilized the same procedures as that of developing themes from repeating ideas. “The mythology of theory emerging from data, fully and beautifully formed, like Botticelli’s Venus from the sea, makes it churlish to ask when your theory will be good enough. But you must ask that. Any old theory won’t do” (2009, p. 138). Richards (2009) continues, writing that for a satisfactory research outcome the analysis should answer the research questions, offer an analysis and not simply a description, and should offer an explanation. Richards goes on to include arriving at something more than any of the participants could have reported, making an adequate report that makes sense to others (p. 138).

The rest of the process for analysis is based on this initial step, yet allowed me to “gain more access to the subjective experience of the research participants” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 54). All of the sorting for repeating ideas and themes allowed for a more organic process, one determined by the participants’ own texts. Sorting for my theoretical framework began to help organize the texts in a more concrete way.

However, as I began utilizing these theme folders, and selecting bits and pieces to use in my dissertation, I found that the cutting and pasting process often left me unsure of which participant or which participant group I was quoting. I also had difficulties distinguishing interview texts from observation texts. I decided on color coding each of the participants’ transcripts and putting observation texts in italics. By using this simple method I could easily identify participants and discern interview texts from observation texts when I cut and pasted them into my results section. I left all of this color coded until
my final edits were completed, and only then did I edit the text into black. Words that I
typed as bold, indicating emphasis by the speaker, were not typed as bold in my results
chapter. They were, however, left bold in my last chapter, with hopes of more precisely
illustrating the participants’ expressions. For the results chapter I also displayed quotes in
a traditional manner, leaving the Gee lines and stanzas for the final chapter.

Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability are post-positivist constructs, and are not overly useful to
this critical and post-structurally influenced study. My research is more interested in what
Dey refers to as an account. Dey writes that “through the challenge of explaining
ourselves to others, we can help to clarify and integrate the concepts and relationships we
have identified in our analysis” (1993, p. 237). For this paper, the constructs of validity
and reliability are reinterpreted.

Validity.

Validity is a major concern with post-positivist research. “Assessment of validity
involves identifying the main claims made by a study, noting the types of claims these
represent (for instance, whether the intent is to define, explain, or theorize), then
comparing the evidence provided for each claim with what is judged necessary to support
its plausibility and credibility” (Singer, 2009, p. 196). Gee (2005) points to two
difficulties with constructing validity specific to discourse analysis:

First, humans construct their realities….Second, just as language is always
reflexively related to situations so that both make each other meaningful, so, too,
a discourse analysis, being itself composed in language, is reflexively related to
the ‘language-plus-situation’ it is about. The analyst interprets his or her data in a
certain way and those data so interpreted, in turn, render the analysis meaningful in certain ways and not others. (p. 113)

Gee does not present this information as a way to explain the complexity involved, but to present a different view of validity. Gee (2005) “sees validity to be something that different analyses can have more or less of, i.e., some analyses are more or less valid than others” (p. 113). So, for Gee, there is no perfect validity in a study of this nature, just more or less validity.

**Other indicators of quality.**

Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) write that a critical analyst must put distance between his/her own initial understanding and “has to be aware of the distinctiveness of one’s own languages of description…and be reflexive in managing their interplay” (p. 68). These authors go on to include an ethical dimension of analysis, ethical in the sense that text producers should themselves be able to engage (agree or disagree) with the description made of them” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 68). This allows for the voice of the “people” as one source of “interpretive authority” (p. 68). Allowing for feedback from participants helps insure interpretive validity, and I did this by inviting their responses to my initial analysis.

Chouliaraki and Fairclough, along with Gee, all take care to point out that the analyst should be able to acknowledge and perceive opposing viewpoints, those not supporting what the researcher may hope to find. The paramount task is to analyze what is there, regardless of where that leads. This problem can also be addressed by having the participants read the initial analysis and provide their feedback. I allowed for this feedback, allowing participants to confirm that my initial analysis reflected their own.
Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) re-term the word validity in the context of qualitative research, and instead refer to it as convincing other people. They go on to write that “as qualitative researchers we strongly disagree with the quantitative approach to evaluating research. We believe, instead, that subjectivity, interpretation, and context are inevitably interwoven into every research program” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 77). While they are proponents of interpretation, they maintain that the researcher should use his/her subjectivity as an aid to interpretation as long as they do not impose this subjectivity capriciously. So, instead of classic validity as it refers to quantitative data, their goal is transparency, communicability, and coherence. These are the “criteria for distinguishing between justifiable and unjustifiable ways of using subjectivity to interpret data” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 83). Richards (2009) defines validity as the researcher’s “ability to show convincingly how they got there, and how they built confidence that this was the best account possible” (p.152). Chapter Three addresses my methodological framework, and throughout the dissertation I acknowledge my own connection to TES. I also included numerous and lengthy direct quotes from participants in an effort toward transparency.

Researchers are concerned with internal validity, which, “refers to the correspondence between measures and the reality of the field situation” (Schensul, et al., 1999, p. 275). In other words, how accurate is the depiction presented by the data? Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) frame this problem with an understanding that a researcher’s subjectivity will be a part of the analysis and interpretation of texts, “however, it is not justifiable for him to impose his own subjectivity in an arbitrary manner, that is, in a way not grounded in the (texts)” (p. 83). For this research, this was
accomplished by examining written texts, interviews, and observations. These sources help to support each other, reveal underlying repeating ideas and themes, and create a more complete picture. For example, material that may be left out (purposefully or not) in face-to-face interviews can be seen in observations, attitudes not revealed in observations may be revealed in interviews. Including four levels of participants within The District’s bureaucratic hierarchy also supports this notion, and as LeCompte & Schensul write, research that utilizes only “one source of data lacks scientific rigor” (1999, p. 144).

Construct validity asks whether the instruments used to gather data actually gathered the intended data. These concerns were addressed by performing a pilot study focusing on the textbooks listed earlier in this section. This examination of written texts helped to inform my interview protocols. The design of the interview was also informed by consulting with my current principal (my immediate supervisor) and a member of my doctoral cohort. The questions for my interview protocol were used with these two individuals, and then the questions were adjusted based on their experiences with the questions and their feedback.

External validity, how the representations of the data can be applied to other groups, is also addressed in post-positivist research. Critical discourse analysis is interested in the little stories of how language manifests itself, content to learn how the discourse and social practices affect individuals. To this end, external validity is a minimal concern. This text is specific to individuals in a place and time which is richly described in this study.
Reliability.

Reliability, in a post-positivist sense, refers to whether or not the research could be replicated by another researcher, and whether or not the same results will be discovered. As with external validity, this research does not lend itself to reliability measures. This research is being conducted by me, and my experiences are unique to me, and those cannot be replicated. As such, my results will be unique to me as well, and may not be replicated either. This research concerns discourse in context, and the language you are reading now is a result of my construction of that language and cannot be duplicated. A critical discourse analysis, particularly one informed by poststructuralist thought, does not adhere to notions of generalizability. That is not the purpose of the research. Instead, “the language poststructuralism puts forward – on the basis, of course, in the first instance, of a study of language itself – is more useful in prompting the uncertainty of questions than in delivering the finality of answers” (Belsey, 2002, p. 107). However, my research may serve to inform the work of others and add understanding, either through the methods employed or through its findings.

Alternative to validity and reliability.

Instead of using the post-positivist terms of validity and reliability, Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) frame this in terms of how justifiable the account is and base this justifiability on transparency, communicability, and coherence. In terms of being transparent, I come with a certain history, with unique knowledge, and with a particular set of beliefs. I formally acknowledged these. It was impossible for me to extricate myself from the research. What is possible, however, is to inform the reader so that my ‘self’ is obvious to all. This was addressed throughout this dissertation. As mentioned
earlier in the proposal, in an effort to remain reflective throughout, I kept a reflective journal.

Communicability refers to my selection of repeating ideas, themes, and theoretical constructs as making sense to other researchers. “This does not mean that other researchers would have come up with your constructs, or agree with them. It only means that what you have done can be understood” (Richards, 2009, p. 85). Coherence speaks to whether or not the story told makes sense. “This does not require that the story that you develop be the only possible one, but rather that your story helps to organize the data” (p. 85). According to Richards (2009), researchers get to claim validity by convincing others of how they got there and their ability to build confidence that their account was the best account possible (p. 152).

Theories are not right or wrong. They do a better or worse job of accounting for the situation, or answering questions, and of fitting the data. Explanations are more or less adequate. So establishing the grounds for your claims requires adequately knowing, exploring, searching and making sense of your data.

(Richards, 2009, p. 153)

The repeating ideas and themes, listed in Appendix L, are presented as a way of allowing the reader access to my organization of the ideas revealed in the texts. My literature review and methodological framework lay the groundwork for understanding the approach to analysis. These things allow readers to understand my path to analysis along with my final analysis.
Significance and Limitations

Significance.

This study is significant because of the highly visible position of principals in the era of high-stakes testing and accountability. In this era, principals are expected to lead their schools to success based on measures of student achievement through effective supervisory and leadership skills. My study investigates how principals and teachers, within the context of this study, navigate their way between supervisory and leadership functions of the principal. The results of this study have implications for our understanding of the role of the principal and how that role is constructed by principals and teachers. This understanding helps to define the latest significant stage of school supervision. The results also help us illuminate perceptions of the role of the peer evaluator.

This study is also noteworthy as a study of the implementation of an important teacher evaluation reform. This reform represented a new model for teacher evaluation. The rapid implementation of this reform was compounded by the large size of The District. The results add to our understanding of how participants respond to and understand school reforms.

This study is also significant in its goal and its application of method, although the two are inextricably connected. Utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to complete a study of a newly initiated teacher evaluation system, TES in this instance, is unique. This method of research may help to reveal aspects of TES that cannot be revealed with other methods of research. While several authors have acknowledged the difficulties of principals navigating their function as leaders with their function as
evaluators, there remain several questions about how principals actually do navigate these waters as well as how others perceive their role(s). How did The District maintain control over the reform? What role did the peer evaluators play? CDA seeks to investigate just these kinds of questions, making it a useful method in this case. But utilizing this method of investigation, a space is created where we can reflect on contemporary structures of schooling, including common-sense notions of schooling, how power operates within these structures, and what the effects of these operations might be (Fejes, 2008, p. 21).

**Limitations.**

**Gender.**

One limitation of this study is that it included women participants only. My intent was to limit the number of factors impacting the discourse for this unique study. In an effort to exclude gender as a mitigating factor I have, ironically, brought it to the fore. While not the main theme of this dissertation, gender certainly impacts the talk around, and the enacting of, educational leadership and teacher evaluation. Although not suitable for being stereotyped, certain approaches to leadership exemplify the leadership of many women (Grogran & Shakeshaft, 2011, p. 5). It is also worth noting that, according to Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011),

Women leaders of education in the United States have not had it easy by any stretch of the imagination. To start with, as we’ve noted, despite being the majority of teachers and the majority of educational administration students in this country, women occupy only a small fraction of formal leadership roles. And women have had few choices in how to lead once they are in the position – being
in the minority, their options have been constrained by stereotypical expectations and beliefs. (p. 101)

I did not intend for this to be “gender” research. In an interesting irony, Grogan and Shakeshaft report that, while women are underrepresented in research in educational administration, research on women is labeled as “gender” research, while research on men is absent the “gender” label. The majority of principals and district administrators in The District are women. This research is on women, but is not intended to be labeled as such. By specifically not labeling this study as a gender study I intend to counter this stereotype.

**Participant motives.**

Another limitation, already suggested, is that the key informants for this research, the two district administrators, may have chosen schools for my research on self-serving needs. My stance was that my research could only be strengthened by focusing on schools that were deemed to be best by them. It was never my goal to find two dysfunctional schools or schools mired in conflict to research in the first place. This research was always more interested in more subtle displays, which could only be enhanced if these administrators sent me to more functional school sites, however “functional” was defined by them.

An unintentional, but related, limitation involved the principals selection of what they thought were highly effective teachers. Again, this limitation may have resulted in my exposure to more subtle relationships and was of interest. These relationships had the potential to be less mired in petty judgments and to be less volatile. These relationships were therefore more apt to be based on trust and to be congenial. If collegial dialogue
were to be taking place, it would be within this type of relationship. This also may have affected the motives of the teachers who participated, thinking that they were abiding by the wishes of the principal.

*My subjectivity.*

Personal analysis and interpretation cannot, and should not, be avoided. This type of research values subjectivity as an essential part of human communication that cannot be done away with or controlled (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 27). My own biases are to be embraced and made known. Fairclough (2003), dismisses the concept of objectivity and writes that “there is no such thing as an ‘objective’ analysis of a text” and that there is no analysis that is not “biased by the ‘subjectivity’ of the analyst” (14-15). Acknowledging my own impact on this research then becomes paramount, and the process of doing so is termed reflexivity. “Take it seriously! It identifies a crucial feature of social research namely that part of the data is the researcher” (Richards, 2009, p. 49). My reflective journal helped me to track my thinking and focused my attention on my impact on the research. Being as transparent as possible is one way to allow the reader to appreciate my influence on the research.

*Limited generalizability.*

Critical Discourse Analysis is interested in small stories, and this research was no different. I investigated small stories, specific instances of TES. These small stories are just that, small stories. These stories are also told through me, meaning that my imprint is contained throughout. As is true of much poststructuralist research, opportunities to generalize are minimal. This research can only illuminate these few small stories, through my lens. As stated by Foucault (1972), “the question proper to such an analysis might be
formulated this way: what is this specific existence that emerges from what is said and nowhere else?” (p. 28). Foucault (1988) may have had it right when he wrote that,

My position is that it is not up to us to propose. As soon as one ‘proposes’ - one proposes a vocabulary, an ideology, which can only have effects of domination. What we have to present are instruments and tools that people might find useful. By forming groups specifically to make these analyses, to wage these struggles, by using these instruments or others: this is how, in the end, possibilities open up. But if the intellectual starts playing once again the role that he has played for a hundred and fifty years - that of prophet in relation to what ‘must be’, to what ‘must take place’ - these effects of domination will return and we shall have other ideologies, functioning in the same way. (p. 197)

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I described my method of analyzing data which was designed to analyze the practice of the new teacher evaluation system recently enacted in The District of my study. The process and organization of language began with a linguistic analysis as outlined by Gee. This linguistic analysis continued with editing the texts for relevance based on my methodological framework. For this process, a method outlined by Auerbach & Silverstein (2003) was utilized. The texts, now limited by relevance, were sorted into repeating ideas. These repeating ideas were then sorted into themes. It was these themes, originating organically from the texts that were sorted into theoretical constructs. My analysis was aided by my intimate connection to the texts, a result of doing the transcriptions myself with an emphasis on accuracy, followed by numerous readings. In the next chapter I begin the presentation of my analysis with my results.
Chapter Five: 
Instructional Leadership and Evaluation as Conflicting Text

Introduction

In this chapter I discuss important themes that emerged from my analysis of texts, texts collected from books, documents, interviews, and observations. This chapter represents descriptive themes while Chapter Six contains my critical discourse analysis, discussion, and implications. This chapter is organized around three major themes connected to my primary research questions. What tensions arise, if any, when principals are expected to be instructional leaders but yet retain evaluative status within the hierarchy and how principals navigate these roles. How did The District maintain control over the reform? How were the peer evaluators perceived by others, and what role did they play? One theme that emerged was the ways in which various participant groups viewed instructional leadership and the principal’s role as an instructional leader. District administrators, peer evaluators, and principals all had similar, yet nuanced, views of the principal’s role as instructional leader. The teachers, however, had a bit different view. Documents specific to The District and Danielson’s 2008 text *The Handbook for Enhancing Professional Practice: Using the Framework for Teaching in Your School* supported a particular view of instructional leadership, and those are included. A second important theme that emerged is focused on tensions and negotiations of responsibilities. A third theme that emerged involved The District’s management and control over the messages delivered around TES and how these impacted the implementation of the reform. These three themes are discussed in the following sections.
Theme One: Instructional Leadership in Action

The commonly accepted vision of current supervisory practice views the principal as the instructional leader. A review of the literature, presented in Chapter 2, highlights the prominence of the instructional leadership role of the principal. My research found that viewing the principal as instructional leader was also prominent in The District, and an important element in the implementation of TES. In fact, according to Debbie, The District has “talked about instructional leadership for years.” How instructional leadership activity is defined, however, is subtly different depending on the participant’s position in the hierarchy.

Definitions of instructional leadership by role.

In the next section, I discuss how instructional leadership is viewed from the district level, peer evaluator level, and then from the school level. Instructional leadership is also addressed in The District documents, and those will be discussed. Here, the district administrators and peers represent a district-wide view, with their perspectives spanning numerous schools. Principals and teachers, however, are concerned with a single school and therefore represent a local view.

District administrators.

Two district administrators were a part of this study. Their views represent a district-wide view, encompassing all schools in The District. Their input is an important element in understanding the implementation and intentions of TES.

Instructional leadership of the principal.

District level participants, Dawn and Debbie, both indicated that instructional leadership is an important element in being a school principal. In speaking about The
District and implementation of TES, Dawn said, “we’re in a journey towards having a much heavier burden on instructional leadership.” Principals, according to Dawn, lead instruction in “a million ways” including analyzing data, allocating resources, providing professional development, progress monitoring, and doing frequent walk-throughs. Debbie emphasized that, within the context of TES, “observations alone do not make you an instructional leader. It’s what you do with that data and with your teachers on an ongoing basis after you collect the data from the observations.” The collection of observation data on teachers is a key element of TES.

TES a tipping point toward instructional leadership.

Dawn and Debbie equate TES with instructional leadership and both feel that TES is helping principals to focus on the instructional leadership functions of the job. “It’s caused people to think outside their comfort zones, those that were not practicing instructional leadership, and it’s caused them, forced them, to get into their classrooms to focus on teaching and learning,” said Debbie. Dawn echoes this sentiment when stating that implementing TES has been “a great tipping point towards instructional leadership.”

Instructional leadership as seamless.

Navigating between the principal roles of instructional leadership and supervision is viewed by both Debbie and Dawn as seamless. For both of these district administrators, everything that a principal does should be with greater student achievement in mind, so therefore everything is related to instructional leadership. Principals, according to Debbie, are hired to make sure that “kids are learning in your building. So every other task you do and every other responsibility you have should relate to that.” Debbie further explained her thinking this way:
It’s been a little challenging for those who don’t know how to manage the balance between being an instructional leader and then taking care of things, and I guess what people need to understand is, the role of an instructional leader is not a separate world to anything else, the bottom line is, why are you hired, this is what we have to get people to understand, why are you hired to be a principal at a school? And it’s to improve student learning. It’s to make sure your kids are learning in your building.

Dawn believes that “in aligning the new teacher evaluation there’s a lot of instructional leadership pieces where the principal is having to manage.” This equates effective management with effective instructional leadership. In this view, the two are necessarily connected. Yet Dawn does draw a distinction between instructional leadership and evaluation, evident in her statement that principals “definitely see themselves as instructional leader and as an evaluator.”

*Support for teachers comes from various sources.*

When asked, however, where teachers should turn for help with improving instruction, Dawn never mentions the principal. She does mention websites, district podcasts, a specific book, staff development opportunities, and other teachers. The post-conference is a time for principals to give teachers, in the words of Debbie, “options for how to make those improvements, specific strategies, or specific trainings that might address those deficiencies.” Debbie points towards staff development, but holds principals responsible for allocating resources to support teachers, resources that can also include other teachers within the school.
Walk-throughs important to instructional leadership.

These two district administrators stressed the importance of classroom walk-throughs as a critical element of principal instructional leadership, echoing the literature presented in Chapter Two. Walk-throughs allow principals to know what is going on in the classrooms and, in the words of Dawn, “through frequent walk-throughs, observing in the classrooms, looking to see that if they have a goal of increasing higher level questioning that it’s actually being put in place.” Both of these administrators often refer to walk-throughs as informal assessments, and Debbie thinks that “maybe observations with informals along the way to help monitor whether the improvements are being made” will provide a full picture of teacher performance. Informal assessments, as referred to by Dawn and Debbie, include walk-throughs and pop-ins. They are also unannounced. These are placed in contrast with formal observations, which include the entire pre-observation, observation, post-observation cycle as required by TES. Debbie would “like to see a more comprehensive approach where you’re using the informals and the formals interchangeably, because the informals are unannounced.” She continues that “formals are important, but I think they need to be mixed with informals.”

Increasing the number of informal observations is seen by these administrators as a way to improve the TES process, and will be required beginning the 2011-2012 school year. These additional informal observations are meant to be unannounced, and Dawn believes these will be welcomed by teachers, stating that “teachers have actually requested more pop-ins” because combined with formal and announced observations, these create “a really good balance for them. And they feel that it helps hold them accountable because you never know when someone’s coming in.” Dawn stresses
balance in several responses, such as when she remarks that teacher evaluations should be “very balanced with careful and systematic observation or what have you, walk-throughs, trend data, as much capture as possible of actual practice in the classroom” and later when she says that she “would reduce the number of formal, scheduled observations and increase some unscheduled visits so that there’s balance there as well.”

Both of these district administrators have similar views of the principal as instructional leader, and both place a high level of importance on this role. Dawn and Debbie both believe that principals are instructional leaders, that all of the principal’s tasks encompass instructional leadership, that frequent classroom walk-throughs should be the norm for principals, and that TES is an important element in principals enacting instructional leadership. They both speak from their district perspective, but they also both speak from their experiences resulting from having been school principals.

_Toward a system of collegial coaching._

While instructional leadership is talked about by these district administrators predominantly associated with the role of principal, others are recognized as leading instruction as well. According to Dawn, “we’re also finding teachers are providing great support to each other because no matter what resource list we put together teachers themselves will make it even better. And so there’s some collegial coaching also.” Debbie believes that when teachers are successful then the principal should “help them share their effectiveness with other people within the building.”

School administrators, resource teachers, academic coaches, and other teachers are typically included in a school’s leadership team, and this team is also held accountable for leading instruction within a school. Dawn referred to the process of
principals enlisting others in instructional leadership as shared leadership and stated that, “in a school that’s fully functioning there’s shared leadership and shared responsibility for all of those issues.” This was described as distributed leadership by Debbie who believes that principals need to “distribute that leadership” with their teams. Dawn explains that:

> Everybody leads instruction in a fully functioning great school because there’s the principal, the assistant principal, all of the members of the leadership team which is a diverse group that differs from school to school. But teachers are leaders of instruction as well. I mean, teachers lead each other across teams and throughout the school, both in formalized PLC meetings but even in informal meetings’

Teachers are outstanding leaders of instruction in our schools.

From this perspective, principals are leaders of leaders, which Debbie equates with being a learning leader and asks, “So then what kind of leader should you be? A learning leader, an instructional leader.” From the perspective of the district administrators, instructional leadership is shared and distributed, with principals ultimately responsible for facilitating this process and assigning resources.

**Peer evaluators.**

The peer evaluator is a new position in The District, having been established as a required element of TES implementation. Each peer evaluator is responsible for numerous teachers and schools. Each of the peer evaluators included in this research were responsible for at least ten schools and between 160 and 180 teachers. The peers, Jeenie and Seelie, also viewed principals as instructional leaders, but talked about this in a more muted manner than the district administrators. The peers tended to emphasize other
teachers as being more important to the everyday enactment of instructional leadership with teachers.

*I’ve always wanted to help teachers.*

Peer evaluators were chosen purposefully, with their expertise as teachers and their leadership as determining factors. Jeenie thought that “they were looking for, of course, teachers that know what best practice is.” The two peer evaluators in this study opted to interview for this new position based on their perceptions of their own knowledge of teaching best practices and their experiences in taking on leadership tasks within their own schools.

These experiences helped to shape their attitudes about instructional leadership. Jeenie talked about being interested in assisting interns and new teachers, and a program she began for new teachers to her school. She talked about starting this program based on her own initiative, and decided that “we just had so many new people. And it was hard for the administration to keep up with because they were always, all that the administrator has to do is a lot, so I just kind of took it on.” Seelie’s experiences were similar, stating that, “I’ve always wanted to help teachers. I’ve taken on interns, I’ve taken on new teachers, all of that. I’m a trainer for The District and so when this position came about it kind of put everything that I really enjoyed doing together.” These teachers, now serving as peer evaluators, both talked about taking on instructional leadership roles within their schools and their knowledge of best practices for instruction. This is the experience that they brought to their new position.
The principal as support for teachers.

The principal, according to Seelie, can be enlisted to provide instructional support for teachers and says that she has “directed teachers back to administration so that administration can help them. I would say if there are specific coursework, professional development, that sort of thing, that they help the teacher get into those courses.” Seelie mentioned administration as the last of her suggestions for teachers, however she indicates that her “feeling is, as administrators, they’re there to support their teachers, for whatever they might need.” The support she envisions is voiced as helping teachers to gain membership in certain staff development courses. Seelie does not mention principals as actually delivering the staff development, but responsible for making sure that teachers have access to the appropriate staff development opportunities. Jeenie, when asked who the instructional leaders were in the school, mentioned first that “I think it has to be more the administration of the building.”

I try and direct teachers.

These peer evaluators had been assuming instructional leadership responsibilities in their prior teaching positions, yet they had different ideas about their abilities to be instructional leaders from their current roles. Seelie spoke about providing “a lot of support myself. Resources, we talk about specifically in the post conference, then we also talk about in general what they can do, so I try and provide a lot of resources and help myself.”

Jeenie felt as if the tremendous case load and the resulting lack of time with each teacher impacted her ability to be an instructional leader, and that “because I’m there for such a short amount of time I don’t think that I have a lot of time to really be a leader.”
Jeenie did, however, along with Seelie, talk about resources they could offer teachers, including websites, professional books, district trainings, and other teachers in the school. Jeenie developed a list of what she considered to be helpful websites for teachers that she had automatically attached as a link in all of her email responses. Jeenie sees herself as an instructional leader, but only “in a way, because I’m helping individual teachers.”

Although Jeenie is reluctant to label these types of actions as instructional leadership, these activities echo what the district administrators thought one form of leading instruction could look like, namely providing resources to teachers. In the words of Seelie, “I try and direct teachers towards different workshops and staff developments they can access whether it’s through The District or elsewhere. And then if there are specific personnel resources at their school or within the District I guide them to those directions also.”

It is the knowledge of these specific personnel resources and how to utilize these resources that these peers bring with them from their prior experiences. Seelie talked about her own quest for input about her teaching, and talked about how she had always enjoyed people coming into her room to give her critical feedback. Jeenie recognizes the importance of seeking out academic coaches to support teachers “because they are there in their building, and that’s their job is to help teachers, and they’re not a lot of times being utilized in that way.”

In the next section I discuss instructional leadership by school. A discussion of instructional leadership as viewed by the principal and teacher at Jefferson Elementary is followed by a discussion of instructional leadership as viewed by the principal and teachers at Southern Pine Elementary.
**Jefferson Elementary.**

Jefferson Elementary is classified by The District as a Title I school, and as such it receives additional resources. These resources come in various forms, and include everything from additional materials and equipment to additional staff members. Jefferson Elementary has an additional academic resource teacher who is charged with working with small groups of students, presenting model lessons for teachers, and planning with teams. Jefferson Elementary also has a reading coach who is assigned to support teachers only, and who does not work with students. Having these extra teachers on campus impacts how staff members view instructional leadership.

**Jamalia.**

The principal at Jefferson Elementary, Jamalia, sees herself in an instructional leadership role, either actually working with teachers herself or allocating other teacher resources for support. When asked where teachers should turn for help, Jamalia thought that administration should be the first stop for teachers, that teachers should “honestly go in and either talk with your AP or your principal, whichever one you feel the most comfortable with.” Jamalia goes on to explain that “the bottom line is, go in and schedule multiple observations for that person and look at specific areas. They could be the observations based the new TES, they could be the classroom walk-through observation.” As did the district administrators, Jamalia links classroom walk-throughs with instructional leadership activities. Jamalia considers her singular self last in the chain of support for teachers when stating that “I either went with my reading coach or I went with my math resource teacher or I actually went back in and said, ‘I’m just going to
come in.” She first mentions relying on support from the reading and math coach, and only then mentions herself as sole supporter.

Assigning resources.

Jamalia includes others as sources of support for teachers, and talks about others as instructional leaders. “I think with me or the AP and giving realistic feedback but then also finding some others that can do some observations and a mentor, per se, at the school level who can give some feedback and some coaching.” This further illustrates her willingness to assign other resources to support teachers. Jamalia offers her own support and elicits the support of others. She provides a rationale for these efforts by explaining that “I think that’s the only way to fairly give that person the opportunity to either improve or be able to get a good handle on it would be in doing those observations along the way.”

During the pre-conference that Jamalia held with Janet, several teachers were mentioned as sources of information regarding the appropriate use of technology. Jamalia mentioned specific teachers at different grade levels to provide Janet with an opportunity to see various uses of technology with various age groups. Jamalia does mention herself as directly supporting teachers, but she relies more heavily on teachers supporting teachers.

Providing feedback, not evaluating.

In talking about providing feedback to teachers, Jamalia is careful to draw a line between coaching or mentoring and evaluating. She points out that “the purpose of the observations is to give them feedback, not from an evaluatory standpoint but feedback from coaching.” Jamalia carries this point of view into her conversation with Janet (the
teacher participant from Jefferson Elementary) during the pre-conference. Jamalia asks if Janet has anything in particular that she is working on that she would like some feedback on, and stresses that “it’s not something that you’ll necessarily be marked off during your observation, because it’s something we’re looking at, and wanting feedback.” The teacher wanted some feedback on her use of technology and explained that because she is working in small spaces in various locations she is not sure how to manage the use of technology. Jamalia offers some support during the pre-conference, naming four teachers who utilize technology that Janet could go visit or observe, and she also talks about ways the room could be organized. The post-conference contained feedback from Jamalia regarding Janet’s use of technology. This demonstrates Jamalia’s efforts at providing feedback to teachers from a coaching point of view, a point of view she purposefully contrasts with evaluation.

**Janet.**

Janet, a teacher at Jefferson Elementary, has a complicated view of the principal as instructional leader. When asked about the principal’s role as instructional leader Janet responds that “I think her role, maybe that’s the AP’s job, is more curriculum then principal’s job.” When asked where she would turn for assistance in improving her teaching, Janet does not mention the principal. Janet responds that “I think you would ask your peers, start with your team, your team level, grade level peers and veteran teachers I would think.” While Janet does not mention it, she is herself a resource teacher in a position to provide support to other teachers.
Lack of clarity.

Janet talks about the principal doing numerous observations throughout the year. She states that “the principal sees you many times, you know, every day throughout the year. She does come in and observe you several times a year.” She expected that during their post-conference Jamalia would “go through the domains and to give me her feedback as far as whether she thought it was exemplary or requires action. I didn’t feel like she, it didn’t go as I expected….I’m very unclear how she felt.” Janet is expressing confusion over the post-conference and expressing her desire to know, up front, what the principal thought. Janet expects her principal, acting as a supervisor, to be direct about her evaluation of her performance.

Principal as coordinator rather than expert.

In our interview, Janet mentioned the principal in relation to TES only when talking about explaining to teachers the nuts and bolts of utilizing the rubric. Her comment that the principal is “doing a good job with going over the domains at a faculty meeting” illustrates this point. Janet mentions this again in the interview. “I think we had three faculty meetings, she would give us different types of examples and we would have to put on where they fell on the rubric. So, she had some hands-on tasks that were helpful.” These comments reinforce Janet’s view of the principal as supervisor.

Yet the principal does offer support and feedback to this teacher throughout the pre and post-conferences. As already discussed, Jamalia offers Janet several options for observing the use of technology, and Jamalia attempts to comfort the teacher by explaining that feedback will be offered in this area in a way that will not negatively impact the evaluation. Janet acknowledges that some of Jamalia’s comments in the post-
conference were helpful. “I feel like her comment on the higher order questioning, to require the kids to have, I think, better, to use their language skills, or try and use the appropriate language. I thought that was a good comment.” Janet goes on to comment that “I agree with her, you know, I should pay more attention to that.” While district administrators and the principal have defined these as instructional leadership activities by the principal, Janet does not recognize them as such. Her comments about the principal’s performance at faculty meetings indicates that Janet views the principal as a supervisor, although the district administrators would view all of these activities as connected to instructional leadership.

**Southern Pine Elementary.**

Southern Pine Elementary has not been identified as a Title I school. This means that Southern Pine Elementary has been assigned only a reading coach, with no other subject area resource teachers that can act in supportive roles or that can act in instructional leadership roles. This has an impact on the views of instructional leadership at this elementary school

**Sally.**

The principal at Southern Pine Elementary, Sally, talks about her role as instructional leader in several ways. She talks about her responsibility for assigning resources to support teachers and also talks about her own responsibilities in supporting teachers. Additionally, Sally discusses walk-throughs and pop-ins associated with TES as an important element in her display of instructional leadership. She also provides several opportunities for teachers at Southern Pine to develop and practice instructional leadership.
Coordinating support.

When Sally was asked where a teacher would go for support, she responded that “we write an action plan.” When I probed for who “we” meant, she responded very quickly with “me, with whatever support I need. I have district resource teachers come in. My reading coach. My leadership team.” Sally continued, “What resources do we have, what can we provide, and what do I need to call downtown and ask the different curriculum areas for?” Here Sally mentions calling The District, indicating the lack of the additional resource teachers available for Title I schools. In giving an example of how this worked with a specific teacher, Sally said that she:

…sat with the teacher, wrote an action plan and who was going to provide the different types of support. We had support in planning, we had people coming in to model, we had support with how to download and use data reports to guide instruction, and we arranged observations in like classes in another school with a district resource teacher sitting there to make sure what needed to be seen was being seen.

While working to make sure the correct resources were made available to help this teacher, Sally was enacting instructional leadership by allocating resources.

Gently moving people.

Sally also talks about her own direct efforts at working with her staff in an instructional leadership role. She talks about coming to a school with a “very seasoned staff” and the challenges that presented. Many of the teachers “have been here for a very long time and they’ve always done things the same way and they’ve always been an A school and it’s always worked. So why change? So that’s my challenge.” Sally talked
about “gently moving people in the direction we need to move” and how she utilized the TES rubric to guide her conversations with teachers about instructional practice. She describes how teachers are beginning to engage in collegial dialogue about teaching practice, and moving to in-depth “conversation about instruction, instructional practice and are the students getting it.” Sally relies on her vast amount of educational experiences as a resource in building trust during conversations with teachers. This is epitomized with the statement that “based on my curriculum knowledge, which fortunately I have a huge amount of, I was able to say, ‘what you have to trust is I’m elementary, I know what rigor looks like in elementary.’”

*Walk-throughs as good sense.*

One recurring theme with Sally was her desire to conduct even more walk-throughs and pop-ins. She identifies this activity as important, one which was labeled as instructional leadership by the district administrators, and states that walk-throughs are “in my mind, in the good sense, forcing us to spend more time in the classrooms.” In discussing the need for more visits to the classroom in addition to the two formal observations that are required, Sally remarks that she will plan better in the future in order to “have more time to do the pop-ins and walk-throughs....One or two observations isn’t enough to do a really reliable Spring evaluation. So I have to get in there more.”

Sally also shares her concern about utilizing the actual pop-in form that is a part of TES. “I didn’t do enough pop-ins and I walked through a lot but I didn’t do enough filling out the pop-in form.” Completion of the online form allows the information gathered to be tracked within the TES system and as she plans for next year Sally intends to utilize the online forms more. “Where I have the comment areas I’m going to be
putting comments in there that give me information that will help me towards using the rubric in Spring evaluations.” For Sally, the lack of pop-in and walk-through data inhibited her ability to complete fair and accurate evaluations.

Sally expresses her concern about doing more official pop-ins during the evaluation conference with Stacy, telling Stacy that “two one hour visits, and then walking in once in a while, isn’t really enough.” Sally further explains to Stacy that “next year’s will be a more accurate evaluation because I’ll have a lot more information from knowing how to do this.” With Stephanie, Sally reveals the importance of the information collected during these pop-in visits. When Stephanie begins to explain how she rated herself on one of the domains, Sally concurs. “I’ve seen it. I’ve sat with you around the reading table with a different piece in front of every student at that table.”

*Distributing leadership.*

Sally overtly recognizes the leadership of classroom teachers and also provides opportunities for them to act as instructional leaders. District administrators talked about this type instructional leadership activity as shared or distributed leadership. During their evaluation conference, Sally recognizes Stacy’s efforts at “collaborating, helping each other work through difficult situations. You’re very supportive to your partner, people on your team.” Stacy talks about a training, and Sally responds, “well, we’ll talk later, we’ll have to find out what we can use here, and see if we can share some of that great stuff.” In discussing Stephanie’s role as team leader, Sally urges her to “because you have that role, look for things that maybe you can help bump it up a notch.” Sally acknowledges that Stephanie is “collaborating and coaching with some teachers.” Sally goes on to
provide a specific opportunity for this teacher to accept more of a leadership role by offering the following:

And what I’d like to do with you is, make sure that when new things are coming down the pike we have some input to the people presenting, if it’s in house, of, ‘how are you presenting this? Would you like me to provide a slide or an extra page of this adapted if you have children mainstreamed?’

What she is offering Stephanie is an opportunity to provide information to teachers on how things presented to the faculty could be differentiated for children identified as having special needs. She is inviting Stephanie to seek out those opportunities by asking her to help adapt the strategies and add that to any training presentations, “helping provide that to the teachers so they have a better understanding of that.”

Sally enacts her instructional leadership role by allocating resources to support teachers and, to a lesser extent, by utilizing her own skills to support teachers. She is planning on conducting more frequent classroom walk-throughs and pop-ins. The direct involvement of other teachers in leadership activities is also part of Sally’s enactment of her role as an instructional leader.

**Stephanie and Stacy.**

The two teachers at Southern Pine Elementary who participated in this research, Stephanie and Stacy, had slightly different ideas about instructional leadership at their school. Both were experienced teachers who were acknowledged by Sally in their evaluations to be outstanding educators viewed as valuable assets. Both of these teachers did view themselves as leaders within the school who tended to rely on other teachers in the school for any needed instructional support.
Administrators rely on teacher leadership.

Stephanie was a team leader, and took quite seriously her duty to gain knowledge and share that with her team. “Being team leader they’re always coming to me” and explains that she has asked questions about TES whenever possible because she knew “other people are going through this and I’m special education lead.” This comment indicates that her team mates would likely turn to her for answers. Stephanie’s role as team leader is reinforced on several occasions during the evaluation conference with the principal. Sally, in the conference with Stephanie, tells her that “you’re the team leader, you’ve been trying to guide other people in keeping up on what we need to be doing.” Sally also explains that “since you’re team leader, I’m trying to make sure so when people say, ‘why did she do that?’ you have my thinking.” Stephanie recognizes the impact of her efforts at being team leader when saying that “there’s apparently some of my team mates who have gone and spoke to the principal and said how much I’d helped them.”

Stacy also recognizes her own ability to lead instruction, although in a much more subtle manner. Stacy believed that her strength as an educator arose from her “wealth of life experience. You know, I just have a lot of things in my background that help me.” When she was asked what opportunities she had to share that knowledge she replied that “I think my administrators know. So, I tend to get kids.” These “kids” are explained as those that are viewed as more challenging students. She specifically talked about one refugee student who was purposefully placed in her classroom. Stacy also talked about other teachers from her team coming to her for advice on handling specific issues with difficult students.
Teachers rely on other teachers.

Stephanie and Stacy tended to rely on other teachers in the school for support with instruction. Stephanie, when first responding to the question about where she seeks support answered “I don’t know.” Then Stephanie talked about sitting around and brainstorming with other teachers. She felt the need for some sort of online forum, “where there’s like a talk board, where they can get together and chit chat, ‘okay I saw this, I saw this, how would you do this?’ that kind of thing.” Stacy said that she relied on her team leader and a team leader from another grade level. “It’s kind of like you find those people. I’m trying to think, those are probably the two people that I use the most.” For Stephanie, the opportunities to talk with other teachers was a bit more random than it was for Stacy, illustrated with comments from Stephanie like “it’s just, you talk to the next person…” and “well, ask your friends.” However, she did specifically mention a resource teacher who she felt very close to and that she felt could support her.

Increased observations by principal.

Stacy never mentioned the principal as an instructional leader. When asked where she would turn for support she mentioned only other teachers. Stacy did, however, talk about the increased number of observations performed by the principal as being a positive thing and says:

I’m satisfied with my evaluations. I think I’m getting more credit for what I’m doing in this method because I am getting observed more, whereas before it was more just the principal’s impression….But with the new system, I am being observed more and I think the criteria are very well spelled out, it’s clear that I
know my job and I’m doing well and, and I’m effective with the kids. So that part I am happy with.

Stacy goes on to remark that the principal walked through her room several times during the year, and “even though it may just be staying for five or ten minutes, I think they can still get a sense for if there’s learning going on, and so they can get a better feel for that.” Classroom walk-throughs are seen as an instructional leadership activity by the district administrators, and her principal. Because she does not mention the principal as a source of instructional support, however, Stacy is viewing walk-throughs as part of the principal’s supervisory role.

Principal’s role as supervisor.

Stephanie did mention administration as a place to turn to for support, and they were included as a “main” source of support. In probing more deeply, Stephanie talked about turning to administration for procedural types of concerns. The district administrators, in defining everything that a principal does as instructional leadership, would include these types of concerns as instructional leadership activities. However, Stephanie spoke more in terms of the principal in a supervisory role. For instance, Stephanie sought administrative help with a writing test and “information about testing and evaluations for the students and some things like that.” Stephanie’s concerns about testing were focused on the actual delivery model of testing and included concerns about scheduling. At the end of their evaluation conference Stephanie thanks Sally and tells her “I’m very happy with the compliments.” She is acknowledging the principal’s evaluation as positive and thanks her, again reinforcing the view of Sally as supervisor.
A greater presence for the principal.

Stephanie does acknowledge her principal’s greater presence as well. She believes that Sally is getting closer to the classroom, “realizing exactly what’s going on with teachers…she has had to be more engaged to see what’s going on, which is good because that gives her more of an opportunity to see what we’re doing.” Stephanie believes that this has helped Sally to develop a greater sense of what her special needs students are capable of, and a greater capacity to “judge” on the evaluations. While Stephanie is witnessing instructional leadership on the part of her principal, again Stephanie puts this in the context of allowing her to be a more accurate evaluator, a function of the principal’s supervisory role.

District documents.

The District maintains that walk-throughs, in addition to TES pop-ins, are an important instructional leadership activity. While in attendance at a district sanctioned and developed leadership development program I received a copy of the “Administrator’s Reading Walk-through Checklist” (See Appendix E). Attendees included experienced administrators acting as mentors, and less experience administrators that were being mentored. I was in this group as a mentee. This checklist was explained to us by a district level administrator as one tool in monitoring teaching and learning, and we were explicitly told that it aligned with Danielson’s framework and therefore our TES rubric.

Danielson, in “The Handbook for Enhancing Professional Practice: Using the Framework for Teaching in Your School” that was widely disseminated by The District to school administrators, writes that these unannounced observations “constitute an important manifestation of an administrator or a supervisor serving as a school’s
These observations are viewed by Danielson as helping supervisors “shape teachers’ thinking and instruction” (p. 74). This text was an important element in The District’s staff development for administrators around TES, further reinforcing walk-throughs as an important instructional leadership activity.

As TES moves into its second year some changes will be made. The Observation Chart and Pop-In Descriptors (see Appendix G and I) both support the increased use of informal or unannounced observations. For a teacher scoring in the top level after the first year of TES, the observation chart lists two required formal observations, and three required informal observations. Previously no informal observations were required, they were only suggested. When given the Observation Chart, it was explained that an informal tool was being developed for two domains on the rubric – classroom environment and instruction. These are described on the Pop-In Descriptors. Together, these two documents reinforce the principal’s instructional leadership responsibility, and The District’s expectation, for frequent classroom visits.

**Theme One: Conclusion.**

There are some commonalities among the participants in what they view as instructional leadership, but there are several differences. Notably, the district administrators consider all activities of the principal as related to instructional leadership. While the district administrators hold principals accountable for ultimately leading instruction in schools, they also spoke of shared and distributed leadership. Peers view the principals as ultimately responsible for guiding instruction within schools, but they also recognize the importance of others. Principals see themselves as instructional leaders, and while they expressed willingness and the knowledge to support teachers,
they tended to rely more on offering support by assigning resources. Teachers were more likely to view principals as supervisors/evaluators and rely on other teachers for instructional support. Teachers also talked about their own roles in supporting other teachers. District documents and supporting textbooks reinforce the use of walk-throughs as an important instructional leadership activity by principals.

**Theme Two: Negotiating Tensions and Responsibilities**

A second major theme emerging from this research is the impact of TES - on district administrators, peers, principals, teachers, and on teaching practices. The impact of TES caused tensions, and these tensions had to be negotiated. While The District message permeated throughout the participant groups and illustrated how much success The District had in branding the message, each of the participants felt the impact of TES differently. For this portion of the chapter I will discuss the results by participant group, and include information from Danielson.

**District administrators.**

Both of these district administrators were directly impacted by the implementation of TES. Dawn and Debbie were both involved in the implementation of TES from the very beginning stages, working closely with the grant funders and various committees within The District to develop the program. When they talk about the impact of TES, however, they mainly talk about how the new evaluation system should positively affect classroom teaching practices and student achievement, how it will allow for more consistency with the principal practice of evaluating teachers, and how TES has impacted The District as well.
Shifting the focus to student learning.

It was common throughout the interviews with all participants for TES to be compared with the old State Teacher Performance Measurement System (STPMS). When talking about how TES has impacted teaching, Debbie draws this comparison in expressing her belief that “I think it’s shifted the focus to our students’ learning.” The old STPMS was focused on teaching behavior, while the new system is focused on student learning and the associated student behaviors. Dawn discussed this in terms of “changing the way it works, that we’re really looking at teacher effectiveness and starting to analyze how we measure that and how we’re looking at that.” It is early in the seven-year implementation, and no student data has yet been connected to TES evaluation scores, so these administrators rely on anecdotal data. Debbie says that “I’ve heard stories where principals have said, ‘you know what, the conversations have never been deeper with my teachers’ and I’ve heard from some teachers that have had good experiences with it, that ‘it’s really helped improve my practice.’” Dawn talks about principals seeing “an increase in collegial discussion on their school site. PLCs talking about the components, the domains, the different pieces, what can be done to improve… that kind of stuff.”

Redefining satisfactory teaching.

According to Debbie, at the end of the first year of TES there were about twice as many teachers rated as unsatisfactory as the year before. This is a new development for The District, although one that was expected. One of the reasons given for initiating TES was the belief that far too many teachers were rated as outstanding. In meetings I attended as an assistant principal and district administrator, the problem with too many teachers being rated as outstanding was that if there were, indeed, that many outstanding
teachers then The District should not have any poorly performing or failing schools. Of course, based on standardized testing data The District did have several poorly performing and failing schools.

The test data has not been fully analyzed at the time of this writing, so no test data has yet been tied to teacher evaluation scores. So far, however, roughly twice as many teachers have been rated as unsatisfactory. Jamalia estimated that, while she did not see an increase in the number of unsatisfactory teachers, roughly 30% of her teachers were rated in the 23-35 range. That would, based on the Observation Chart (See Appendix H), result in an increased number of both formal and informal observations.

**Need for consistent teacher evaluation.**

TES relies on the principal conducting numerous formal observations, accompanied by walk-throughs and pop-ins. While The District has promoted this practice for many years now, it is obvious from the district administrator participants that they believed that many principals did not follow through on this in the past. According to Debbie, TES implementation will “hold people accountable for actually being in classrooms and determining are teachers meeting the mark based on this rubric. And before you could have people not go into classrooms at all and then do an evaluation at the end of the year.” Debbie and Dawn both talk about this in terms of gaining some consistency with the principals’ practice of evaluating teachers. As Debbie explained:

It was based on the fact that we had so many people getting certain marks but their student achievement data not necessarily matching it. So you might have teachers getting complete outstandings, having perfect scores of 144 in the old system but if you look at their student achievement data it wasn’t matching, and
so there were inconsistencies, we had some schools that every one of their teachers was rated that, yet their data was not matching it and you had some schools where there was a principal who was actually looking at each individual and using a lot of thought in giving their ratings. And so there was inconsistency.

Dawn talked about ensuring that principals were rating teachers “fairly” and “accurately” and the fact that under STPMS “like 96% of the teachers were rated satisfactory or higher” and that evaluating teachers “needs to have accountability.”

*Added accountability for principals.*

This has added a layer of accountability to the principal’s job. TES expects principals to be able to fairly and accurately rate teachers because, says Debbie, “that’s the main role of the principal, to identify effective teaching and learning in a classroom and if you really can’t, and give that honest feedback to your employees, then you shouldn’t be in that role.” Dawn adds that being able to fairly rate teachers “becomes a professional behavior on the part of the principal” and that “there is a part of the principals’ evaluation that includes how well they evaluate their teachers.” In an effort to make sure that principals maintain their ability to be fair and accurate raters, Debbie talks about “one thing we’re doing in the future is we’re going to use certification assessments where we all watch the same videos, you go in, you rate, and within a range, if you’re correct, you can stay certified every year. Just like we did with the old protocol every three years.”

*Peers corroborate principal views.*

Peer evaluators are a new element for The District, and their evaluations will be 30% of a teacher’s final evaluation, equal to the 30% from the principal’s evaluation.
Dawn reports that those principals “that have spoken to me about it are very much in favor because they like having an extra set of eyes.” The explanation is framed by Dawn in terms of “either your high, high performing or your low performing teacher, it’s nice to be corroborated.” Dawn explains that the peer evaluations have “added strength” for the principals, and that:

It’s actually given more credence to the principal evaluation and teachers are seeing that as well because they are seeing their peer and their principal, and when they both are saying the same thing about a certain component or a certain domain, they’re like, ‘okay, I guess it’s not just because this one doesn’t like me. There must be something I need to work on.’

Debbie calls the peer evaluators “teacher experts” and sees their input as a bonus for principals, that “the peer has added more data in that teacher’s file to where you can make a better decision, or better judgment about a teacher’s overall performance.” This has also forced principals, according to Debbie, “to be even more on point” and will “force them to raise their game with what they’re seeing in classrooms.” For Debbie, while peer evaluators can add strength to a principal’s evaluation, they act to regulate the principal’s evaluation as well.

**Impact on the delivery of staff development.**

TES has impacted The District as well, and aside from the obvious impact of implementing a new program, Dawn talks about how TES has helped focus district efforts at delivering staff development to teachers. A good example of how this has affected The District is in the following quote from Dawn:
We’re also even finding, it was mentioned the other day by one of our senior staff members, principals are requesting professional development for their school sites differently than they’ve done in the past. They are requesting specific training related to a specific element, related to a specific component or domain because of trend they’ve seen over their school as opposed to, oh, ‘we just need behavior management.’ It’s a huge way to change the way of work at central office too. When they see, I mean, even district wide we see the statistics that the highest percentage of developing ratings is in domain three. The highest percentage of accomplished ratings is in domain two. So it’s so exciting, because even at a district level it’s focusing our discussion because it’s giving us a common base from which to discuss, decide, make decisions, etc.

Much of what the district administrators describe as impacts from TES are unique to their perspective. While all groups speak about the impacts on teaching, no other participant group mentions staff development or the principal’s consistency with rating teachers. **Peer evaluators.**

TES has had a direct impact on the peer evaluator participants as well. The peer evaluators worked with teachers and principals, some of whom were more receptive to the peer’s role than others. The peer evaluators also had a view to how TES affected teachers and principals. These peers provide a unique glimpse of the impact of TES and the impact of their new role on both teachers and principals. Their views are discussed in the next section.
Teachers resistant to TES.

The peer evaluators took on a new role, knowing that they were entering fresh territory that would have to be negotiated. This presented no small challenge to them. Both peers dealt with resistance from teachers and principals, and both encountered successes as well. Seelie talked about some teachers being “quite receptive and want what’s best for the kids and are willing to do whatever they need to, to improve their instruction, to make sure they’re teaching for learning.” She then goes on to say that “I think teachers are also intimidated to have somebody they don’t have a relationship with, they don’t know, come in and, as they see it, a lot of them see us as more telling me what I’m doing wrong.” These teachers, according to Seelie, do not see the peers as a “teaching tool or a way to improve their instructional practices.” Seelie described her position as a “double-edged sword. On the one hand they appreciate having a peer come in….At the same time I think teachers, at least until they got to know me a little bit better, were very apprehensive.” Jeenie had similar experiences. “I guess the most challenging was just the teachers who were resistant” and yet there were some that she “observed and helped along, a few of them did ask well can you come in and show me what you’re talking about.”

The peers discussed differences between types of teachers and their reaction to having a peer evaluator. Both peers talked about new, inexperienced teachers as being receptive to them and their presence. Jeenie thought that these new teachers “wanted the feedback and they were used to feedback because they hadn’t been out of school very long, and they were used to people coming in and observing and whatever.” Seelie
echoed this belief, that “the new teachers, I think they felt that I don’t know everything so please help me.”

Both of these peers also agreed that veteran teachers were more accepting of the role of the peer and, in the words of Seelie, “understand and kind of have gotten back to that beginning point of okay, there are so many different ways, they’ve seen all the changes and the pendulum swings and everything that they know there’s never one way to do something.” Jeenie had a bit different view of why veteran teachers may be more tolerant. As she puts it “they know they only have a few more years and then they’re out of it. So they listen to what you have to say but…” Jeenie also adds that most teachers who “had really big areas to improve” were also receptive to her presence.

These peer evaluators both articulated the biggest source of resistance as coming from the teachers in the middle – teachers no longer fitting the description of new, but not quite veteran either. “It was mainly the ones in the middle” is how Jeenie described it, adding that “I’m not sure why.” Seelie also called this the “middle group” and that “I don’t know if it’s that they haven’t been there long enough or what, but it was interesting.”

**Confusion over the evaluation scoring process.**

A new element of TES is that peers complete a final evaluation on teachers that becomes 30% of their overall final evaluation. Many teachers were uneasy with this process as this was a new way of The District arriving at a final evaluation score for teachers. “I think they’re just now kind of starting to grasp that. I don’t think that they really understand the whole process” according to Seelie. She continues this line of thought by adding that:
I don’t know if they are going to feel that the peer evaluation is as valid because it goes back to that if they don’t feel that the peer was effective in the first place then they’re not going to feel that the evaluation is valid. That the peer didn’t know them, they only saw me for a few minutes, that kind of thing.

Jeenie’s concerns about the acceptance of her evaluations by teachers had more to do with teachers understanding the process of coming to a final score, and that she had received “many” emails from teachers “on the fact that my evaluation really wasn’t reflective of what was in their file.” Jeenie explained that the final evaluations were not to be an average and that they were supposed to consider everything in a teacher’s file “holistically.” Both peers expressed their feeling that teachers are still confused about the process of reaching a final evaluation score.

**Teachers persuaded to improve their practice.**

The peer evaluators saw TES as positively impacting teaching and that TES presents a new way at looking at classroom practice. Seelie says that:

This process that we have now is doing a lot of good things in that it’s looking at student learning. That’s where the focus should be, should have always been, because we can do a song and dance but if the kids aren’t learning, what good is that going to be? So I think definitely a strong focus on student learning and how that teacher, or what that teacher is doing and how it’s impacting that learning.

Seelie points out that most teachers are now “more cognizant of what they’re planning and what affect it will have on students” and that teachers “are making changes in their classrooms.” Jeenie also sees TES as a positive initiative and says that “I think the idea of the whole system is good.” She continues that: “having teachers coming in, peers helping
other teachers, is a good thing. Teaching can be a very isolated profession, and I think it’s real important for teachers to be collaborating, teamwork and all that business.” Jeenie thinks that “teachers have upped their game a bit… it has improved best practice, and at least if they’re not doing it at least they know what it is.” She adds that “I think it will persuade teachers to improve their practice, I do.”

Jeenie believes that tying TES to teacher salaries will add additional motivation for teachers to improve their practice, although this benefit is tempered. Jeenie says that “I think the hardest part is that it’s tied to pay. So anything that’s tied to money, of course, is going to be a little bit more challenging. But then, I think about, if it weren’t tied to money would people take it as seriously.” TES is designed to tie student performance to teacher pay after its third year of implementation.

**Peers’ add support for principal.**

Peers not only dealt with teachers but also dealt with principals. While this too was a mixed bag, mostly the peers felt like their new role added positive support for the principals. Jeenie thought that “most of the time they were really receptive.” The peers both spoke about how principals thought that the peer observations and evaluations added strength to the principals’ own observations and evaluations. Seelie thought that she added “an outside perspective of what’s going on in the room.” Seelie pointed out that the information added by the peer evaluator gives a different perspective that allows principals to say “okay, this is where our school needs to go, the direction.” The perspective of the peer is seen as adding support for the principal, and adding additional information. “I really think that most of them thought that I was there to back them up” explained Jeenie, and that:
They see things and I think I was there a lot of times just to confirm what they were seeing. I think it helped them. They were, most of the time they were really receptive to what I had to say, so I think I was just there to confirm what they thought anyway. Most of them knew where the areas of concern were, with what teachers, and I think they were glad that I was there to say there’s an issue.

The principal would feel more confident in her own appraisals because of the peer’s reinforcement. “I think it was good for most of them because, it was another set of eyes that were objective” explained Jeenie.

**Challenge of working with a resistant principal.**

Jeenie did mention one principal with whom she had difficulties communicating. This principal was described by Jeenie as “overwhelmed with the whole job of being the principal.” There was a lack of communication between Jeenie and this particular principal and that “not only with me as well as the faculty. I don’t think they understood the process either, so I was going into a situation where it wasn’t received at all.” The lack of communication by this particular principal impacted the entire staff’s attitude about TES and the peer evaluator. Teachers at this school did receive good evaluations from the principal however, who rated “everybody exemplary with a sprinkling of accomplished” according to Jeenie, who goes on to explain that this particular principal “was retiring so I think she was leaving everybody in a feel good way.” In this case Jeenie felt as if she could not rely on any input from the principal when it came to completing the final evaluation for these teachers. This is precisely what the district administrators talked about with TES and forcing principals to be better evaluators.
Principals now more accountable.

Seelie relates a story from her own teaching past, about a principal who never walked through her room and would never observe her teaching and yet this principal evaluated her, but “for all they knew I was just sitting there eating bonbons and reading the paper. So I don’t think that it was a truly accurate picture of what teaching was going on and what learning was occurring.” Seelie related this story to say that she believes TES is going to hold principals “more accountable for actually going into the rooms, actually observing the teaching, observing the learning.”

Overall the peer evaluator participants did feel as if TES was a positive initiative that is moving teachers and principals toward best classroom practices. They feel they have something important to add to the principal’s view, and that the process makes principals more accountable. They both expressed the belief that teachers are still confused about how final evaluation scores are determined and about the fact that they get two separate evaluations.

Principals.

These two principals, while working at very different types of school sites, expressed similar ideas about the impact of TES. Some themes that emerged from the principals included the usefulness of the TES rubric, dialogue about teaching, the effects on teachers, and the effects on their own jobs. Principals also revealed ways in which the presence of peer evaluators impacted them.

Usefulness of the rubric.

“I like having a rubric. I like the fact that it’s divided into domains. I truly like having a rubric…because it really gives you a focus” is how Jamalia described the TES
rubric. Sally talks about using the rubric during observations and how, when she is observing teacher behaviors “we’re now looking at it on a rubric and when you can recite specific behaviors that they are not doing, it’s like a big aha to them.” Sally discussed using “the rubric a lot.” While both principals talked about this in interviews, they also both utilized the rubric during conferences with teachers. Sally sat with the evaluation rubric displayed on a computer that both she and the teacher had access to viewing. Sally talked through each item, explaining her interpretation, and explaining how that might look in that teacher’s particular class. As an example, Sally explains her thinking on a particular item with Stephanie, the teacher of children with special needs:

Managing student behavior, and this is hard because of the, some of the things you have going on in your classroom. Considering the level of the students I have marked this one accomplished. Based on the fact that when one is back over here laying on the floor making the noises and stuff they all keep working. It’s not impacting, it’s only impacting that one student and you’re dealing with that student based on their needs and the amount of time they need…

Sally expressed in her interview that she “was concerned. Will I be able to use the rubric correctly in there because I’m not trained in that ESE specialty?” of Stephanie’s class. Sally talked about taking the time to explain her use of the rubric in post-conferences and that “a lot of them ran over because I wanted to make sure they had the opportunity to become more comfortable with the rubric” and that it took several of conferences for teachers “to really start becoming more comfortable with okay, now, after the first round then everybody really did better because now they knew how the rubric was being used
in their class.” She concluded one of her responses in our interview with the comment that “people learn.”

Jamalia also explained use of the rubric during the post-conference, in one instance describing the difference between marking something as developing versus accomplished, that developing “would be instructional outcomes are at moderate rigor,” accomplished “would be reflecting higher level of learning curriculum standard,” and exemplary “is a lot of what accountability are the students taking for themselves?” With these explanations Jamalia is framing her response to the teacher, although she does not indicate what particular rating she gave the teacher on this area. Jamalia, towards the end of the conference, directs Janet to “check out the rubric again.”

The entire teacher evaluation system is built around this rubric. It is clearly an important element, and one appreciated and utilized by both principals.

*The rubric contains some negative connotations.*

Jamalia and Sally, while both expressing their fondness for the rubric, also both express frustration over some of the wording in the rubric. Jamalia’s is frustrated with “the way developing is written, the verbiage of it. A teacher could find very offensive and become resistant to the verbiage and not hear the message.” Sally says something almost exactly like this when talking about “some areas where the developing wording in the rubric sounds like needs improvement. Having been a teacher as many years as I was I would have considered that very negative and needs improvement.” Both principals compare wording to the “needs improvement” rating from the old STPMS, a rating that was viewed as negative and caused teachers to become defensive. Sally explained that some teachers were not truly accomplished, but that “they were not nearly as bad as the
rubric language in developing” either, that developing sounded awful but they were not truly accomplished teachers either. While both of these principals expressed a liking for the rubric, this area presented them with challenges.

**Professional dialogue enhanced by TES.**

TES was intended to increase talking and dialogue around teaching and teaching practices, which many teachers were not used to. Sally explained that teachers were used to hearing that they did a “good job” but were not used to engaging in “in-depth conversation about instruction, instructional practice and are the students getting it.” Now at Southern Pine Elementary Sally describes a changed type of dialogue, where the discussions are more like “this is what I saw, have you ever thought about trying this?” and “I never even thought about that and I went back and I tried it, and wow, it’s great and now it’s part of my regular practice.” This, according to Sally, “is making them stop and rethink and think, and that is empowering.” Jamalia has “actually even heard” some of her teachers say, “oh, you know, I really need to make some changes here. I really need to try such and such” and she heard others to say that they “could see how they could make some changes in what they’re doing.” Teachers at Jefferson Elementary were also not accustomed to this type of talk about teaching, or the questions that result from the pre-conferences and post-conferences. Jamalia says that “I had a lot of questioning about where this is coming from because they haven’t had that questioning before.” These principals feel that TES is changing the dialogue about teaching on their campuses.

**Teachers appreciate the opportunity to reflect.**

When Sally was asked if she thought that TES had made an impact on the teaching practice at Southern Pine Elementary she responded “yes, in fact, they told me it
did.” She goes on to talk about how even little suggestions from administrators or the peer evaluator were taken to heart, that “it was often very small things that were suggested, but they listened, they took it.” Jamalia responded to the same question about if TES had impacted teaching by saying “oh yeah.” Jamalia and Sally, although mentioning that TES will positively impact teaching, spent time also talking about the impact on actual teachers.

TES was new, and teachers responded in various ways. At Southern Pine Elementary, TES affected “everybody. They really weren’t used to being observed and having people come in regularly and stay for longer periods of time and ask questions and want to talk about it” explained Sally. She continued that now “they’re having to reflect more and they’re having to really be able to describe why they’re doing what they’re doing.” This represented a shift at Southern Pine Elementary because, as Sally explained “there are a lot of people who have not been observed in a long time and they were not used to being, people coming into their room and being in their business and that was very uncomfortable for them.” Sally felt as if her teachers were “scared” of TES, unsure of exactly how it would impact them, and that there was a lack of “trust” in how it was going to work.

*Listening to the chatter: Teachers being nervous.*

Sally also talked about the differences between newer teachers and veteran teachers. As Sally explains it, veteran teachers were nervous about how she would view the practices in their classrooms, “nervous that maybe I wouldn’t recognize what it was supposed to be…or understand their style of teaching.” Veteran teachers who were used to scoring a perfect 144 or a nearly perfect score were also nervous, as they wondered
how TES would affect them. Newer teachers were nervous for “different reasons” and were influenced negatively by “listening to the chatter.”

At Jefferson Elementary “pretty much some of the older ones were more resistant to this type of evaluation, the younger ones were more receptive” according to Jamalia. She explained that, like at Southern Pine Elementary, teachers worried about TES were “the ones that have always gotten that overall satisfactory and outstanding evaluation, for years and years and years” Some teachers at Jefferson blamed poor performance on others, which Jamalia described as “you know, it’s not them, it’s the evaluator, or it’s me.”

Both of these principals are dealing with the effects of coming out of a teacher evaluation system that rated, according to Dawn, “96% of teachers” as outstanding. These principals are dealing with what Sally calls an “uneasiness” from teachers. This is something that both Sally and Jamalia acknowledge as necessary, because they both support the implementation of TES.

*The amount of time required by TES was excessive.*

One thing that both principals emphasized was the sheer amount of time TES requires, making it difficult for them to perform other parts of their jobs. Pre-conferences, observations, post-conferences, walk-throughs, pop-ins, and evaluation conferences all added up to a tremendous amount of time that principals were not used to spending on such tasks. While agreeing that the process has had a positive impact on the learning in their schools, the time required was a definite drawback. For Jamalia, “I think the amount of time, though, is excessive. The amount of time involved with inputting and going through is excessive.” She talks at length about the “amount of time that is involved” in
pulling together the correct information, including the “self-evaluation, employee summary, professional development” documents necessary “so that when I’m going through and completing the rubric I have the information there to substantiate it.”

For Sally the task is no less daunting. She believes that TES has affected her job “hugely.” While she views the time spent in classrooms as a good thing, “it also makes it very difficult to do some other parts of our job.” Sally says that The District “is talking to us, asking what else can we take off your plate…I know they’re concerned about it.” Throughout the TES process, The District has monitored principals, providing them with several deadlines for completion of certain tasks, which Sally says “they constantly changed for us because we couldn’t do it.”

The observations completed for this research illustrate the amount of time some of these tasks entailed. The principals were required to complete at least one full cycle for every teacher, to include one pre-conference, one observation, one post-conference, and a final evaluation conference. Using the observations from this research, and including the observation that lasted an hour, the time a principal would have spent on this would have been four hours and forty minutes per cycle, not including any walk-throughs or pop-ins or the time it took to write up each observation and enter all of the required information onto the website. Each principal completed one cycle on every classroom teacher, although some teachers required additional cycles. This made a pronounced impact on their work loads.

**Being in line.**

When Jamalia was asked if she felt that the peer evaluator impacted her at all, she was quick to remark that “she really didn’t.” But then just as quickly she changed course
and said that “except for the fact, and I take that back when I say she really didn’t affect me.” Jamalia went on to explain that she used the information entered into the teachers’ files to see if her own observations were “in line.” The peer evaluator’s data was “for the most part” in line with her own, “so that just kind of reaffirmed to me that…what I was seeing in the classroom and what I was reporting was very similar to what she was seeing and what she was reporting.” Sally actually referred to the peer evaluator in the evaluation conference with Stacy, telling her that “Seelie and I both got, we both feel like you’re really strong there.” The district administrators and the peer evaluators thought that the peer observation ratings added strength to the principal evaluations, and that feeling is reaffirmed by these two principals.

Both principals spoke about the impact TES has had on their schools and their teachers. They also spoke about how TES impacted their own jobs as principals. They feel as though TES has changed teaching and dialogue about teaching on their campuses positively. The impact of the peer evaluator was also seen positively. The sheer amount of time required was highlighted as the one negative aspect of TES.

**Teachers.**

TES is a teacher evaluation initiative, and as such has had direct impact on teachers. The teachers involved in this research have felt the effects, with some aspects of TES being received more positively than others. Overall, teachers still have not been able to sort out exactly what TES will mean to them and their careers. Generally, they relayed much more concern than the other participant groups over the impact of TES.
**TES driving teachers apart.**

It is to be expected that a new initiative may be met with apprehension and these teachers had numerous concerns and worries. One major concern expressed by teachers was concern about the ability of teachers to continue working with each other. For Stephanie, that concern was a result of teachers comparing observation ratings. Stephanie relayed a story about how one of her teammates had much poorer observation ratings when compared with her own. As reported by Stephanie, “they came to me and said, ‘well, you’re doing this and I’m doing this, why did I get that?’” Stephanie responded to this teacher, explaining that it could be the difference between evaluators or circumstances. This created, according to Stephanie, “a lot of hard feelings” and “a lot more confusion.” Stephanie was in the position of having to explain why she got higher ratings than another teacher. Stephanie talks about the impact that poor ratings are having because nobody was really sure “what meant what.” She says that “if you get something that you didn’t expect I think it’s really demoralizing a lot of people…and they’ve just gotten livid.” This creates what she sees as difficult working conditions that inhibit the ability for teachers to work together.

**We are going to lose people.**

Another major concern is that teachers will leave the field. The concern, voiced by Stephanie, is that teachers judged as mediocre will be lost, what she calls “those that are just your medium level” teachers. “I think in the long run we’re going to lose people because they may not be the best teacher but they’re doing the best with the kids they have and the abilities they have.” Sally, unhappy with TES, talked about her own contemplation of whether or not to stay in the field of education as a result.
A lack of clear answers.

Teachers are also concerned about the lack of direction offered for teachers in conforming to the expectations of TES. Stephanie talks about the lack of clear answers on how to make improvements and how that negatively affects these mediocre teachers who may become “frustrated” because they would like to improve but are just told that they should “know their kids” and to “figure out how that works.” Teachers are unsure of what they need to do to move their marks up consistently. “This first year there’s been a lot of confusion” is how Stephanie describes it.

I doubt that it will be fair.

Janet teaches children with special needs in a Title I school, and she is worried about how her students will be accepted by other teachers. “I worry,” says Janet, “that you’re not going to work together as a staff because you’re going to have students that people aren’t going to want and I think there is going to be some in-house fighting over it.” She is worried that because special needs students and financially poorer students generally are viewed as performing inadequately on standardized tests teachers will not want their salary tied to those students. The District will be implementing a value-added approach to generating a prediction of student achievement that takes into account disabilities, but not economic status. Janet is concerned about this formula. She mentions “other states who have tried that, it’s not working well, even with the value added.” She goes on to say that “basing on what, 40% of a teacher’s performance on standardized testing, in special situations such as Title I or special needs students, I’m just unsure how that’s going to impact, whether it’s going to be fair. I just don’t know if it will be. I doubt
that it will be.” Janet is concerned that teachers may become unwilling to accept special needs students in their classrooms, and may avoid Title I schools altogether.

**Tying teacher pay to TES.**

Stacy is concerned about money issues, and she feels empowered to voice her opinion because she is nearing retirement and that she “can say things” because she is “not probably going to have to live with it.” She says that “I was hoping to make it two more years, and then I will retire. So at that point that’s when they’ll be fully implementing it.” If things go according to what she currently believes, she thinks she will be “seriously debating” whether or not to stay in the field. In discussing her salary, Stacy stated that “the real fear is that this is a way to roll back beginning salaries, because nobody will talk numbers with us.” For Stacy, there are not enough answers. “You know, the people that talk about this program talk about ‘oh, you’re gonna be evaluated and beginning teachers will be able to make more money if they’re evaluated better and blah, blah, blah.’ But nobody will talk numbers to us.” She wonders out loud what’s going to happen to her pay and if she should be trying to get out of teaching now. Stacy believes that it is only fair for The District to make these things known now so that teachers can make good decisions, and she is looking for some kind of blanket statement. This concern, for Stacy, is also tied to the fact that her husband has been affected by the current economic downturn and they rely heavily on her salary.

While teachers currently employed can opt out of the TES salary schedule and remain on the old system, this has been described by The District as advantageous only for veteran teachers. Stacy and Janet are not veteran teachers. While nearing retirement age, teaching is a second career for both of them. They will be given the option as to
whether they want to be a part of the new salary schedule or remain in the old one.
Neither seems comfortable with the new option at this point. The old system pays teachers based on seniority alone, although a state mandated merit pay option is included. The new system is based on evaluations and student performance, with no inherent reward for seniority.

**Peer evaluators cause tension.**

The view of the impact of the peer evaluator differed greatly between teacher participants. All three teachers expressed some sort of negative view of the impact of the peer evaluator, and two relayed some positive views as well. Each of the three teachers had a different peer evaluator assigned to them, so each teacher’s views will be discussed separately.

*Janet.*

Janet’s peer made “a couple of good suggestions.” These suggestions concerned the use of technology. “My peer did pick up that I didn’t use technology” which Janet makes an overt attempt to include in the observation from the principal. This was addressed in Janet’s pre- and post-conference with the principal, and she received positive feedback regarding her use of technology. “I did make sure I used technology and I liked it, and I will implement that into my future lessons.” In this instance, the peer’s observation feedback provided something positive for Janet. However, Janet also received feedback from her peer who “mentioned that I didn’t use a graphic organizer.” Janet does not use a graphic organizer every day, and she explained that this was one instance where she did not use one. She felt that the peer unfairly penalized her based on
one observation. “Your peer comes in and observes you, they’re only getting a snapshot of you a couple of times a year. So that can work for you or that can work against you.”

Stacy.

Stacy felt she was marked down unfairly by her peer as well. There is a pre-conference form that is to be completed which includes a place for teachers to write about special situations in their classrooms. Stacy wrote about a student “with extenuating circumstances with his home life.” This student acted up during the peer’s observation “but I still got marked down because of he acted up.” Stacy was then directed by the peer to go to a staff development class, saying that she wasn’t managing her students’ behavior “properly.” For Stacy, this peer “totally misread the situation.” As Stacy explains:

I knew exactly what was going on, and I knew exactly how far I would let this person go and as long as he was getting the lesson, and so to me, when I look at the whole picture, he’s not having a negative impact on his own learning or anybody else, that’s my judgment as the teacher.

Stacy did not want to reveal “the whole case history” to the peer but she did give some indication that this student was going to present some behavior issues. She thought that the peer “just totally misread the situation.”

Stacy also thought that the peer misunderstood her objective for the lesson. The peer evaluator “critiqued my objective, that it wasn’t a true objective.” Stacy is still unclear of what the problem was. During her evaluation conference with the principal Stacy brought this up as well, even bringing in her old textbook that she used to create the objective for the lesson that the peer evaluator observed. She felt as though she never had
the opportunity to completely understand the peer’s stance, saying to the peer that “I quoted out of books and I went back and looked this stuff up and I don’t understand your point of view. If this is what I’ve been taught and this is what I’ve been doing…we still haven’t talked about it.” Clearly Stacy was frustrated by her interactions with the peer evaluator.

*Stephanie.*

Stephanie’s frustration came out of the differences between her peer evaluator’s observation feedback and that from her principal. She talked about this repeatedly. Stephanie’s peer evaluator commented on her room arrangement, which Stephanie offered as “the perfect example” of how different evaluators rate differently. She explained that “I got developing in my room arrangement with my peer evaluator and I got exemplary from my principal and not a thing had changed.” Stephanie felt as if the principal had more knowledge about her day-to-day classroom operations, and could more appropriately gauge whether or not the room arrangement was conducive to teaching and the needs of her students. She described this as a “tug-of-war” and thinks “this new evaluation allows for a lot more interpretation from person to person.” Even if two people observed her teaching the same lesson, Stephanie believed that “you’re still going to interpret it differently. It’s just human nature.” She was also frustrated by the lack of answers provided to her by her peer evaluator. She attempted to clarify with her peer evaluator exactly what it was that would lead to higher marks on the rubric, but she “didn’t have an answer, and that was the frustrating part.” Again here Stephanie mentioned that “what one person expected was not necessarily how the other person interpreted it.” This was a recurring theme in Stephanie’s critique of TES.
TES useful for other teachers.

The teacher participants all felt that TES was minimally useful for themselves. Janet, who expressed concern over tying pay to test results, will try “not to let the tests or the evaluation influence my job. But I can tell you that I think it is going to.” What she sees as the negative impact of tying pay to academic testing she is trying to avoid herself. In fact, Janet is trying to avoid what she views as negative impacts on her teaching. She has hopes that TES will weed out poorly performing teachers. She hopes that teachers “that teaching is not their calling” will get “every chance they can to make their corrections” and then if no improvement is made that they will “be shown to the door.”

Even though Janet does not discuss positive impacts on her teaching, Janet did talk about incorporating the use of technology as a result of TES observation feedback. She viewed this positively.

Stephanie implemented one change based on her peer evaluator’s feedback, and that was to implement backward planning. This is planning with the end in mind, a process advocated by The District and often referred to as lesson study. She qualifies this by saying that she was already doing this, but because the peer evaluator mentioned it and “that’s what she was looking for” Stephanie made this process more apparent. Generally, Stephanie felt as if her teaching was impacted very little because the rubric did not match so easily with her teaching in a special needs classroom. She felt as if there were many times the rubric was applied unfairly to her teaching and so therefore made less of an impact on her teaching. She changed very little of her teaching based on feedback from her observations and that a rubric for special populations would be more appropriate.
“because what is good for one isn’t good for the others.” This rubric, she felt, was “unfair” to her and that it needed to be “tweaked a little.”

When asked if TES has impacted her work in the classroom, Stacy replied that “it really hasn’t.” Stacy describes herself as a competent teacher who takes the amount of time necessary to plan and implement lessons. TES, she feels, adequately rewards her for her good work by putting more responsibility on the evaluators. As discussed earlier, Stacy felt that she should not have to prove the quality of her teaching order to receive high marks, and that the proof was in her classroom. For her “the questions they’re asking” during the pre-conferences “are really relevant to the normal process you should go through to plan a lesson” and that TES has made absolutely no impact on that at all, just on how she was rated. Stacy’s difficulty communicating with her peer corroborates her belief that TES has not impacted her teaching, stating that “it doesn’t have an impact on my teaching. I don’t know what to change. I don’t know what you want me to do, because we haven’t communicated.”

Stacy also added that the process of completing the pre-observation form and any additional notes was time consuming. “It’s not taking time away from the classroom. It’s taking time from the family because there’s no way you can do it during the day.” Even the staff development that her peer requested she attend related to behavior management took time away, requiring her to spend parts of two Saturdays at the training. This was seen as very time consuming, and her attendance was explained in terms of compliance. Stacy also shared that another teacher commented to her that “I don’t feel like this is helping me, they just keep telling me to go to trainings.”
District documents.

District documents and supporting texts were also impacted by TES, as well as making an impact themselves. The rubric was directly affected by the implementation of TES and feedback from evaluators. Supporting texts by Danielson provided the roadmap to intended impacts.

Toward collegial dialogue.

The second version of the rubric (see Appendix I) is a response by The District to objections regarding the language of the rubric. Sally and Jamalia both expressed concerns that the language of the rubric in certain areas was difficult to navigate and much more negative sounding than they were comfortable with. As explained when the newest version of the rubric was handed out, the changes made directly reflected these concerns. Sally addressed this by expressing her satisfaction with changes that “were in alignment with what principals and others had requested. The language was made more positive.” The changes in language are envisioned a way to move the dialogue between principals and teachers from a defensive posture to a more collegial posture.

A lack of collegial dialogue between principals and teachers.

The TES rubric, fashioned after Danielson’s framework (2008), was intended to advance collegial dialogue at schools. It was a goal that discussions between principals and teachers become more collegial. District administrators talked about increased collegial dialogue on campuses, and principals noted this same phenomenon. The observations revealed, however, that there is little collegial dialogue between principals and teachers. Teachers are turning to each other, and district administrators and principals
report that teachers are talking together differently, and that these new discussions are around the rubric.

**Theme Two: Conclusion.**

The effects of TES were felt differently by each participant group, and were felt differently within participant groups as well. The district administrators framed their discussions around the overall positive impact that TES has had on teaching and also the instructional leadership of principals. Peer evaluators were a new element in The District, and they impacted principals and teachers. They felt like they were in a position to support both teachers and principals, however, they were both confronted with teachers and at least one principal resistant to TES and the presence of the peer evaluator. Principals believe that TES has had a positive impact on teaching and talk about teaching. They believe that the peer evaluators have lent support to their own evaluations. Principals also addressed the impact that TES has had on their workload, and that TES is a time consuming activity that had a negative impact on their ability to perform other aspects of their jobs. Teachers presented a more diverse range of feelings about the impacts of TES. Teachers talked about the impact on salaries, on their abilities to work with other teachers, and on the usefulness of the peer evaluator. By and large the teachers felt that TES had minimal to no positive impact on their teaching, and had some negative impact. The District responded to concerns about the rubric by changing some of the language in an effort to create the atmosphere for meaningful conversations about teaching.
Theme Three: District Control of the Language of TES.

This theme permeated throughout the interview texts and in the materials disseminated by The District. What becomes apparent is that The District has vast resources and networks of communication capable of circulating its messages. Contrasting with the many questions the teachers had concerning the implementation of TES was the amount of knowledge that had managed to filter down to them through the various hierarchical layers. These examples illustrate how The District is asserting its power to determine meaning. Examples of this include the notion that principals should be in classrooms with some frequency and regularity, the use of the term “snapshot,” the idea that ratings are not averaged, and the idea that pre-conferences are not for coaching. Also discussed here is The District’s oversight of TES in the form of discrepancy reports – computer generated reports containing TES data.

Principal walk-throughs and pop-ins as central.

All participants talked about principal walk-throughs and/or pop-ins, and all couched this in positive terms. As discussed earlier in the chapter, district administrators expected that principals would complete numerous walk-throughs as an instructional leadership activity that would provide them with data that would guide campus based decision making. Dawn referred to these as systematic observations, allowing principals to gather as much data as possible of classroom practice. Debbie talked about TES holding principals more accountable for getting into classrooms more often. Peers talked about walk-throughs, and their desire to complete more of them themselves as TES enters its second year of implementation. For Seelie, TES was holding principals accountable for getting into classrooms and observing teaching practices more often, and that
increased observations would help principals to make better decisions for their schools. Principals felt that walk-throughs and pop-ins were an expectation and provided them with useful information. These walk-throughs were new for many teachers at Southern Pine Elementary, but the teachers also felt them to be useful. Both teachers at Southern Pine Elementary felt that their evaluations were much fairer as a result of the principal being in their rooms more often. This was echoed at Jefferson Elementary, where Janet felt that the principal’s evaluation was much fairer due to her knowledge of the students.

The idea that principals should be walking through classrooms frequently and regularly was widely seen as a part of the principal’s duties and a natural event. District administrators expected principals to be doing walk-throughs, principals were doing walk-throughs, and teachers were happy with the results of the walk-throughs. This is a relatively new practice for The District, as evidenced by the fact that for teachers at Southern Pine Elementary this was new. Since the implementation of walk-throughs several years ago, walk-throughs have become a part of supervision vocabulary in The District. However new in the actual practice, the idea of walk-throughs has been established as a normal part of the principal’s duty, and walk-throughs are an occurrence that teachers expect and view positively.

District documents support the increasing use of walk-throughs and pop-ins. As already discussed, the new requirements for the next year of TES will include required informal pop-in observations as well as those formal observations already required. The Observation Chart (see Appendix H) shows the number of required observations. A teacher coming out of the first year of TES rated as unsatisfactory will have eleven
required observations, four of which must be unannounced pop-ins. It was explained that these informal observations do not require letting the teacher know prior to walking in.

**Observing snapshots of teaching.**

This phrase is one that has come with the implementation of TES. Each observation is seen as a “snapshot” of teaching practice. As such, it is seen as a singular occurrence that may or may not be generalized as a representation of the overall practice of a teacher. The final evaluations are meant to be holistic, with an attempt by evaluators to include all information gathered about a teacher to draw a conclusion about that teacher’s practice. The term “snapshot” was used nine times throughout the interview and observation texts. It showed up at every level of participant group and in each school. It also showed up in the Coached Cycles Script (see Appendix D). This script is designed to guide evaluators through a mock cycle. At one point in the script the principal says, “This is only one snapshot.” Janet talks about having an observer “that comes in that gets a snapshot...they’re only getting a snapshot of you a couple of times a year.” Sally discusses the difference between “a snapshot of one day, one lesson” and the final evaluation where you are to consider everything a teacher has done all year. The term comes up in conferences as well, as when Jamalia reminds Janet that her observation is “a snapshot, and then you’ve got different observations.”

**A teacher’s final evaluation score: Not an average.**

Teachers and evaluators use the term “snapshot” and understand that these become a part of their final evaluations. However, teachers are still in the old habit of averaging scores to come up with a final evaluation score. This is not what is indicated by TES. Scores are purposefully not averaged for the observation ratings because evaluators
are charged with considering all of the data holistically to come up with a teacher’s final rating. An example would be a teacher who was marked developing early in the year but exemplary later in the year in a certain domain. This does NOT average to an accomplished rating. If the teacher is currently performing at exemplary then the previous developing is not indicative of the teacher’s current performance. This teacher would receive an exemplary on the final evaluation. Dawn discussed training for evaluations where we:

- Taught them how to look through the items that are in the teachers’ space, in their file. Because, a reflective principal can then see the whole school year, they can see observations that they did, they can see observations that the peer did.

Principals can see comments made by themselves, by the peer, and by the teacher. All of this information, considered together, helps principals and peer evaluators come to final evaluation ratings. Teachers are still not comfortable with this process, and as was discussed earlier in the chapter, left them confused. Jeenie said that she told teachers “at the last post-conference it wasn’t an average of their scores” and yet teachers continued to believe that it was.

The message regarding averages was discussed by Charlotte Danielson in a keynote address at the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) National Conference on April 9, 2011 in Tampa, Florida. Danielson discussed, in depth, the reasons why the final score should definitely not be an average. She gave the example of a teacher who might receive a score of requires action in one domain and an exemplary in another. This would average to something in between the two, which for Danielson meant that the score reflecting requires action is hidden. As Danielson explained, some
requires action scores are so egregious that they should not be hidden in a score that is averaged. This conference was promoted throughout The District as a way to hear more about TES. Over forty district administrators attended this event. There was even a group photo taken with Charlotte Danielson and all of these administrators.

The District does not average each individual observation. It does, in the end, produce a composite score, which is only very subtly different from averaging individual observations. All observation data is considered when assigning a final evaluation score for each domain on the rubric. These scores are then weighted. Here is how Dawn explained it:

So, what Charlotte’s talking about is absolutely 100% correct, because her instrument was designed for observing teachers in practice. Observing teachers in practice and giving feedback to those teachers in practice….And so what we train our evaluators to do is they are to consider everything in the file…to look at everything and develop the true picture of that teacher….There is a number assigned per rating at the evaluation time, and that number then is multiplied by the component weight, and the weight for that observer, and it becomes a number that in the end totals to the total number for the teacher.

This is conceived of by The District as different from an average. Danielson’s concerns about one egregious rating being hidden among other better ratings is still not accounted for, however. Dawn explains that the method for coming up with the teacher’s final evaluation score is The District’s hybrid.
There is a place for coaching.

The District’s message of the pre-conference being for clarifying and not coaching shows up in the Coached Cycles Script (see Appendix D). In this script, evaluators are cautioned against using the pre-conference as a coaching session. The pre-conference is supposed to be for information gathering only, and is specifically referenced as not intended for coaching. On the third page of the Coached Cycles Script, the principal is directed to respond to an opportunity for coaching in the pre-conference by saying:

Well, depending on the circumstances I wear several hats. Sometimes I am a thought partner and coach, and other times I have to be an objective ‘rater.’ I would be happy to talk with you after the observation but it is not appropriate for me to do so now. I know this may seem odd, but in this model, the time for developmental conversation occurs in the post-conference.

Both peers addressed this by explaining that the pre-conference is to get a better understanding of what the teacher is trying to do. As Jeenie says, it is “to get an accurate picture of what their teaching looks like before we give them more specifics.” Seelie offered a similar explanation, and when asked what happens if she knows during the pre-conference that the lesson would be less than stellar, responded that, “I do let them dig their hole.” With questions of safety, however, she would intervene.

Sally, the principal at Southern Pine Elementary, also articulated that during the pre-conference you “don’t coach them. Listen, ask a few clarifying questions, but don’t coach them.” This presented a challenge voiced by both Sally and Jennie, the challenge of asking questions that elicit information but that are not coaching. Staying away from
coaching is important however, as is stressed by the Coaching Cycle Script’s assertion of the “importance of avoiding coaching at this stage of the process” (page 3).

Stacy expressed some frustration over not having been coached in the pre-conference. She talked about writing an objective for the lesson that was discussed in the post-conference as not being an appropriate objective. For Stacy, she would like to have known this up front, and did not understand why the peer did not share this with her. The peer was clear about why this had occurred, but Stacy felt that “some coaching should go on” in the pre-conference.

During Jamalia’s pre-conference with Janet, she does offer some coaching, Jamalia suggests that Janet observe the use of a specific technology that is in use at Jefferson, and mentions several teachers by name. Jamalia discusses the technology with Janet, and offers suggestions that might help it work. The coaching was, however, offered in an extra area that Jamalia asked Janet to specify, and area that she said would not be included in the observation ratings. Still, though, she is coaching Janet in the pre-conference although she does state in our interview that no coaching is supposed to take place in the pre-conference.

**District supervision of TES.**

The District’s oversight of TES was much more apparent to the district administrators than any other group, although it was recognized by peer evaluators and principals as well. Teachers did not speak of district oversight because it did not directly impact them at all. District oversight concerns involve a search for consistency in evaluating teachers, and one major way that The District oversees and manages TES is through discrepancy reports. These elements are discussed in the next section.
The search for consistency.

As already discussed briefly, TES was seen by The District as a way to ensure consistency in teacher evaluations – consistency between teachers and across schools. Debbie explains that “it was inconsistency and not having a rubric to measure. When you don’t have a rubric people can just say, ‘well, this is outstanding at my school.’” The District was trying to find a way to grade teacher evaluations so that there was more differentiation between teachers. It was felt that the old system resulted in too many teachers being rated outstanding, even, as Debbie explained, if their student achievement data “was not matching it.” Dawn explained that “the overall commitment by The District to re-look at teacher evaluation” was a prime motive in choosing to apply for the TES grant funds and go forward with a new way to evaluate teachers.

Discrepancy reports.

Discrepancy reports are computer reports that are generated by The District’s TES office. These reports show a teacher’s ratings after each observation cycle. These reports show the peer evaluator’s ratings and the principal’s ratings. The comparisons of these ratings were then used to drive discussions with both peers and principals. Dawn discusses how, “for example, if a peer develops a strong relationship with a specific teacher and tends to rate too high, then we see that in our discrepancy reports.” When these kinds of anomalies are discovered, Dawn says that “we need to get in there and we need to see some calibration and try to fix that.” The District looks at these reports “every week” says Debbie, and that “if you were way out as an outlier compared with your peer, or vice versa, the peer, we send another calibrator in with the principal or the peer to see if they were on track.”
What Dawn stresses is that “they understand that we are constantly looking behind the scenes to try to make sure that everyone’s in alignment, and if not then they get a calibrator…to make sure that we’re not having anomalies happen.” This has resulted in what Dawn calls some “very high level visits to principals to say, ‘you gotta get this together.’” Debbie believes that because we are looking at peer data “it’s forced the principal to be even more on point because you want to make sure that you are in line.” Dawn goes on to explain that there is part of the principals’ evaluation “that includes how well they evaluate their teachers. So that means how well they are aligned with the peer and how well they’re aligned with student data.”

Jamalia talked about being in line with her peer, and that she actually pulled summaries by the peer in order to see if her own observations were “in line.” For her, this is one way to make sure that she is accurately observing teachers. Jeenie, a peer evaluator, thought that she added another set of “objective” eyes for the principal. The other peer evaluator, Seelie, thought that her presence as a peer evaluator forced principals to be more accurate “because they aren’t the only ones anymore, so what they rate has to be more aligned with what is actually happening.”

Alignment between peer evaluator observation ratings and principal observation ratings is what the discrepancy reports target. These reports are viewed by every layer of district administration including the superintendent. These reports are used by district administrators in their meetings with principals and peer evaluators. Discrepancy reports are used to determine, according to Dawn, “if the principal is completely out of the league.” This is an important element in district oversight of TES implementation.
**Inter-rater reliability.**

Charlotte Danielson opened her keynote address at the NAESP National Conference in 2011 with a discussion about how she and the members of her consulting group had not yet cracked the inter-rater reliability problem with use of her own framework. She discussed this as problematic, and something that they thought would be less difficult that it has turned out to be. Danielson said that they had been looking at numerous videos collected of teachers actually teaching that was part of another grant. Through the use of these videos, and using the framework to assess the teachers on these videos, she found that it was very difficult to attain inter-rater reliability.

Debbie responded to this by describing The District’s effort at getting “inter-rater reliability within a range” and that Danielson was saying that “you’re never going to be a hundred percent on with the person next to you but…you should be on within a range.” Debbie provided practice for school principals, at each of The District’s principal meetings, by viewing sample videos, with a belief that “that’s how you get to that calibration, through continued conversations watching videos.” This type of practice is condoned by Danielson who believes that constant training with groups of other professionals is precisely what is needed, that the ensuing conversations are truly the aim of the framework (2008, p. 11). Debbie offers her thoughts on inter-rater reliability, and says that, “is it ever going to be a science, where you get everybody exactly a hundred percent of the time on the same component? No, and that’s what Charlotte meant I think by the inter-rater reliability.” Danielson’s concerns over inter-rater reliability are thus minimized.
The District provided numerous staff development opportunities for administrators. My own training, which was the same for all administrators, included four sessions with trainers, including one session consisting of three guided observations followed by group discussions with other administrators and trainers. I also went through two required TES cycles with a one-on-one coach. For this purpose, I worked with two volunteer teachers at a school unfamiliar to me. I completed a pre-conference, observation, and post-conference with each teacher. Each of these parts of the cycle was followed by a debriefing with my one-on-one mentor. These sessions were designed to give me an opportunity to practice, but also acted as a manner of final examination because I needed to be checked off as using the rubric appropriately and managing teacher conferences appropriately by my mentor before I was cleared to begin observing teachers under TES. These efforts were aimed at calibration, a term used by The District to denote some level of inter-rater reliability.

*Modified Rubric.*

The District has shown some response to concerns over some of the language in the rubric. This was addressed by The District in some new language to replace what was felt to be inappropriate language in the rubric. Jamalia and Sally both discussed language which they felt was too negative and that left a huge void between a very negative rating and a very positive rating. Both expressed an interest in finding some middle ground. The District presented a new rubric to principals and administrators on August 11, 2011. A new rubric is contained in Appendix I. This updated rubric will be utilized during the 2011-2012 school year and reflects some new wording. For example, wording in 2b was changed to reflect a more positive view. The wording of “little teacher commitment” was
changed to “moderate teacher commitment.” The statement that “both teacher and students appear to be only going through the motions” was removed entirely. Several of the components in Domain 3 were re-written completely As this was presented, district administrators expressed that these updates were in response to criticisms from evaluators and teachers.

**Theme Three: Conclusion.**

District oversight of TES is a theme that percolated down through the various hierarchical layers and was also reinforced with materials and trainings provided to administrators by The District. The District has been able to amass their resources in an effort to circulate consistent messages regarding TES and to provide the vast amount of training needed for administrators and teachers. These messages include the use of walk-throughs as a vital part of principal instructional leadership, the understanding of TES observations as snapshots, and the constant analysis of computer generated TES data.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I discussed three important themes emerging from my texts collected from books, documents, interviews, and observations. The first theme reviewed was instructional leadership and how the various participants defined the principal’s role as an instructional leader. District administrators, peer evaluators, and principals all discussed principals as instructional leaders. Teachers, however, turned to other teachers for support and advice and viewed principals primarily as supervisors and evaluators. The second theme discussed concerned tensions created as a result of TES. Again, district administrators, peer evaluators, and principals had similar views. They, together, believed that TES was having a decidedly positive impact on teaching. The teachers, in contrast,
believed that TES did not meaningfully impact their teaching, and one teacher was trying to avoid what she considered to be negative impacts of TES. The final theme discussed regarded The District’s ability to manage the messages of TES and execute oversight.

In the next chapter I discuss critically the implications and address my research questions. The results impact our understanding of how principals navigate between instructional leadership and supervision within the context of a newly implemented teacher evaluation system. These results also speak to how power is circulated as a result of TES, how layers of accountability helped The District to control TES, and what role the peer evaluators played in forming these layers.
Chapter Six
To See and Be Seen

Hierarchized, continuous, and functional surveillance may not be one of the great technical ‘inventions’ of the eighteenth century, but its insidious extension owed its importance to the mechanisms of power that it brought with it. By means of such surveillance, disciplinary power became an ‘integrated’ system, linked from the inside to the economy and to the aims of the mechanism in which it was practiced. It was also organized as a multiple, automatic, and anonymous power; for although surveillance rests on individuals, its functioning is that of a network of relations from top to bottom, but also to a certain extent from bottom to top and laterally; this network ‘holds’ the whole together and traverses it in its entirety with effects of power that derive from one another: supervisors, perpetually supervised. The power in the hierarchized surveillance of the disciplines is not possessed as a thing, or transferred as a property; it functions as a piece of machinery. And, although it is true that its pyramidal organization gives it a ‘head,’ it is the apparatus as a whole that produces ‘power’ and distributes individuals in this permanent and continuous field. (Foucault, 1984b, p. 192)

Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the results presented in Chapter Five and their implications for our understanding of the impact of TES on principals and how they navigate their roles as instructional leaders who coach and mentor teachers and their roles as supervisors charged with evaluating those same teachers, and tensions this creates.
TES represents a shift in The District – a shift in how teachers are evaluated that is accompanied by increased accountability for teachers and principals. This shift can be characterized by its link to neoliberal education policies and the resulting increase in surveillance. All of this affects the production and distribution of power, creating new dynamics within deeply entrenched norms of teaching and school supervision.

My critical analysis is informed by Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework described in Chapter Three. In Chapter Five I began examining texts, and provided a descriptive analysis of the texts. In this chapter I begin with a review of intertextuality, and then continue with discourse practice, the second circle. I analyze the language around the principal’s place within the hierarchical structure of schools. These two circles, then, sit inside the last circle that is social practice. The analysis of social practice begins with Foucault’s metaphor of the panopticon, and also includes the impact of neoliberal education policies. “Key here is the importance of distinguishing between the apparent intentions of situated language and discourse practices and their actual effects. The effects of power and ideology embedded in these practices cannot be assumed” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 119-120).

**Intertextuality**

Fairclough describes intertextuality as related to hegemony, that “ideologies and the power relations which underlie them have a deep and pervasive influence upon discourse interpretation and production” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 127). A study of intertextuality “is helpful in exploring relatively stable networks which texts move along” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 84). There were several examples of intertextuality illustrated in
Chapter Five, with the various interpretations of instructional leadership being of primary importance to this research.

Instructional leadership meant different things to different participant groups. What was striking was the similar manner in which district administrators and principals discussed instructional leadership. Yet the discussions differed from how instructional leadership was enacted by principals. When Fairclough ties intertextuality to hegemony he is mindful that the power to assign meaning does not lie with all players. In the example of instructional leadership, the meaning as it is discussed is controlled from The District, and the meaning as it is enacted is controlled by the principals and teachers.

District administrators talk about instructional leadership as encompassing basically everything that a principal does. That is, everything is tied to doing what is best for students, and that is linked directly to instructional leadership. More specifically, district administrators believe that TES is the tipping point toward increased instructional leadership, and that principals will now be making more frequent classroom visits, an activity vital to instructional leadership. Walk-throughs and pop-ins are viewed as essential instructional leadership activities.

Principals echo these same ideals, and discuss instructional leadership in the same terms. They recognize the expectation that they will act as instructional leaders, and sound very much like the district administrators in their description of these activities. Both principals talk about getting into classrooms more often as a result of TES. They talked about increasing walk-throughs and pop-ins. Jamalia wanted to schedule multiple observations for struggling teachers, and Sally valued the opportunity to be forced to spend more time in classrooms. Both principals discussed the opportunities for providing
feedback to teachers. Sally talked about gently moving teachers in the direction they needed to go.

District administrators and principals had virtually the same understanding of what it meant to be an instructional leader, at least through many of the words used. The one glaring difference is the district administrators’ concept that everything that a principal does is related to instructional leadership. In that area, principals differed in their understanding and enactment of instructional leadership. Both principals talked about the tremendous amount of time required to complete TES observation cycles. Sally mentioned that The District was trying to take things off of the plates of principals in order to free up time and allow for TES. For the principals, the tasks to be taken away were managerial and procedural tasks that could be completed by others in the school, tasks viewed by them as unrelated to instructional leadership.

The definition of what it means to be an instructional leader was virtually the same for district administrators as it was for principals. Much of the text on instructional leadership was interchangeable. This illustrates the power of the message, that principals are expected to be instructional leaders. Principals, however, see their roles are dual, encompassing both managerial/supervisory tasks and instructional leadership tasks. For district administrators the two roles are seamless.

The further you move down the hierarchy, the more distinct the two roles became. Teachers expected principals to be supervisors and to deliver evaluations of their teaching performances. Teachers included in this study did not view their principals as instructional leaders. Teachers viewed others in the school as instructional leaders, and their principals as their supervisors. Teachers see their principals acting as supervisors,
reinforcing this role for teachers. Teachers and principals have been socialized into these roles, and they are well-established norms. Regardless of The District’s expectation for principals and the ideal that supervision and instructional leadership are blended, principals - while talking the talk - act in ways that separate these roles, and teachers expect precisely that.

The Discourse Practice of the Principal Position in the Hierarchy

A principal’s ability to act is rooted in his/her position within the hierarchy of the organization. A certain amount of hierarchical power is attached to the position which allows principals unique access to classrooms and teachers. This position is reinforced in various and subtle ways through discourse practices. This begins at the level of words in texts. How participants frame the principal’s position in the hierarchy establishes the role of principal as supervisor.

Principals reinforce their supervisory role in the hierarchy.

Consider this comment by one of the participant principals in response to a question about how support is offered to struggling teachers.

Jamalia:  
I either went with my reading coach  
or I went with my math resource teacher  
or I actually went back in and said, “I’m just going to come in…”

The reading coach and the math resource teacher are both referred to as hers. She calls them “my” teachers. As the one responsible for hiring these teachers, this use of the term “my” does indicate her position of hierarchical superiority. She could have described these teachers as “the” or “our” but instead she chooses the term “my.” Jamalia emphasizes “I” in the last line above, an indication of her own position and that her own expertise might be called for. This shows up on line three above, placing her individual
efforts only after considering others who she might involve. Her use of the word “actually” further qualifies this as an action of importance, an action requiring an explanation offered to the teacher. This comment indicates this activity is usually not something she does on her own, that “her” reading coach or “her” math resource teacher usually engage in this kind of activity as directed by her, indicating that she is granting permission for the reading coach and the math resource teacher to engage in the support of teachers.

Sally, the other participant principal, uses similar terms. This is her response to being asked about how she supports struggling teachers.

Sally: Me with whatever support I need. I have district resource teachers come in. My, two, reading coach. My leadership team.

Sally, in a manner similar to Jamalia’s, qualifies the leadership team as her own. She further indicates her position of supervisor in the hierarchy by displaying her ability to garner resources. Sally emphasizes “me” and then she quickly qualifies her involvement as “with” support. She can find “whatever support” she needs and remarks that she is able to get district resource teachers to come in. Sally owns this activity.

In discussing how she would rate a teacher of special needs students Sally explains that she takes into account the abilities of the students. Her wording of her response offers support for her position as evaluator in the hierarchy.

Sally: I’m not judging you on their discussion with each other.
In this remark, Sally indicates that it is her responsibility to judge teachers. She emphasized the word judging, and it was preceded by a gap, giving it prominence. This deliberately places her in a hierarchical position above teachers.

In her post-conference with Janet, Jamalia offers what seem to be suggestions to Janet. However, these suggestions are delivered in a manner that point toward Jamalia’s role in the hierarchy. Examples of her comments include:

**Jamalia:** So that’s probably what I would have done.

One of the things I noticed

And I noticed you had said that a couple of times.....

**One** other suggesting that I had was,

You see what I’m saying?

I would do a,

quick review.

That’s what I’m **saying**,

Suggestions were all given in “I” statements by the principal. Should Janet care what Jamalia would have done? Jamalia thinks she should. Janet should consider these comments because the principal is the principal – in a supervisory position of authority and in a position to deliver these types of suggestions. In another exchange, Jamalia continues to reinforce her position with Janet. During the observation, Jamalia sat next to several students. Here is how Jamalia put it.

**Jamalia:** now,

granted,

I was right there **with them**, but they seemed to remain on task.
This comment reveals that Jamalia believes it may not have been the teacher who was in control of the students, and that it may have been her own presence that influenced their ability to remain on task. Instead of simply stating that the students remained on task, her presence is offered as a reason for their doing so. This teacher was working with a small group of students in a small area in the back of a classroom, and she would have remained in close proximity to all of these students anyway. However, Jamalia still mentions her presence as an obvious caveat to the teacher being in control. Once again Jamalia is reinforcing her supervisory position in the hierarchy.

Both principals establish themselves as supervisors. They speak in terms of how they manage others. They talk about judging teachers. They are enacting the supervision and evaluation functions of their roles.

**District administrators reinforce principals’ role as supervisor.**

District administrators also reinforce the principal’s supervisory position in the hierarchy. Dawn and Debbie, in discussing the role of the principal within TES, offer the following:

**Debbie:** So we’ve got to get people to understand that mind shift and if you understand that and can utilize your team and distribute that leadership with your team

**Dawn:** But what that means is also in the back of their mind finding ways to delegate and /or ensure that some of those other management things are being taken care of so that there are other individuals that are helping with that management as well as helping with that instructional leadership
Leadership is expressed as an entity transferred by the principal to others. This leadership is distributed to others by the principal. Principals must understand and “utilize” others, “delegate” to others. Debbie wants The District to help principals understand how to distribute leadership to what she calls “your” team. Again, ownership of the team is given to the principal. Dawn expects principals to delegate management and leadership as a way of “helping” the principal. Both of these district administrators believe that it is the principal’s responsibility to distribute or share leadership.

A unique part of TES for The District is the inclusion of peer evaluators. A teacher’s final evaluation is a total of scores from principals and peers, combined with student achievement data. When the Observation Chart (see Appendix H) was distributed during a meeting for principals and supervisors, it was tempered with comments about a principal’s use of peer data. It was suggested that principals make sure to meet with peers to talk about trends they are seeing in the school. Principals were asked to initiate these meetings because, as taken from my notes, it was explained that “you are the principal. A peer is a teacher. They are intimidated by you.” This is the complete explanation that was given. “You are the principal” is all the explanation that was needed for why a teacher might be intimidated. This is another example of how the placement of the principal as supervisor within the hierarchy is reinforced.

Peer evaluators also reinforced the principal’s position in the hierarchy. Here is a response given by Seelie when asked how her own influence affected the principal.

Seelie: but again, it gives that outside perspective. **Even** as a principal it’s an outside perspective of what’s going on in the room.
Seelie believes her perspective is useful in that it adds an outside perspective. This was a commonly held belief, as discussed in Chapter Five. In this excerpt, though, Seelie qualifies her additional perspective as being useful “even” to the principal. She seems to be explaining how “even” a principal would find a peer’s perspective valuable.

Jeenie, the other peer evaluator participant, also believed that her observations added value for the principal. Here is an excerpt from Seelie.

Seelie:

I was there to back them up,
in a way,
you know, that they see things and
I think I was there a lot of times just to confirm what they were seeing.

Seelie believes that she is backing up the principal. She does not indicate that the principal’s ratings would support her own, but that her own ratings would “confirm” what the principals already knew. Both of these peer evaluators, while confirming their own credibility as evaluators, indicate that they are not to be equated to principals. The principal’s position in the hierarchy is reaffirmed.

**The principal’s role is to evaluate.**

Teachers also understand the principal’s position in relation to where it sits in the hierarchy of The District. Their understanding is revealed in their discussions of what they expect from their principals and what role they expect the principal to fulfill. Teachers included in this study viewed the principal as their supervisor and evaluator. They expected the principal to supervise them, and to offer their evaluation of their performance. Stacy, in providing her interpretation of TES, offers her positive feelings that the principal will be observing her more often. In the system utilized prior to TES, teachers had to support outstanding ratings by providing documentation. For Stacy, this
was too much of a burden, so she would “just go for satisfactory…and I knew I wasn’t satisfactory.” Providing the proof required sparked this comment by Stacy.

Stacy: You know, but I just,
I guess that was one of my stubborn streaks about,
that’s not my job that’s your job.

But with the new system,
I am being observed more
and I think the criteria are very well spelled out,
it’s clear
that I know my job and I’m doing well and,
and I’m effective with the kids.
So
that part I am,
I am happy with.

Stacy explains her refusal to provide documentation required for higher marks as a “stubborn streak” about what the job of the principal should be. Stacy expects the principal to evaluate her, that it is part of the principal’s job. Her emphasis on the words “my” and “your” in line three of stanza one in the above quote reinforce this notion. She then goes on to explain that the “new” system allows for more frequent observations which she likes. Here, Stacy equates more observations by the principal with the principal doing her job in evaluating teachers. For Stacy, this is a welcome development that will result in what she thinks will be better evaluations. This is because, in the eyes of Stacy, the principal is finally doing her job. In line five of the second stanza, Stacy again reiterates what she believes to be her job by emphasizing the word “know.” She believes her job is being effective with students. This supports her assertion in line three of the first stanza that evaluation is not her job, that teaching is. Evaluation is left to the principal.
Stephanie, like Stacy, believes that TES will allow principals more opportunities to come observe their teaching.

Stephanie: It’s definitely getting her closer to the classroom. You know, realizing exactly what’s going on with the teachers.

Because we’d have to come in, explain to her what she was seeing, what, you know, what’s going on and she has to at least be more hands on instead of doing just a casual five minute walk through, you know, she has to be there more engaged to see what’s going on.

Which is good because that gives her more of an opportunity to see what we’re doing, where the kids are really standing because if you go by special needs kids they’re low performing kids, their test scores don’t always show that.

But if you see them in the classroom engaging and making some of those connections then it gives her another avenue to judge so that’s, that’s a major plus.

Stephanie believes that the principal’s presence will help the principal understand the needs of her students, allowing for some “hands on” opportunities for understanding instead of reliance of “test scores.” Stephanie trusts that more frequent visits by the principal will provide positive information that will ultimately provide the principal with “another avenue to judge.” TES will allow the principal more opportunities to visit Stephanie’s classroom, and will allow the principal to be “more engaged.” This is all framed in terms of how the principal’s judgment will be enhanced. It is to be noted that her principal, Sally, also used the word “judge” to describe her role.
Stephanie also mentions, as did Stacy, that the burden in the old system was on teachers to come in and explain to the principal what was being seen. The burden was also on the teacher, according to Stephanie, to explain the poor standardized test results. She views more frequent principal visits and increased principal engagement as a “major plus” with regards to the principal passing judgment. TES is seen by Stephanie as a way for the principal to provide more accurate judgment of her teaching.

Janet also expresses some relief concerning TES and its ability to evaluate teachers. Here is what she said about adopting a new method of teacher evaluation.

Janet: I think an evaluation system would point out your strengths and your weaknesses, help you work on your weaknesses, and with that said, given time to improve on your weaknesses and if you can’t make the corrections then I guess you should be shown to the door.

I hope that the teachers that, that teaching is not their calling, I hope that, that they get every chance they can to make their corrections and if they can’t I hope that they will be weeded out.

Janet is hopeful that ineffective teachers will be “shown to the door” or “weeded out.” Janet’s emphasis on the word “out” in the final line of the second stanza suggests finality. This is important for Janet, who believes that “90%” of the teachers at her school are “phenomenal teachers.” She is obviously concerned about the remaining 10%. She allows for weaknesses and some time period allowed for growth, but views TES as a method of
removing teachers who “can’t make the corrections.” The role of evaluating is expressed by Janet as the principal’s role.

Janet: I expected her to go through the domains and to give me her feedback as far as whether she thought it was exemplary or requires action.

This excerpt illustrates Janet’s expectation that the principal will provide her evaluative feedback during their post-conference. She is expecting to hear how her lesson was judged, and receive appropriate feedback.

All three teachers included in this study view principals as responsible for evaluating teaching performance, that this is absolutely necessary, and that TES further enhances the principal’s ability to provide accurate judgments. The hierarchy places the principal in this position, which the teachers understand. They expect this from their principals. Their words continually support the notion that principals are supervisors and evaluators.

**Mentoring not the principal’s role.**

In our interview, Stacy talked at length about one of the problems she had with the new evaluation system, TES. She told a story about how she was mentored as a new teacher out of college, and what a “trusting” relationship she built with this person that she now refers to as a close friend. Her comment regarding mentors illustrates the fragile nature of mentoring.

Stacy: To me, a true mentor should not be evaluating you because I think that’s a different relationship.

I think the person that mentors you would have,
would be able to see your observations, you know, the write-ups from the observations, would be able to come in and observe you without necessarily doing a formal write-up but to give you that feedback.

Stacy believes that a mentor should not be an evaluator, that the beauty of having a true mentor is that you can ask even the silliest of questions and not have that reflected in your evaluation. The mentor should see your evaluations, and be able to offer support based on them, but should not be in a position to evaluate you. Stacy believes that conversations between the mentor and the teacher should be “totally non-threatening.” Danielson’s framework was designed to stimulate such conversations. Danielson (2008) discusses mentors and writes that “because mentors and coaches have no evaluative authority over teachers” later discussions will be “relaxed, without a teacher feeling threatened by the situation” (p. 75).

**Teachers rely on principals’ supervisory role.**

As already discussed in Chapter Five, none of the teachers in this study relied on their principals for support with teaching. None expected to engage in collegial dialogue with their principals. Each of the participant teachers relied solely on the support of other teachers. When the three participant teachers did seek the support of principals or administrators it was for purely procedural information, such as information on testing. All three viewed the principal as supervisor and evaluator. Stacy’s rationale, that mentoring and evaluating should remain separated, offers a partial explanation of why teachers view principals as supervisors/evaluators and not as coaches or mentors. Teachers are, additionally, socialized to understand the role of the principal in a certain way.
None of the language around a principal’s supervisory position in the hierarchy is out of the ordinary. The role of the principal has been established for over 100 years, as was examined in Chapter Two. This is the common discourse around being principal in a school. Principals have a visible supervisory position in the hierarchy, a position continually reinforced in The District by district administrators, principals, peer evaluators, and teachers. Teachers’ understanding of the position in the hierarchy results in an expectation that principals will evaluate them. This is a result of deeply entrenched norms of what it is to be a principal and a teacher. This expectation is further established in The District as a result of a new evaluation system where so much attention has been focused on the act of evaluating.

**The dialogue between principals and teachers.**

The discourse between principals and teachers reveals the continued impact of these norms. English (2010) writes that “the language that school administrators typically use at the juncture of their relationships with teachers reveals assumptions about their role as the ‘boss’ of the subunit in which teachers work” (p. xx). English goes on to write that principal visits to classrooms are about managing conformance and controlling teachers (p. xx). Observation cycles, such as those mandated by TES, are described by English (2010) as typical of traditional supervision and so deeply embedded that it is very hard to change.

Danielson’s framework relies on collegial dialogue and reflection as a means of furthering professional practice. Can collegial dialogue between principals and teachers take place when teachers view the principal as supervisor and evaluator? Collegial dialogue relies on trust. The District, however unintentionally, has reinforced the idea
that mentoring and collegial dialogue must be divorced from evaluation through the initiation of the reading coach program. The reading coach program was implemented in The District as a way of maximizing staff development for teachers, supporting the belief that teachers would allow themselves to be mentored by reading coaches if the reading coaches had no evaluative status. At least somewhere in The District it is believed that evaluation and dialogue must be separate. In the next section I examine the dialogue between principals and teachers participating in this research.

*Jamalia and Janet.*

None of the observations completed for this research revealed sustained collegial dialogue. Most of the conversation was around questions and answers. During the post-observation with Jamalia and Janet, Jamalia started with an attempt at dialogue.

Jamalia: *What* are your thoughts on how you’re doing?

Janet: On the lesson that we’re working on? I thought it went *well.* I thought the technology went well, how did *you* feel about that? Did you think it helped with better understanding of the words?

Jamalia: Yes, because you wanted me to look at that.

they were *all* able to see it, so in a *small group* a *laptop* will work very well. So they were, *all* able to see without a problem and I could see it from.
the angle where I was sitting which was good.

In a whole classroom situation it might be

Janet: Right

Jamalia: It might be more difficult unless you are able to project it on a screen.

But yes, so I can utilize that that itself was a good strategy.

Jamalia begins by seeking the input of Janet, which is included in the Coached Cycles Script (see Appendix D) as a strategy for engaging the teacher. In fact, the example given in the script has the principal asking the teacher “what are your thoughts….” So Jamalia is off to a good start according to The District’s script. Janet offers her thoughts, and then asks Jamalia for more information. Jamalia’s answer ends with an assessment of the strategy as “good” based on two “I” statements. Jamalia asked no further questions of the teacher until the very end, when asking if Janet had any questions. Even when the transcript from this observation of a post-conference was edited into what Gee calls an idealized transcript (removing extraneous words), Jamalia accounted for 3,139 of the 3,886 words spoken, accounting for 81% of the conference. During this conference Janet replied with one word answers fifteen times. Jamalia is in control of this conversation, and Janet removes herself to the level of compliance. Collegial is not how this conversation could be categorized as this was not a conversation between colleagues, but was instead a dialogue almost completely controlled by the principal. Janet was asked only once about her teaching practice, and was virtually silent.
Sally and Stephanie.

Sally’s evaluation conference with Stephanie lasted for just a few seconds over forty minutes. As I was transcribing this conference I wrote a note to myself to go back and listen for interruptions. These interruptions were very distracting, and I had not been aware of them as a distraction during the actual conference. I went back listened for instances when it sounded like Sally either cut off or talked over Stephanie. During this forty minute conference Sally interrupted Stephanie thirty-one times. Most of these were efforts at keeping on task and moving the conference along, but these were dictated by Sally. In this example, Sally interrupts, cutting Stephanie off to advance the conversation.

Sally: Now I know a lot of that is being given to you from the department saying, “whoo, here, we’re giving.” Do you feel like you’re out there pounding the pavement for it or do think you’re just thankful that you’re the recipient?

Stephanie: For, especially, in the area of communication I’m out there pounding the pavement because I’ve had to bring XXX in to evaluate both my students, I’ve brought them in to do a consultation on another student, brought in OT to do a consult on two students

Sally: Okay, so you’re seeking out the resources. Okay, in and beyond the school district, definitely the school or the district. XXX is definitely a professional organization, okay.

Stephanie: And I’ve also gotten resources for my parents, for three of the parents this year for XXX services. So, that’s, I knew it was there but I pulled it in to
Sally: Designing coherent instruction.
   I put you as accomplished on this one.
   Do you have any thoughts or questions about that one?

Sally is in control of the conversation, deliberately and continually moving it forward.

Sally does seek Stephanie’s input, but instead offers her own answers. This is epitomized when Sally asks Stephanie what she thinks, but qualifies the question by telling her that she already has an opinion.

Sally: Setting instructional outcomes.
   This one’s, this is more learning.
   How do we do this?
   Where do you feel like you live?
   Because I have a general idea.
   When you think of all day, every day,
   in the real world.

Sally does this several times, seeming to ask if Stephanie has input but overtly recognizing her own already formulated ideas.

   Sally uses the phrase “I know” or “I do know” nineteen times in this post-conference. This phrase shows up in various ways, including:

Sally: I know you do tons here…
   But I know you’re not only
   Staying upon the research…
   I know what you’re doing
   And I know from other knowledge that that’s where we really are.

Sally emphasizes the word “I” in these phrases twice, and emphasizes the word “know” eight times, and emphasizes “do” twice. Her emphasis on “know” or even the “do” in “do know” is an emphasis on her own knowledge, her ability to make the judgment. Sally
talks about this in her interview, as discussed in Chapter Five. She is relying on her in-depth content knowledge and experience to help build trust with teachers. Her emphasis on the word “I” indicates a privilege that others might not have.

This evaluation conference was controlled by Sally, who interrupted often and talked over Stephanie. Sally often had answers for her own questions, and asserted her own knowledge. However, even with the interruptions one could describe the conversation as congenial. Sally sat next to Stephanie and spoke in a quiet voice. Sally took time to explain her thinking so that Stephanie would understand. Sally also acknowledged Stephanie’s expertise and provided ways she could assert her leadership with the staff. When the conversation was over, Stephanie thanked her for the compliments. This conversation was congenial but not collegial. These were not two colleagues discussing practice. This was a principal evaluating a teacher, moving the conversation, and explaining her own thinking. The following excerpt is a result of a high marking from Sally. This exemplifies the conference:

Stephanie:  Okay,
  I’m not going to argue that.

Sally:  You’re not going to argue that.
I didn’t think you would, but I wanted to explain myself…

Stephanie is acknowledging a high mark from Sally. This exchange, however, makes the mark seem like a reward from Sally. Stephanie accepts this as a “compliment” but this further defines the conversation as not between colleagues, but between superior and subordinate.
**Sally and Stacy.**

The post-conference with Stacy was far different. This conference was not defined by interruptions from Sally. Stacy still relies on “I know” in this conference, but this time only seven times with an emphasis on “I” once and “know” twice. Sally begins this conference on a positive note. She emphasizes Stacy’s observations as producing high ratings, and then mentions that some conversations with her students.

Sally:

So, you had, actually for the most part, rather high marks in your observations and I’ve even talked to a few of your students outside of class about what they feel, and actually some of them approached me to talk about you in a nice way, so you need to know that.

Sally wants to make sure that Stacy is aware of the way in which her students describe her, and that this has produced positive information for Sally. Far from acknowledging herself as the only one that sees how effective Stacy is, Sally mentions the students. In this excerpt she further acknowledges Stacy’s good work and how others view her.

Sally:

So it sounds like, and that’s my point, okay. Give yourself credit where credit’s due, really look into that, and say, “where do I live most of the time in technology?” You live at the top end of the scale, most of the time. I know that, your peers know that, your students know that, and they can verbalize it, okay?
This is a very positive comment. Where Sally could have framed this comment within her own privileged access to Stacy’s talents, she instead recognizes others as possessing this knowledge as well. As she did with Stephanie, Sally asks for Stacy’s input. Here is one example when Sally asks Stacy how she rates herself in the area of planning. Stacy expresses her frustration with the arrangement of items on the rubric, and Sally offers her response.

Sally: So, this is all about the planning, And stating those high level goals for each subject as we go through. Where do you feel like you live in that, most of the time?

Stacy: Most of the time I’m accomplished, I think. I mean, I’ve developed course materials, I know how to write objectives, you know, I think in the pre-conference documentation there was one issue with, you know, that I didn’t have my measure but then there’s another question down here that does say, well, how are you going to assess the students so that’s really the measure. I’m not sure why they’ve separated them, but it makes it look like I didn’t know up here there would be a measure.

Sally: And that’s going to be a conversation as we move into school wide professional development where we have our TES champion, our on-site professional developer, is getting to that we all have the same understanding of these things.

My goal is to do “Teach Like a Champion” and some other things that will get us understanding what we want, what needs to be there for the observations but that, more and more it becomes our normal practice
And we’ll be talking about writing, how to write the SMART goals and that it’s you state this is what you’ll be able to do and this is how I’m gonna know it, and it has to be measurable, and one good thing about the book “Teach Like a Champion” that I’m working on getting for us, is that it gives non-examples and examples of what that sounds like.

Stacy’s concern is followed by Sally’s “goal.” From her response, it is to be assumed that Stacy truly did not understand how to write a goal. It is now incumbent on Sally to correct that misunderstanding, having already accepted the responsibility for trying to get a specific book into the hands of teachers. Sally later asks Stacy specifically about a rating.

Sally: Do you think we’re at accomplished or
Stacy: We’re at accomplished.
Sally: We’re at accomplished. That was my sense, but I wanted to hear if you had anything.

Here again, Sally qualifies the teachers rating by agreeing that it was her own as well. She offers, only after offering her agreement with the accomplished rating, that the teacher could have provided evidence for an exemplary rating. However, the exchange was already over at that point.

Again, this conference was marked by calm and quiet talk by Sally who purposefully seated herself right next to Stacy. This allowed both of them access to the computer. Sally spoke highly of Stacy, and offered several examples of her good work,
and while maybe congenial, this was not a conversation between colleagues. Sally was evaluating Stacy, providing her with comments about her practice and also about professional development activities.

These conversations between principals and teachers further define the principal’s role as that of supervision and evaluator. While they may be described as congenial, these conversations reflect talk between superiors and subordinates. Yet principals, both in recent history and currently in The District, are expected to become instructional leaders engaging in collegial dialogue with teachers. The District expects that principals can, and will, do both, and that they can move in and out of these roles seamlessly. Principals believe that they are instructional leaders, and yet they are not engaging in collegial dialogue. Teachers do not define the role of principal through instructional leadership or view principals as coaches or mentors. Teachers expect that conversations with principals will be of a supervisor nature. We have already seen Stacy’s explanation of why principals should not engage in both activities. We have also seen that teachers expect principals to act as supervisors/evaluators.

**Tensions.**

Stacy expressed anger over not being coached in the pre-conference. This seemed to her as malpractice. If the evaluator knew something was wrong, she should have told her before marking her down for it. Stacy was “critiqued” on her objective, which the evaluator thought was not a true objective. Stacy wondered why they had not talked about that “up front.” For Stacy, if they had discussed this issue prior to the observation then the conversation would have revealed that it was indeed a true objective. For her, waiting for the post-conference seemed unfair.
The role of the peer evaluator caused tension for all of the teachers. Each felt that the principal had a better feel for their classrooms, and that the peer evaluators did not have a true picture of their teaching, their students, or their schools. All three teachers wondered if their peers accurately understood what they were evaluating. Stacy stated that her peer “totally misread the situation.” Janet talked about peer evaluators as unfamiliar with the clientele at Jefferson Elementary School, and that teachers questioned how they could be evaluated by someone who has not “been in the situation.” Stephanie was concerned that her peer and her principal saw the exact same room arrangement, but the peer thought it needed to be adjusted and the principal thought it was totally appropriate. For Stephanie, this was confusing. She talked about doing things specifically to conform to the rubric, but this conflicting message caused confusion for her.

The peers expressed frustrations as well. Jeenie talked about “challenging” teachers who were resistant to the new processes of TES. Jeenie also expressed frustration with dealing with one particular principal who she described as retiring at the end of the year. This particular principal did not have any conversations with Jeenie. This particular principal’s final evaluations also caused stress for Jeenie, because Jeenie felt they were inappropriately positive. Jeenie’s own evaluations were not as positive, contrasting with the principal’s desire to leave “everybody in a feel-good way.”

Teachers understand the role of principal as evaluator and supervisor. When this role becomes blurry at all, tensions arise. Janet wants and expects the principal to offer an assessment of her teaching. When that assessment does not arrive in the form she is expecting, Janet does not know how to respond. In our interview, Janet stated that she did not know how the principal felt about her lesson, that she was “very unclear.” Janet also
expressed a desire avoid being “defensive” or “argumentative.” Her lack of clarity and her desire to not come across as argumentative are illustrated in the post-conference with Jamalia. During this conference, Janet responded fifteen times with one word answers. Not wanting to become argumentative, and not understanding where she stood, she instead simply responded with one word answers.

Stacy also expressed concerns over the mentoring role, and that mentors should not be evaluators as well. Stacy is discussing the mentors that were assigned to beginning teachers, which she was not eligible for as an experienced teacher. However, Stacy mentioned this at two different times during our interview, illustrating her concern. This reinforces her belief that mentoring and evaluating should remain separate roles.

For principals, tensions arose because of the sheer amount of time required to complete the observation cycles required by TES. Some of this is a result of each teacher being evaluated more, and some is a result of the required pre-conference and post-conference and the accompanying computer documentation. Both Jamalia and Sally pointed to this as a major issue that impacted their jobs. These principals felt that TES and the accompanying observations were a function of their instructional leadership and evaluation roles, but neither saw this as a conflict. The only conflict they saw was a result of the time spent doing the observation cycles. The reason that principals did not see their roles of instructional leadership and supervision conflicting was due to the way in which they navigated the two.

TES is viewed by district administrators as a way of empowering teachers. As I will investigate later in this chapter, some teachers may be empowered by the new evaluation system, and these teachers may feel a passion for excellence. Other teachers,
however, may meet TES with resistance and a sense of discord. These teachers may be reacting to what they believe is a culture of performativity, and this will also be discussed later in the chapter.

I expected to find tensions resulting from principals acting as both supervisor/evaluators and instructional leaders. Danielson (2009) writes that there is “an inevitable tension between the professionalism of teachers and the authority of administrators” (p. 13). Danielson goes on to write that “for administrators and supervisors to exercise leadership, they must appreciate the interlocking demands of their roles as the individual in whom the authority of the organization resides and the complex matter of exercising leadership in a professional organization” (2009, p. 14). Danielson, in discussing power and leadership in schools, seems to answer this inherent tension by stating that “although principals are nominally the leader of the building, including in instructional matters, they are not necessarily the most expert, and this reality influences how power is exercised” (2009, p. 15). This statement accurately describes exactly how the principals in this study were able to navigate between instructional leadership and supervision. This is discussed in the next section.

**Principals allocate resources.**

One crucial way that principals navigate the roles of supervision/evaluation and instructional leadership lies in how principals define and enact instructional leadership, fulfilling the needs of The District and also teachers. As described in Chapter Five, principals defined their instructional leadership roles as including the allocation of resources. It is this allocation of resources that provides the mechanism for principals to navigate between supervision and instructional leadership.
By allocating resources to support teachers principals are not actually engaging in the instructional leadership activities directly with teachers. Principals are relying on other teacher experts to provide direct support to teachers. This is who the teachers in this study said they relied upon. There is no need to rely on the principals for any direct support, there are other teachers on campus to provide this assistance. This assistance is also separated from any evaluation, an issue discussed by Stacy. The teacher experts can function as coaches and mentors without the burden of also having to evaluate teachers they are supporting. Principals view their allocation of resources as instructional leadership. They are providing instructional leadership by making sure that the resources for coaching and mentoring are pointed in the correct direction.

In The District, there is a long-standing reading coach program, one initiated over ten years ago because it was felt that teachers would welcome the support if it were unattached to evaluation. The District is also large enough to maintain a robust district staff in the content areas, with several staff members in each content area available to provide support at individual school sites. Additionally, Title I dollars are often spent on securing additional staff, as was the case at Jefferson Elementary. These efforts, combined, provide principals many opportunities to be able to direct resources without actually having to provide them through their own direct contact with teachers.

By having all of the resources provided by The District, principals have been normed by The District to act as instructional leaders without having to rely on their own hands-on support of teachers. Principals maintain their evalutative status in the hierarchy, and carry out instructional leadership activities one step away from struggling teachers. For the teachers in this study, this was a comfortable understanding of the role of
principal. Sally, at Southern Pine Elementary, took responsibility for writing the action plan for struggling teachers. Yet she relied on support to come from the reading coach and the leadership team among others. The writing of the plan was a function of her supervisory role. The allocating of resources was a function of her instructional leadership role. For the teachers, these remain two distinct activities. For Sally, this was a natural method of providing instructional support to her teachers.

The tensions that Danielson (2009) writes about with regards to principals being asked to fulfill dual roles were not present for teachers. Principals, and teachers, relied on direct instructional leadership from other teachers. Teachers saw principals as evaluators and supervisors, and did not rely on them for instructional leadership. For teachers, then, there was no dual role. Principals were able to act as instructional leaders in a way that did not come into conflict with evaluation of teachers.

**The View from the Panopticon – Social Practice**

For all of the discourse around principals, their roles within the hierarchy, and their positions in that hierarchy above teachers, TES has brought with it a new perspective on the hierarchy coinciding with new power dynamics. In the next section I will examine the panopticon effects of TES and ways in which TES acts as a disciplinary power. In the words of Foucault (1984b):

> The exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation; an apparatus in which the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power and in which, conversely, the means of coercion make those on whom they are applied clearly visible. (p. 189)
TES, in this instance, becomes a mechanism that coerces through multiple observations of teachers and principals. These observations reinforce the principal’s position in the hierarchy. This is a highly visible and tense process. The net cast by TES encompasses district administrators, principals, peers, and teachers and has been influenced by the social discourse around teaching and education.

**Techniques that make it possible to see.**

**Observations of teachers.**

The new teacher evaluation system, TES, is built on the observation of teachers. The District has been moving toward increased observation of teachers for several years, as was discussed in Chapter Two. This move began with the introduction of The Three-Minute Walk-Through (Downey, 2004, et al.), included teachscape’s Classroom Walkthrough, and now includes what TES terms pop-ins. The District remains committed to principal walk-throughs as well, in addition to the formal and informal observations required by TES.

The pop-ins and walk-throughs result in much more observation of teachers than was common even five years ago. Prior to TES, a tenured teacher was required to be formally observed once every three years. A beginning teacher typically had at three formal observations per year. Any walk-throughs completed on top of these required formal observations were to drive teacher reflection or collegial dialogue. The walk-throughs also supplied the principal with overall information on trends throughout the school.

Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, teachers scoring at the top range, regardless of tenure status, will have two formal and three informal observations required.
each year. Teachers scoring at the bottom range will have seven formal and four informal observations required. New teachers will have five formal observations required. See Appendix H for the Observation Chart that outlines the number of observations required. This represents a shift toward much more observation of teachers.

The teachers’ union, teachers, principals, and administrators from all levels were involved in the decisions regarding how TES would be implemented. This shift toward more observation is generally seen as a positive move. As reported in Chapter Five, teachers are glad that principals will have more accurate information on what is going on in their classrooms. District administrators felt that requiring principals to do more observations was completely aligned with their duties as instructional leaders. While principals felt that the amount of time it took to complete the observation cycles was oppressive, they believed that teachers were more engaged in dialogue around teaching practice as a result.

All of this observation, what Foucault would call surveillance, is presented as a common sense way to ensure teachers are utilizing best practices. Foucault utilizes the metaphor of the panopticon to explain how surveillance works to control through consent. “The inmate cannot see whether or not the guardian is in the tower, so he must behave as if surveillance were perpetual and total. If the prisoner is never sure when he is being observed, he becomes his own guardian” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 19). In practice, TES acts to surveil teachers, with informal – and therefore unannounced – observations adding up to more than the formal observations in number. If a teacher never knows when a principal or peer evaluator will “walk through” then, as described above, she becomes her
own keeper. Teachers are seen, and this visibility serves as a mechanism for ensuring that teachers regulate their own behavior.

Foucault defines the panopticon as a disciplining technique. “The costliness of observing them all the time is replaced by instilling into the observed that, at any moment, they might be observed” (Jardine, 2005, p. 61). It is important, then, to define what it is that the observed should be doing. Foucault calls this normalization.

**Normalization.**

Foucault points to another rationality built into the metaphor of the panopticon, a logic of efficiency and normalization (Foucault, 1984a, p. 20). Rabinow (1984) explains it this way:

By “normalization,” Foucault means a system of finely gradated and measurable intervals in which individuals can be distributed around a norm – a norm which both organizes and is the result of this controlled distribution….Such a power has to qualify, measure, appraise, and hierarchize, rather than display itself in murderous splendor…it effects distributions around the norm. (p. 20)

The method of qualifying, measuring, and appraising is represented by the rubric that The District has adopted as the foundation of TES. Evaluators rate teachers on the scale and a final score is assigned. The resulting ranking of teachers is shown on the Observation Chart (see Appendix H).

The rubric very specifically outlines what teaching should look like, what kinds of things are being looked for, and the relative importance of those various things. This rubric is then used multiple times to judge teachers. This is what Foucault called a normalizing gaze “a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify, and to
punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates and judges them” (Jardine, 2005, p. 63). Foucault talks about the success of disciplinary power in relation to the school examination, but I believe the same could be said of teacher evaluation. Foucault writes that “the success of disciplinary power derives no doubt from the use of simple instruments; hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and their combination” (Foucault, 1984b, p. 188). The rubric acts as an examination, establishing over individuals a “visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them” (p. 197). Foucault goes on to write that:

> Like surveillance and with it, normalization becomes one of the great instruments of power at the end of the classical age. For the marks that once indicated status, privilege, and affiliation were increasingly replaced – or at least supplemented – by a wide range of degrees of normality indicating membership of a homogeneous social body, but also playing a part in classification, hierarchization, and the distribution of rank. (p. 196)

The TES rubric allows for differentiation of teachers that serves to normalize their behavior. The panopticon effect, paired with this, is disciplining. Teachers will behave as indicated on the rubric of their own accord, mindful that at any moment they may be observed by an evaluator. Foucault’s most complete vision of disciplining results in teachers believing that the best way to teach is to follow the rubric, and that the amount of surveillance is a good thing. This is precisely what peer evaluators and teachers involved in this study believed. This evokes a “level of complicity that is hard to take…that our very desire to make things better for ourselves and our students is itself caught under ‘the gaze’” (Jardine, p. 75).
Discrepancy reports.

Another example of the insidious nature of surveillance and normalization is The District’s use of discrepancy reports. Both Dawn and Debbie talked about these reports, as was discussed in Chapter Five. These reports were generated weekly, according to Dawn and Debbie, and used as a topic of discussion at staff meetings and also with peer evaluators and principals. These reports showed observation ratings for each teacher – observation ratings from the peer evaluators alongside observation ratings from the principal. The resulting “discrepancy,” if any, is what the reports were named for. No one that was part of this research had anything negative to say about these reports. They were described as offering information used to determine if peers and principals were “in line” or “aligned.” Problems were illuminated, and what Dawn called “high level” discussions were had. These discussions involved principals and peer evaluators.

Aside from the inter-rater reliability problems already addressed, the result of these discrepancy reports is that the teacher is no longer alone in the surveillance encompassed by the panopticon. Principals and peer evaluators are now included as well. Adherence to the appropriate usage of the rubric was being closely and continually watched. If it was found that a principal or a peer evaluator was giving inconsistent ratings, they were “recalibrated.” In fact, the addition of the peer evaluators was described by Dawn as a way of keeping teacher evaluations more honest. Here is an excerpt from her explanation of why peers were included.

Dawn: And that there’s a strong correlation that typically peers tend to be much more honest than a typical boss would be in the business world.
And in a school world, it’s true that principals over long term tend to drift in their ratings with teachers that they’ve been working with long term at the same school site.

Dawn emphasizes “much” in line two of the first stanza, then emphasizes boss in the next line. In the second stanza she emphasizes “true.” Dawn’s statement represents her understanding of the reality of the situation, and her emphases indicate how true she believes these statements to be. It is, therefore, to be understood that peers are much more honest than principals, and that principals rate their teachers too easily. Obviously, we can surmise, principals need to be scrutinized with regards to teacher evaluations, and the presence of peer evaluators will perform that task.

Again we see the perfect storm of surveillance and normalization. Within the first year of the implementation, this normalization has occurred. Peers spoke about principals, and how principals believed that the peers were there to support their views. Jamalia looked at the peer ratings as a way to gauge if her own ratings were “in line.” Principals engaged in conversations with the peers, trying to get a feel for trends occurring throughout the school. Principals were continually “recalibrated” in their monthly principal meetings, and Sally expressed pleasure with receiving district guidance on use of the rubric with special needs classes.

The use of discrepancy reports comparing principal ratings and peer evaluator ratings also speaks to the addition of a layer of accountability. While the role of peer evaluator was defined as one responsible for evaluating teachers, their role also included the evaluation of principals. District administrators Dawn and Debbie both spoke of “drift” and a lack of consistency with regards to principal evaluations of teachers. The
addition of peer evaluators was seen as a way of evaluating principals, a way of ensuring that principals accurately and objectively evaluated teachers. Jamalia spoke about looking at the peer ratings to make sure that her own ratings were “in line.” This is precisely what Dawn and Debbie saw as a benefit of TES. In this way, peer evaluators controlled the work of principals. The addition of peer evaluators helped The District control the work of principals as well as teachers.

Principals, peer evaluators, teachers, and district administrators are all caught up in the panopticon. Teachers are being watched by principals and peer evaluators, principals are being watched by teachers and peer evaluators, peer evaluators and principals are being watched by district administrators. The “watching,” however, does not stop there.

**Technically speaking.**

The District’s motivation for certain aspects of TES was a result of state legislation efforts at regulating education. The State wrote into law an expectation that districts would rely on student achievement data for the largest portion of a teacher’s evaluation score. Dawn explains why TES relies on student achievement data for only 40% of a teacher’s evaluation.

Dawn: …it was written **purposefully**
so that **technically**
student achievement is the **greatest**
portion
of **any** of the three portions
because its 30-30-40.

So
to **legislators**
it **looks** like we’re really going there

which we are
but we feel 40% is much more fair than 50 or 60, which is where other state and federal levels want you to be.

But, on the flip side, even though it is 30-30 and it’s two different evaluators, when you put that together, 60% of this evaluation is based on observed practices in the classroom.

The use of the 30-30-40 formula allows TES to rely more on student test data than any other, yet the two evaluators add together to account for more than that data.

“Technically” student achievement is valued more than anything else, even though it is only valued at 40%. This is an end-around that was purposeful by The District. The District feels that their 30-30-40 formula is “more” fair to teachers. In fact, the legislature deliberately excluded The District from an initial round of laws regarding teacher evaluation in order to allow The District to continue to develop TES. It remains to be seen if this exclusion will continue.

The legislative scrutiny presents another player in the panopticon. Teachers are being watched, principals are being watched, peer evaluators are being watched, and The District is being watched. According to Dawn, relying on student achievement data for 40% is only equal to “more” fair, not completely fair. Student achievement data is still being calculated for teachers, based on a complicated value-added formula that is supposed to account for all manner of influences from language preference to prior performance to attendance, and everything in between. When asked about student achievement data matching teacher performance ratings, Debbie had this to say:

Debbie: That’s what every district is talking about right now. Like what if our student achievement data comes back
and is not matching because honestly, we are predicting that if a teacher got accomplished and exemplary marks most of the time that their data should match that If we’re wrong, it’s going to be interesting.

It seems appropriate to suggest that this kind of information may help The District make the case for TES, or the information may make the case against TES altogether. In any instance, everyone will be watching, including the legislature. The influence of legislation will be investigated more thoroughly below. State legislation is mentioned here, specifically, to illustrate its inclusion as a major player in the panopticon that is TES.

The means of coercions are clearly visible.

There is no denying TES, or its pervasive entrance into the lives of district administrators, principals, peer evaluators, and teachers. The District has mobilized its resources in order to deliver the message and implement a new method of evaluating teachers. National media attention and funding by a large private grant only add to the visibility of TES in general. The specific means of coercions are no less visible. These means are discussed favorably and are endorsed by all participant groups.

These means begin with the observation of teachers, a significant amount more than in the prior evaluation system. These evaluations make teaching visible, and when that visibility is combined with the rubric, teaching is normalized. Teachers, wanting to do their best, conform to the rubric. They are thus regulating their own behavior.

The means of coercion then moves to peers, who are seen as adding an objective view of teachers. District discrepancy reports constantly compare peer and principal
ratings, serving to normalize both. Principals are the main focus of this however, as they are viewed as much less objective than peers. Principals, as described by Dawn, tend to drift in their evaluations of teachers, resulting in unreliable and inconsistent evaluations. The addition of the peers, and the constant comparison to them, is seen as a way to keep principals in line. Principals are thus normalized to adhere strictly to the rubric through very visible means. When Jamalia talks about looking at the peer ratings to gauge her own competence she is regulating her own behavior.

For evaluators, the means of coercion also includes training meant to “calibrate” or, if one is determined as out of line, “recalibrate.” The message here is that there is a correct and appropriate method for utilizing the rubric, and evaluators will be held to that standard. Implicit is the notion that The District will know if they are not performing up to that standard.

The means of coercion then moves on to include the State legislators. They, for various reasons, have found it necessary to legislate issues around schools. Much of this legislation has directly targeted teachers, and the resulting legislation has included mandating minimum teacher contributions to pensions, limiting tenure, controlling retirement earnings, limiting the influence of teacher unions, and mandating that student achievement data be included in teacher evaluation. In order to avoid being subject to further legislation, The District deliberately wrote the 30-30-40 formula. If The District will be able to keep that formula has still not been definitively decided by the State Legislature. Clearly The District is under scrutiny, in a very visible manner. This scrutiny has resulted in TES with The District regulating its own teachers and itself.
This scrutiny, however, goes far beyond simply the 30-30-40 formula and teacher evaluation. The State Legislature’s actions are motivated politically, and those politics are an important factor in how schools are “watched.” All of this “watching” eventually trickles down to observing teachers and testing students, but it begins with the social context and ideology.

The means to coercion are visible, hiding the ideological hegemony in plain sight. The ideology of TES has become common sense. It is obvious that teachers have been inconsistently evaluated by drifting principals, it is obvious that students should be achieving more, and it is obvious that teachers need to be more frequently observed in order to improve their practice. The obviousness of these things leads logically to The District’s initiation of TES. TES will lead to better teaching and learning. Everyone is on the same page, it is just common sense. This common sense, however, has been deeply influenced by neoliberal policies.

**Neoliberal education policies.**

Neoliberal policies have directly impacted public education with a belief that everything private is necessarily good and everything public is necessarily bad (Apple, 2006, p. 31). Students, in this view, are human capital. “If we were to point to one specific defining political/economic paradigm of the age in which we live, it would be neoliberalism” (Apple, p. 14). Neoliberalism values personal responsibility. McChesney writes that:

Neoliberal initiatives are characterized as free market policies that encourage private enterprise and consumer choice, reward personal responsibility and entrepreneurial initiative, and undermine the dead hand of the incompetent,
bureaucratic and parasitic government, that can never do good even if well
intended, which it rarely is. (as cited in Apple, 2006, p. 14)

The neoliberal political climate that ushered in NCLB is still flourishing. Giroux (2008)
links neoliberal policies to policies of subjectification and self-regulation. “Under
neoliberalism, everything either is for sale or is plundered for profit” (Giroux, p. 2).

Giroux paints a rather grim picture, going on to write that the discourse of neoliberalism
is a discourse that wants to squeeze out ambiguity from public space, to dismantle
the social provisions and guarantees provided by the welfare state, and to
eliminate democratic politics by making the notion of the social impossible to
image beyond the isolated consumer and the logic of the market. (p. 114).

Neoliberal views of education are anchored by a view of education as tied to economics.
As Ball writes (2008) “education is now regarded primarily from an economic point of
view. The social and economic purposes of education have now been collapsed into a
single, overriding emphasis on policy making for economic competitiveness” (p. 11).

Olssen, Codd, and O’Neill view neoliberalism as an extension of market rules and
principals to guide both private and public organizational restructuring (2003, p. 153).

Apple writes that neoliberals view schools as “black holes” that suck the financial life out

Teachers’ actions are now subject to much greater scrutiny in terms of process
and outcomes. Indeed, some states in the United States not only have specified the
content that teachers are to teach but also have regulated the only appropriate
methods of teaching. Not following these specified ‘appropriate’ methods puts the
teacher at risk of administrative sanctions….a strong and interventionist state will see to it that only ‘legitimate’ content and methods are taught. (p. 43)

This is motivated, according to Apple, by a lack of trust in teachers, resulting in attacks on their claim to competence as well as teachers’ unions (p. 43). Neoliberalism ushers in a reliance on “vigilance, surveillance, performance appraisal and control generally. In this new model, the state has taken it upon itself to keep us all up to the mark” (Olssen, et al, p. 137). This attitude has been repeatedly illustrated by legislation directed at public education. The insistence that teacher evaluation be tied to student achievement data is a further example of a lack of trust in teacher competence. All of this has been addressed by the State Legislature even as they voted to decrease spending in public schools and increase spending for charter schools.

TES is a method of surveilling teachers and teaching, regulating the methods teachers employ as well as the content they include. TES intends to dictate both, and provides numerous opportunities for principals to monitor teachers. Indeed, a poor evaluation will result in administrative sanctions. Teachers receiving the lowest scores this year have been put on notice, and were all sent a letter from The District informing them of that. One more poor rating and their teaching credential will be put in severe jeopardy. TES is a method of surveilling principals as well, regulating the methods they employ to evaluate teachers. TES evaluation data is scrutinized and compared, and discrepancies are addressed with “high-level” meetings. Peer evaluator ratings, while ostensibly for the purpose of evaluating teachers, more importantly evaluate principals. Principals not adequately evaluating teachers will receive additional staff development and be subject to “recalibration.”
The District’s efforts at teacher evaluation have been impacted by legislation designed to surveil schools, teachers, and school districts. State and federal laws mandate what is to be taught and students are tested on those things. TES is tied to student performance on tests, resulting in yet another method of insuring that the legislated curriculum is taught. TES also ensures that teachers are using best practices, as those methods inform the rubric.

Neoliberalism is a “mode of control” according to Olssen, Codd, and O’Neill (2004). All of the surveillance required of TES, resulting in teacher ratings based on a set of skills combined with student achievement data, is a method of measuring the costs of, and placing a value on, human activity (Olssen, et al., p. 172).

Thus, while subscribing to the doctrine of the minimal state, neoliberals have promoted the development of the strong state. While advocating privatization of resourcing and decentralization of provision of social services, neoliberal governments have build stronger state structures and introduced more robust modes of centralized control and regulation. (Olssen, et al., p. 172).

Surveillance becomes a method of controlling the work of teachers. Ball (2008) writes about this in terms of performativity.

**Terror of performativity.**

All of the surveillance involved in TES results in what Ball (2008) calls the terror performativity. This performativity, writes Ball, is a culture of terror, a “regime of accountability that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition, and change…..These performances stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual” (p. 49). Monitoring and rewarding performance
achievements are significant tools for the management required, what Ball calls performance management (p. 50). It is no small irony that the computer system that maintains TES records in The District is called the “talent management” system. “Information is collected continuously, recorded and published…and is also monitored eventfully by peer reviews, site visits, and inspections” (Ball, p. 50). Ball writes that all of this has several results, including an increase in paperwork and an increase in surveillance of teachers’ work.

The increase in surveillance has already been described. The increase in paperwork was duly noted by both principals included in this study. In fact, Sally even remarked that several deadlines were changed by The District as a reaction to principal workloads. Teachers and peer evaluators also mentioned the increased workload, both on themselves and principals. Stacy talked about the length of time needed to complete the pre-observation forms. Seelie and Jeenie both talked about their immense workloads and resulting paperwork. Elliott, as cited by Ball (2008), explains the contradictions of increased surveillance and the resulting increase in paperwork:

This contradiction arises between intensification as an increase in the volume of first-order activities (direct engagement with students, research, curriculum development) required by the demands of performativity and the ‘transaction costs’ in terms of time and energy of second-order activities, that is, the work of collecting performance data, monitoring and reporting. Acquiring the performative information necessary for perfect control consumes so much energy that it drastically reduced the energy available for making improvement inputs. (p. 15)
As was already discussed, principals enacted their instructional leadership by garnering the resources around them, not by actually engaging in the direct support of teachers themselves. While this was already described as a way principals navigate the roles of instructional leadership and supervision, this may also be a result of the contradiction of spending so much time and energy collecting data that there is no time left to actually engage in supporting teachers. While principals are expected by district administrators to be instructional leaders as well as supervisors, the immense amount of time spent supervising may impede efforts at instructional leadership. This is not surprising to Ball, who writes that “in a sense the new school leader embodies policy within the institution and enacts the processes of reform. The self-managing school must surveil and regulate itself. The leader becomes, among other things, the manager of institutional performance” (2008, p. 140). As applied to The District, this means that principals are managing instructional leadership.

Ball (2003) explains that performativity is “misleadingly objective and hyper-rational” (p. 217). It is this deceptive objectivity that Ball is concerned about. The real purpose of performativity, as Ball writes, is not simply to change policy, but is instead a mechanism for reforming teachers and “for changing what it means to be a teacher, the technologies of reform produce new kinds of teacher subjects” (p. 217). “It’s not that performativity gets in the way of ‘real’ academic work or ‘proper’ learning, it is a vehicle for changing what academic work and learning are” (Ball, p. 226).

The performativity of TES fundamentally changes what it means to be a teacher, and what is taught. “The act of teaching and the subjectivity of the teacher are both profoundly changed within the new management panopticism…” (Ball, 2003, p. 219).
Ball warns that the new performative teacher may be successful, but may also be faced with inner conflict and inauthenticity (2003). While TES declares the importance of open and collegial dialogue, “the ethical practices of teachers and managers are a second order casualty….Effectivity rather than honesty is most valued in a performative regime” (Ball, 2003, p. 226).

Performativity causes teachers to re-think their professional selves, selves that are the subject of regular surveillance and inspection. This impacts managers as well. As Ball writes (2003), “the work of the manager, the new hero of educational reform, involves instilling the attitude and culture within which workers feel themselves accountable and at the same time committed or personally invested in the organization” (p. 219). Ball goes on to explain how these technicians of transformation invoke “new invisible pedagogies of management, realized through appraisals, performance reviews and forms of performance related pay, ‘open up’ more of the managed to control” (p. 219).

Ball’s explanation of performativity mirrors The District’s initiation of TES. District administrators believe that teachers really do want to be accountable, and teachers like the idea of (at least) other teachers being accountable. TES becomes an invisible pedagogy, one that opens up more aspects of teaching to control. The culture of performativity is linked to a culture of competition. Ball writes about teachers caught up in the spectacle of compliance. He writes of one specific teacher who:

is having real problems in thinking of herself as the kind of teacher who simply produces performances – of her own and by her children. This is not ‘who she is’ and in the heat and noise of reform she cannot ‘find herself.’ Her commitments to and purposes for teaching, her reasons for becoming and being a teacher have no
place. Her relations with children are changed by reform, are at them rather than with them. These relations seem to her to be inauthentic. (2003, p. 223).

Ball continues his analysis of performativity by describing it in terms of cynical compliance, that teachers are pressured to contribute to the performativity of their school, making it a real possibility that “authentic social relations are replaced by judgemental relations wherein persons are valued for their productivity alone” (p. 224).

**Technologized language.**

Danielson’s Framework, from which TES is derived, includes advice and charts for helping evaluators to guide conversations with teachers during the pre and post-conferences. This is a highly technologized use of language. This technologized language is furthered with The District’s Coached Teaching Cycles Script (see Appendix D). The District spells out what a conversation in the pre- and post-conferences should sound like. For Fairclough, these technologies are designed based on the expected course of the conversation, including linguistic choices relating to word choice, sentence structure, and even the order of dialogue (1992). Fairclough further describes technologized language as a tool used by bureaucracies to impose change (p. 239). The process of technologizing language in the case of TES is directly related to the appearance of informality, where evaluators are given precise ways to move the conversation towards collegial dialogue. The appearance of informality is a guise. “The simulation of power symmetry and informality are widely used techniques on the part of institutional power holders” (Fairclough, p. 216). The technologization of language is a method of controlling language, yet hiding the unequal relations of power by dictating a more informal style of
communication. Unequal power relations remain, regardless of the language around the evaluation of teachers.

Fairclough refers to technologized language as an “intervention” that is used consciously by institutional agents to “engineer changes in discursive practices” (1992, p. 55). TES can be described as one of these interventions, with intentions of changing the discourse practices of teachers and evaluators. The use of the technologized language of informality only serves to make more subtle the power relations firmly entrenched in schools. Principals retain their position in the hierarchy, and are charged with evaluating teachers. Teachers continue to know and expect this from principals. The more informal language does little to change the underlying structure of schools.

**Effects of power.**

The reach of TES envelopes all district employees. Foucault used the metaphor of the panopticon to describe this phenomenon, with everyone caught up in the machinery of surveillance. Foucault (1980a) writes that

One doesn’t have here a power which is wholly in the hands of one person who can exercise it alone and totally over the others. It’s a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised….Power is no longer substantially identified with an individual who possesses or exercises it by right of birth, it becomes a machinery that no one owns. (p. 156)

Foucault links this machinery and the effects of power to regimes of truth. TES is a disciplining technique, and as such, power is produced and circulated in a way that creates a regime of truth, and in the process controls the work of district administrators,
peer evaluators, principals and teachers alike. (Ball, 2008). This process, however, is productive.

Power produces in us the desire to know what it has produced, all the while hiding itself in its product. We want to know the latest news when it comes to classroom techniques, new materials and textbooks we can use that will “help the kids,” new “authentic assessment” methods. Power and its knowledge products produce a desire for those products, a desire the fulfillment of which further entrenches the reach of that power. (Jardine, 2005, p. 75)

**TES as a Disciplining Power.**

TES can be viewed as a disciplining power, a regime of truth that controls the work of teachers and principals through their own consent, one that has been deeply influenced by neoliberal politics. TES is marked by increased surveillance – not just of teachers. TES is marked by an increase in surveillance of principals and The District as well. Let us return to a quote from Foucault that began the discussion of the panopticon.

The exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation; an apparatus in which the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power and in which, conversely, the means of coercion make those on whom they are applied clearly visible. (Foucault, 1984b, p. 189)

The mechanism that coerces by means of observation is TES, the apparatus making it possible to see. This apparatus sees teachers, peer evaluators, principals, and district administrators through an elaborate system of surveillance. District administrators believe that TES is positively impacting teaching, teachers, and principals. Peer evaluators believe that TES is positively impacting teaching and teachers. Teachers believe that TES
is positively impacting teaching and teachers. Teachers and principals are working to
conform to the expectations of TES. TES is a regime of truth that makes itself clearly
visible to all.

The observation implicit with the implementation of TES creates additional layers
of accountability in The District. These layers include teachers, peer evaluators,
principals, and district administrators. Teachers are now being observed by principals and
peer evaluators. Teachers are being held to the expectations of the rubric, and are also
held to the standards outlined in the curriculum through standardized testing of students
and eventually having those test results tied to their pay. Peer evaluators evaluate teachers
and principals. Their own performance is evaluated through use of discrepancy reports.
Principal evaluate teachers, and their performance on evaluating teachers is now
evaluated by peer evaluators and district administrators.

An additional layer is formed between teachers and principals as a result of the
reliance on academic coaches to support instruction. Teachers rely on these teacher
experts for classroom assistance. Principals rely on these teacher experts to assist
teachers. It is through these teacher experts that principals enact their own instructional
leadership.

All of these layers, represented in the metaphor of the panopticon, serve to
redefine what it is to be an instructional leader and a supervisor. The heavy emphasis on
evaluating teachers, the tremendous amount of time consumed in this process, and the
vast amount of surveillance of all parties serve to reinforce efforts by principals to rely on
others for instructional leadership. For teachers, this is expected, further emphasizing the
supervision role of principals. TES, while explained initially as a way to open up
collegial conversations between principals and teachers, may do just the opposite, further underscoring principals as supervisors who occupy a particular place in the bureaucratic hierarchy – a place above teachers.

The technologized language of informality does little to change the underlying structure of schooling or normalized roles. The informal language, in fact, did little to mask or to change these relationships. Principals are expected to evaluate teachers, and teachers expect principals to evaluate them. This is, after all, a teacher evaluation system.

Neoliberal attitudes about education and its place in the economy have deeply influenced efforts at evaluating teachers. Much of the move toward more surveillance of teachers has been due to legislation. As the move has been made toward increasing surveillance of teachers, principals, district administrators, and now peer evaluators have been caught up in what Foucault would call the machinery of the panopticon. In the process, educators have come to want for themselves what the system wants from them. Educators have internalized the prescribed knowledge and practices, so all are objectified and controlled (Jardine, 2005, p. 61).

**But Maybe…**

**Teacher empowerment.**

Apple (2005) counters neoliberal explanations somewhat, arguing that, in fact, all of the bureaucracy required by TES is precisely because teachers and principals do retain some agency. If teachers and principals were only obedient and “if they always followed what management wanted them to do, then the enormous cost of bureaucratic and hierarchical supervision and control would not have to be paid” (p. 69). It is because teachers and principals attempt to hold on to some autonomy that a hierarchical structure
remains a necessary element of control. This idea that some agency is retained is also evidenced by The District’s marked attempt to out-maneuver legislation aimed at schools and teachers. This attempt was directly tied to minimizing the impact of including student achievement data in teacher evaluations, and although The District has thus been successful in minimizing that impact, student achievement data was still included.

The District’s acknowledgment of comments regarding the negative language of the rubric is an illustration of The District’s flexibility and willingness to adapt. This also illustrates that principals and teachers may have retained some agency within The District. The new rubric to be utilized in the 2011-2012 school year was a result of much commentary from evaluators, principals, and teachers. The changes were made as a show of solidarity and eagerness to respond to their employees. Again, the increased accountability seems to be balanced with some amount of power. By responding to voices from schools, The District demonstrated its ability to be moved by those same voices. The voices are reinforced, believing that they can have an impact. Indeed, they have made an impact. However, the impact seems superficial. Changing some wording is not the same as changing the process. It remains to be seen if this amount of impact will be enough to offset the increased accountability, and allow for what Ingersoll (2003) calls the balance between control and autonomy.

Ingersoll writes about teachers feeling empowered, as that empowerment aids communication between principals and teachers. As illustrated, principals overtly rely on teacher leaders in the school to provide assistance to other teachers. Principals also found opportunities to grow teacher leaders, which is another overt method that principals enlist to empower teachers. The principals’ primary mode of enacting instructional leadership,
the mode which allows them to forge instructional leadership and evaluation, relies on the empowerment of teachers and their agency to act. Principals rely on the teachers around them, so if teachers feel empowered to act based on their own best judgment and their experiences, then maybe TES will result in real teacher empowerment.

It may be that, as described by Ingersoll (2003), finding the balance between control and employee autonomy is reliant on this empowerment of teachers. Ingersoll writes that “accountability and power must go hand in hand; increases in one must be accompanied by increases in the other. Imbalances between the two result in problems for both the employee and the organization” (p. 244-5). TES has resulted in increased accountability, yet teachers may also be garnering more control by being called upon to act as leaders within the school. It remains to be seen if teachers are empowered to act based on their own instincts and experiences or if they are empowered only to act based on established performance standards.

Teacher agency.

Teacher agency has been impacted by TES, but there remained instances of teacher agency apparent in the texts. Teachers rely on each other for guidance with regards to managing difficult students or instructional practices. Stacy and Stephanie both talked of how their principal relied on them to help guide the staff, and both spoke of specific instances when they had supported other teachers. While TES was controlling, much more so than any recently implemented teacher evaluation system in The District, teachers were able to maintain some agency, however limited. Ingersoll (2003) stresses the importance of balancing autonomy with control. Questions remain about how
teachers will respond to TES, and whether they will find new ways to garner agency and maintain some autonomy.

The district administrators talked about teachers relying on each other for support. Teachers also talked about relying on each other, and they talked about this in a way that suggests informal networks they had formed to support each other. Principals, enacting their educational leadership through academic coaches and teacher experts, further reinforce the importance of these networks for teachers. Increased importance of these networks for teachers may be an important consequence of the enactment of TES for teachers.

**Only men complain about TES.**

Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) offer an explanation for why women, the sole focus of this study, may be more comfortable sharing leadership. This may help explain why the principals in this study enacted leadership by engaging others. Women, write Grogan and Shakeshaft, often describe power as something that is increased as it is shared. For women, “power needs to be conceptualized as something that is shared with others” (p. 7). Grogan and Shakeshaft also emphasize that women place importance on instructional leadership activities and that women “are likely to stress the importance of instructional competence” (p. 18).

The ideas expressed by Grogan and Shakeshaft help to explain the comment that was directed toward me while in a TES administrator training. During this training, another female administrator remarked that “only men complain about TES.” Women, according to Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011), are drawn to “putting instruction and learning at the center of their leadership mission.” This is the stated goal of TES.
“Women educational leaders often make decisions based on the priorities of student learning. They acknowledge that the school must be managed well, but their hearts are moved by watching students grow and develop” (p. 19).

If women are drawn to instructional leadership, then maybe they are intrigued by TES, an effort focused on teaching and learning. This might explain why “only men complain about TES.” It may be that TES is a result of, and reaction to, female leadership. It was, after all, based upon a model written by a woman that is being implemented by a largely female work force. This model values what Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) write that women value – a focus on student learning and sharing of power. The women in this study did focus on student learning, and shared power by relying on teachers at the school.

**Bureaucratic compliance or teacher professionalization?**

When writing about the practice of classroom walk-throughs and their ability to prompt collegial dialogue between principals and teachers, English (2010) writes that “when the function of observation is not bureaucratic compliance but enhanced professionalization of teacher decision making, we have the beginnings of a changed education system, one teacher at a time” (p. xxv). Much remains to be seen. If teachers are empowered only to act based on recognized standards then TES will result in competition and what Ball (2003) terms fabrications. The surveillance and performativity of TES will have resulted in creating a climate of competition that will engender performance for performance’s sake and fabrications that are reproduced by systems of recording and reporting on practice (2003, Ball, p. 225). The surveillance will have resulted in a deeply changed ethic of teaching, a change very unlike the one English is
looking for, a change that will instead leave no space for “an autonomous or collective ethical self” (Ball, p. 226). Neoliberal policies will have effectively controlled the work of teachers.

**My own socialization.**

My own extensive socialization in The District impacted the way in which I chose to analyze the texts. Analyzing the texts by participant group was a decision impacted by my experiences in The District. District administrators, principals, and teachers are distinct groups within the bureaucracy as I understand it and as I have worked within it. As I participated as an observer in the conferences between principals and teachers I focused on the individual acting within a role. Having been in both roles of evaluator and teacher I could place myself in them both, simultaneously and alternately putting myself in the place of one and/or the other. While my intimate relationship with The District allowed me access and background information, it also limited my ability to be an outside observer. This was an issue I struggled to understand and acknowledge. Several times during the initial writing of this dissertation I referred to The District as “us” or “we.” I also referred to The District as “our” district. This proved to be difficult for me to avoid, highlighting my complete socialization into The District which I wrote about in my journal. It was, however, impossible for me to understand the enactment of TES except through my own experiences.

**Other implications.**

*Teachers leaving the field.*

One of the reasons for implementation of TES was expressed as the need to provide consistent evaluations for teachers. The evaluations based on the old system were
seen by district administrator participants as too inconsistent and permissive. A better method for sorting teachers was seen as a benefit of TES. However, Stephanie discussed what she believed to be the unfair burden on mediocre teachers, and that TES might squeeze them out. District administrators did not talk about otherwise high performing teachers leaving the field because of TES, and yet this is what Stacy was contemplating. Both of these concerns speak to whether or not TES will have the desired effect of sorting out only poorly performing teachers.

**Sharing privileged information.**

Stacy felt as if she was judged unfairly by the peer evaluator regarding the behavior of one of her students. This student was experiencing a tough time in his private life, and Stacy did not feel as if she should divulge his complete story to the peer evaluator. For Stacy, her unwillingness to share the student’s entire case history resulted in what she considered to be an unfair assessment of her teaching. This brings to the fore an important consideration regarding what information teachers ethically can, and should, divulge to others with regards to privileged student information.
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# Appendix A

## Rubric, Version 1 - Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Requires Action (0 points)</th>
<th>Developing (1 points)</th>
<th>Accomplished (2 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td>(Component weight: 4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Domain weight: 20%)</strong></td>
<td>The teacher's plans and practice display little knowledge of the content, prerequisites and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements include:</td>
<td>Knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of prerequisite relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of content-related pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</th>
<th>Requires Action (0 points)</th>
<th>Developing (1 points)</th>
<th>Accomplished (2 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</strong></td>
<td>(Component weight: 5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Domain % of evaluation score: 20%)</strong></td>
<td>Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' cultural backgrounds and are characterized by racism, put-downs, or conflict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements include:</td>
<td>Teacher interaction with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interactions with other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 3: Instruction</th>
<th>Requires Action (0 points)</th>
<th>Developing (1 points)</th>
<th>Accomplished (2 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3a. Communicating with Students</strong></td>
<td>(Component weight: 9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Domain % of evaluation score: 40%)</strong></td>
<td>The teacher has an inauspicious presence in the classroom. The teacher does not effectively develop students' understanding of the objective by not communicating it, or the lesson does not connect to the objective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements include:</td>
<td>Expectations for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directions and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanations of content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of oral and written language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4: Professional responsibilities</td>
<td>Requires Action (0 points)</td>
<td>Developing (1 point)</td>
<td>Accomplished (2 points)</td>
<td>Exemplary (3 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a. Reflecting on Teaching</strong> (Component weight: 3%)</td>
<td>The teacher does not accurately assess the effectiveness of the lesson and has no idea about how the lesson could be improved.</td>
<td>The teacher provides a partially accurate and objective description of the lesson but does not cite specific evidence. The teacher makes only general suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.</td>
<td>The teacher provides an accurate and objective description of the lesson, citing specific evidence. The teacher makes some specific suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.</td>
<td>The teacher's reflection on the lesson is thoughtful and accurate, citing specific evidence. The teacher draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative strategies and predicts the likely success of each.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accuracy**

**Use in future teaching**
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District Permission for Research

Ms. Jennifer Neale
8608 Cattail Drive
Tampa, Florida 33637

Dear Ms. Neale:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in your research proposal, *Instructional Leadership and Supervision: Exploring Tensions in District Teacher Evaluation Protocols Utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis*. A copy of this letter MUST be presented to all participants including principals and teacher at each school to assure them your research has been approved by the district. Your approval number is RR01027. You must refer to this number in all correspondence. Approval is given for your research under the following conditions:

1) Participation by any school is to be on a voluntary basis. That is, participation is NOT MANDATORY and you must advise ALL PARTICIPANTS that they are not obligated to participate in your study.

2) If a principal agrees the school will participate, it is up to you to find out what rules the school has for allowing people on campus and you must abide by the school’s check-in policy. You will NOT BE ALLOWED on any school campus without first following the school’s rules for entering campus grounds.

3) **Active permission must be obtained for all participants involved in your research.** You must indicate in your request to the participant all the types of data you will be collecting. You must have this consent before you begin your research of data.

4) Confidentiality must be assured for all. That is, **ALL DATA MUST BE AGGREGATED SUCH THAT THE PARTICIPANTS CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED.** Participants include the district, principals, administrators and teachers.

5) Since you are an employee of the Hillsborough County Public Schools, all work related to this research must be done outside your normal working hours.

6) If this work is not part of your job, you can not use the school mail or school system to send or receive any documents.

7) Research approval does not constitute the use of the district’s equipment or software. In addition, requests that result in extra work by the district such as data analysis, programming or aiding with electronic surveys, may have a cost borne by the researcher.

8) Work on your research must not be done during teacher/student contact hours.
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9) This approval WILL EXPIRE ON 5/31/2011. You will have to contact us at that time if you feel your research approval should be extended.

10) A copy of your research findings must be sent to us for our files and must be submitted to this department BEFORE ANY DATA IS PUBLISHED IN ANY FORM.

Good luck with your endeavor. If you have any questions, please advise.

Sincerely,

Signature

Manager of Evaluation
Assessment and Accountability
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Appendix C
Letter to Participants

My name is Jenifer Neale and I am a doctoral student at the University of South Florida in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. I have been an educator in [__________] county Public Schools for 27 years and I am excited for the opportunity to conduct research for my dissertation, which is titled *Instructional Leadership and Supervision: Exploring Tensions in District Teacher Evaluation Protocols Utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis*. I would like for you to consider participating in my study.

For this research, I am interested in analyzing discourses in texts on the instructional leadership and teacher evaluation protocols in [__________] county in order to investigate the various roles principals are asked to fulfill. For this dissertation I will investigate the role of the principal as a colleague and mentor and compare this with the role of the principal as supervisor and evaluator in hierarchical systems. I am utilizing qualitative research techniques, and will analyze District documents as well as principal, teacher, and peer evaluator talk about teacher evaluation. There is limited research in this area, therefore this study could inform our knowledge of how principals, evaluators, and teachers construct their roles and understand the roles of others. Your contribution is vital and your time is greatly appreciated.

For this research, you will be asked to participate in at least one, and possibly two, one-on-one interviews. Each interview will take approximately 30-60 minutes. These interviews will take place outside of school time, in a location specified by the interviewee. In addition to the interviews, teachers and principals will be observed in one teacher/principal pre-observation, and the subsequent teacher/principal post-observation. All participants will receive a copy of my initial analysis, and have the opportunity to respond to this analysis. You may respond either in writing or orally. This input may become a part of the final analysis.

Participation in this study is voluntary and anonymous. Neither individual nor school names will be used as all participants, schools, [__________] county, and the [__________] will be referred to with pseudonyms. Participation will not result in penalty or loss of benefits and there is no cost to participate in the study. There are no foreseeable risks to participate and you may voluntarily remove yourself at any time. Data will be stored under lock and key and will be accessible only by myself. This research has a projected window of March, 2011 through May, 2011, as has been approved by [__________] County Schools. Your candid responses and time are greatly appreciated.

The University of South Florida and the Department of Health and Human Services can review all research records. The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board, IRB, may be contacted at: 12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd. MDC 035, Tampa, Florida 33612, (ph) 813-974-5638. For questions about the research, please contact me at jneale925@gmail.com or my doctoral supervisor, Dr. William Black, at wrblack@usf.edu. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jenifer Neale
Appendix D
Coached Cycles Script

Pre and post conferencing

The purpose of the Hillsborough County Excellence in Teacher Effectiveness Program is three-fold:
- high quality teacher evaluation
- excellence in teacher effectiveness
- and better achievement for ALL students

The following script provides principals with an example of pre- and post-observation conferencing that is directly tied to the previously viewed training video provided by the New Teacher Center, featuring a lesson on inferences and feelings in poetry. It is important to note that these conference scripts are not happening in real time. They have been greatly condensed for training purposes. Both of these activities can take up to 30 minutes each.

Let's get started by reviewing the purpose of pre-conferencing. The pre-observation conference is an information gathering meeting to ensure that the principal is absolutely clear about the purpose of the lesson and the strategies to be used to secure the learning objectives as outlined by the teacher. It is not a coaching session. It is important that the principal observes the teacher's planned lesson as outlined and discussed. Opportunities to coach the teacher towards greater effectiveness occur only in the last portion of the post-observation conference.

Prepare for the pre-observation conference by reviewing the Pre-Observation Conference Tool, submitted to you by the teacher. Should you want additional support in conducting the pre-observation conference, please refer to the Pre-Observation Conference Guide. During the pre-observation conference, the evaluator may record notes on the Pre-Observation Conference Tool.

Part 2: Pre-Conference

PRINCIPAL

Good morning. Thank you for taking the time to meet with me before your lesson tomorrow. We are going to use this time to ensure that I fully understand the purpose of your lesson, the objectives you intend to address, and the learning you want your students to acquire. This conference also provides you with an opportunity to let me know if there are any unique circumstances about tomorrow's lesson that might impact the observation. You may see me taking some notes during this conference and I want you to know that these are just notes for me to help remember this conversation.

TEACHER

That sounds good. I have to admit that I am a little nervous about going through this process but I think this pre-conference is a good way to make sure that we are both on the same page.

PRINCIPAL

I think so too, so let's begin. Thanks for uploading your pre-observation conference tool. I have reviewed it and have a few clarifying questions. I see your lesson objective about inferences and feelings. Why those concepts?

TEACHER

Well, you can see that they are Sunshine State Standards for 3rd grade in Reading/Language Arts and these concepts are also being covered at this point in the reading program.
PRINCIPAL

So I noticed you are going to be using a T-chart. Have the students used a T-chart before and why a T-chart?

TEACHER

Yes, the students previously learned about inferencing with narrative text and I used a T-chart in that activity too. I wanted to use a T-chart again because the concepts are somewhat related and students did well in using a T-chart then. The structure is familiar and seems to work well for them.

PRINCIPAL

OK. Will your students work in groups or individually?

TEACHER

Well, I am going to start with them in a whole group setting on the rug to introduce the concept and do some practicing together. Then I am going to transition them into cooperative groups to complete the T-chart.

PRINCIPAL

Again, just so I am clear, how will you know if your lesson objective is achieved?

TEACHER

Well, I am going to be circulating between the groups and asking them lots of questions related to inferencing and the clues that helped them to identify the "big feeling" in the poem. I will also be assessing their progress in completing the T-chart.

PRINCIPAL

OK, I understand where you are going with this lesson, are there any special circumstances, or situations, that I might need to be aware of?

TEACHER

Well, as you know, Anna can melt down. She's been pretty good lately but you never know. And I have two students with pretty high absence rates. If they come in that day, they might be a little bit behind so I have to make sure I am scaffolding this for them.

PRINCIPAL

I noticed on your pre-observation tool that you have asked me to focus on meeting the needs of all learners. What does that mean to you?

As you know, I have a lot of English Language Learners in my room who are at varying levels of English proficiency and have a wide range of reading abilities. I am curious if they are all able to access the material and comprehend the objective as I have been struggling with choosing appropriate text.

PRINCIPAL

OK. I will make sure that my feedback includes this focus and since the Danielson rubric has us focus on students’ learning anyway, this is a perfect match.

TEACHER
Oh, but before I go, will you look at the poem I am planning to use and tell me what you think?

PRINCIPAL

Well, depending on the circumstances I wear several hats. Sometimes I am a thought partner and coach, and other times I have to be an objective ‘rater’. I would be happy to talk with you after the observation but it is not appropriate for me to do so now. I know this may seem odd, but in this model, the time for developmental conversation occurs in the post-conference. I recommend that you show the poem to one of your colleagues if you want feedback before tomorrow’s lesson.

So I’ll see you tomorrow at 10:00am and as a quick reminder we have agreed to conduct the post-observation conference on Thursday, from 9:00 - 9:30am.

TEACHER

Oh, OK. I’ll see you tomorrow.

The pre-observation conference included reference to the pre-observation conference tools, clarifying questions and the possibility that the teacher will seek coaching from you. Our principal demonstrated the importance of avoiding coaching at this stage of the process.

Part 3: post-observation conference INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the post-observation conference is to provide accurate judgments tied to collected evidence and appropriate recommendations for next steps. The conference is intended to be a dialogue rather than a monologue; however, the conference is structured with the judgments and supporting evidence up front and the dialogue, or coaching, following.

The structure of the post-observation conference consists of two sections. The first section is formal feedback on the lesson judgments made, both strengths and areas for development, with the areas for development reported in priority order.

The second section of the post-observation conference includes next steps and it is in this section of the conference where the dialogue, and possible coaching, begins. It is also important to note that it is in this section of the conference where the principal will begin to gain insight as to the teacher’s ability to be reflective of their practice, which will be summarized at the end of the year evaluation in Domain 4a of the Danielson rubric.

In preparing for the post-observation conference, the evaluator uses their selected scripting notes captured on the Formal Classroom Observation Tools and their ratings form based on the Charlotte Danielson rubric to complete the Classroom Observation Summary. This summary serves as the basis for the post-observation conference and is the artifact that becomes part of the teacher’s performance record. Additionally, guidance in running a post-observation conference has been provided in the Conference Discussion Guide.

The post-observation conference.

PRINCIPAL

Good morning. Did you catch that game last night? How about those __________?

TEACHER
I did catch the game. What a game! Close for a bit but they really came through. I think it’s going to be a great season!

PRINCIPAL
I hope so. Well, I know how valuable your time is and I want to make sure I get you out of here on time, so let’s get started.

As you know, the post-observation conference consists of two parts. The first part is where I am going to be evaluative about student learning and how you influenced it and then we’ll move into more of a dialogue where, together, we explore your reflections and next steps. Do you have any questions about the process before we begin?

TEACHER
No, I guess I’m ready but I admit this is causing me a little bit of anxiety.

PRINCIPAL
That’s understandable. This is a new process for the county and a new focus on student learning, but I know with time and support, all of our comfort levels will increase.

TEACHER
OK, that makes sense. Then I’m ready to go.

PRINCIPAL
OK. I am going to lead off with strengths. Learning was best when students effectively moved into cooperative groups with a solid understanding of roles and responsibilities within those groups.

For example, when you questioned the students about roles and responsibilities within their cooperative groups, most students raised their hands to relay their understanding of their roles and responsibilities within those groups. And the students you called on did have a clear understanding of the role. So, in the area of Domain 2c, Managing Classroom Procedures, this is a positive feature of the lesson.

Also, in Domain 2a, ‘creating an environment of respect and rapport’, this is another area of strength. Interactions were generally warm and appropriate and student interactions were the same. For example, in small groups, students willingly accepted each other’s answers.

So, these are two areas of strength and now, for areas for development, I am going to tell them to you in priority order. There is one area for development in Domain 1, Planning and Preparation and two in Domain 3, Instruction.

In the area of Domain 1a, Knowledge of Students, you do know your students and their language backgrounds; however, that knowledge was not demonstrated yesterday in this lesson. Here are some examples. Students were unfamiliar with many terms in the lesson (e.g. tar, ornaments). Also, since all students were using the same text, but not all are on the same reading level, I would have liked to have seen more differentiation, either by providing alternate reading materials, or by focusing more individual attention on struggling readers. Your knowledge of their reading ability was not evident in today’s lesson.

Domain 3e, Flexibility and Responsiveness. When students were unable to make the inferencing connections, or gave you the answers you were looking for, instead of finding a different tack, you continued on with the lesson when students experienced great difficulty.
Lastly, in Domain 3b, Questioning and Discussion Techniques, students had multiple opportunities to respond to questions. Their efforts were minimally effective at producing thoughtful responses because the questions were leading them in a direction you did not want them to go. For example, you asked them, "What kind of dragon lives below the city streets and snorts steam and you could hear it rumble?" Students needed more guidance because they were trying to answer your question literally, which caused them to be more distracted from inferencing.

Another example of a question that continued to throw students off track was, "What's underneath the city that would let off steam in holes in the sidewalk?" Again, the students responded literally, and correctly, with "heaters" which again took them further away from inferencing.

So, that's the end of the feedback on the domains. And you also asked me to additionally focus on meeting the needs of all learners. I hit upon some of this in the areas for development through lack of differentiated text. I would also add that a 'best practice' when working with English Language Learners is to pre-expose students to unfamiliar words before they begin to read. This is definitely a good area of focus for you and we will continue to work on this together. Does this all make sense to you?

TEACHER

Yeah. I get it. I do know this. I just need to make sure I use all of my skills.

PRINCIPAL

You will have an opportunity to demonstrate your skills. This is only one snapshot of this lesson and you will have multiple opportunities this year to be observed.

TEACHER

I know all that but when you work so hard it is not easy to hear about three areas that could be better.

PRINCIPAL

OK. Let's remember back to the beginning of this section, I named strengths in your lesson that are really there. They will serve you well as you continue to focus on the learning for all students. So let's focus on next steps and continue to dialogue.

TEACHER

OK.

PRINCIPAL

So to continue, "What were your thoughts about student engagement at the beginning of the lesson?"

TEACHER

Well, at the beginning of the lesson on the rug, students were making great eye contact with me so I know they were paying attention. And, they were also pretty focused at their desks.

PRINCIPAL

I agree. How do you think we could ensure that they really got the objective of your lesson?
TEACHER

Well now I can really see how the poems were all wrong for them. Based on how hard I was having to pull answers from the kids, I knew I should have scrapped the lesson but I am never sure how to do that if I don't have a new lesson ready to put in front of them. Plus, I was being observed!

PRINCIPAL

You're right. You were being observed. But the stage we want to get to, and we will get to, is that no matter who is in your classroom, you will be comfortable making instructional decisions like that.

TEACHER

I hope so. Can I ask, at what point would you have stopped the lesson and what would you have done?

PRINCIPAL

Once I realized how difficult it was for them to understand that it was a subway, I would have gotten their attention using your effective clapping cue, and told them, "It's a subway." I would have ensured that all students understood what a subway train is, and then directed them to use the same T-chart and now record clues that indicate that it really is a subway. That way, I wouldn't have to scrap the whole thing.

TEACHER

Wow. I always assumed that when I scrapped a lesson, I had to stop it entirely.

PRINCIPAL

Sometimes you do, but not every time. I am going to have our reading specialist sit down with you soon to help you select appropriate text for the wide range of students in your room. This will continue to help you to build your skills in meeting the needs of all learners.

So what are your thoughts about the effectiveness of the questioning in that lesson?

TEACHER

I thought I asked a lot of questions and the students tried to answer them.

PRINCIPAL

Again, we agree. You did ask a lot of questions and your students really were trying to answer them. OK, but volume of questioning is not what we are looking for, it is critical thinking. Student learning will be better when we require students to support their answers with responses that can be connected to the text.

TEACHER

Boy, you have really given me a lot to work on. I am trying to figure out where to start.

PRINCIPAL

You don't have to do this learning alone. As you know, these next steps will be posted in your teacher bucket, which your mentor has access to. Also, I have a check-in with your mentor next week. Would you mind if I mention to your mentor this as an area for development?

TEACHER
No, that's fine. She has helped me a lot and I know she will have some good strategies to help me question my students better.

PRINCIPAL

Alright, then I will relay this information. As you are thinking more about this conference and if any additional questions arise, please feel free to touch base with me.

TEACHER

OK, thanks. Have a great rest of the day.

PRINCIPAL

You too, thanks.

The post-observation conference has two distinct sections, starting with the evaluative feedback followed by dialogue, and/or coaching. At the conclusion of the conference, the principal will upload the Classroom Observation Summary, and the complete rubric with ratings into the teacher's bucket.

In closing, we recognize that participants using this process for the first time may naturally experience some anxiety, which will dissipate over time. It is with confidence that we continue to move forward knowing that this process will raise teacher effectiveness and achievement for all students.
## Appendix E
### Reading Walk-through Checklist

**Administrator's Reading Walkthrough Checklist**

**Date** ____________________  **Time** ____________________  **Teacher** ____________________  **Grade Level** ____________________  **3/28/11**

### Circle Reader’s Workshop components observed:
- Read Aloud
- Shared Reading
- Guided Reading
- Independent Reading
- Word Work

#### Classroom Environment/Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>An environment of respect and rapport is evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>The classroom culture for reading is characterized by high expectations for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td><em>Materials displayed are current</em>, related to topics of study, organized and useful for instruction (word walls, poems, charts, songs, anchor charts, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td><em>Daily class schedule</em> is posted and includes an uninterrupted 30 minute reading block and an additional 30 minutes for intervention. Transitions between components of Reader’s Workshop occur smoothly with minimal loss of instructional time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Students demonstrate clear understanding of how to use literacy areas within the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>The classroom is well supplied with varying levels of books that are organized in a manner that invites children to select and read independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td><em>A defined meeting place</em> that promotes reading instruction (guided reading table, shared reading rug) is evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td><em>Work areas are clearly defined</em> and labeled: Reading Area, Writing Area, Listening Area, etc. and are appropriately challenging for the grade level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td><em>A print rich environment</em>, produced collaboratively by teacher and students, is evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td><em>Books are displayed</em> and accessible to students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher Instruction

- Teacher effectively delivers rigorous initial instruction based on the current standards/benchmarks and data making the purpose of the lesson clear for students.  **3a**
- Teacher performs think-alouds to explicitly model comprehension and/or decoding strategies and provides opportunities for student guided practice.  **3b**
- Teacher poses higher order questions and monitors for student understanding.  **3b**
- Teacher successfully incorporates supplemental and real-world reading materials to reinforce initial instruction.  **3b**
- Teacher includes a variety of genre for reading instruction including informational text.  **3c**
- Teacher incorporates oral language activities that promote phonological awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.  **3c**
- Teacher monitors and confers with students during independent, shared, and guided reading.  **3d**
- Teacher provides small group differentiated reading instruction.  **3e**
- Teacher provides data driven immediate intensive intervention (iii) to students in need.  **2e**

### Student Engagement

- Students can articulate the purpose of the reading activity and how it helps them become a better reader. Students can answer the following questions:
  1. Why are you doing this activity?
  2. How will it help you become a better reader?
- Students are responding to higher level questions about the selections read.  **3b**
- Students engage in lively discussions focused on a particular text.  **3b**
- Students are identifying and using comprehension strategies before, during, and after reading.  **3b**
- Students are actively engaged in the reading process during read aloud, shared, guided and independent reading as evidenced through conversation and sharing their thinking about text.  **3c**
- Students are actively engaged in reading text throughout the Reader’s Workshop.  **3c**
- Students are developing fluency through a variety of reading activities which may include oral reading, choral reading, or buddy reading.  **3c**
- Students engage in discussions that support development of oral vocabulary.  **3c**
- Students use common language to engage in literate conversations about books.  **3c**

*These activities can be seen throughout all Reader’s Workshop components.*
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Appendix F
Danielson Keynote Notes

Charlotte Danielson - NAESP
Purpose of Teaching - 10:30 am, Tampa Convention Center

Professional learning
Collegial/congenial
vs.
Harder stuff
Combining prof skills - (dual roles)
Merge through design of purposes

Who does evaluating? "Who"
- Peers
- Content fellow
- Site administrators

"High stakes" evaluation
"Equity"

MET - connected to teachscape
Through this we found that it is very difficult to get inter-rater reliability
Framework as analytic tool

Learning done by learners through an active practice—applicants, teachers.

Who is doing work of evaluation process?

Minute 48, Isy

Fear shuts people down—hardest to integrate, especially for probationary teachers—very vulnerable.

Can learn more from mentor/coach—harder from principal.

Gives rationale for using tenured teachers.

Reflection on practice essential:
1906 Dewey—learn from how we think about what we do.

"It's all about the conversation."
CD cont

Lowest level below "Do No Harm" threshold

levels of performance of teaching, not teachers.

Not in average.

At what point do we have an egregious mark that is enough to outweigh others?
Appendix G
Pop-In Descriptors

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
1a. Setting instructional outcomes
   • Posted instructional outcome written correctly
   • Instructional outcome evident to most students

Domain 2: Classroom Environment
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
   • Interactions among students are respectful
   • Interactions between students and teacher are respectful

2b. Establishing a culture for learning
   • Relevant, rigorous, and current work displayed
   • Students working on relevant and rigorous work

2c. Managing classroom procedures
   • Procedures Posted
   • Procedures implemented and/or evident
   • Materials handled efficiently

2d. Managing student behavior
   • Student behavior managed respectfully and appropriately

2e. Organizing Physical Space
   • The classroom is safe
   • The physical arrangement supports the learning activities

Domain 3: Instruction
3a. Communication with students
   • Directions clearly communicated
   • Effectively communicated lesson content
   • Transitions managed so that instructional time is not lost

3b. Using questioning and discussion techniques
   • Level of Questioning contains appropriate number of high, moderate, low questions

3c. Engaging students in learning
   • Students engaged in work of a high level of rigor
   • Teacher Checks for comprehension throughout the lesson
   • Pacing of the lesson is appropriate

3d. Assessment in Instruction
   • Ongoing assessment is evident in the instruction
# Observation Chart

### Teachers Assigned a Peer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 - 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 24.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22 (or designated a “NI”)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 17 (or designated a “U”)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminder:** All teachers must have 1 formal observation conducted by the principal.

### Teachers Assigned a Mentor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Formal Observations</th>
<th>Mentor (Swap) Formal Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Informal tool for Domain 2**

**Unannounced**

**You don't have to test the person you're coming in.**

**Pre or post observation conference need to include comments**

---

**Appendix H**

Observation Chart

---

**Aug. 11, 2011**

Joint Principals/Supervisors
## Appendix J

### Rubric, Version 2 (Excerpts)

---

### Performance rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Requires Action (0 points)</th>
<th>Developing (1 point)</th>
<th>Accomplished (2 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</strong> (Component weight: 4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher's plans and practice display little knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between different aspects of the content, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.</td>
<td>The teacher's plans and practice reflect some awareness of the important concepts in the discipline, prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.</td>
<td>The teacher's plans and practice reflect solid knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.</td>
<td>The teacher's plans and practice reflect extensive knowledge of the content, the structure of the discipline and instructional practices. The teacher actively builds on knowledge of prerequisites and misconceptions when designing instruction or seeking causes for student misunderstanding. The teacher stays abreast of emerging research areas, new and innovative methods and incorporates them into lesson plans and instructional strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elements include:**
- Knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline
- Knowledge of prerequisite relationships
- Knowledge of content-related pedagogy

---

### 1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (Component weight: 4%)

| | Requires Action (0 points) | Developing (1 point) | Accomplished (2 points) | Exemplary (3 points) |
| | | | | |
| The teacher demonstrates little or no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs, and does not seek such understanding. | The teacher indicates the importance of understanding students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole. | The teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students. | The teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources, and attains this knowledge of individual students. |

**Elements include:**
- Knowledge of child and adolescent development
- Knowledge of the learning process
- Knowledge of students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency
- Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage
- Knowledge of students' special needs

---

**Bold indicates changes from 2010-2011 School Year.**
### Performance Rating

#### Domain 3: Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Requires Action (0 points)</th>
<th>Developing (1 point)</th>
<th>Accomplished (2 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3a. Communicating with Students**  
( Component weight: 9%)  
Elements include:  
Expectations for learning  
Directions and procedures  
Explanations of content  
Use of oral and written language | The instructional outcome of the lesson is unclear to students, and the directions and procedures are confusing. The teacher's explanation of the content contains major errors. The teacher's spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax. Vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or use incorrectly, leaving students confused. | The teacher's attempt to explain the instructional outcome has only limited success, and directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion. The teacher's explanation of the content may contain minor errors, some portions are clear, other portions are difficult to follow, the teacher's explanation consists of a monologue with no invitation to the students for intellectual engagement. The teacher's spoken language is correct, however, vocabulary is limited or not fully appropriate to the students' ages or background. | The instructional outcome of the lesson is clearly communicated to students, but finding where a task is situated within broader learning, directions and procedures are explained clearly. The teacher's explanation of content is well scaffolded, clear and accurate, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. During the explanation of content, the teacher invites student intellectual engagement. The teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to the students' ages and interests. | The teacher links the instructional outcomes of the lesson to students' interests, the directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstandings. The teacher's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through artful scaffolding, and connecting with students' interests. The students contribute to providing the content, not in engaging and talk to their classmates. The teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to the students' ages and interests. |

#### Domain 3: Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Requires Action (0 points)</th>
<th>Developing (1 point)</th>
<th>Accomplished (2 points)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3b. Engaging Students in Learning**  
( Component weight: 9%)  
Elements include:  
Activities and assignments  
Grouping of students  
Use of instructional materials, resources and technology (as available)  
Structure and pacing | The learning tasks and activities, materials, resources, instructional groups, and technology are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or require only rote responses. The pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed. Few students are intellectually engaged or interested. | The learning tasks and activities are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant. The pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged. | The learning tasks and activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and are designed to challenge students thinking, resulting in active, intellectual engagement by most students with important and challenging content, and with teacher scaffolding to support that engagement. The pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged. | Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content, through well-designed learning tasks, and suitable scaffolding by the teacher, and fully aligned with the instructional outcomes. There is evidence of some student initiative if inquiry, and student contributions to the exploration of important content. The pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning and to consolidate their understanding. Students have some choice in how they complete tasks and may serve as resources for one another. |
Appendix J
Interview Protocols

**District Level Employee Interview Protocol**

- **Personal/Background Information**
  - What is your job title?
  - Tell me about how you got into the field of education.
  - Can you tell me how you came to be in your current position?
  - What do you like most about your job?
  - What do you find most challenging?
  - What do you think a teacher evaluation system should do?
    - What should it look like?
    - Have you seen elements in practice?
    - How?
    - When?
    - Where?
    - Why do you think it worked?
  - When did you first learn about this new teacher evaluation system? How?
  - What is your purpose within the new teacher evaluation system?
  - Talk about your interactions with principals with regards to the new teacher evaluation system.
    - Teachers?
    - Peer evaluators?

- **Defining Roles**
  - How do you think principals define their roles within the new teacher evaluation system?
    - Teachers?
    - Peer evaluators?
  - In what ways do you think this new teacher evaluation system may impact principals?
    - Teachers?
    - Peer evaluators?
  - What do you understand to be the purpose of this new teacher evaluation system?
  - Explain the role of staff development regarding the new teacher evaluation system.
  - What is your involvement with staff development?
  - Talk a little about the pre-conference.
    - What should an evaluator do in the pre-conference?
    - The teacher?
    - Why?
  - Talk a little about the post-conference.
    - What should an evaluator do in the post-conference?
- The teacher?
  - Why?

**Impact**
- What impact has the new evaluation system made in classrooms?
- Do you think the new teacher evaluation system has affected teacher performance?
  - How?
- Has this new teacher evaluation system affected the work of the principal?
  - How?
- What has been the impact of the addition of the peer evaluator?
- Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the principal?
  - In what ways?
- Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the teacher?
  - In what ways?
- How do you think teachers view the new teacher evaluation system?
- Do you think that there are differences in how effective and ineffective teachers view this new teacher evaluation system? Why might that be?
- If a teacher were to want to improve practice based on observation coding, where would he/she turn for help?
- Has this new teacher evaluation system affected the number of observations required?
  - How?
  - What impact has this had?

**Instructional Leadership/Supervision**
- In what ways do principals lead instruction?
- In what ways do others in the school lead instruction?
  - What others?
  - How?
- How would you define school supervision?
  - What types of responsibilities are attached to this?
- Who would you describe as supervisors within a school?

**Reflection**
- Does the new teacher evaluation system align with your philosophy of evaluation?
- How do you ideas about supervision and instructional leadership align with the new teacher evaluation system?
- Do you think there might be differences on how teachers, peer evaluators, and principals view the new teacher evaluation system?
  - Why?
  - In what ways?
  - Can you give me some examples?
Is there anything regarding the new teacher evaluation system and your experiences that you would like to share?

**Principal Interview Protocol**

- **Personal/Background Information**
  - What is your job title?
  - Tell me about how you got into the field of education.
  - Can you tell me how you came to be in your current position?
  - What do you like most about your job?
  - What do you find most challenging?
  - What do you think a teacher evaluation system should do?
    - What should it look like?
    - Have you seen elements in practice?
    - How?
    - When?
    - Where?
    - Why do you think it worked?
  - When did you first learn about this new teacher evaluation system? How?
  - What is your purpose within the new teacher evaluation system?
  - Talk about your interactions with District level personnel with regards to the new teacher evaluation system.
    - Teachers?
    - Peer evaluators?

- **Defining Roles**
  - How do you think teachers define their roles within the new teacher evaluation system?
    - District level personnel?
    - Peer evaluators?
  - In what ways do you think this new teacher evaluation system may impact teachers?
    - District level personnel?
    - Peer evaluators?
  - What do you understand to be the purpose of this new teacher evaluation system?
  - Explain the role of staff development regarding the new teacher evaluation system.
  - What is your involvement with staff development?
  - Talk a little about the pre-conference.
    - What should an evaluator do in the pre-conference?
    - The teacher?
    - Why?
  - Talk a little about the post-conference.
    - What should an evaluator do in the post-conference?
• The teacher?
• Why?

• Impact
  o What impact has the new evaluation system made in classrooms?
  o Do you think the new teacher evaluation system has affected teacher performance?
    ▪ How?
  o Has this new teacher evaluation system have affected the work of the principal?
    ▪ How?
  o What has been the impact of the addition of the peer evaluator?
  o Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the principal?
    ▪ In what ways?
  o Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the teacher?
    ▪ In what ways?
  o How do you think teachers view the new teacher evaluation system?
  o Do you think that there are differences in how effective and ineffective teachers view this new teacher evaluation system?
    ▪ Why might that be?
  o If a teacher were to want to improve practice based on observation coding, where would he/she turn for help?
  o Has this new teacher evaluation system affected the number of observations required?
    ▪ How?
    ▪ What impact has this had?

• Instructional Leadership/Supervision
  o In what ways do principals lead instruction?
  o In what ways do others in the school lead instruction?
    ▪ What others?
    ▪ How?
  o How would you define school supervision?
    ▪ What types of responsibilities are attached to this?
  o Who would you describe as supervisors within a school?

• Reflection
  o Does the new teacher evaluation system align with your philosophy of evaluation?
  o How do you ideas about supervision and instructional leadership align with the new teacher evaluation system?
  o Do you think there might be differences on how teachers, peer evaluators, and principals view the new teacher evaluation system?
    ▪ Why?
    ▪ In what ways?
Can you give me some examples?
  o Is there anything regarding the new teacher evaluation system and your experiences that you would like to share?

Peer Evaluator Interview Protocol

- Personal/Background Information
  o What is your job title?
  o Tell me about how you got into the field of education.
  o Can you tell me how you came to be in your current position?
  o What do you like most about your job?
  o What do you find most challenging?
  o What do you think a teacher evaluation system should do?
    - What should it look like?
    - Have you seen elements in practice?
    - How?
    - When?
    - Where?
    - Why do you think it worked?
  o When did you first learn about this new teacher evaluation system? How?
  o What is your purpose within the new teacher evaluation system?
  o Talk about your interactions with District level personnel with regards to the new teacher evaluation system.
    - Teachers?
    - Peer evaluators?

- Defining Roles
  o How do you think teachers define their roles within the new teacher evaluation system?
    - District level personnel?
    - Peer evaluators?
  o In what ways do you think this new teacher evaluation system may impact teachers?
    - District level personnel?
    - Peer evaluators?
  o What do you understand to be the purpose of this new teacher evaluation system?
  o Explain the role of staff development regarding the new teacher evaluation system.
  o What is your involvement with staff development?
  o Talk a little about the pre-conference.
    - What should an evaluator do in the pre-conference?
    - The teacher?
    - Why?
Talk a little about the post-conference.
- What should an evaluator do in the post-conference?
- The teacher?
- Why?

- **Impact**
  - What impact has the new evaluation system made in classrooms?
  - Do you think the new teacher evaluation system has affected teacher performance?
    - How?
  - Has this new teacher evaluation system have affected the work of the principal?
    - How?
  - What has been the impact of the addition of the peer evaluator?
  - Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the principal?
    - In what ways?
  - Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the teacher?
    - In what ways?
  - How do you think teachers view the new teacher evaluation system?
  - Do you think that there are differences in how effective and ineffective teachers view this new teacher evaluation system?
    - Why might that be?
  - If a teacher were to want to improve practice based on observation coding, where would he/she turn for help?
  - Has this new teacher evaluation system affected the number of observations required?
    - How?
    - What impact has this had?

- **Instructional Leadership/Supervision**
  - In what ways do principals lead instruction?
  - In what ways do others in the school lead instruction?
    - What others?
    - How?
  - How would you define school supervision?
    - What types of responsibilities are attached to this?
  - Who would you describe as supervisors within a school?

- **Reflection**
  - Does the new teacher evaluation system align with your philosophy of evaluation?
  - How do you ideas about supervision and instructional leadership align with the new teacher evaluation system?
  - Do you think there might be differences on how teachers, peer evaluators, and principals view the new teacher evaluation system?
Teacher Interview Protocol

- Why?
  - In what ways?
  - Can you give me some examples?
  
  Is there anything regarding the new teacher evaluation system and your experiences that you would like to share?

**Personal/Background Information**

- What is your job title?
- Tell me about how you got into the field of education.
- Can you tell me how you came to be in your current position?
- What do you like most about your job?
- What do you find most challenging?
- What do you think a teacher evaluation system should do?
  - What should it look like?
  - Have you seen elements in practice?
  - How?
  - When?
  - Where?
  - Why do you think it worked?
- When did you first learn about this new teacher evaluation system? How?
- What is your purpose within the new teacher evaluation system?
- Talk about your interactions with principals with regards to the new teacher evaluation system.
  - Peer evaluators?
  - District level personnel?

**Defining Roles**

- How do you define your role within the new teacher evaluation system?
  - District level personnel?
  - Principals?
  - Peer Evaluators?
- In what ways do you think this new teacher evaluation system may impact you?
  - District level personnel?
  - Principals?
  - Peer Evaluators?
- What do you understand to be the purpose of this new teacher evaluation system?
- Explain the role of staff development regarding the new teacher evaluation system.
- What is your involvement with staff development?
- Talk a little about the pre-conference.
What should an evaluator do in the pre-conference?
- The teacher?
- Why?
  o Talk a little about the post-conference.
    - What should an evaluator do in the post-conference?
    - The teacher?
    - Why?

- **Impact**
  o What impact has the new evaluation system made in classrooms?
  o Do you think the new teacher evaluation system has affected teacher performance?
    - How?
  o Has this new teacher evaluation system have affected the work of the principal?
    - How?
  o What has been the impact of the addition of the peer evaluator?
  o Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the principal?
    - In what ways?
  o Has the peer evaluator affected the role of the teacher?
    - In what ways?
  o How do you think other teachers view the new teacher evaluation system?
  o Do you think that there are differences in how effective and ineffective teachers view this new teacher evaluation system?
    - Why might that be?
  o If a teacher were to want to improve practice based on observation coding, where would he/she turn for help?
  o Has this new teacher evaluation system affected the number of observations required?
    - How?
    - What impact has this had?

- **Instructional Leadership/Supervision**
  o In what ways do principals lead instruction?
  o In what ways do others in the school lead instruction?
    - What others?
    - How?
  o How would you define school supervision?
    - What types of responsibilities are attached to this?
  o Who would you describe as supervisors within a school?

- **Reflection**
  o Does the new teacher evaluation system align with your philosophy of evaluation?
o How do you ideas about supervision and instructional leadership align with the new teacher evaluation system?

o Do you think there might be differences on how teachers, peer evaluators, and principals view the new teacher evaluation system?
  ▪ Why?
  ▪ In what ways?
  ▪ Can you give me some examples?

o Is there anything regarding the new teacher evaluation system and your experiences that you would like to share?
From Debbie’s interview (original in dark turquoise):

are teachers meeting the mark based on this rubric.
And before you could have people not go into classrooms at all and then do an evaluation at the end of the year. Which is really, and then give the person a 144. I mean, what is that based on?

I

Do you know why we chose Charlotte Danielson’s work, or how that happened?

B (7:23)

We hired, when we received the grant, we hired a consulting group called XX Consulting Group, and they found a few things. And Charlotte was being used in many districts already, and so in their research they gave a few different models and our teacher evaluation committee then pursued which one we would use and so Charlotte, in looking at her rubric, it was one that was generic enough that it could be used across grade levels, and so, the committee made the decision to go with her work. They had the option of they didn’t have to.

I

What parts of her work have we modified for use here in the district?

B (8:10)
Well, we took her rubric pretty much as is. We might have made, we made a few changes in a little bit of the language in some of the cells to try to make it less ambiguous, but we didn’t make a lot of changes.

she has made revisions to the rubric because when she created her rubric initially it was really just to promote teacher growth. It was to give people a common language in our profession. It was never intended to be an evaluative tool and because so many districts have adopted it she’s created critical attributes and she’s, she’s taken, she’s given more language in the actual grid of the rubric so that someone can read it and, and make a, a differentiation between what that says and what the other, the other part of the rubric says. So that is a plus.

We changed the levels, the proficiency levels, the wording of them so instead of having a needs improvement we have a developing, instead of having a, a, we have an exemplary versus a distinguished. they mean similar things but we changed that language and that was the committee decision. They wanted to change that language. I

Do you know why they changed that language?

B (9:20)

Yeah, the teachers on the committee just felt like, like in the requires action versus unsatisfactory. They felt an unsatisfactory felt hopeless, but a requires action felt like
with action it could be fixed.

So that kind of started the conversation but when you think of the difference between exemplary and distinguished, they just didn’t like the, the wording of the proficiency levels.
So, there were a lot of different terms were thrown back and forth. But they pretty much mean the same thing, you know.

I

I heard Charlotte speak recently at the principals’ conference, and she, one of her opening comments was that they have not been able to crack the inter-rater reliability problem. So, tell me how that’s been addressed in our district because you mentioned consistency using the other instrument.

B (10:26)

I do think that, that, you can get to the point where you have inter-rater reliability within a range.
So basically, with Charlotte, she had said, she has a group of Danielson, you know, her group, that are well trained in her rubric that rate.

And she said Never in every component are they exactly on because you may have asked this kid a question about their learning and it, or you may seen something that the teacher did and while I was writing you didn’t see it. I mean, just, there’s, you’re never going to a hundred percent on with the person next to you.
But what there is is you should be **on** within a **range**.

in **some** cases we’ve been right on **in** our, when we look at our data, in **some** cases they were **identical**, the principal to the peer.

But, **once again**, it’s a different **lesson** in different **time** and so that’s hard to look at as well when you’re looking at **two** different lessons but if we were watching the same exact video we should see **pretty** much the same things.

This year when I worked with principals and we used videos throughout the year at our council meetings we used videos and we **rated** them.

**That’s** how you get to that calibration, through continued conversations watching videos, watching the **same** lesson. Is it ever going to be to a **science**, where you get everybody exactly a hundred percent of the time on the same component? No, and **that’s** what Charlotte meant I think by the inter-rater **reliability**

but **one** thing we’re doing in the future is we’re going to use certification assessments where we all watch the same videos, you go in, you rate, and within a range, if you’re correct, you can stay **certified** every year. Just like we did with the old protocol every **three** years.

Excerpt from (Idealized) Post-Conference with Jamalia and Janet (original in red for Jamalia, light blue for Janet):

**P**

So that’s **probably** what I would have done. *I’m reading over it and I would looked at said, “Okay, here’s some things I **know** the kids already have, so let me pull in some new words*
that might not even be on this list
but are things that would be relevant
to this story. (3:00)

T

Okay

P (2:56)

You were very good
you stated your objectives
and
that you’re working on vocabulary
and you talked about the purpose,
you reviewed the reading
that you’d done previously.
So that was very good,
setting the pace and setting the standards that you’ll ask them.

And you reiterated
and said,
“that’s, you know,
developing vocabulary is one way, to
improve fluency.”

the kids really did like the activity in which they were using,
with the laptop there,
and then looking at the pictures and matching the words.

And it was quick,
which was good.
It actually gave them
help with
putting that in mind.

One of the things I noticed
when you were doing that
is
when they were trying to verbalize the meaning,
one of the things you said was,
“think about a workhouse,
who,
who lives there,
who lives there,
a little bit of wait
what does that mean,
what are they doing?"

And during that time period, I don’t know if you realized it, but, you asked like multiple questions.

T

Okay

P (5:39)

So you might wanna really learn to, incorporate in that wait time.

Because when you do that, you were getting responses.

T

Okay

P (6:10)

Which I knew you were trying to clarify, but it was with one question after another question, it was three questions right in there together where maybe you could have restated some information and then asked them some more, probing questions with the wait time.

You know, it’s interesting, when you’re talking about the pickpocket. And then you connected it to the story, and asking who was asking the question, “Who was in training for a pickpocket?” and the student was able to
answer.
There’s another student that was trying to answer,

And I noticed you had said that a couple of times when they’re excited about answering and you said,
“Wait, give them a chance.”
And he responded that and used it with whoever was sitting, I think next to him.

The students were very good.

Getting to some specific information,
one other suggestion that I was, when they’re giving the specific information get them to answer in a complete sentence.

it’s not like they’re just giving a one word answer, they’re giving some information that really getting them to answer completely using the correct verbiage.
Appendix L
Repeating Ideas and Themes

Accountability
Alignment between peer and principal
Alignment within system
Calibration
Collaborative dialogue
Collegial conversation
Danielson intent
Disagreement equals arguing
District message delivery
District oversight of evaluations
Evaluation should give clear criteria
Gaming the system (by the District)
Human error can occur
Instructional leadership
Lack of differentiation in teachers scores (old eval)
Lesson observations as snapshots
Need for unscheduled observations
Peers communicating with principals
Peers included based on extensive research
Peers tend to be much more honest
Power issues
Principal reflection
Principals as supervisors
Principals create climate for teacher improvement
Principals feel peer adds strength to their evaluations
Principals have some autonomy
Principals meeting with peers
Principals requesting PD
Principals tend to drift
Raters must be trained
Reflection not only due to doing something wrong
Resources for helping teachers
Rubric alignment to PD
Scoring for teacher reflection
Search for consistent teacher evaluation
Shared and distributed leadership
Some teachers more comfortable with peers
Struggling teachers don’t trust the system
Teacher data matching student achievement data
Teacher evaluation in a balanced approach
Teachers as instructional leaders
Teachers journal discrepancies
TES benefits teaching
Principals uncomfortable with peers
Usefulness of rubric as a strategy
Veteran teachers more skeptical
Walk-throughs, pop-ins
Why we chose Charlotte Danielson as a district

**DISTRICT THEMES**

**Alignment**

Alignment between peer and principal
Alignment within system
Peers tend to be much more honest
Lesson observations as snapshots
Search for consistent teacher evaluation

**Collaboration/Collegiality**

Collaborative dialogue
Collegial conversation

**District Oversight**

Accountability
Calibration
District message delivery
District oversight of evaluations
Raters must be trained

**Danielson Intent**

Danielson intent

**Instructional Leadership**

Instructional leadership
Need for unscheduled observations
Walk-throughs, pop-ins
Principals requesting PD
Teachers as instructional leaders
Principals create climate for teacher improvement
Shared and distributed leadership
Evaluation should give clear criteria
Supervision/Management

Principals as supervisors

Principal relationships with Peers

Peers communicating with principals
Principals feel peer adds strength to their evaluations
Principals meeting with peers
Principals uncomfortable with peers

Why a new system was needed

Lack of differentiation in teachers scores (old eval)
Search for consistent teacher evaluation
Why we chose Charlotte Danielson as a district
Usefulness of rubric as a strategy
Teacher data matching student achievement data
Teacher evaluation in a balanced approach
Peers included based on extensive research
Principals tend to drift
Rubric alignment to PD

Teacher issues

Resources for helping teachers
TES benefits teaching
Some teachers more comfortable with peers
Struggling teachers don’t trust the system
Teachers journal discrepancies
Veteran teachers more skeptical

Reflection

Principal reflection
Reflection not only due to doing something wrong
Scoring for teacher reflection

Power

Power issues
Principals have some autonomy
Disagreement equals arguing
Gaming the system (by the District)
Human error can occur
Calibration
Reflection not only due to doing something wrong
Shared and distributed leadership
Principals have some autonomy
Some teachers more comfortable with peers

**Increased surveillance**

Walk-throughs, pop-ins
Need for unscheduled observations

**Trust**

Human error can occur
Some teachers more comfortable with peers
Teachers journal discrepancies
Veteran teachers more skeptical
Struggling teachers don’t trust the system

**Role of the Peer**

Alignment between peer and principal
Peers communicating with principals
Peers included based on extensive research
Peers tend to be much more honest
Principals feel peer adds strength to their evaluations
Some teachers more comfortable with peers

**Role of the Principal**

Alignment between peer and principal
Disagreement equals arguing
Principal reflection
Principals as supervisors
Principals create climate for teacher improvement
Principals have some autonomy
Principals meeting with peers
Principals requesting PD
Principals tend to drift
Instructional leadership

**Role of the Teacher**

Teachers as instructional leaders
Instructional leadership
Struggling teachers don’t trust the system

JEFFERSON INTERVIEWS REPEATING IDEAS

- Evaluations as holistic
- Language in rubric lacking
- Need for more informal observations
- New system unfair to some teachers
- Observations only a snapshot
- Peer adds another set of eyes
- Peer adds objectivity
- Peer doesn’t get the full picture
- Peer doesn’t know the teachers
- Peer evaluator case load
- Peer evaluator wants to mentor more
- Peer evaluators as instructional leaders
- Peer qualifications
- Post conference
- Pre conference
- Principal and peer alignment with evaluations
- Principal as instructional leader
- Principal receptivity to peer evaluator
- Principal wanted teachers to feel good
- Principals come in the room often
- Principal’s role not that of leading instruction
- Principals talking heads for District
- Rubrics are wonderful
- Some teachers resistant to TES
- Standardized testing of ESE students is troubling
- Teacher evaluation should…
- Teachers get two evaluations
- Teachers have upped their game
- Teachers will not want ESE students
- Teaching should be continual reflection
- TES impact on teaching
- TES vs old evaluation system
- Tying pay to performance problematic
- Utility of comments made by peer
- Utility of comments made by principal in post conference
- Value added points for certain students
- Weak teachers should be shown the door
- Why I became a peer
- You don’t want to get defensive
Teachers as instructional leaders  
Where to go for assistance in improving

**JEFFERSON INTERVIEWS THEMES**

**Rubric**

Language in rubric lacking  
Rubrics are wonderful  

**Instructional Leadership**

Principal as instructional leader  
Principal’s role not that of leading instruction  
Peer evaluators as instructional leaders  
Teachers as instructional leaders  

**Role of Peer Evaluator**

Peer adds another set of eyes  
Peer adds objectivity  
Peer doesn’t get the full picture  
Peer doesn’t know the teachers  
Peer evaluator case load  
Peer evaluator wants to mentor more  
Peer qualifications  
Utility of comments made by peer  
Principal receptivity to peer evaluator  
Why I became a peer  
Peer evaluators as instructional leaders  

**Impact on Teaching**

Teachers have upped their game  
TES impact on teaching  
New system unfair to some teachers  
TES vs old evaluation system  
Tying pay to performance problematic  
Teachers will not want ESE students  
Evaluations as holistic  

**Role of the Principal**
Principal wanted teachers to feel good
Principals come in the room often
Principals talking heads for District
Utility of comments made by principal in post conference
Principal’s role not that of leading instruction
Principal as instructional leader
How TES affects principals

**Resistance**

Some teachers resistant to TES

**Elements of TES**

Post conference
Pre conference
Teachers get two evaluations
Value added points for certain students
Observations only a snapshot
Evaluations as holistic

**Role of Teacher**

Teaching should be continual reflection
Standardized testing of ESE students is troubling
You don’t want to get defensive
Teachers as instructional leaders

**Teacher Evaluation Should…**

Teacher evaluation should…
Need for more informal observations
Weak teachers should be shown the door

**Alignment**

Principal and peer alignment with evaluations
Where to go for assistance in improving

**JEFFERSON OBSERVATIONS REPEATING IDEAS**

Additional sources of support
Areas for teaching improvement
Clarifying questions
Coaching in the pre-conference
Explaining TES
I can’t stay for the whole observation
Interruptions to conference
Just a snapshot
Peer evaluator suggestions
Refer to the rubric
Reflection
Teacher asks for feedback
Teacher responds with one word
TES vs. old evaluation
That is probably what I would have done

JEFFERSON OBSERVATIONS THEMES

District Message
Explaining TES
Just a snapshot
Refer to the rubric
TES vs. old evaluation

Instructional Leadership
Additional sources of support
Areas for teaching improvement
Clarifying questions
Coaching in the pre-conference
Peer evaluator suggestions
Reflection
Teacher asks for feedback
This is probably what I would have done

Principal power
Clarifying questions
Coaching in the preconference
I can’t stay for the whole observation
Interruptions to the conference
Refer to the rubric
Teacher responds with one word
This is probably what I would have done
Peer evaluator suggestions

SOUTHERN PINE INTERVIEWS REPEATING IDEAS
Difficulty with implementation
Excessive workload
I’m being taped
Impact of TES on teaching
Impact on teachers
In the new system I’m being observed more
Instructional leadership by principal
Lack of communication
Nobody will talk numbers
Not all teachers are reflective
Peer as resource for providing support
Peer impact on teachers
Peer inexperienced
Peer misread the situation
Peer there for the kids
Peers an extra set of eyes
Peers help teachers
Peers offering suggestions to teachers
Post conference teaching
Pre conference not for coaching
Principal alignment with peer
Principals held more accountable
Purpose of pre conference
Put comments in my journal
Resources for helping teachers
Snapshots
Some teachers resistant
Teachers as instructional leaders
Teachers do not understand two evaluations
Teachers go to principal for assistance
Teachers intimidated by peer
Teachers uncomfortable with observations
TES challenges for principal
TES does NOT impact teachers
TES impacts principals
TES mentors not true mentors
TES takes away time
TES vs old evaluation
Timing of observation
Timing of pre and post conferences
Tweak language of rubric
Use of rubric
Walk-throughs
What a teacher evaluation system should do
What should an evaluation system do
Where people live
Why I wanted to be a peer
You have to trust me (the principal)

**SOUTHERN PINE INTERVIEWS THEMES**

**TES implementation**

- Difficulty with implementation
- Lack of communication
- Nobody will talk numbers
- Snapshots
- Teachers do not understand two evaluations
- Tweak language of rubric
- Use of rubric

**Role of the teacher**

- Not all teachers are reflective
- Some teachers resistant
- Teachers as instructional leaders
- Teachers intimidated by peer
- TES does NOT impact teachers
- Resources for helping teachers
- In the new system I’m being observed more

**Role of the principal**

- Instructional leadership by principal
- You have to trust me (the principal)
- Teachers go to principal for assistance
- Principal alignment with peer
- Principals held more accountable
- TES impacts principals
- Post conference teaching
- Where people live

**Role of the peer**

- Peer as resource for providing support
- Peer impact on teachers
- Peer inexperienced
- Peer misread the situation
- Peer there for the kids
Peers an extra set of eyes
Peers help teachers
Peers offering suggestions to teachers
Teachers intimidated by peer
Why I wanted to be a peer
Principal alignment with peer

**Pre and Post conferences**

Post conference teaching
Pre conference not for coaching
Purpose of pre conference
Timing of pre and post conferences

**What should evaluation do?**

What a teacher evaluation system should do
What should an evaluation system do?

**Impact of TES**

TES challenges for principal
TES mentors not true mentors
TES takes away time
TES vs old evaluation
Impact of TES on teaching
Impact on teachers
In the new system I’m being observed more
TES does NOT impact teachers
Excessive workload

**Observations**

Teachers uncomfortable with observations
Timing of observation
Walk-throughs

**Providing support for teachers**

Resources for helping teachers
Put comments in my journal

I’m being taped

**SOUTHERN PINE OBSERVATIONS REPEATING IDEAS**
Adapting rubric for ESE students
Collaborative culture
Explaining procedures to teachers
Give yourself credit
I do not believe in pay for performance
I make out better with TES
I’m not going to argue that
It’s not an average
Observations not the whole story
Principal giving teacher opp for inst ldrshp
Principal offering professional development
Principal seeking input from teacher
Principal will see the record anyway
Recognizing teacher as instructional leader
Reflection
School and district alignment
Teacher offering herself as instructional leader
Teacher questioning pre conference form
Teacher seeks advice from principal
Thank you for the compliments
The principal has seen it in action
Through our conversations
Walk-throughs
We all want more feedback
What can I do to help move you higher
Where do you live most of the time
Words of advice from principal
Would you agree on that?

SOUTHERN PINE OBSERVATIONS THEMES

Instructional Leadership

Principal giving teacher opportunity for instructional leadership
Recognizing teacher as instructional leader
Teacher offering herself as instructional leader
Principal offering professional development

Holistic Evaluation

It’s not an average
Observations not the whole story
Through our conversations
Walk-throughs
Role of the Principal

Principal offering professional development
Collaborative culture
Explaining procedures to teachers
Teacher seeks advice from principal
The principal has seen it in action
We all want more feedback
What can I do to help move you higher
Words of advice from principal
Give yourself credit
Principal seeking input from teacher
Principal will see the record anyway
Where do you live most of the time
Would you agree on that

Principal as instructional leader

Principal offering professional development
Collaborative culture
What can I do to help move you higher
Words of advice from principal
Walk-throughs

Principal as evaluator

Thank you for the compliments
I’m not going to argue that
Words of advice from principal
Principal seeking input from teacher
Would you agree on that
The principal has seen it in action

Reflection

Reflection

School/district alignment

School and district alignment
Adapting rubric for ESE students

I do not believe in pay for performance
I make out better with TES
Teacher questioning pre-conference form
MASTER LIST OF THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTS

LANGUAGE TEXT

Alignment
Collaboration/collegiality
District message
District oversight
Power

DISCOURSE PRACTICE

Alignment
Collaboration/collegiality
Danielson intent
District message
District oversight
Elements of TES
Impact of TES
Impact on teaching
Observations
Pre and post conferences
Power
Reflection
Rubric
Teacher issues
TES implementation
What should evaluation do?
Why a new system was needed

SOCIAL PRACTICE

Alignment
Collaboration/collegiality
Danielson intent
District message
District oversight
Elements of TES
Holistic evaluation
Impact of TES
Impact on teaching
Increased surveillance
Power
Principal power
Principal relationships with Peers
Reflection
Resistance
Rubric
Teacher issues
TES implementation
Trust
What should evaluation do?
Why a new system was needed

**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Collaboration/collegiality
Instructional leadership
Principal as instructional leader
Providing support for teachers

**EVALUATION**

Principal as evaluator

**ROLES**

Role of the peer
Role of the principal
Role of the teacher
Supervision/management

**ORPHANS**
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