

Purdue University
Purdue e-Pubs

Open Access Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

January 2016

Perceptions of and Experiences with the Indiana Teacher Evaluation System in Physical Education

Andrew Dale Eberline
Purdue University

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_dissertations

Recommended Citation

Eberline, Andrew Dale, "Perceptions of and Experiences with the Indiana Teacher Evaluation System in Physical Education" (2016).
Open Access Dissertations. 1247.
https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_dissertations/1247

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

**PURDUE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
Thesis/Dissertation Acceptance**

This is to certify that the thesis/dissertation prepared

By Andrew D. Eberline

Entitled

Perceptions of and Experiences with the Indiana Teacher Evaluation System in Physical Education

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Is approved by the final examining committee:

Thomas J. Templin

Chair

Bonnie T. Blankenship

William A. Harper

Timothy J. Newby

To the best of my knowledge and as understood by the student in the Thesis/Dissertation Agreement, Publication Delay, and Certification Disclaimer (Graduate School Form 32), this thesis/dissertation adheres to the provisions of Purdue University's "Policy of Integrity in Research" and the use of copyright material.

Approved by Major Professor(s): Thomas J. Templin

Approved by: David B. Klenosky

Head of the Departmental Graduate Program

7/15/2016

Date

PERCEPTIONS OF AND EXPERIENCES WITH THE INDIANA TEACHER
EVALUATION SYSTEM IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty

of

Purdue University

by

Andrew Dale Eberline

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

August 2016

Purdue University

West Lafayette, Indiana

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Janet Hagen, who has endured more throughout my doctoral studies and persevered with poise and grace; and also to my incredible wife Lisa, who has sacrificed and supported me throughout the entire journey.

Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The African proverb "It takes a village to raise a child" also seems appropriate when speaking of dissertations. It takes a village to obtain a doctorate, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to acknowledge my own. I would first like to thank the physical educators who took the time to participate in my research. Their contributions made this dissertation possible, and I greatly appreciate the insight gained and lessons learned. I look forward to working with you all in the future.

Lisa, along with my faith, you were the rock through it all. You challenge and love me, and I'm a better man for it. Thank you to my parents, Janet Hagen and Paul Eberline, for all the love, support, and encouragement. Mom, I still have the Christopher Robin quote you sent me all those years ago from A.A. Milne's *Winnie the Pooh*: "Promise me you'll always remember: you're braver than you believe, stronger than you seem, and smarter than you think." Thank you also to my parents-in-law, Raymond Padron and Eva Lopez, for your support throughout my time at Purdue. To my siblings, Nathan (and Tara), Anne (and Nate), and Ray. I can't thank you enough for your edits, prayers, meals, and overall support, especially with the encouraging pictures and chats with my delightful nieces and nephew: Lydia, Grace, and Joel! I am confident that I would be nowhere near the current path I'm on without my family. Thank you.

I would like to express a deep sense of gratitude to my committee chair and mentor, Dr. Templin. Dr. T, along with Sarah (Hank and yes, even Gus!), I appreciate

your tremendous generosity in welcoming Lisa and me to Purdue. Your patience and guidance throughout the program has provided an excellent roadmap in how to navigate multiple roles in higher education. Thank you for pushing me to find the right dissertation topic and for challenging me throughout the process. Your demonstration in what leadership can and should look like in a collegiate setting is not lost on any of your former students. I have learned much and am extremely thankful.

Thank you to my dissertation committee, Dr. Templin, Dr. Blankenship, Dr. Harper, and Dr. Newby. Dr. Blankenship, thanks for your wisdom and help throughout the entire program, both as a committee member and also as a mentor in teaching. Also thanks for showing what faith in the workplace looks like, which is something I hope to emulate in the future. Dr. Harper, thank you for the incredible connections between philosophy and sport. You challenge my ability to think big picture and not settle for mediocrity. A C.S. Lewis quote reminds me of some of the lessons learned through our conversations: "Friendship is unnecessary, like philosophy, like art. It has no survival value; rather it is one of those things which give value to survival." Dr. Newby, thank you for your help as a committee member, especially as things shifted away from one of our passions in educational technology. Your support and understanding through this process has provided comfort through the challenges, and I'm glad our paths crossed during my time at Purdue.

A special thank you to some other influential individuals in my life, Beth Kirkpatrick and Rick Schupbach. Beth, I cannot thank you enough for your vision related to my future and your unwavering support. Without your belief in me, I might still be searching for my true calling and passion. Mr. Schupbach, your expertise and passion in

teaching physical education remains with me to this day. I am grateful for the positive learning environment you provided and for your demonstration of faith and focused work ethic. As you taught me early on: proper planning prevents poor performance! Related to these individuals from Grundy Center, I would also like to thank Professor Peter and Jean Chen, as well as Dr. Paul Schempp. Professor Chen, thank you exhibiting the power of profound, intentional, and meaningful conversation. Your thoughts on deliberate, long-term planning and concise, clear communication continue to influence my life. Reflecting on a conversation we had in Earlham, your vision of my doctoral pursuit and future plans planted a seed well before I could see my path for myself. I have been able to learn so much from you in a short amount time. Thank you for sharing your wisdom with me. Dr. Schempp, in a similar fashion, thank you for the confidence in my abilities to pursue another degree, and for the challenging and helpful conversations that ultimately led me to Dr. Templin and Purdue University.

I would like to thank the many friends who have supported me both near and from afar during my time at Purdue. Thanks to Kara Trebil, Bob Kuennen, and all the other FRFs for your love and support. Kara, I am grateful for our “shared experience” as we overlapped our doctoral studies. I look forward to your completion and future in higher education! I appreciate the support and proverbial push from both Kevin Williamson (and family) and Jason Hammen, who encouraged me to pursue my first higher education position at Ball State University. Also thanks to the rest of the Earlham staff who welcomed me to a second hometown and who continues to support me: Dan von Rentzell, Marty Dalton, Tim & Mindy Harskamp, Jon Peterson, and Dion Braet. Thank you to the Polar Scholars, specifically Jen (Hadler) Hoell, Emily Jones, Bob Knipe,

Becca Lambdin-Abraham, George and Erin Centeio, and Jaimie McMullen. The camaraderie and time spent in my hometown has lasting impact, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to share this title with you all. Additionally, I would like to express my appreciation to my colleagues at Ball State, Barb Weyenberg, Dr. Denise Seabert, and Dr. Tom Weidner for the statewide support and for the opportunity to collaborate in our HPE program.

Finally, I am grateful to the graduate students and faculty at Purdue University. Thanks to the Sport and Pedagogy group for the support, guidance, and mentorship throughout our shared time on campus: Dr. Michael Hemphill, Dr. Sookhenlall Padaruth (& family), Chris Berg, and Dr. Kevin Richards. The friendships built and connections made during this time are long lasting, and I look forward to our continued collaboration in the future. A special thank you to Lindley McDavid and Jannah Downing, Chris and Abby Berg, Kevin Kaluf, and their respective families for providing perspective, sanity, friendship, and support throughout the journey. Thanks also to Jordan Blazo, Lisa Duncan, Katie Breedlove, Josh Liddy, Rachel Harris, Nicole Blaize, Travis Dorsch, and J.D. DeFreese. Lastly, thanks to all the countless family, friends, and colleagues for your overall encouragement during my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	x
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Statement of Problem	5
Purpose and Research Questions	7
Significance of the Study	9
CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Teacher Socialization Theory	11
Teacher Evaluation Policy as a Socializing Factor	16
Teacher Evaluation Overview	17
Teacher Evaluation Models	19
Teacher Evaluation Key Features and Obstacles	26
Administration	36
School Context and Culture	41
Indiana Teacher Shortage	48
Conclusion	51
CHAPTER THREE – METHODOLOGY	54
Research Design and Social Constructivism	54

	Page
Data Collection Procedures.....	59
Data Analysis	64
Trustworthiness.....	65
CHAPTER FOUR – RESULTS	68
Theme One: Teacher Evaluation Process	71
Theme Two: Teacher Evaluation Preparations.....	86
Theme Three: Physical Education is Unique.....	93
Theme Four: Administration/Evaluators	107
Theme Five: Teacher Evaluation Outcomes.....	117
Theme Six: Teacher Evaluation Policy.....	134
Teacher Evaluation Purpose Summaries	150
Conclusion	151
CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION.....	153
A System in Need of Change.....	154
Recommendations.....	170
Limitations	177
Future Research	179
Final Thoughts	180
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	183
APPENDICES	
Appendix A School Corporation Permission Documentation	213
Appendix B Corporation Sample Letter of Consent.....	215
Appendix C Physical Educator Recruitment Email.....	216

	Page
Appendix D Interview Contact Information (Qualtrics)	218
Appendix E Physical Educator Teacher Evaluation Interview Guide	219
VITA	224

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013).....	21
3.1 Timeline Summary of Phases I and II Research.....	56
3.2 Physical Educator Interviewee Profiles	63
4.1 Results: First Order Themes and Subthemes	70

ABSTRACT

Eberline, Andrew D. Ph.D., Purdue University, August 2016. Perceptions of and Experiences with the Indiana Teacher Evaluation System in Physical Education. Major Professor: Thomas J. Templin.

Physical educators face a difficult task of using limited time and resources to fully impact students in the gymnasium. Physical education is labeled as a noncore subject with no standardized test to evaluate student learning. In Indiana, multiple types of teacher evaluation models are used in schools across the state, causing concerns of reliability and validity for educators. The purpose of this study was to describe physical educators' perceptions of and experiences with the teacher evaluation system in the state of Indiana. Additionally, this research examined challenges faced by teachers as they adapted to teacher evaluation systems. Solutions to the evaluative mandates were sought to address the shortcomings of Indiana teacher evaluations in physical education.

This research was a qualitative study of multiple schools throughout Indiana. It was grounded in teacher socialization and involved 22 interviews of physical educators from 15 school corporations. Data were analyzed using inductive analysis and constant comparison. Results revealed six first order themes: Evaluation Process, Teacher Preparedness, Teacher Evaluation Outcomes, Teacher Evaluation Policy, Administration/Evaluators, and the Unique Qualities of Physical Education. Furthermore,

the findings showed that while physical educators agreed that evaluations were necessary for accountability, they were dissatisfied with the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation process. Teachers perceived that evaluations negatively impacted their profession, and expressed that changes are necessary at the state policy level.

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

The United States has experienced numerous reforms in its public education landscape. Many of the reforms were initiated due to the country lagging behind other nations academically. A 2012 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report revealed that America ranked 27th, 17th, and 20th out of 34 countries in math, reading, and science, respectively (OECD, 2012). Concerns have created an increased emphasis on the accountability of schools and local education authorities for improvements in academic achievement (Benedict, Thomas, Kimerling, & Leko, 2013). Throughout the last decade, reforms have centered on federal funding distribution connected to teacher evaluation and highly qualified teachers. These two variables were deemed most manageable within the school context (Popham, 2013).

Teacher evaluation policy has received considerable attention from state legislators in recent years. Specifically, due to government pressure, school corporations and teachers are facing higher scrutiny in creating increased student learning. The catalyst for increased emphasis on teacher evaluation revolves around federal initiatives over the past four decades. These mandates encourage states to design and implement educational reform programs that are geared toward more rigorous teacher evaluation systems. One of the initial educational reforms included the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The ESEA was the largest federal education bill in

history, and the goal was to provide full educational opportunities for all. A notable contribution from the ESEA was the ability for states to apply and receive federal grants to improve elementary and secondary school quality. This important historical context provided the groundwork for the current educational climate across the nation.

More reforms were sought following the release of the 1983 report entitled, *Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (National Commission on Excellence in Education [NCEE]). The report motivated government officials to begin placing a higher emphasis on both teacher accountability and student learning. The following excerpt highlights a theme that fueled lawmaker intervention and painted a bleak picture of our educational system: “If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves” (NCEE, 1983, p. 7).

Educational developments continued in the following decades. One of the most influential reforms included the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, introduced in 2001. Built on the foundation of the ESEA, NCLB stressed the need for accountability and for highly qualified teachers in every classroom. NCLB placed an emphasis on the use of intensive achievement testing to assess student learning and held teachers accountable for changes in test scores (Ennis, 2014). NCLB also instituted harsh sanctions on states and schools that failed to comply with their directives, such as permanently closing schools or reduced access to funding. Consequently, teacher evaluation became a policy target for individual states (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009).

In 2009, the Race to the Top Program (RTT), as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, provided substantial grants to reward states that created conditions for educational innovation and reform. RTT also called for the use of multiple measures in appraising teachers by focusing on student growth as a significant factor (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). With government funding, these laws place a heavy responsibility on today's educators. McGuinn (2012) stated that RTT only supports states that have strong track records, plan for innovation, and demonstrate a commitment to reform. As a result, many states have been systematically changing criteria for teacher evaluation whether they are part of RTT or not (Rink, 2013).

The 2011 ESEA Flexibility Program provided state relief from NCLB via federal waivers. In exchange, states were required to develop comprehensive and rigorous plans to improve the quality of instruction as well as educational outcomes for all students. The ESEA Flexibility Program encouraged states to modify their teacher evaluations according to six specific guidelines. It required the state's teacher-evaluation system to (1) be used for continual improvement of instruction, (2) to employ at least three performance levels, (3) use multiple evidence sources including student growth as a significant factor, (4) evaluate on a regular basis, (5) provide clear, timely, and useful feedback for professional development, and (6) be used to inform personnel decisions (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The sizeable impact federal initiatives present on the current state of education emphasize the use of student learning to hold teachers accountable (Ward, 2013), as a majority of states complied with the ESEA Flexibility Program.

Federal mandates have led to various reforms at the state level as well. Indiana complied with the federal mandates and made changes within the state level with the 2011 Indiana Public Law 90-2011-IC 20-28-11.5 entitled Staff Performance Evaluations. This law focused on new staff performance evaluation regulations, and the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) initiated the implementation of a new teacher evaluation system called RISE Indiana. The RISE evaluation system was piloted over 18 months between 2011-2012 (NCTQ, 2014) using three school corporations as beta sites. While some issues were identified during the pilot (e.g., time intensive, evaluator training, and stakeholder communication), it was determined that the system was a fair, credible, and accurate evaluation. The goal of RISE was to provide differentiation to teacher and principal performance, and to also support their professional growth. This evaluation system placed an emphasis on two major components – professional development and student learning – and rates teachers in four categories (IDOE, 2013). Teachers are evaluated as highly effective, effective, improvement necessary and ineffective. The RISE system will be discussed in greater detail in chapter two.

The original plan was for RISE to be released statewide beginning fall 2012. The RISE state mandate was placed on hold due to the 2012 electoral change of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for Indiana. School corporations were able to use the RISE system, but the Indiana Department of Education also allowed schools to create and implement their own variations of teacher evaluations. Corporation-level authority over the teacher evaluation process aligns with other states that also allow schools to use locally developed measures of classroom and professional practice (Harris et al., 2014). In addition to state mandates on teacher evaluation, Indiana also implemented an A-F

school grade rating in 2011 (IDOE, 2015). This added a public element to the state teaching profession, putting schools and their associated teachers on display. Changes such as these, as well as the removal of the traditional teacher pay scale toward a merit-based system, have impacted teachers of all subjects.

With all the changes occurring at the federal and state levels, a traditional understanding of teacher evaluation is necessary to highlight the monumental shift in approaches. Historically, annual evaluations of teachers were designed and implemented at the district or school level (Popham, 2013). Evaluations tended to be compulsory yet trivial, and unions, along with teacher contracts, were structured to ensure teachers kept their jobs (Popham, 2013). Jim Hull, a senior policy analyst for the Center for Public Education, stated, “for decades, teacher evaluations were little more than a bureaucratic exercise that failed to recognize either excellence or mediocrity in teaching” (Hull, 2013, p. 1). Linda Darling-Hammond, a renowned expert in educational policy, felt previous teacher evaluations rarely helped teachers improve or differentiate between successful and struggling teachers (2013). The combination of these factors linked to the construct of teacher evaluation helped pave the way for the most recent federal initiatives pertaining to education reform.

Statement of the Problem

Research involving teacher evaluation has risen within the last decade. However, there are very few studies that focus on specialty subjects, such as physical education (Norris, in press). The majority of research concerning teacher evaluation focuses on classroom core subjects (Donaldson, 2013; Kimball, 2002; Looney, 2011). Core subjects are typically defined as subjects given the highest priority within a school corporation.

These core subjects are often connected to standardized testing and tend to include language arts, science and math. Standardized tests are used to measure student-learning objectives (SLOs) and are well defined for these subject areas. For example, Indiana utilizes the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP) standardized test, which emphasized language arts and math for grades three through eight and high school sophomores. Additionally, science (fourth and sixth graders) and social studies (fifth and seventh graders) are involved in the ISTEP process. An added layer of uncertainty in Indiana includes the House Enrolled Act 1395, which designates that ISTEP will end after the 2016-2017 academic year (IDOE, 2016d).

Conversely, noncore subjects usually include physical education, music, industrial technology, and art. These subjects are categorized as “specials” and are often perceived as providing daily breaks and/or planning periods for classroom teachers. Noncore subjects lack standardized tests, which enhances the distinct difference between their core subject counterparts. Noncore SLOs are frequently designed and implemented at the individual school corporation level, and as resident experts, teachers of noncore subjects are often involved in the SLO process. If teachers demonstrate and identify student performance improvement, they are usually deemed effective. In addition to a lack of an objective and standardized test, there are also contextual factors that are beyond control of physical educators. For example, adequate curricular time for physical education and student-related factors such as previous learning, social background, nutrition, and overall health, factor into a student’s ability to experience success. These factors all interact with the ability to effectively evaluate physical educators.

Another factor that may play into the evaluation of physical education teachers is the status of physical education within the school curriculum. While physical education is a required subject and should be treated with the same respect as core subjects, it is often marginalized (Sparkes, Schempp, & Templin, 1993; Prince et al., 2008; Ennis, 2014). Physical education programs are not valued in the same manner as core subjects, and have consequently been ignored as administrators have focused their attention on increasing students' standardized test scores (Rink, 2013). Rink (2013) states, "physical education profession tends to be saddled with the perceptions of policymakers whose personal experience with physical education was not positive. While the other 'noncore' subject areas like art and music have a large political constituency, physical education does not" (p. 409). Administrators, who are tasked with evaluating all teachers across all grade levels and school subjects, are challenged by their own knowledge of various subjects as well as their past perceptions and experiences of varying subject areas. Smith (2005) emphasizes that teaching cannot be decontextualized; yet teacher evaluations are often vague and created in a one-size-fits-all approach regardless of subject matter (Jerald, 2009). Physical education faces challenges in evaluation largely due to subject uniqueness and lack of evaluation consistency across the variety of school locations and settings. The status of the subject and the limited research on the topic has implications for teacher evaluation within physical education and hence becomes a valuable area of research.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to describe physical educators' perceptions of and experiences with the teacher evaluation system in the state of Indiana. The research

examined the experiences and challenges faced by physical education teachers as they adapted to changing evaluation systems, specifically the transition to a more rigorous evaluative process. Moreover, the study sought to uncover factors that led to teachers' approval or rejection of the educational reform. This result was derived by implementing a two-part data collection process, which included in-depth interviews of physical education teachers. The following primary research questions guided the inquiry:

1. How do physical education teachers perceive their current teacher evaluation system?
2. Does the teacher evaluation system call for some adaptations for how the teacher performs his or her role?
3. How do physical education teachers perceive the significance or importance of physical education within the school relative to teacher evaluation?
4. What are the consequences of the teacher evaluation system for Indiana physical educators?

Delimitations

There were several delimitations identified:

1. Teachers were recruited throughout the entire state; however, only certain school corporations provided permission to contact physical educators.
2. This study was delimited to teachers working in rural, suburban, and smaller city locals. There are no teachers from large, metropolitan, or urban school corporations represented in the data. Interviewee school populations ranged from 400-12,000 students.

3. Interviewees only included physical educators, which limited the perspectives gained from the research.
4. The interview pool only consisted of teachers who volunteered from an online survey.

Significance of the Study

While teacher evaluation research has occurred on a school wide scale, very few studies have emphasized evaluation within physical education. Norris and colleagues (in press) appears to be the only known study that focuses on physical education teachers' perceptions to teacher evaluation. Their study found physical education remained a low priority subject, teacher evaluations are not designed for noncore subjects, and teachers doubt their evaluators' ability to provide a valid and fair assessment (Norris et al., in press). Physical education is a unique subject taught in schools and this study seeks to capture and describe physical educators' experiences with the teacher evaluation system in Indiana. Policies have drastically altered the educational experience for teachers, and understanding the impact on physical educators' effectiveness to accurately deliver subject content is important. Additionally, understanding the policies and systems related to teacher evaluation will help in identifying physical educators' status as bona fide community members within the educational context. The study also provides greater insight into how teachers approach the subject of student learning and data collection, two key components of teacher evaluation. Due to the emphasis on high stakes testing centered around the sciences, English, and math, physical education appears to be undervalued and considered low-status within the educational community (James, 2011). Studying the impact of teacher evaluation on physical education has the potential to

provide insight into not only what is occurring in the evaluation of physical educators, but on the potential marginalization of the subject and its treatment compared to other subjects.

The study will help both researchers and practitioners gain a better insight and understanding of the evaluative processes through a physical education lens. It will focus on the overall teacher evaluation process through a variety of approaches, and contribute to the research on the ever-changing policy landscape. Furthermore, it is hoped that this research has potential to establish a baseline for future research on teacher evaluation of teachers of physical education.

CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter one provided a brief historical overview of educational teacher evaluation in the United States. It also outlined the emphasis of the research related to physical educators' perspectives and experiences embedded in teacher socialization. This chapter presents a literature review related to teacher socialization theory, along with various elements related to teacher evaluation. This includes legislative policy, models and procedures, and obstacles or barriers related to teacher evaluation generally and more specifically to physical education.

Teacher Socialization Theory

This study utilizes teacher socialization theory as a theoretical framework (Lawson, 1983a; Lawson, 1986; Templin & Schempp, 1989). Lawson (1983a) built teacher socialization on Lortie's seminal work entitled *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (1975) and identified a three-phase socialization process that shapes physical educators' practices and perspectives (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014). These phases include acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization (Lawson, 1983a). The framework is ideal for this research as it concentrated on physical educators in their professional environment. Within teacher socialization theory, teacher values, beliefs, and assumptions act as socializing agents for educators (Lawson, 1983a). Pike and Fletcher (2014) state that teaching "comes with its own

processes of socialization for those who are – or are learning to become – part of the profession” (p. 2).

Acculturation

Acculturation is the process that begins at birth and continues until an individual makes the decision to enter a teacher education program major at college or university. (Lawson, 1983a; Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014). Curtner-Smith (1999) describes the process as the influence of a combination of childhood experiences that includes interactions with significant individuals, which act as socializing agents. During acculturation, the experiences of individuals within a K-12 school context, as well as their time in physical education, are pivotal and potent factors that help shape one’s decision to enter teaching (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Lawson, 1983a; Lortie, 1975; Schempp, 1989). Acculturation may also impact how one teaches in the future due to Lortie’s (1975) ‘apprenticeship of observation,’ where individuals form their own understandings of good pedagogical practices. These perceptions may impact teacher evaluation for the prospective educator due to the potency of this stage.

Professional Socialization

The second phase described in teacher socialization is professional organization. During this phase, students have chosen to enter a physical education teacher education (PETE) program at a university or college (Lawson, 1983a; 1986). Students are taught to “acquire and maintain the values, sensitivities, skills, and knowledge that are deemed ideal for teaching physical education” (Lawson, 1983a, p. 4). PETE faculty have the opportunity to reshape students during this phase, although the overall effectiveness

depends on students' acculturation, the quality of the PETE program, and the PETE faculty themselves (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Graber, 1991;). Curtner-Smith (1999) suggested that professional socialization is weak relative to acculturation and organizational socialization phases, however, there is potential for PETE faculty to influence student perspectives on teacher evaluation during this training period.

Organizational Socialization

The third phase of teacher socialization is organizational socialization, which takes place after students graduate and enter the workforce in physical education. In this phase, Van Maanen and Schein define organizational socialization as “the process by which one is taught and learns the ropes of a particular organizational role” (1979, p. 211). Lawson (1983a) describes this process in terms of teachers' ability to acquire and maintain valued skills that organizations reward. The socialization process is continuous and influences teachers' experiences throughout their careers (Lawson, 1983b; Richards et al., 2014). Teachers also form their own culture within their respective schools, which shapes their orientations, actions, and behaviors regarding teaching (Feiman-Nemser & Folden, 1984).

Lawson (1989) states that powerful school personnel, such as administrators and veteran teachers, promote assumptions that are embedded in a school's culture. Padaruth (2016) framed his research in organizational socialization and discovered similar findings based on the influential relationship dynamic between administration and physical educators. In this regard, schools act as the primary socializing agents in attempting to socialize new teachers into the school culture (Templin & Schempp, 1989). Lawson (1983a) states that schools act as “custodial bureaucracies” that employ both formal and

informal mechanisms to perpetuate themselves, even if it means preventing innovation and change” (p. 6).” The powerful influence of schools, in addition to teachers’ K-12 student experiences, has the ability to wash out the effects of professional socialization (Pike & Fletcher, 2014; Schempp et al., 1993; Smyth, 1995; Stroot et al., 1993; Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981). Blankenship and Coleman (2009) state that school cultures are often passed along from one generation of teachers to the next, and are often in contradiction with lessons learned in PETE programming. Other negative influences that can contribute to the washout effect include a lack of respect toward physical education, minimal equipment, and a lack of facilities (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009). While negative cultures and tendencies exist, Richards and Templin (2011) found that communities of practice could have positive impacts on beginning teachers and could be very beneficial in their socialization. Organizational socialization plays an important role within the context of this research, as it seeks to understand current teachers in their individual circumstances related to teacher evaluation.

It is important to note that socialization is dialectic in nature, and teachers are active agents in their own experiences (Schempp & Graber, 1992; Templin & Schempp, 1989). Additionally, educators often adopt either an innovative or custodial teaching orientation. According to Richards and colleagues (2014, p.114),

A custodial orientation reflects an individual or context that is concerned primarily with maintenance of the status quo and the use of traditional teaching methodologies. Change is viewed with skepticism and is avoided rather than pursued. An innovative orientation, on the other hand, reflects an individual or

context that is open to change and solicits new, up-to-date approaches to teaching PE.

The degree of agreement between teacher and school orientations might influence the dialectical exchange and determine potential agreement or conflict between the two factions (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009).

Socializing agents are defined as those who influence a teacher's actions, perspectives, and beliefs (Zeichner 1979; Zeichner & Gore, 1990). School culture and influential individuals, such as administrators, are examples of socializing agents, and teachers are able to actively accept or resist certain elements of the socialization process (Richards & Templin, 2011; Schempp & Graber, 1992). Depending on pre-service training and their subjective teaching perceptions, new teachers employ one of three strategies to comply with or resist social structures of a school context (Lacey, 1977). This includes: 1) strategic compliance, 2) internalized adjustment, or 3) strategic redefinition. Some educators choose to comply with school socialization, others might overtly or covertly resist, while others might take targeted action to create change (Richards et al., 2014). New teachers employing innovative teaching ideologies also have more chances of being in conflict with custodial school ideologies (Schempp, 1986), which further demonstrates the influential nature of the administration on teachers. Within the organizational or school context, other factors may socialize the teacher. Templin (1989) found that resources, equipment, colleagues, and students influence physical educators' potential success or failure within the profession. Other influential factors include students, administrators, policies, school context, the teacher evaluation process, and local communities help shape physical educator philosophies and ideologies

(Lawson, 1986; Padaruth, 2016; Richards, Templin & Gaudreault, 2013; Woods & Lynn, 2014).

In terms of this research related to the dialectical process, both physical educators and their administrators have the opportunity to socialize each other within the school context. Richards and colleagues (2014) noted that power dynamics between individuals, such as physical educators and administrators, are often unequal. The teacher's influence tends to be the weaker of the two, and teachers often align with their school norms (Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014; Schempp & Graber, 1992). These influences relate to the experiences and perceptions physical educators faced while navigating teacher evaluation within this study.

Teacher Evaluation Policy as a Socializing Factor

As previously discussed in chapter one, many states reformed their teacher evaluation policies to align with federal funding connected to NCLB and RTT (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009; Popham, 2013). These policies include both classroom observations and student growth factors to determine teacher effectiveness (Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014; NCTQ, 2015). The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) identified 35 states, including Indiana, who adhered to the guidelines by revamping their educational accountability measures to include student growth (NCTQ, 2015). The NCTQ (2015) also found states that integrated student learning into teacher evaluation varied between 5-50%, with Indiana accounting for the lower 5% range. The most recent federal update includes the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which reauthorized the 1965 ESEA and eliminated the previous version, NCLB (Department of Education, 2015).

Policymakers appear to be dissatisfied with reforms due to continual changes in evaluation practices.

The top down approach comprises states such as Indiana interpreting federal initiatives and incorporating them into law related to evaluation. These laws and state mandates involving evaluation policies were then designed for implementation at the local level. Administrators, therefore, have the power to interpret evaluation mandates and influence or socialize their educators to the process. Their understanding of evaluation policies can provide a spectrum from clarity to confusion for educators within individual schools. The individual interpretations add a layer of difficulty in the implementation of fair and objective evaluation processes across the state and even within individual corporations.

Teacher Evaluation Overview

Teacher evaluation policies have been instituted in schools through various processes to improve teacher quality and increase academic student achievement (Kimball, 2002) Additionally, evaluation systems are designed to identify, retain, and reward effective educators while simultaneously remediating or dismissing ineffective teachers (Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014; NCTQ, 2015). Although evaluative systems were created to identify educators of all teaching abilities, Marzano (2012) found that teacher evaluation systems have failed to accurately discriminate between effective and ineffective teachers. Research has also shown that teacher evaluation systems have been unable to remove low performing educators. According to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) (2014), less than 0.5% of educators were rated ineffective during the 2013-14 academic year. In 2014-15, less than three percent of teachers were rated as

needs improvement or ineffective (IDOE, 2016a). These percentages support previous research stating that traditionally, only one to three percent of educators are identified as ineffective or unsatisfactory while in most cases, more than 90% are rated highly effective or excellent (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012; Stoelinga, 2011). Indiana is one of 18 states in the country that employs school wide achievement data for evaluations for teachers of core and noncore subjects (NCTQ, 2015). Schools in the state are annually assessed with an A-F rating. The low percentage of ineffective Indiana teachers does not align with the 103 D rating and 56 failing schools identified from the state during the 2013-14 year (IDOE, 2014). Kimball (2002) found that teacher evaluation systems have failed to meet policymaker expectations and also lacked educator support, placing evaluation at an educational crossroad.

Many studies have highlighted flaws within evaluation implementation. These include evaluator issues such as lack of training, lack of time, unclear evaluative guidelines, and defining evaluations as summative or formative (Barnett, 2012; Donaldson, 2013; Marshall, 2012; Schachter, 2012; Stoelinga, 2011). States, including Indiana, have rushed their evaluation implementation. For example, the RISE system was piloted and implemented within 18 months, with little time to address potential concerns identified from the RISE summer pilot report. These concerns included: a substantial shift in professional expectations, evaluator observation development, and a prioritization of student learning measurement (IDOE, 2012b). While many challenges and difficulties define current teacher evaluation, several studies found that quality teacher evaluation models, when aligned with proper professional development, can contribute to increased

student achievement and quality teacher improvement (Donaldson, 2013; Kimball, 2002; Looney, 2011).

Teacher Evaluation Models

There are various evaluation models used throughout the nation and within the state of Indiana. According to the Indiana Department of Education (2016), 194 of the 310 public school corporation in the state use either the RISE or a modified RISE variation. RISE is based in part on Danielson's Framework for Teaching model, and was the predominantly used model throughout the state. Following RISE, 62 corporations used their own locally created evaluation models. These models were vetted by the IDOE and met the minimum requirements based on the state mandates. The mandates originate from the 2015 Indiana Code 20-28-11.5-4, which states school corporations must include the following components: 1) annual evaluation, 2) objective measures of student achievement and growth, including statewide assessments, 3) rigorous measures of effectiveness, which includes observations and other performance indicators, 4) four categories to designate certified employees (highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, and ineffective), 5) explanation of evaluator's recommendations for improvement, if needed, and the time frame in which improvement is expected, and 6) a provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective. Lastly, eight corporations used the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) while the final 46 corporations were either designated as "other" or were unlisted on the IDOE website (2016a). The following sections provide an overview and details related to Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013), RISE, and the TAP system.

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

The current gold standard for teacher evaluation is Danielson's Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013). Dodson (2015) identifies over 20 states that have adopted the model. The evaluation model recognizes the complexity of teaching, and organizes accordingly with four major domains divided into 22 researched-based components of instruction (Danielson, 2013). The components are then broken into 76 smaller elements. Table 2.1 provides a visual representation of the framework (Danielson, 2013).

Table 2.1

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013)

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation		Domain 2: Classroom Environment	
1a	Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	2a	Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
1b	Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	2b	Establishing a Culture for Learning
1c	Setting Instructional Outcomes	2c	Managing Classroom Procedures
1d	Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	2d	Managing Student Behavior
1e	Designing Coherent Instruction	2e	Organizing Physical Space
1f	Designing Student Assessments		
Domain 3: Instruction		Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	
3a	Communicating with Students	4a	Reflecting on Teaching
3b	Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	4b	Maintaining Accurate Records
3c	Engaging Students in Learning	4c	Communicating with Families
3d	Using Assessment in Instruction	4d	Participating in Professional Community
3e	Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	4e	Growing and Developing Professionally
		4f	Showing Professionalism

One of the many strengths of Danielson's framework is the specificity of the 76 elaborate elements, which provides opportunities for school corporation adaptability. While widely accepted in multiple states, Edgar (2012) does note schools have criticized the model's complexity. With the depth and detail in mind, Danielson (2013) stresses the importance of developing a common understanding within the model for accuracy and implementation purposes, especially as teaching is a complex skill.

RISE

Indiana's Department of Education initiated the implementation of a new teacher evaluation system called the RISE Evaluation and Development System in response to state mandates from Indiana Public law 90-2011- IC 20-28-11.5. This evaluation was based on three core beliefs: 1) nothing we can do for our students matters more than giving them effective teachers, 2) teachers deserve to be treated like professionals, and 3) a new evaluation system will make a positive difference in teachers' everyday lives (Indiana Department of Education, 2012c). While originally intended for statewide implementation, the evaluation model was designed in 2010-11, and piloted in 2011-12; two versions were released prior to statewide release beginning fall 2012 (IDOE, 2012c).

The RISE evaluation tool was designed to provide "fair, credible, and accurate annual evaluations to differentiate teacher and principal performance and to support their professional growth" (p. 4, IDOE, 2012c). Teachers are categorized in three different groups based on the grades and subjects they teach, with each group having a unique weighting method of evaluation. Four measures are used for this purpose: 1) Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER), 2) Individual Growth Model (IGM), 3) School-wide Learning Measure (SWL), and 4) Student Learning Objectives (SLO). The tool relies on

evaluation of two major components, professional practice and student learning, to rate teachers into four distinct performance level ratings: highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, and ineffective. While the student-learning component relies on multiple measurements, it emphasizes heavily on SLOs in state, corporation, or school-wide assessments. The majority of professional practice is evaluated within the Indiana TER, which is broken into four domains: 1) Planning, 2) Instruction, 3) Leadership, and 4) Core Professionalism. The planning domain has five competencies that revolve around utilizing assessment data to plan standards-based lessons, setting measurable goals, and tracking student data to analyze progress. Instruction domain is broken into nine competencies and involves many pedagogical strategies, such as maximizing instructional time, checking for understanding, modification, demonstrations, and creating a classroom climate for success and respect. The leadership domain emphasizes five competencies related to school culture, including collaboration, professional development, advocacy, and community engagement. Finally, the core professionalism domain has four criteria: attendance, on-time arrival, policies/procedures, and respect.

Different weight schemes are used for the three groups of teachers. Group 1 is categorized as teachers who have growth model data for half or more classes taught, and include most 4-8th grade teachers. Group 1 is broken down into the following percentages for evaluative purposes: 50% TER, 35% IGM, 10% SLO, and 5% SWL. Group 2 includes teachers who have growth model data for less than half of classes taught yet at least teaching one class with growth model data. These teachers include some elementary and middle schoolteachers, and is broken into the following: 60% TER, 20% IGM, 15% SLO, and 5%SWL. Since physical educators have no data within IGM,

they are evaluated in the Group 3 classification with the following percentage breakdown: 75% TER, 20% SLO, and 5% SWL. Other teachers in Group 3 include most high school and PK-3 grade teachers. Evaluation criteria for teachers and the SLOs of academic subjects, such as science and languages are well defined; however, it was left to the schools to decide the criteria for the evaluation of physical education teachers and the SLOs. Thus, the criteria and method of physical education teachers' evaluation vary from school to school.

Teacher Advancement Program

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) evaluation model is another system used in Indiana Schools. As of the 2015-16 school year, the DOE lists eight school corporations who utilize TAP within Indiana. The goal of TAP is to keep talented individuals in teaching, as well as recruiting others to the profession, through incentivizing teachers (Teacher Advancement Program Foundation, 2006). The four elements of TAP include 1) Multiple Career Paths, 2) Ongoing Applied Professional Growth, 3) Instructionally Focused Accountability, and 4) Performance-Based Compensation. The model typically involves high-need or high poverty schools with financial awards or federal grants to assist with implementation. Characteristics of the model include regular class observations, weekly meetings between mentors and teachers ("cluster groups"), and the provision for teachers to have the opportunity to earn extra money through responsibilities and promotion (Glazerman & Seifullah, 2010). While previous research on the TAP model indicated success in improved student achievement and teaching (Solmon, White, Cohen, & Woo, 2007), more recent findings have

discovered increased teacher retention but inconsistent student improvement (Glazerman & Seifullah, 2012).

NASPE Teacher Physical Education Evaluation Tool

The NASPE Physical Education Evaluation Tool was created to identify behaviors and knowledge skills needed to provide quality instruction for K-12 physical educators (NASPE, 2007). Its foundation is built on the physical education national standards, and was also designed to assist administrators and other evaluators in the evaluative process. The tool is customizable, includes a five-level scoring guide, and includes suggested descriptive terms to use in the evaluation (NASPE, 2007). Similar to other evaluation models, the NASPE evaluation tool has various domains, which include: 1) instruction, 2) evidence of student learning, 3) management and organization, 4) learning climate, and 5) professionalism. It should be noted that the tool also allows for use of both formative and summative designations throughout the tool, which distinguishes itself from other evaluation models. While the model is not currently used in Indiana, it is a model that provides both flexibility and creativity for administrators to apply within their own corporation's evaluation models.

Another NASPE guidance document entitled, *How Can I Demonstrate to My Building Principal That I Am an Effective Physical Education Teacher* (2012) was created to help physical educators document both the complexities of the profession and student learning. Communication between physical educators and their administrators is an important component, and this document highlights six areas on which teachers should concentrate on to showcase their abilities as effective physical educators. These areas include the following: 1) Provide evidence of your teaching and learning in your physical

education class, 2) provide evidence of efficient program management, 3) provide evidence of professional development, 4) assess your students in accordance with curricular objectives and physical education standards, and share results with your building principal and parents, 5) engage the school community, and 6) be the physical activity champion in your school. While a seemingly tall task for individuals in the profession, the document breaks each category with multiple suggestions to accomplish each area. For example, within the section to provide evidence of professional development, they encourage teachers to develop an annual professional development plan while employing the NASPE Physical Education Evaluation Tool (2007) to identify potential areas for growth (NASPE, 2012). While the document acts as a guide to help physical educators avoid feelings of isolation and being overwhelmed, there is little evidence of research utilizing the evaluation tool.

Teacher Evaluation Key Features and Obstacles

There are a plethora of key features and obstacles related to effective evaluations. Edgar (2012) stated the importance of valid tools and processes to be implemented for teacher evaluations. These processes and tools should also be clearly linked to standards based on teaching (Edgar, 2012). Teachers of non-tested subjects, such as PE, are often unclear of how they will be evaluated (Edgar, 2012; Murphy et al., 2014). Additionally, evaluative effectiveness depends on teacher and student standards, teacher expertise, and teacher contribution in learning and development of their peers (Looney, 2011). The following section will provide depth to many components, including: formative versus summative evaluations, student learning, assessments and standardized testing, professional development, and value-added models.

Formative versus Summative Evaluations

Related to the idea of formative versus summative evaluations, formative evaluations seek to assist teachers in developing instructional effectiveness by improving teacher performance (Darling-Hammond, 2013). Formative assessment results in long-term student learning retention (Nuthall & Alton-Lee, 1995) and can help teachers effectively help students learn (Popham, 2013). Conversely, summative evaluation determines the competence of teachers, which results in rewards, employment continuation, or dismissal. Evaluators often use the same evaluations for both types of evaluations. Popham (2013) discusses the need for evaluators to separate formative and summative evaluations. He contends that evaluators need to be direct and clear about deficiencies in order for educators accurately improve. Teachers can have trouble with this degree of candor if evaluators who were assigned to help them formatively were simultaneously assessing their abilities in a summative fashion. Teacher evaluation research suggests summative evaluations do little to increase teacher effectiveness or student learning (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000; Popham, 2013). Popham (1988) warned that unless the deficit of combined summative and formative approaches is recognized and improved, teacher evaluations would continue to be a high-cost, low-yield effort. While the statement was made over 25 years ago, the issue clearly remains relevant today.

Firestone (2014) cited research from Bell (2012) who posed the question about using evaluative data to reward or punish educators while creating teacher learning-opportunities to improve data with the same information. Firestone echoes Popham's approach defining extrinsic (summative) incentives as an economic-based theory, which

uses quantitative data to distribute rewards and punishment for teachers (2014). This approach aligns with the RTT and federal insistence of tough over tolerance (Popham, 2013). On the opposite end of the spectrum are intrinsic (formative) incentives. Firestone (2014) uses a psychology-based theory to describe intrinsic incentives through professional development, which defines quality teaching and provides feedback to assist in educator motivation. While both formative and summative assessments are necessary, future teacher evaluations need to separate the two types. Marzano (2012) surveyed over 3,000 educators about teacher evaluations. He found that the majority of teachers felt that while both summative and formative evaluations were needed, teacher evaluations should be used more for educator development (Marzano, 2012). After an evaluator assesses the entire formative data and assists in helping educators improve as much as possible, they can make an accurate and summative conclusion at the end of an academic year. Once the separation between formative and summative evaluations occurs, student learning should be of the highest priority within a quality evaluation.

Student Learning and Teacher Evaluation

Research has established that quality teachers enhance student learning (Donaldson & Papay, 2014; Firestone, 2014; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Rowan, Correnti, & Miller, 2006). Student learning can also be improved by increasing teacher knowledge, increasing the complexity of student content, and changing the role of the student during the instructional process (City et al., 2010). Additionally, federal mandates insist on the inclusion and central focus of student learning (Kersten & Israel, 2005). Currently, 22 states require evaluations of all teachers to include student growth measures (NCTQ, 2015; Schachter 2012). Ennis (2014) stated the art of teaching should directly lead to

student learning within standards-based content. Standards-based student learning provides opportunities for teacher autonomy to determine student outcomes (Rink, 2013). Teaching according to standards and learning outcomes along with grade-level benchmarks help educators of all subjects. Within physical education, aligning with SHAPE national standards helps students become physically literate (SHAPE America, 2013). Ennis (2014) provided the following summary: “student learning of performance-based skills, fitness, and physical activity content is the primary goal of physical education” (p. 7). Currently, only South Carolina has a state law requiring physical education assessment. The South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Program (SCPEAP) was designed to measure student learning through indicators of standards achievement (Rink et al., 2007). While initially encouraging for the profession, Rink (personal communication, June 14, 2016) stated that due to the recession and current backlash against all types of assessment, SCPEAP is on hold.

In previous research (1996, 1998), Ennis cautioned about the complexity of student learning, which is an area that cannot be generalized due to contextual factors outside the control of the teacher. These factors include social backgrounds, previous learning (in past grade levels or different schools altogether), socioeconomic status, and ineffective teachers. While educational research in physical education agrees on the importance of student learning, coming to a consensus in best practice and approach remains elusive. Physical education, for example, lacks a universally accepted measure for student learning. Therefore, physical educators often resort to fitness testing for student progress measurement (Rink, 2013). Fitness testing captures one component of physical education, however, teachers can effortlessly show improvement through basic

pre- and post-testing. According to the NCTQ (2015), teachers often lack the knowledge to determine appropriate student learning measures, and in turn might set goals too low in order to achieve student growth necessary for effective rating. This creates a dilemma for physical education, as student learning is increasingly required within the subject.

Assessments and Standardized Testing

Coinciding with student learning are assessments. Physical educators face time constraints, large classes, and a lack of class meetings (Wood, 2003), which tend to create a culture of teachers who are unwilling to assess (Rink, 2013). Zhu and colleagues (2011) state: “In today’s educational climate in schools, what is not assessed does not ‘count.’ If PE programs are to be considered an integral part of the school curriculum, then they have to be able to demonstrate student achievement (p. 90).” Therefore, assessment within the subject is vital for both effective teaching and quality teacher evaluations. Hay (2006) states that “assessment should redress the mind/body dualism propagated by traditional approaches to assessment, curriculum and pedagogies in physical education, through tasks that acknowledge and bring to the fore the interrelatedness of knowledge, process (cognitive and motor), and the affective domain” (p. 317).

Assessments should also measure the amount of time students are engaged in content-related motor activities (Rink, 2013). Various types of technologies, such as heart rate monitors, can help teachers objectively assess student effort and provide accurate data to both physical educators and administrators (Eberline & Richards, 2013). Rink (2013) states that reporting data to administrators also acts as a mechanism for accountability. Other current research based assessments include Fitnessgram (Plowman et al., 2006), TGMD-2 (Ulrich, 2000), and PE Metrics (NASPE, 2010). While some

instruments, such as PE Metrics (NASPE, 2010), have provided a noteworthy development of a valid and authentic standards-based student achievement measure. However, Ennis (2014) cautions that the mechanism is still in development of large population testing. Murphy and colleagues (2014) supports the development of common assessments and testing for noncore educators in Indiana. Assessments assist physical educators in demonstrating and documenting successes within programs to maintain the very survival of the profession (Wood, 1996).

Embedded in assessments are standardized testing. This type of assessment can be problematic as student performance on standardized tests do not reflect the entire range of learning that occurs in the classroom or learning that both parents and educators care about (Donaldson & Papay, 2014). Indiana's version of statewide-standardized test, ISTEP, is utilized in evaluation models throughout the state. According to the IDOE (2016d), state policymakers have voted to discontinue the use of the ISTEP testing after 2017. A review panel has been tasked with developing assessment alternatives that shift away from high-stakes, pass/fail-testing ISTEP currently encompasses (IDOE, 2016d). Most educators teach a subject or grade level that does not utilize standardized test results for evaluations (Donaldson & Papay, 2014). Currently, physical education has no standardized test, yet school wide improvement is often based on standardized test scores. All teachers should be rewarded when the entire schools improves, however current evaluative scenarios do not include physical education in the scoring. According to Padaruth (2016), this frequently becomes a point of contention among educators within a school. Murphy and colleagues (2014) stated we need to: "support the development and testing of common assessments for 'non tested' personnel, especially at the secondary

level and explore the development and use of formative assessments that will inform instruction during the teacher evaluation process” (p.10).

With no standardized test or test series within physical education, Rink (2013) stated it becomes more problematic for the subject as it lacks clearly defined outcomes that are not measurable by standardized tests. The absence of a standardized test has aided in the marginalization of the profession. There is some momentum for physical education to be added to the common core and the creation of a standardized test. However, there is no current consensus within physical education concerning the development of a test, leaving a large gap in the evaluative process. It should be noted that the lack of state or federal tests provides a certain amount of freedom to implement curriculum models and approaches, such as the Health-Optimizing Physical Education (HOPE; McKenzie & Lounsbery, 2013), Sport Education (Siedentop, 1994), or Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (Hellison, 1995). Standardized tests potentially narrow the curriculum by teaching to the test yet would account for minimum student requirements (Rink, 2013). The lack of physical education test consensus, in addition to yet another transition at the state level related to the looming ISTEP removal, create an unstable future concerning standardized tests in assessment.

Professional Development

Professional development is an important component both to the teacher evaluation process and teacher effectiveness. The importance of quality professional development is defined based the fact that:

Teaching is highly skilled, intellectually challenging work. A skilled teacher makes thousands of decisions a day, employs dozens of strategies to assess

student needs, orchestrates productive group work, provides opportunities for feedback, taps prior knowledge, and inspires students to engage. The growth of these skills, talents, and knowledge is a continuous process throughout a teacher's career (Network for Public Education (NPE), 2016, p. 14).

According to the NCTQ (2015), the purpose of a revised teacher evaluation system is to provide educators with feedback aimed at increasing improvement and professional development. Templin and colleagues (2011) indicated teachers feel empowered and better prepared when they have opportunities to engage professionally. In a similar finding, Fullan (2007) stated that teacher choice should be included as top down initiatives are ineffective in creating lasting change. Teachers are motivated most through the autonomy to guide their own path professionally (Pink, 2011). With a variety of evaluation models implemented throughout the state, schools are in need of individualized support, which are cost prohibitive (TNTP, 2015). While individualization is ideal, previous research have reinforced the difficulty of reconciling school and individual teacher goals to professional teacher growth (Conley & Glasman, 2008; Kimball, 2002; Milanowski & Heneman III, 2001).

Previous research on designing effective opportunities for educators is challenging (Armour & Yelling, 2004; Deglau, 2005; Guskey, 1986, 2002; Rink & Mitchell, 2002; Ward & Doutis, 1999). Topics have concentrated on teacher beliefs, continuous professional development, and teacher change to gain further understanding of high quality professional development. Current practices of professional development tend to be single episodes that offer little content knowledge and are unconstructive for current school problems (Firestone & Hirsch, 2006). According to a study conducted by

the Network for Public Education (2016), 85% of respondents reported that professional development was not connected to their evaluations. The report also found that professional development hindered growth and teacher autonomy. Teachers learn best through authentic components related to school improvement, and not when influenced by evaluation scores (NPE, 2016). Additionally, “teacher evaluation systems fail to provide teachers with the necessary information to make timely and effective improvements in their instructional practice” (Stoelinga (2011, p. 58). Relative to physical education, Sears and colleagues (2014) noted that professional development is typically generalized with little to specificity available for the subject. Many schools may not offer necessary resources for teachers to grow professionally (Doolittle & Schwager, 1989; Richards et al., 2014; Templin, 1989). Due to the insufficient support, many educators do not perceive professional development as helpful (Bechtel & O’Sullivan, 2006).

However, one of the positive effects of the emphasis on student learning is that it provides both teacher and corporation or district motivation to utilize professional development (Rink, 2013). Professional development can also be implemented to improve teacher evaluations (Kimball, 2002), and Bredeson (2000) states, “the role of the school principal is to encourage, nurture and support teacher learning, not to be the gatekeepers or governors of teacher professional development” (p. 398). Ward (2013) contends that effective professional development should focus on physical educators’ understanding of content knowledge. Teachers are encouraged to participate in meaningful professional development, which includes follow-up remediation (Armour,

2010). The research is encouraging, yet more research on the effectiveness of professional development is needed to address the shortcomings of teacher evaluation.

Value-added Models

While there are many key features within quality teacher evaluations, there are some obstacles that can hinder evaluation effectiveness. One of these obstacles is the use of Value-added Models (VAMs). VAMS are designed to measure teacher effectiveness by calculating the individual teacher's student achievement gains over time (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). Baker and colleagues (2010) state that VAMs provide a more accurate comparison of teachers, stronger analyses of school progress, and evaluation method validity. School corporations and districts have adopted VAMS to address teacher evaluations, which is due to increased accountability and an emphasis on providing student achievement evidence (Little, Goe, & Bell, 2009). VAMs are popular throughout the country, yet are also controversial (Donaldson & Papay, 2014).

While VAMs appear to be the best tool for evaluations, they are too unstable to have as a single measurement. VAMs assume that the teacher alone influences student success; however, assigned students also impact a teacher's performance (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). Darling-Hammond and colleagues (2012) stated that contextual factors, such as class size, home or community support, peer culture, and previous teachers are attributed to student growth as well, and not test scores alone. It is also unclear if VAMs can be interpreted across a variety of educational contexts (Blazar, Litke, & Barmore, 2016). Studies have shown that a teacher's effectiveness significantly fluctuates from year to year and VAMs are better predictors of the student achievement from the previous year as opposed to the predictive future (Baker et al., 2010). Hill and

Herlihy (2011) stated that educators attribute differences in student behavior for changes in annual teacher scores. These individual student differences, as well as student data accounting for only one aspect of teacher effectiveness, are identified as the primary VAM weaknesses (Donaldson & Papay, 2014; Looney, 2011).

According to the Educational Testing Services and the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, VAM results were deemed too unstable to make personnel decisions (Baker et al., 2010). Rothstein and colleagues (2010) advised against using VAMs as the sole criteria for deciding teachers' fates, and research entities such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA, 2015) and RAND Corporation (Baker et al., 2010) stated that VAMs were too imprecise to support high stakes decisions about individual teachers. The Network for Public Education (2016) found that both teacher and principals believe evaluations based on VAMs are neither valid nor reliable measurements of their work. Clearly, as stated from these prominent research communities, VAMs are tools that need to be used cautiously and should only be used as one of many sources in the evaluative process.

Administration

One of the most important components related to evaluation is the administration, as teacher evaluation is one of the principal's formal roles (Conley & Glasman, 2008). Evaluators are typically building-level principals (Ovando & Ramirez Jr., 2007), and Ebmeier and Niklaus (1999) discovered a principal's amount of support in the evaluative process sets a tone for the entire school. Relatedly, teachers tend to value the evaluation process to the same level as their administrators (Nicholson & Tracy, 2001). The importance of administration lies in the successful implementation of the new teacher

evaluation policies (Fowler, 2013). At first glance, principals appear to be well equipped for evaluations based on their previous teaching experience and training in teacher supervision and evaluation (Torff & Sessions, 2005). However, previous teacher evaluation research has raised concerns about the reliability of implementation and who should observe teachers (Murphy et al., 2013). Padaruth (2016) found that principals lacked the skillset to accurately evaluate physical education content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Furthermore, physical educators have previously been found to teach according to either what is expected or what teachers believe to be expected of them from both administrators and or colleagues in physical education (Curtner-Smith et.al, 2008; Templin & Schempp, 1989). The current high stakes era of accountability, highlighted by teacher salaries and job statuses both contingent on evaluation scores, demonstrate teacher compliance to administration expectation (Padaruth, 2016). The following sections describe concerns related to administrators' evaluation attributes. These include observations, lack of time, and lack of subject expertise.

Observations

Classroom observations are an important piece of the evaluation puzzle. Observations are required in Indiana (IDOE, 2016) and are included in a majority of evaluation models. According to Little and colleagues (2009), teacher effectiveness is assessed using evaluation outcomes, which are based on evaluator proficiency levels. When quality observations occur, principals provide constructive and valuable feedback to their educators, who can then apply the information to facilitate self-improvement and support professional development (Glickman, 2002; Ponticell & Zepeda 2004).

Conversely, if feedback from an evaluator is non-specific, non-constructive, lacks meaning, or only contains general praise, teachers are unable to gain a proper understanding of their performance (O’Pry & Schumacher, 2012). Feedback should be timely, and evaluators must develop observation and feedback skills to effectively implement teacher evaluation (IDOE, 2012b). The NPE (2016) recognizes that teaching is complex and cannot be completely captured by rubric scores. They recommend that observations focus on improving instruction while utilizing reflection and communication between teachers and evaluators, resulting in a narrative as opposed to a number (NPE, 2016).

Classroom observations should also include enough time to accurately evaluate educators. According to White (2014), “Quick, cursory observations are also likely to damage teachers’ trust in the evaluation system, further undermining efforts to improve their instruction” (p. 3). Teachers who felt administrators did not spend enough observation class time questioned the validity of their assessor’s evaluation, doubted that the observation reflected a proper understanding of their daily work, and mistrusted the evaluation credibility (Reinhorn, Johnson, & Simon, 2015).

The precursor to classroom observations includes evaluator observation training. While observations are vital to teacher evaluation, proper training is required in order to ensure its effectiveness. Evidence indicates evaluators receive minimal observation training and that evaluation outcomes are often subjectively scored (Brandt, Mathers, Oliva, Brown-Sims, & Hess, 2007; Jacob & Lefgren, 2008). In Indiana, the IDOE offered 13 hours of evaluator training on RISE, which included rubric instruction, note taking and mapping, and video observations (Cole et al., 2012). Prior to the RISE

implementation, teachers in focus groups suggested that administrators required more training in order to properly and consistently implement evaluation systems (IDOE, 2012a). In the same report, over one third of administrators lacked confidence in their own ability to help struggling teachers, provide effective instructional coaching, or effectively evaluate teachers. Subsequent research found that 82% of administrators reported sufficient training for the model, which factored in their decision to implement evaluations within their corporations (Cole et al., 2012). These conflicting reports from roughly the same time period provide examples of conflicting reports in administrator comfort concerning evaluation.

Physical education is often defined as controlled chaos, and to the untrained eye could scream of disorder and havoc. Principals who serve as evaluators have the difficult task of observing and evaluating a subject unlike any other in the school system, and are often unable to effectively evaluate physical education due to generalized evaluation tools and lack of expertise. Evaluators need to be properly trained in physical education practices using measures specific to the profession (Rink, 2013). This requires extensive mentoring for evaluators to assist in understanding quality physical education (Ennis, 2012).

Lack of Time

Time demands related to observations and evaluation creates a substantial burden for principals (White, 2014). Principals are often tasked with evaluating all teachers of every subject within their building (Conley & Glasman, 2008; Edgar 2012, Kersten & Israel, 2005). This frequently results in uncompleted state-required observations and minimal feedback. Principals have other roles and responsibilities as well, and have not

been provided with adequate evaluation time to complete observations and evaluations (Blase & Blase, 1999; Derrington & Campbell, 2015; Kersten & Israel, 2005). Ramirez and colleagues (2014) found that “given an already overwhelming workload, it is easy to predict that the most likely scenario for the new teacher evaluation policy will be for administrators to find the most time-saving means of completing their duties” (p. 49). Similarly, Kimball (2002) stated, “increased workload may have contributed to some evaluators cutting corners on evidence gathering, writing reports, and providing feedback” (p. 261). Most principals are too busy to complete high quality supervision and evaluation (Donaldson, 2013; Marshall, 2005; Murphy et al., 2013), which results in evaluations of questionable reliability (Donaldson & Papay, 2014). When it comes to high stakes teacher evaluation, where the career of teachers, school budgets, and more importantly the future of students are at stake, teacher evaluation cannot be viewed as a fringe activity for administrators on top of all the other responsibilities of running a school (Donaldson & Donaldson Jr., 2012).

Lack of Subject Expertise

In their study of Indiana teacher and administrator perceptions of the new teacher evaluation system, Murphy and colleagues (2014) found that 94 percent of administrators felt confident in their knowledge and competencies to evaluate teachers while only 54 percent of educators felt the same way. Halverson, Kelly, and Kimball (2007) found that some teachers felt their evaluators lacked in pedagogical content knowledge and were not qualified to evaluate them on instructional content decisions. Since teachers of different subjects teach in different settings, it is difficult to achieve reliable judgments among evaluators unless they are very well trained (Looney, 2011). Of a similar note, school

principals with specific content knowledge are more confident and successful in providing support to teachers in their practice (Tuytens & Devos, 2011).

In their study of physical educator perceptions of teacher evaluation, Norris and colleagues (2016) found that 54.55% of physical education teachers felt their evaluators were not able to determine their effectiveness. Their discovery aligned with previous research on classroom teachers' perceptions of teacher evaluations (Darling-Hammond et al., 1999; Halverson et al., 2004; Loup et al., 1996; Reinhorn, Johnson, & Simon, 2015; Zimmerman, 2003). These findings are problematic in an era of accountability, where teachers are required to teach in accordance with their principal's evaluative expectations (Padaruth, 2016). Kimball (2002) suggests matching evaluators and teachers by content background, while White (2014) presented the idea of a multi-rater system, which is designed to give teachers more interactions with multiple evaluators. Regardless of the evaluation model used in a corporation and without required continual training and accountability of evaluators, evaluation consistency will suffer (Schachter, 2012).

School Context and Culture

School context and the culture created within individual buildings are important components to successful schools throughout the country. According to the IDOE (2012b), a school culture is created by the prevalent beliefs, mindsets, and actions of its teachers, administrators, and students that either contribute to or distract from teacher excellence and student achievement. Today's society is rapidly changing and increasingly complex, yet schools must be able to quickly react, respond, and adapt (Fullan, 1993). The following influences teachers: colleagues and peers, the administration team, and even members of the community, which are typically parents of students they teach.

These interactions are pivotal to understanding the school climate and operational methods utilized by the administration, especially related to high stakes evaluation.

A study conducted by The New Teacher Project (2015) surveyed more than 4,800 teachers in almost 250 schools and found that successful schools carefully foster cultures that help both educators and students reach greater heights. The research also indicated that teachers value working toward clearly defined goals and collaborating with their peers under leadership committed to teacher success (TNTP, 2012). Fullan (2001) suggested collegial relationships, knowledge building, and consistency are key characteristics of learning institutions such as schools. Previous research also denoted that effective professional collaboration influenced the expertise within schools to build collegial communities (Leana, 2011). “Successful collaboration between administrators and teachers requires honesty, reflection, and a commitment to constant improvement” (IDOE, 2012b, p. 2). Hoyle (2002) states relationships are vital to motivation and recommends that leaders should motivate through a deep caring of others. He also states that schools must be caring organizations versus competitive environments (Hoyle, 2002).

As previously stated, administrators influence and develop school environments, which is important for evaluations as they occur between administrators and educators. Principals are responsible to create, nurture, and maintain a healthy and productive learning environment at school (Bredeson, 2000). Administrators also determine teacher evaluation value and meaning within their schools (Davis et al., 2002). Davis and colleagues (2002, p. 297) summarize the external and internal forces at hand within the school context:

School administrators frequently face a considerable number of dilemmas, resulting from conflicting demands, from powerful interests within and external to school organizational cultures. On the one hand, large bureaucratic public schools systems, supported by public funds and under the direction of democratically elected public officials, seek to implement a variety of well-intentioned educational reforms. On the other hand, teachers and other educators are striving for autonomy and control of their own professional practices within the everyday life of their schools. While bureaucratic systems are characterized by standardization of rules and procedures, professionals value their own judgment to determine the best course of practice.

According to Supovitz and colleagues (2009), administrators play a pivotal role in the development of school missions, creating an environment of trust and collaboration, having high teacher expectations, and the overall support to her or his educators. These components are further demonstrated relative to the evaluative process.

Personal, social, political, situational and contextual factors influence the way reforms are interpreted and implemented by educators (Bechtel & O'Sullivan, 2006; Larsen, 2005; McCaughtry et al., 2006). Previous research also indicated that teachers value trust and communication between their evaluator and themselves (Davis, 1988; Valentine, 1992). When educators are prepared for the evaluation process and supported by their administrators, they tend to feel more successful and positive about the experience overall (O'Pry & Schumacher, 2012). Regardless of the model adopted within schools, evaluation system design, planning, and implementation require a large time commitment and willingness for school culture transformation (IDOE, 2012a). This

culture shift requires school corporations to create a collaborative environment and shared vision of instructional excellence (IDOE, 2012a), yet current research on teacher evaluation reveal new systems have not met stakeholder expectations (NCTQ, 2015).

Many educators reported a negative influence on current evaluation reforms. Teachers often feel an increased pressure to improve student test scores while support to do so dwindles (NPE, 2016). Students are also impacted from evaluations, as teachers described negative impacts on student relationships due to the pressure and emphasis on test scores (NPE, 2016). A study from the Network for Public Education (2016) found 84% of respondents reported a negative impact on interactions between other teachers as well as their evaluators. 81% of individuals from the same study also reported negative impacts on workplace collegiality. Principals, according to Donaldson (2013), reduced their efforts to increase teacher effectiveness in order to preserve teacher relationships. Administrators in this study created a ‘culture of nice’ by allowing teacher influence to hinder trust and accountability within the environment.

Culture also influences teacher occupation status. Schools with weak cultures found that teachers left due to dissatisfaction with school leadership, insufficient development opportunities, and financial compensation (TNTP, 2012). Conversely, schools who developed strong cultures retained more educators and help students learn more by focusing on student learning, real instructional leadership, better professional development, and utilizing proper responses to quality and poor teaching performance (TNTP, 2012). The TNTP (2015) states a culture shift toward teacher evaluations as a tool to is required to achieve the necessary support and recognition that teachers deserve, which has yet to occur in Indiana schools. This can be accomplished by adjusting

classroom practice and raising student achievement through observation, feedback, reflection, and improvement (IDOE, 2012a; TNTP, 2012).

Relative to physical education, principals have a responsibility in shaping the school culture and directly influence the level of marginality experienced by physical educators (Padaruth, 2016). Frequently, evaluative systems adversely impact physical educators (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Curtner-Smith and colleagues (2008) found that principals ‘didn’t know anything about PE’ and that their behaviors and communications undermined physical educator teaching efforts. According to Richards and colleagues (2014), “Lack of professional, emotional, and financial support sends powerful explicit and implicit messages about the perceived importance of PE” (p. 127). Additionally, Norris and colleagues (2016) found that physical education was valued, yet not prioritized. This could lead to a scenario where physical educators must advocate to administrators, teachers of other subjects, and the community for status, recognition, resources, and respect for the profession (Locke, 1992; Sparkes, Templin & Schempp, 1993).

Marginalization

While quality teacher evaluations may contribute to the promotion of quality schooling, physical education has historically been a marginalized subject in education (James, 2011; Lawson, 1986; O’Sullivan, 1989; Rink, 2013; Templin et al., 1994). According to Richards and colleagues (2014), physical education teachers straddle the fence between being part of the central school mission and also a peripheral subject. Physical educators “may have a formal position with the educational bureaucracy, but are not afforded the same rights and rewards as those viewed as central to its mission”

(Richards et al., 2014, p. 126). Along with other noncore subjects, such as art and music, physical education also frequently receives low status and priority within schools (Norris et al., 2016; Prince et al., 2008; Puhse & Gerber, 2005; Sheehy, 2011). Status minimization includes a variety of areas, such as: budgetary resources, similar student-teacher ratios, and guaranteed inclusivity of school curriculum (Prince et al., 2008; Sparkes, Schempp, & Templin, 1993; Sparkes & Templin, 1992).

Due to marginalization and low status, the profession has felt the indirect effects of federal and state mandates often through reduced time for the subject matter (James, 2011). These mandates also take the form of state loopholes, such as waivers and shortened summer classes, which minimizes the effectiveness of quality physical education (Norris et al., 2016; SHAPE America & American Heart Association, 2016). Yet time appears to be the biggest threat to effective teaching, as physical educators are expected to teach content, develop skills, and interact all within one to two classes per week (Lindsay, 2014). Strategies to resist marginalization include creating connections and relationships with fellow teachers, communicating with administrators to advocate for proper resources to teach effectively, and reaching out and connecting with the community for advocacy purposes (Lux, 2011; Lux & McCullick, 2011). Additionally, “teacher effectiveness can be measured if time, teacher training, resources (one ball per student), space, and program goals are consistent. The biggest hurdle in the PE discipline is obtaining sufficient time” (Lindsay, 2014, p. 33). These factors play a large role in a physical educators ability to successfully navigate their experiences in the profession, as well as the impact on choosing to stay within the teaching profession (Sparkes, Schempp, & Templin, 1993).

Traditionally, physical education has been characterized as a subject focused on keeping students “busy, happy, and good.” A large body of research states that in the eyes of principals and evaluators, a physical educator was considered successful so long as students were on-task, happy, and well-behaved (Arrighi & Young, 1987; Placek, 1983; Placek et al., 1995). If students are busy or on-task in PE, they have little to no time waiting in line, they have total and constant participation and have minimal time wasted by lengthy instruction or transition time (Placek, 1983). When students are happy, they are engaged and visibly having fun by demonstrating excitement and motivation throughout class (Placek, 1983). Students who are happy in class often display characteristics of interacting with others and or cheering to the delight of the casual observer. Finally, the research shows that if students are good or well-behaved, they are behaving for a majority of the duration of class without being often reprimanded. If students are engaged, they tend to be good, as well (Arrighi & Young, 1987; Placek, 1983).

While these traits are desirable, physical educators were able to coast down what Kretchmar described as Easy Street (2006). The educator goals on Easy Street are to introduce, inform, and entertain students through mini-games and units. Introductions of multiple games and activities allow physical educators from needing a deep understanding of pedagogy and content (Ward, 2013). Additionally, using superficial information with limited feedback provides few opportunities for students to actually be challenged and to learn (Bulger & Housner, 2009). Finally, entertaining students helps prevent possible behavior issues (Ennis, 2014) while simultaneously creating environments that lack teacher accountability (Placek, 1983). Ennis (2014) challenges

future physical educators to break the mold of busy, happy, and good on easy street by increasing cognitive demands within the profession. “Until local, state, and national decision makers take note of the research as to the benefits of healthy and active students, PE will continue to be marginalized, and the teachers will be left to the whims of the evaluation method of the day” (Lindsay, 2014, P. 37). The sentiments communicated from Lindsay call for greater understanding of the teacher evaluation process within the physical education profession.

Indiana Teacher Shortage

In addition to teacher evaluation mandates, Indiana is also facing a statewide teacher shortage problem. Between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years, enrollment in Indiana Teacher Preparation Programs decreased 31% from 13,029 to 8,991 (U.S Department of Education, 2013). In fact, the United States Department of Education (2013) stated enrollment in these programs decreased 50% since 2009. A related component is the amount of total initial Indiana licenses issued from 2009-10 to 2014-15 decreased from 5,685 to 3,802 (IDOE, 2016b). Carroll and Fulton (2004) conservatively estimate the cost of replacing public teachers who have quit the profession at over two billion dollars a year. The amount rises to \$4.9 billion with the inclusion of teachers who transfer to different schools. Additionally, the average cost to recruit, hire, prepare, and lose a teacher is roughly \$50,000 (Carroll & Fulton, 2004).

To gain a better understanding of the issues related to the teacher shortage, the IDOE created the Blue Ribbon Teacher Commission in September 2015 (IDOE, 2016c). According to the IDOE (2016c), the committee included 49 educators, legislators, and key stakeholders throughout the state. The commission identified a variety of teacher

shortage root causes, which included: perception of teaching, especially related to public policy; compensation; job demand and stress; compensation versus cost and rigor of preparation and certification; public perception from stakeholders; and standardized assessments for students (IDOE, 2016c). The commission identified eight strategy statements to combat the shortage from multiple fronts. These included: 1) Mentoring, 2) Positive Press, 3) Compensation, 4) Evaluation and Assessment, 5) Diverse Workforce, 6) Clinical Experiences, 7) Professional Development, and 8) Career Pathways and Leadership (IDOE, 2016c). The strategies are designed in a systematic approach to be implemented through individuals' recruitment, pre-service, induction, and career stages (IDOE, 2016c). The effectiveness of these strategies remains to be seen.

High Stakes Evaluative Environment

One possible cause of the teacher shortage could be the evaluative environment due to the current high stakes nature of teaching. In Indiana, educators can be dismissed based on evaluations. The state indicates that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal, and teachers who are rated in the lowest two categories can be dismissed if they fail to raise their evaluative ratings to effective or highly effective after two years (NCTQ, 2015). Indiana is also one of 23 states that require teacher performance to inform educator tenure decisions (NCTQ, 2015). Relatedly, and also disconcertingly, is that there is between a 10 and 20 percent chance a quality educator might be falsely identified as a poor teacher (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2013; Green, Baker, & Oluwole, 2012; Schochet & Chiang, 2010).

Although administrators make an effort to remove ineffective teachers from their schools, schools receive an "F" grade 8x more than educators receive an ineffective

rating, indicating a discrepancy (IDOE, 2014). As previously mentioned, each school receives a letter grade after the completion of each school year (IDOE, 2014). This information is public and accessible to all, which places educators under further scrutiny. Stoelinga (2011) found that principals used alternative methods to pressure perceived low-quality educators, as opposed to relying on the corporation's formal dismissal procedures tied to evaluation. An example of an alternative method includes harassing supervision, which might involve principals visiting a teacher unannounced multiple times each week. Other alternatives include assigning teachers new grade levels or subjects, or placing teachers in rooms that are difficult to access in a building (Stoelinga, 2011). Due to the ineffectiveness of teacher evaluation, various issues arise such as inflated teacher ratings, isolation of educators, and unjustified dismissals (Marshall, 2012). These shortcomings hinder the potential of teacher evaluation and increase pressure to hastily "fix" the current evaluative system.

Financial Component

Related to the high stakes evaluative environment are teacher salaries. Indiana is one of seven states throughout the nation who directly compensate teachers based on their evaluations (NCTQ, 2015). Indiana policymakers devised laws tied to distribution of state funds for evaluations (IDOE, 2016e). According to the IDOE (2016e), school corporations are required to create their own compensation plans that follow Indiana Code 20-28-9-1.5 and all other relevant laws and rules. Corporations must comply with two of the following factors when considering salary increases for employees: evaluation, education and experience, academic needs of students, and leadership. Additionally, the education and experience factor must not account for more than 33% of the money

distribution for salary increase. Teachers who are rated as “needs improvement” or “ineffective” are not eligible for salary increases, and performance awards or supplemental payments for master’s degrees are no longer available due to compensation plan mandates (IDOE, 2016e). After an in-depth analysis of Indiana’s evaluation system, TNTP (2015) recommended that the state should address the perceived negative impact of disallowing salary increases for teachers who receive the bottom two evaluation ratings.

According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2016), Indiana teacher salaries, when adjusted for inflation, have decreased 13.7% since the 1999-2000 school year. This represents the highest percentage drop in the nation. TNTP (2015) also suggests allocation for more funding through grants used to support performance-based compensation for educators. There are multiple factors that equate to the teacher shortage within Indiana, and both state officials and school corporations need to address controllable areas in order to reverse the trends.

Conclusion

Despite continued reductions in class frequencies and time, evidence indicates that physical activity provides a wealth of benefits to children, including development of healthy life habits, improved concentration, healthier bone development, superior classroom behavior, increased graduation rates, and higher educational aspirations (Bailey et al, 2009). More time in physical education reduces the likelihood of childhood obesity, which highlights the benefit of physical education (Cawley, Frisvoldc, & Meyerhoeferd, 2013; Pate et al., 2006). A recent research study concluded there was no evidence that additional physical education time harmed academic performance (Cawley,

Frisvold, & Meyerhoefer, 2013). These powerful findings demonstrate the importance of physical education.

Physical educators face the challenge of navigating the evaluative process through administration, the state system, and colleagues teaching other subjects. Popham (2013) felt that all professionals, including teachers, should be evaluated according to their efforts. He suggested that quality teacher evaluations are needed to become accurate and fair to help provide students with the best teachers and education possible. Evaluations are flawed, contested, and problematic according to Hazi & Rucinski (2009). They contend that existing evaluation statutes and regulations will be changed to try to make teachers more accountable through this highly ritualistic procedure, and in so doing, will further complicate a flawed practice (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009). However, according to Davis (2002, p. 298),

It seems a reasonable assumption that as long as schools remain publicly funded institutions, schools will continue to be required to implement a variety of top down reform and mandated change initiatives. Powers external to the school-site organization will continue to exert much control over schools. New policy mandates targeting the evaluation is an example.

Education itself is messy, and there is no magic equation to solve teacher effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). According to Marshall (2005), teacher evaluation should be based on classroom observations, student achievement gains, and feedback from students; however, its effectiveness will depend largely on how the data is used in the process. Teacher evaluation should be the engine that drives student achievement

through the promotion of collaboration, empowerment, and professional development of teachers (Marshall, 2005).

CHAPTER THREE – METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology used for the study. It builds upon the second chapter literature review that concentrated on teacher socialization, with a particular emphasis in organizational socialization as it relates to school physical educators and the teacher evaluation process. The research design, data collection procedures, paradigm choice, participants, general setting, and data analysis will be described within this chapter. Finally, elements related to trustworthiness conclude the chapter.

Research Design and Social Constructivism

Grounded in teacher socialization theory (Lawson, 1983a; Lawson, 1986; Templin & Schempp, 1989) and utilizing a social constructivist perspective (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Vygotsky, 1978), the design of this research is descriptive and framed in qualitative methods. Sekaran and Bougie state that a descriptive study is “undertaken in order to ascertain and be able to describe the characteristics of the variables of interest in a situation” (p. 105, 2009). The research presented in this dissertation is part of a larger study that involved an investigative study of the perceptions of both physical education teachers and principals about a state-mandated teacher evaluation system throughout the state of Indiana. Padaruth (2016) focused on administrative perceptions of the evaluation process relative to physical educators. The current study utilized interviews with physical

educators in order to gain access and insight to their perceptions of and experiences with teacher evaluation. The research consisted of a single design study with a two-part data collection process, Phase I (local) and Phase II (statewide).

The initial interview protocol was created utilizing the RISE Pilot Study (2012) and questions developed from the research team. The research team consisted of the major advisor of this study, another doctoral candidate colleague, and myself. The interview questions were then sent to three current physical educators for review, and they provided feedback for the creation of the final instrument. This helped capture and represent actual evaluative experiences in the field, which increased question validity. Interview access was gained by an initial survey instrument, which was employed by physical educators prior to any interviews. Following the completion of both Phase I and Phase II survey collections, data from both surveys were used to refine and finalize the interview protocol. The questions were purposely designed to be open-ended to allow for interviewee flexibility. This aligns with the social constructivist paradigm used throughout the collection and analysis process (Creswell, 2007). Table 3.1 provides a brief timeline of the protocol development and data collection procedures (detailed below).

Table 3.1

Timeline Summary of Phases I and II Research Design		
Phase	Date	Description
Protocol Development	Fall 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey Development • Initial Interview Guide Development • Physical Educator Interview & Survey Feedback
Phase I	Spring 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial contact with corporation administrators • Local Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initial Survey Invitation ○ Two Follow-up Requests • Close Local Online Survey
Phase II	Spring 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial contact with corporation administrators • Statewide Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initial Survey Invitation ○ Two Follow-up Requests • Close Local Online Survey
Phase I & II	Summer 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact Potential Interviewees (From Survey) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Both Local & Statewide • Conduct Initial Interviews
	Fall 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview Data Transcription • Interviewee Member checking • Analyze Quantitative Data

Social Constructivist Paradigm

In addition to being grounded in organizational socialization, the research was executed utilizing a social constructivist paradigm, where individuals' goals are to understand the world in which they work and live (Creswell, 2007). Constructivism does not intend to demolish or create an alternate reality, but to reconstruct past and shape present experiences based on the individual. Within education, constructivism revolves around psychologists Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky. Cognitive constructivism is based on the Piagetian model, which focuses on the individual and her or his construction of meaning (Piaget, 1970). Additionally, Vygotsky's approach emphasizes on language and social interactions (1978). Vygotsky also states that within social interactions, cultural meanings are shared and internalized (Maypole & Davies, 2001). John Dewey agreed with both psychologists, who believed constructivism was better accomplished through social interactions (1916). The writings and discussions from these originators help build the foundation in a constructivist approach, especially in the realm of educational research.

Guba and Lincoln (1994) stated, "Constructions are not more or less 'true,' in any absolute sense, but simply more or less informed and/or sophisticated" (p.111). They also indicated that constructionists are alterable in their associated realities (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The interpretations people make about the world around them, along with past experiences, help to create their foundations of knowledge (Maypole & Davies, 2001). The connections between socialization and a constructivist paradigm work in a similar fashion. This research was based on the combination of formal knowledge with real world experiences and new perspectives or ideas in the construction of new knowledge

and understanding (Maypole & Davies, 2001). Holstein and Gubrium (2011) state that daily realities are actively constructed through types of social action. Individuals seek understandings of the world where they live and work (Creswell, 2007). Creswell also states that individuals develop subjective meanings of their experiences. Their views are varied and multiple, which requires the researcher to sort through the complexity of views to gain understanding (2007). According to Runyan (1984, p. 3):

There are few things more fascinating or informative than learning about the experience of other conscious beings as they make their way through the world. Accounts of their lives have the power to move us deeply, to help us imagine what it must be like to live in different social and historical circumstances, to provide insights into the workings of lives, and perhaps, to provide a frame of reference for reassessing our own experience, own fortunes, own possibilities of existence.

Researcher Background

As a researcher exercising a constructivist view, it was important to gain participants' understandings as much as possible to negotiate their perceptions and experiences. This was accomplished as an insider to the physical education profession. Having taught for two years as an elementary physical educator, in addition to seven years experience in Physical Education Teacher Education, the researcher was able to interact and relate with the participants to gain further access to their insight and experiences. The topic is also important as the researcher currently works as a teacher educator at a state university in Indiana, where the findings, policies, and experiences directly impact current and former students, as well as contemporaries across the state.

Lastly, as a former teacher in a K-12 setting, the researcher is a “passionate participant” (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011) as the facilitator of multi-voice reconstruction. With the help of the participants, their understanding of the teacher evaluation process was analyzed. This was accomplished while also being mindful of the potential researcher influence on participants, data, and representation of the emerging reality (Yin, 2011).

Data Collection Procedures

Phase I involved data collection from physical educators teaching within public schools in one county in the state of Indiana while Phase II added additional teachers throughout the state. Phase II collection procedures replicated Phase I procedures. Physical educators (n=309) from 41 of the 310 public school corporations (13.23%) were recruited to participate in both phases of the overall teacher study. For this dissertation, 22 teachers participated in the interview process representing 15 school corporations

Phase I.

Subject recruitment.

Phase I involved participation of physical educators (n=52) in three school corporations within one Indiana County. Initial contact occurred through electronic letters sent to each of the superintendents from the respective corporations in the county (Appendix A). The letters explained the purpose of the study and requested permission to contact potential participants. Participants included each physical educator from all three teaching levels (elementary, middle, and high school) within the three corporations. After the superintendent granted permission to contact the schools, she or he coordinated communication to potential teachers involved in the study. Additionally, the superintendent and/or school principal provided the researcher a letter of approval

(Appendix B) on school corporation letterhead in accordance with IRB approval #1310014176.

Following provided school access, the researcher sent separate emails to each physical educator (Appendix C). The email provided an overview of the research project, including an estimation of time needed to participate, the required tasks, and how the data would be interpreted. Teachers who responded to the survey were invited to participate in the interview phase of the study. These individuals were asked to connect to a separate Qualtrics link at the end of the survey indicating their willingness to participate in the interview by providing their contact information (Appendix D). Teachers who elected to participate in an interview about the teacher evaluation process did so voluntarily. Approved IRB procedures, such as organizing and securing storage of personal information were followed in order to ensure confidentiality and anonymity for the teacher participants. Furthermore, teachers were given pseudonyms in all reports connected with the study. Pseudonyms were used to replace participants' actual names, and language was used to disassociate the subject with a school, community, sport, and colleagues.

Interviews

As noted above, participants who volunteered to be interviewed were provided a link at the end of the Qualtrics survey asking for contact information. The link sent participants to a separate page where they were able to voluntarily provide their contact information. The information provided was only used to contact participants for the interview purposes. Separation between the two Qualtrics links assisted in providing

extra identity protection for participants. To help with the recruitment process, teachers who participated in the interview process were financially compensated for their time.

Participants were contacted via email to set up an interview time at the participant's convenience. The interviews were conducted either in person or via phone, and lasted between 30 and 90 minutes with an average of roughly 50 minutes per interview. All interviews were audio recorded for accuracy and transcription purposes. Subjects had the opportunity to decline answering any question or discontinue participation at any time. The interview protocol consisted of in-depth, semi-structured interviews for physical educators (Appendix E). Example questions include: "How is the current teacher evaluation system different from other teacher evaluation systems you have been through in the past?," "What is your general opinion or impression of the state educational policies and reforms on teacher evaluations?," and "If you were given the opportunity, what would you change, if any, in the present teacher evaluation system, specifically for PE?" Semi-structured interviews followed a formal interview guide yet also provided both the interviewer and participant freedom to discuss topics from their experiences (Patton, 2002). Phase I interviews were conducted in summer, 2015.

Phase II.

As previously stated, Phase II replicated Phase I on a statewide scale. A separate IRB, protocol # 1402014471, was completed and approved for this portion of the project. All superintendents in the state of Indiana were contacted with the intent to gather a representative sample on the teacher evaluation process from as many schools as possible. Due to low response rate, follow-up emails were sent a second and third time to Indiana superintendents. Surveys were sent to all physical educators from approved

corporations (n=257) with the same interview opportunity as Phase I. The questions used for both surveys and interviews targeted physical education teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation system. Questions also centered upon what instruments were used to evaluate educators, as well as how the instruments assessed student learning and growth. Phase II interviews were conducted with 13 physical education teachers concurrently with the nine teachers interviewed in Phase I.

Interview Participants

Based on the recruitment process outlined above, a total 22 individuals from 15 of corporations agreed to participate in interviews for this project. The represented corporations included student populations from as little as 400 students up to over 12,000 with a mean of 3,432 students per corporation. The interviewees teaching levels represented eight high school, 12 middle school, 12 elementary (which includes intermediate schools), and two K-12 all-grade physical educators. Gender representation included 15 males and seven female interview participants. Interviewees were selected based on individuals who volunteered following the completion of the survey. Table 3.2 profiles each of the 22 interviewees to provide some context. The table provides each educator's pseudonym, gender, years of experience, and teaching level.

Table 3.2

Physical Educator Interviewee Profiles			
Pseudonym	Gender	Years Teaching	Teaching Level
Marty	Male	34+	Elementary
Trent	Male	< 10	Elementary
Rick	Male	< 20	Elementary
Jordan	Male	< 30	Elementary
Lydia	Female	< 10	Elementary
Neil	Male	34+	Elementary
Jen	Female	< 30	Elementary
Sookhen	Male	< 5	Elementary
Kara	Female	< 10	Elementary
Jason	Male	34+	Elementary
Carl	Male	< 5	Elementary
Kurt	Male	< 10	Elementary
Nathan	Male	< 30	High School
Travis	Male	< 20	High School
Anne	Female	34+	High School
Eva	Female	< 20	High School
Joel	Male	< 20	High School
Tara	Female	< 10	High School
Michael	Male	< 10	High School
Grace	Female	34+	High School
Dan	Male	< 20	K-12 All Grades
Bob	Male	< 5	K-12 All Grades

Data Analysis

The information gathered from teachers across the state aids in describing physical educators' perceptions of, and experiences with, the teacher evaluation system within school corporations in Indiana. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. The initial analysis process began with using open and axial coding (Creswell, 2013; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Transcripts were read and analyzed through the use of memos from various interviews. The memos included thoughts and other points of interest that stood out to the researcher, and were used to reveal broad themes across the interviewee data (Creswell, 2013; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Inductive analysis and constant comparison allowed for concepts to emerge from the data (Patton, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). All transcripts were initially coded line-by-line based on the broad themes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Yin, 2011). At this juncture, peer debriefing was employed to review the code themes along with multiple interview transcripts. A peer debriefer is an outside researcher who participated in the data analysis process. In this case, the peer debriefer was a fellow doctoral candidate who was familiar with the research yet not directly involved in the teacher project. He was able to comment, confirm, or refute ideas and themes throughout the process. After the initial and broad themes were shared, the researcher and peer debriefer discussed discrepancies in the major themes at length and reconciled any issues within theme categorization. Following the peer-debriefing meeting, a codebook was created and organized by a single teaching level. The codebook was then shared with the peer debriefer, who reviewed and discussed any remaining disparities at length. Finally, all interviews were organized into codebooks by teaching level.

The use of NVivo 10 facilitated the interview data organization (QSR International, 2012). Patton (2002) states that software tools can assist with facilitating coding, organizing, comparing, and data storage. While software helped in organization, the investigator was still the “driving force” behind the theme development, as intelligence and creativity generated the unique attributes of qualitative research (Patton, 2002). NVivo assisted in generating a set of categories (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Yin, 2011), which the software labels as nodes. Nodes were used to categorize and code all interview data. All emerging themes from interview transcripts were coded as separate nodes and categorized in as many as many relevant nodes as possible (Holton, 2007). Subthemes were added as they emerged from the data (Creswell, 2013). NVivo labels first order themes as “parent nodes” while subthemes are labeled as “child nodes.” Initially, there were six parent nodes and 30 child nodes, which were eventually reduced into the current organization. Additionally, the codebooks from each teaching level were also organized within the software as separate sources, which help with identifying individuals and teaching levels throughout the process. Due to the large amount of data from multiple sources, themes were organized through NVivo and subthemes were created within the software to track all interview data. A peer-debriefing meeting was again utilized to review, discuss, and finalize subthemes.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was employed in the research to enhance the quality of the methodological decisions within the research design and implementation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). Keeping a constructivist approach in mind, the researcher approached the study with the understanding that participants were not treated as research

objects, but as collaborators in the project. An “ethics of care” approach was also implemented relative to the school communities involved based on mutual respect, communication, and care (Prosser, 2011). As a former physical educator with a predominantly teaching orientation (Lawson, 1983a), the researcher approached the project based on his own socialization experiences into the physical education. This proximity and insider status helped with both subject content and participant teacher experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The researcher was also mindful of the influences past experiences might have on the participants and data representation. Therefore, there were several features used to enhance trustworthiness for this study, including member checking, an audit trail, a peer debriefer, and transferability.

Once interviews occurred and were transcribed, interview transcripts were sent to volunteers electronically for member checking (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2011). Interviewees were asked to review transcripts for accuracy. At the time of request, participants also had the opportunity to provide additional information or redact comments made during the discussion (Graber, 1991). Interviewees had the power to decide the amount of reported information and also the ability to collaborate in the construction of the data, which ensured its credibility (Creswell, 2013). An audit trail was also employed throughout the data collection and analysis, which helped enhance trustworthiness. The trail included all electronic record keeping comprising of interviewee email communication, interview audio files, and data analysis software. Additionally, NVivo includes a tracking log within the software to keep record of the analysis processes used to organize, code, and manage the qualitative data. This tracking process for the audit trail helped keep the researcher on track throughout the analysis process.

As previously discussed, peer debriefing was accomplished through the involvement of an outside researcher. Beginning with the initial research design, including school corporation permission and field entry, interview question development, and survey design, peer debriefing was an integral portion of the research process. During each stage of the study, a colleague and peer played “devil’s advocate” to keep the researcher honest and helped reduce biases (Creswell, 2013; Graber, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Finally, transferability is defined as the degree in which research results are applicable to individuals in other contexts. According to Graber, it is possible “to transfer results to other contexts when readers are able to perceive connections between events as they are described in the study setting and events they have observed or experienced in their own lives” (p. 44). Graber (1991) does, however, caution that a single qualitative study is not generalizable due to other important differences and context that might exist. Each school is unique and has its own culture and teaching environment. Therefore, the conclusions from this research will only be transferable to schools that are similar in locale and or context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher included rich and considerable contextual data (Creswell, 2013), yet was also restricted in terms of participant anonymity.

CHAPTER FOUR – RESULTS

The results of this investigation help define and understand physical educators' experiences with and perceptions of the teacher evaluation process. According to Murphy and colleagues (2014), many states are in the process of reforming teacher evaluation processes, which for the purposes of this study, had made for opportune timing for further research into Indiana schools. The information collected and analyzed represents the 22 physical educators from 15 school corporations across Indiana. Interviewees quoted are identified with pseudonyms and any other identifying information has likewise been removed or changed to protect the identities of the participants. Teachers represented present an equal balance between elementary and high school physical educators. Surprisingly, despite the contextual differences between teaching levels, a majority of individuals regardless of teaching level suggested similar thoughts and approaches within the major themes. Individuals that deviate from the main themes or subthemes will be commented on throughout the chapter.

Six first-order themes and 21 subthemes will be presented, and table 4.1 provides a visual representation of the themes and subthemes. First-order themes are presented starting with the teacher evaluation process, which sets the scene and describes the models used, observations, and student learning as experienced by the physical educators. Theme two is teacher preparations, which informs the work educators complete prior to

their evaluations. Themes three and four, physical education is unique and administration/evaluators respectively, highlight two important influences of physical education evaluations. Theme five highlights a variety of outcomes that result from completed evaluations while theme six concludes the results with physical educator thoughts and opinions on the state mandates that dictate their evaluations.

Table 4.1

Results: First Order Themes and Subthemes	
First Order Theme	Subthemes
1) Teacher Evaluation Process	Models Student Learning Observations
2) Teacher Preparations	Former Evaluations Planning Teacher Test Input
3) Physical Education is Unique	Contextual Factors Physical Education Status
4) Administration/Evaluators	Trust & Support Subjectivity Communication
5) Teacher Evaluation Outcomes	Accountability & Effectiveness Emotions Feedback & Results Professional Development Financial Career Changes
6) Teacher Evaluation Policy	State Mandates Excessive Work Unintended Consequences Potential Solutions

Theme One: Teacher Evaluation Process

This theme emphasizes the procedures used in the teacher evaluation process.

Teachers describe typical evaluation procedures within their school corporation, as well as various logistical items, such as evaluation duration, frequency, and type. Additionally, physical educators define student-learning components used in their own evaluations. Subthemes include Models, Student Learning, and Observations.

Models

Teacher evaluation models are the primary component of the evaluative process. The models dictate the various domains and metrics used to determine a teacher's effectiveness. A majority of school corporations represented by interviewees utilized either the RISE or some RISE modification. Of the 15 corporations represented, 10 used some RISE variation (66.7%). This percentage is similar and only slightly higher than the roughly 63% of Indiana school corporations who implemented either RISE or modified RISE. For example, Lydia stated, "Our school came up with their own, they took the RISE model and they tweaked it to fit our corporation, and the Indiana Department of Education approved it." Similarly, Dan stated, "We're on the RISE, but we kind of messed with [and modified] it a little bit. We based everything off the RISE program."

The remaining five corporations represented locally created evaluation plans or some variation of models other than RISE. Neil stated, "Our evaluation process is unique in that we don't follow the state's mandated policy. We have our own." Additionally, Michael said, "To my understanding, my corporation created their own evaluation type that they had approved by the state." Jason indicated that his corporation adapted their evaluation model after another state. He explained:

[Our evaluation was modeled after an] evaluation system from North Carolina. When the evaluation systems were coming up, our school system, a year before the [RISE] came through, started the process of changing our evaluation system with this company, and we applied to the state to see if we could keep it, and were accepted.

The variability in evaluation models adopted by school corporations across the state highlight some of the potential issues with a one-size-fits-all approach in terms of implementation and professional development. Both administrators and teachers tend to change jobs throughout their careers, and a corporation's teacher roster is rarely unaffected from year to year. Having a variety of models, while helpful for contextual purposes can become problematic in terms of consistency throughout Indiana. This is due to the individualized support needed in order to support schools across the state, which might be cost prohibited (TNTP, 2015).

Student Learning

Student learning is required for Indiana evaluations (NCTQ, 2015), and has been prioritized with the updated evaluative mandates (IDOE, 2012b). SLOs are included within the RISE evaluation model, and corporations also have the opportunity to use school wide achievement data within evaluations (NCTQ, 2015). The following sections describe metrics physical educators used to evaluate student learning and potential student and teacher benefits to the student learning emphasis throughout Indiana.

Measurement Tools for Learning

In order to better understand student learning, the physical educators in this study described how student learning is measured. Due to the lack of consensus for a physical

education student learning measure, a majority of participants regardless of teaching level utilized fitness testing as an evaluation tool to determine student learning. Typical evaluations required physical educators to show student improvement in order to receive a quality evaluation score. FitnessGram was the dominant assessment tool, while some others used the Presidential Fitness test. A typical implementation for fitness testing protocol is similar to Neil's elementary classes, who assessed third graders for his student learning. He indicated, "I do the PACER test every year. We have to pick some test where a student is pretested and then post-tested, and then they have to show improvement." Comparably, high school teacher Grace explained "We do a pretest at the beginning of the semester and a post test at the end." Grace was quick to provide the caveat that "A semester's not very long to make a kind of improvement." Another fitness testing example included Carl, who described his approach in the elementary setting:

At the beginning and end of every semester I would take a fitness test using the same four core tests, which evaluated the core strengths, upper body strength, lower body strength and then cardiovascular. We would measure those tests and do a comparison. If they improved, they would get a 20 out of 20. If they remained within the ballpark, they received a 15 out of 20. If they dropped significantly, it was going to be a 10 out of 20 based on the idea that if you were working hard, you should be at least maintaining, most likely improving.

Michael had a unique case relative to the other educators in that his high school department was never assessed on student performance. "I believe in my corporation, we had two different evaluation models. I never had to show any student data in the evaluation model I always chose."

While fitness testing was the primary evaluation tool used by physical educators, there were a few alternatives presented. Jordan was particularly happy with the thoroughness of his school's tool: “

Our PE department is only expected to turn in data and be evaluated on second grade skills, and there are 80 competencies we have to check off on to make sure that the second graders can do, and the other competencies is what we call fitness for life, to make sure that the kids are physically active outside of school.

It should be noted that Jordan assessed all k-5 grade levels in a similar age/grade developmentally appropriate approach, although only second grade was required for his evaluation. Some school corporations used school-wide grades or goals as part of their evaluation scores. School-wide goals are related to ISTEP scores in core subjects, while school grades are annually assessed in an A-F rating (NCTQ, 2015). Kara noted that in her elementary school, “50% of the school goal was how well kids did on the ISTEP,” and “there's nothing PE-related on ISTEP.” Travis, a high school teacher, agreed and was critical on the lack of Physical Education representation. He had to employ a written test to address his school evaluation requirements:

I had to create an exam because we don't have an ISTEP test or any major connection that ties into it. I gave it as a pretest and a posttest. The kids walked in on day one, I said hey here's this test. I know, you don't know anything about it, but just do your best, and all the kids were just terrible at it because they didn't know what it was, and I said this is what I need. I need you to do terrible at it. Then at the end of the semester they took the same exact test again and knock it out of the park and hey, look at all this growth they had.

These examples of developing skill-related tests or other school-related components demonstrate some of the varieties within the subject related to evaluation tool metrics used for student learning. While a lack of consensus can provide freedom to a certain degree, it further complicates an administrator's evaluation due to the increased variability.

Student Learning Benefits

The impact of student learning both on students and teachers was discussed among interviewees, who had mixed feelings on the issue. As the promotion of student learning is a main objective of the state, the question posed to interviewees asked if students benefit from the updated state emphasis on learning. Individuals such as Rick agreed by stating, "No, the students don't benefit from the evaluation that we have now." Dan replied similarly, "No, I don't think they benefit whatsoever. It doesn't do anything for them and it takes away from lessons I'd like to teach because now I need to take and lose three classes for a test. I don't agree." Sookhen also disagreed with the idea of students benefiting from evaluations by replying, "I don't think it's hurting our students necessarily, but I don't think it's helping either. It's just kind of there. I guess you could argue it ensures formal lessons, but I don't think it's helping our students at all." Effective teaching focuses on enhancing SLOs, and according to these individuals, the current approach to student learning was lacking.

Some educators remained neutral in their thoughts on the impact of student learning related to evaluation mandates. Marty responded accordingly, "I don't think students really know what's going on. I don't think parents know what's going on with the different things." Neil also mentioned, "I think students have nothing to do with [teacher

evaluations], in my opinion. Luckily, over the years, my classes have improved. Not drastically, but enough to get you some good scores.”

A few educators felt that students were positively impacted from the evaluation mandates by improving SLOs. Trent thought student learning should be emphasized and felt that “the goal for any evaluation system is for anybody to think outside the box and not act like a robot by doing the same thing every year.” Carl also said that he is “continually looking for ways to make [the curriculum] better, but I'm always going to emphasize fitness and behavior above all things.”

Lydia had mixed emotions concerning student learning in the elementary setting, and was troubled by the large quantity of testing that occurs in schools today, both standardized and otherwise. She said:

Do students benefit from the teacher evaluations? Yes, overall I think they, they, they do. But at the same time I think that they don't because we over test them. I feel like we test our students way too much and so by the time it's time to take that final, they're done. They're like, 'this is just another test, and I'm just going to blow through it because I am so sick of taking tests.'

On a similar thought, Eva stated, “When it comes to the present evaluation system, quite frankly I think the kids couldn't care less. Although, at least it is a little more objective on what you need to improve to become a better teacher.”

Bob recognized the importance of emphasizing student learning in his K-12 lessons. He explained:

Absolutely. It's a quarter of the evaluation, and you can't afford not to make sure every kid is reaching their goals every single day because you need to show what

they've learned and how they've grown or your evaluation, and therefore your raise, is gone. You've got to make sure you're at your best every single day and not settling for good in your classroom, but making yourself a great teacher.

Joel thought students felt the pressure and impact of evaluations by stating:

The new process is much more student focused, although some students may not be aware of it. That being said, I think other students are going to be stressed to hear that teachers are stressed about it. So now that teachers know results from that test are going to be used not only for the school wide grade also for the individual teacher. I think the students feel that. They can sense that from the teachers and the whole process.

Summary

The wide variety of opinions related to student learning in teacher evaluation demonstrates the lack of consensus from physical educators across the state. Additionally, teachers were mixed in their feelings toward the actual benefit of the current implementation of student learning. The physical educators recognized that student learning is important, but not necessarily beneficial for students themselves. These findings are important as one of the priorities of the evaluative mandates included the overall benefits students would receive based on an improved and effective teacher workforce.

Observations

A final subtheme that emerged from the data included observations, which are instrumental to the evaluative process. Observations are required within state evaluation guidelines, and are factored into determining teacher effectiveness and also for final

teacher evaluation ratings. The following sections highlight important components within observations, which include observation totals, representative observations, and physical education observation ability.

Observations Totals

Observation totals refers to the amount or how often physical educators are evaluated in their teaching environments. In line with state policies, each educator is required to have a minimum of two short and one long observation. Short observations typically last between five and 15 minutes while long evaluations often last between 40-60 minutes. The interviewees had a variety of observation totals, although many, such as Carl, had the “typical two longs, two shorts” for their academic year observation totals. Kurt indicated that his corporation “typically have two shorts, which is from five to ten minutes, and then we have one long observation, which is an entire period.” Marty and Rick had the highest recorded observations, with at least six annually. Rick stated, “Yeah, six to seven times, yeah. I think it's three and two [per semester]. It might be four and two. I can't remember.” Following his comment about losing count of how many times he was observed in a given year, Rick said, “Yeah, it's pretty bad.” Marty explained, “I think I had a long evaluation each semester, then short pop-in ones, I think I had about three each semester.” While these two individuals represented the high end of the observation experiences of the interviewees, it should be noted that the state laws only requires two short observations and one long observation as the minimum. Jordan described his corporation’s realization and transition away from high volumes of observations. He said, “the first year was a little bit more, two long and two shorts, but that was time consuming for the evaluators, so they decided to evaluate down to the one long, two short for this

past year.” Many of the represented corporations followed in similar patterns as described above, however Jason experienced a unique scenario for his observations: “It’s on a three-year rotation base. Every three years you have a full evaluation, and the evaluator will come in three times a year for a whole hour if you’re on full evaluation. The other two years, she or he comes in once or twice for 30 minutes at a time with random walkthroughs every once in a while.”

Representative Observations

To help gain a better understanding of a representative teacher evaluation observation, physical educators described their typical experiences within the current system. Marty described his class long observation in the elementary as a planned event. He said:

The evaluator would send me an email about a week prior saying that they would like to come in and visit. Then we agree on a time. I’ll be teaching the activity planned for that week. The evaluator would come in, sit down, and have their iPad and they’ll just observe an entire class.

Similarly, Sookhen stated:

When they come in, the first one, obviously, is scheduled. They just sit at the end [of the gym]. I hand them my lesson plans and also keep all my plans in an online electronic plan book. This is so they can choose any day I have and can view my lessons.

While multiple educators had planned observations, Tara objected to the known approach within her high school. She said:

The evaluators actually have to give us a three-week window before they come in for our long evaluation. I don't agree with that; the administrator is my boss. They could walk in my classroom everyday if they wanted to. For some reason, the union made a deal that a three-week window is required.

Anne's corporation had a unique and formative approach with her teacher evaluation procedures relative to most of the other interviewees. Her high school had an option for a "do over" if they were unsatisfied with their evaluation:

If I'm a new teacher, if I'm not sure I'm doing things right, or I want [evaluators] to observe a lesson so they can go, 'Wow they're really good!' they can request more than one evaluation. Or if you get your evaluation and you don't like it, and you think you can do better, then the [evaluators] can wipe that one out and they'll come observe again.

This formative approach Anne's school took regarding evaluations helped increase Anne's confidence when observations occurred: "I don't really change much of anything when they come in because I don't think I need to." Nathan was truthful with thoughts on being observed by an evaluator:

I'm going to be bluntly honest, I'm going to do the lesson the meets the RISE demands, is that what I do on a daily basis? Absolutely not. But when you come in on an evaluation day, it will be teacher centered, and then there will be activities, checks for understanding at various points, and you know, I'm going to check off every part of that RISE checked off as I can in terms of different strategies.

Lydia contrasted her thoughts by stating, “There would actually be no difference [in my teaching approach] than if you would have walked into my classroom any other day. I usually know when my evaluator comes in within a certain time frame.” The variety of approaches and experiences appear to be similar regardless of teaching level from the interviewee sample.

Some individuals were dissatisfied with their observation procedures. Kara felt pessimistic towards the unannounced drop-ins, especially if they occurred during classes with behavioral issues:

It could be any day, any time, within a three-week period. When you got stuck with class moving at the pace of a snail, because you're dealing with behavior, after behavior, after behavior. Then [the evaluator] comes in, and they just walk in [unannounced], and you instantly get a knot in your stomach thinking ‘Oh, this is the class you're coming to?’ So you already feel defeated, and you haven't even opened your mouth to say welcome to the class.

Carl took issue with the timing of his observations. He stated:

It's kind of difficult, I'm pretty sure I was the last one to get evaluated. Both evaluations almost came right during gameplay at the end the year [and semester].

It seems like both times I've been evaluated, it's been under abnormal circumstances for my classroom.”

These few experiences highlight some teachers that might not necessarily represent the entire group of physical educators in this study. However, their experiences should be documented and portrayed for accuracy purposes to highlight both ends of the observation spectrum for physical educators.

Physical Education Observation Ability

Embedded within evaluation observations is an administrator's ability to accurately observe physical education. This topic was often discussed and many of the educators examined their concerns of an evaluator's ability to properly evaluate. When asked if his principal could accurately evaluate him in physical education, Dan disagreed, "She knows what I tell her, and that's about as far as it goes. She doesn't know what she's looking at. She could come in and look at the worst PE teacher ever and might not even realize it." Neil described some of the aspects he was looking for in a quality elementary evaluation by saying:

If my discipline wasn't good, I would like to see and hear some corrections or possibilities to be better if my organization wasn't good. A principal, who was a former classroom teacher, doesn't understand organization of PE. Sometimes as you walk in a gym, it looks like unorganized chaos.

Jen agreed with this thought by stating:

I think it's hard for a person that has not been in physical education to be able to evaluate a physical education teacher because so much is going on that they're not aware of or don't understand. You and I both know kids come to us from a wide range of backgrounds and it's hard for [evaluators] to sit there and not understand why they're not all doing the same thing.

These educators struggled with the idea of an unqualified administrator evaluating them in a high stakes setting, especially with their merit pay and job security at risk.

Further discussing concerns of the untrained eye, Kurt stated that "Literally we have windows outside our gym. If you're a novice walking by and look into the gym,

you're thinking, 'what's this guy doing? Are they having recess?' It's not recess people, it's not called gym class; we're educators." Kurt followed these comments with additional thoughts on his administrator's lack of understanding in elementary physical education and how it relates to growth as an educator. He said:

To be quite honest I feel our content area is a little bit out of our administration's expertise. I think he lacks the ability to help me progress in my teaching craft.

Mostly because I don't think he knows how to teach PE. I think he truly appreciates what he sees, but he doesn't know how to cultivate and teach me how to get better or lead me to get better.

Marty expressed similar concerns in the elementary school he teaches in by stating:

In my experience, when the evaluators come in, I'm being evaluated by someone that has never taught PE, who has never been in a physical education situation or classroom, unless they were in the classes back when they were students. When they're coming in, and I never know what they're looking really for. Maybe just general guidelines as to whether there's good classroom control, acceptable behavior, and whether lesson plans are being followed, things like that.

Tara had experience with her high school evaluator's inability to properly observe PE, stating, "We have a [teacher] in our building that has no business still teaching. He doesn't really do his job, and [evaluators] don't know what they're supposed to be looking for or what a P.E. teacher's supposed to be doing." Unfortunately, continuing the thoughts of others related to administrator's observation abilities, Nathan's high school had individuals who took advantage of their situation. He said:

I hate to say it, but I know colleagues game it and put on a show, I know [a few] colleagues come in and are a super teacher when they get evaluated and if an administrator isn't closely watching and doing walk-throughs like they really should do, then, [the teachers aren't] doing anything.

On a personal level, Nathan also struggled with the inexperience of a PE evaluator, explaining:

I had another administrator not too many years ago, who was younger and had a math background and he was pretty linear, pretty black and white. I'll be blunt; he was the one that made me do two [full length evaluations] because he couldn't see everything he wanted to see in the first one.

Clearly, many of the educators struggled with their administrator's knowledge and ability to properly observe in the gymnasium.

While a majority of the educators struggled with their administrator's PE observation abilities, there were some teachers who had positive experiences. High school teacher Grace thought, "I do feel that [evaluators accurately evaluate PE]. Our administrators know what's going on, if you're doing what you're supposed to be doing, and if you're not. I think our administration has a good hold on what we're doing." Trent, teaching in an elementary setting, was optimistic for the upcoming year, "This year we actually have a new principal who has a PE background, so I that might help me out with the teacher evaluations, because he'll know kind of what to look for without talking to me because he's been in the field." Similarly, Carl said:

The principal was actually a PE major before he got his administrator's license, so he has a lot of valuable feedback for me, which was wonderful. You don't

normally get that. I thought [the administration] understood PE on a different level than most places. From that standpoint I've been very, very lucky.

Bob also responded regarding his experiences, "My evaluator was a guy that's taught Health and P.E. for over 10 years before he went into administration. He gave obviously some good feedback." Lydia also felt that her elementary administrator was up to the evaluation task regardless of her or his background. She explained her positive experiences:

Yes [evaluators accurately assess teachers]. I always like to put myself in other people's shoes, and I feel if you're an evaluator, you usually can tell what the teacher strengths and weaknesses are. The evaluators we've had have been through training and are prepared to accurately assess all subjects.

These individuals had a positive outlook on their evaluator's ability to properly observe physical education. It appears those educators who had the best experiences tended to have administrators with a physical education, health, or coaching background while others felt that an administrator would be able to view and understand good teaching regardless of the teaching environment. This component was very important in determining whether or not a physical educator had a quality observation experience.

Theme Summary

The process theme is an important component in gaining further insight and understanding the experiences of teacher evaluations for physical educators. This is especially true in terms of the models used, student learning impact, and observations incorporated along the way. An important finding was that many physical educators in this study questioned their evaluators' ability to accurately observe them in an active

setting. The information from these subthemes set the foundation for teachers to prepare and plan for evaluation in the present setting and climate.

Theme Two: Teacher Evaluation Preparations

This theme analyzes the preparation physical educators apply based on their understanding and execution of their teacher evaluations. Physical educators provided comparisons of former evaluation experiences relative to the current system. Additionally, educators discussed their planning and the impact evaluations have on teaching. Finally, physical educators described the amount of input and involvement they had in their student learning measurement development. Subthemes include: Former Evaluations, Planning, and Teacher Test Input.

Former Evaluations

Prior to discussing teacher preparations made for the current evaluation environment, physical educators discussed their previous evaluation experiences prior to the state mandates. Many of the interviewees felt their former evaluations were lacking and absent of any real substance. Tara felt that:

The old evaluations were almost too basic in a sense. At my previous school there were two guys who taught 30 plus years, and on the old system they were only evaluated maybe once every three years. There was no pressure to do something [worthwhile and valuable] every day.

She followed with thoughts from her high school teaching experience: “Sometimes in P.E. they almost based it off injury. If you go injury-free for the year, it's been a good year.” Discussing his experiences teaching in high school, Michael stated, “Before [the new evaluation system], PE kind of got away with anything and were able to do whatever they

wanted.” Jordan, whose perspective was that of an elementary teacher, echoed similar comments, “The principal would come in and they'd evaluate what you need to work on. After year ten, I didn't have anybody walking in my classes. I haven't had anyone in my classroom evaluating me for 20 to 25 years.” Finally, teaching in a K-12 setting, Dan indicated that in the past, “you'd go through the evaluation process about every 4 or 5 years. That's not enough.”

Describing his past evaluations, Travis stated, “There's been times [in the past] when the principal came for an observation and was gone in ten minutes like ‘you're fine, I'm out of here, you've been doing this long enough.’” Jen felt similarly, saying:

The old evaluation system was horrible. In the old one, the principals would sometimes come in, often not, and then would fill out either meets expectations or doesn't on a ten item checklist. I think [evaluations occurred] once every three years, so that was quite a bit different.

Marty felt his elementary administrators entrusted veteran teachers. He communicated, “Whereas before, the principals had their finger on the pulse of the staff, and they knew who was doing a very good job with the students, and weren't as concerned about the experienced teachers because they trusted them.” Nathan suggested that younger teachers might be more prepared than the older generation. He said:

I feel like the younger generation, if they've gone through a good preparation program, seems to have a little better footing than some of us older folk who knew what it was like before, because it's all they know.

While some of the views differed from each other, former evaluations appeared to be less stressful or impactful, although also less effective, on educators' ability to plan and implement lessons for their students.

Planning

Interviewees also discussed the planning changes related to the new state evaluative mandates. Changes described included thorough documentation of student data and making pertinent information such as objectives visible in the classroom. These two changes were quite evident, especially in light of their experiences with former evaluations. Regardless of teaching level, many teachers felt little to no change concerning their planning. Grace explained her high school teaching by stating:

Do I think it's [my teaching] changed anything drastically? Absolutely not. The only real change is probably just the documentation because that takes time.

You're taking extra time to pre and posttest. That's kind of a pain sometimes, but again, it's something that has to be done.

Anne agreed with the notion by saying, "like I said, I didn't really change much of anything" regarding her planning. Sookhen stated that other than the modernization of switching from paper to electronic that "No, not a lot has changed. I still go to work with the same passion that I had before." Carl felt his preparations were consistent regardless of the evaluation day. He said, "I'm not one to put on performances, so I typically did the same type of thing I would do on a daily basis anyhow."

Changes

While many of the teachers felt little to no change regarding their class preparations, others were aware of changes and impact to their planning. Kurt recognized this notion in his elementary teaching by stating:

I think [teacher evaluation] definitely makes me more cognizant of it now. I feel like I'm on my toes more not knowing if they're going to be in my classroom or not. It's not announced, the short ones. But I don't know if I ever had a problem with it. I guess I'm more alert than before and maybe a little bit more planned.

Bob, teaching in a K-12 capacity, noticed some extra work leading up to the new school year. "It's stressful, you're putting your SLO together at the beginning of the year because it's a pile of paperwork and as busy as teachers are, it is time-consuming." He followed with comments about the pressure of receiving a quality evaluation score, stating:

You can't afford not to make sure every kid is reaching their goals every single day because you've got to show what they learned and how they've grown or your evaluation to receive your raise. You've got to make sure you're at your best every single day and not settling for good in your classroom, but making yourself a great teacher."

Jordan recognized the value of increasing his elementary planning; "I think it sharpened me up a little on certain aspects of what I do and maybe some time management. I think I get more out of the half hour now than I did five or six years ago." In this instance, Jordan was able to maximize his contact time and increase the value when interacting with students in class. Prior to the new evaluation implementation, Travis' high school helped prepare teachers for the evaluation transitions. He said, "We spent a lot of time

getting ready for [teacher evaluations]. Our school said we have two years so we're going to use it wisely to plan and get ready. I feel well-versed in it and am pretty comfortable." Reflection was a component that Jason recognized as supporting his preparations. He stated, "Our evaluation is pretty good. It makes you really reflect and is more of a tool used to make you a better teacher. It makes you look at weaknesses and strengths and figure out a goal to improve weaknesses."

It appears these educators recognized improvements from the updated evaluations and some of the positive impacts made on teacher preparations. These educators appeared to value the updates and the potential increase in accountability to help hone their teaching craft.

Teacher Test Input

The physical educators in this study had a unique opportunity compared to their core subject counterparts. Almost all physical educators interviewed participated in the development or choice of evaluation used in their student learning objectives (SLOs), whereas core teachers are subject to standardized testing to document student learning. The importance relates to the SLO portion or percentage that is taken into account within a teacher evaluation score. The scores or ratings translate to their level of effectiveness, and for most educators, their bonus or raise connected to the evaluations that take place. For example, Neil said, "I get to pick which class I want to use to show improvement. So what I do is test all those classes, and the class that has the most improvement, that's the one I pick for my evaluation." Neil had a distinct advantage in surveying his entire elementary classes to find the class with the most improvement. This set him up for success for an effective evaluation related to the SLO component. Sookhen stated, "With

my corporation, the administration allowed the other PE teachers and me to come together and decide what our student learning objectives are.” Having similar experiences as the previously mentioned elementary teachers, Lydia recognized the privilege of her circumstances:

We cover all of the standards, but we were given the wand to say that this is what we’re covering and this is what our students need to achieve in order for us to evaluate them, so I’m very fortunate and lucky that our corporation approached us about that rather than saying this is what your testing on.

Grace’s high school was also able to choose their student-learning objectives, and her department chose to group students into high and low groups. She said:

What you're really concentrating on is your low group; you want to see improvement with that group. Of course you want them all to improve, but you're looking at the low group and trying to get them to work harder and be at an increased level.

Sookhen was very mindful of the integrity of playing a role of being involved in the development of an SLO for his evaluation. He said:

All of these P.E. Teachers I work with have integrity. We mark the people down but there is an opportunity to cheat on that if you wanted to. I wouldn't do it because I don't think it's the right thing to do, and also you would be in some serious trouble, but it could be done. But you have to trust them. [Schools] hired these people and you think they're good at their job and they have integrity, so you don't have to worry about it.

Dan disapproved of the involvement physical educators have in creating SLOs. He felt the involvement discredited the profession by stating:

We get to create our own tests, which oddly some teachers could be biased and make that test easier to pass. Whereas other teachers are required to use ISTEP scores or ECAs, and we kind of look like a joke as [physical] educators that way because they don't have a test for us [PE Creates the test in this corporation].

Bob contrasted Dan's thoughts and was more optimistic concerning PE teacher involvement. He said:

We actually get to make our own test up. It allows for what I feel should be tested on as far as content is concerned, because I feel as a classroom teacher, you know your students best, not some state mandated that test will try to tell you whether they learned or not.

With a variety of opinions surrounding the topic of teacher input, there is a potential conflict of interest surrounding the creation of student learning outcomes, especially relative to other subjects within a school corporation. Currently, physical educators are able to influence SLOs by having a hand in either the creation or selection of student data used in their evaluations. This is unique to other core subjects. In both teaching levels, some educators recognized the benefits while other struggled with the approach and credibility to the profession.

It should be noted that while most educators had input in their SLO development, three of the 22 teachers did not participate in creating SLO for their evaluations. Neither Trent nor Michael's school corporations used student-learning components in their

teacher evaluations, and Kara's corporation used an entirely different evaluation system that chose not to incorporate student learning into the evaluation equation.

Theme Summary

Teacher preparations were an important theme in identifying perceptions of physical educators as they navigated the evaluative process. Comparisons of former evaluations were made, which helped educators understand the changes and updates from past to present. Additionally, evaluation planning highlighted some of the changes that occurred in the new system. The ability to provide input for a portion of physical education evaluations stood out as a noncore subject variation to the traditional evaluation model implementation. The level of educator preparedness provides insight on necessary steps required to successfully approach the evaluation observations, both for future and current professionals.

Theme Three: Physical Education is Unique

Physical education, while included in most school curricula, is a unique subject. It is the only subject that explicitly addresses the psychomotor domain and takes place in an active setting, which is typically a gymnasium. Students are also cognitively learning fitness concepts, rules, and strategies while navigating class affectively and cooperatively working together at various times as well. Information included in this theme demonstrates the idiosyncratic environment in which physical educators teach in, as well as other external uncontrollable factors that impact classes. The treatment of physical education in represented corporations is also discussed. Subthemes include Contextual Factors and Physical Education Status.

Contextual Factors

Multiple interviewees considered contextual factors in their discussions.

Contextual factors are defined as characteristics that facilitate or inhibit student learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). These include both controllable and uncontrollable factors, such as student characteristics, time, space, and the evaluation differences in physical education compared to all other subjects.

Student Characteristics

Many of the physical educators, who base their student-learning component on student fitness scores, recognized the uncontrollable factors that played a role in their students' lives. In the elementary, Neil poignantly noted, "I'm banking that they feel good that day. That they've had breakfast. That they didn't have an argument with their mom or dad before they came to school. If they got a good night's sleep." Lydia painted an even bleaker scenario, stating that policy makers should visit and interact with the schools that are impacted by their laws and regulations. She said:

I know they hear about them, but I think they really need to feel the stories about your kids that come in the classroom who moved in the middle of the night because something happened at their house, between either their parents or their relatives, and they got kicked out on the street at like midnight, because grandma threw them out of the house and threw their things on the front porch and here they are trying to get ready for school. Or my kids who don't have beds, they sleep on the couch, why are they so tired when they get up in the morning, it's because somebody at their house was watching TV until two o'clock in the

morning and, in their so called bedroom. So I think they need to be more aware of today's societal kids.

These teachers highlight some of the uncontrollable student characteristics that all educators might face depending on their individual school locations.

Continuing the discussion on contextual factors, Jason, Marty, and Bob discussed the impact of socioeconomic statuses on various students. Specifically, Jason verbalized:

The unfortunate thing that I see is that in our situation is that we have close to 65% reduced/free lunch. These are kids that are coming from poor backgrounds, maybe other kinds of families that are struggling; these students are looking for an opportunity. I think we were able to provide those opportunities as part of their PE experience, because it's been proven by all kinds of [research] that when you participate in sports, your brain activity increases. It's worthwhile.

Marty's corporation had a small percentage of free and reduced lunch percentages, however; he said, "My wife teaches in an urban school system, she deals with a student population about seventy percent free lunch program, that's quite a difference in terms of students." Similarly, Bob had a friend who taught in an urban setting in the state:

It was the only job he could get. That's a tough gig down there and he had a couple of low [evaluation] marks a couple of years in a row and he was let go. It's unfortunate that it's such a high-stakes game now because you want kids to succeed and learn, but there are some kids out there that sometimes, in extreme circumstances, aren't really reachable. Students don't know they're part of your evaluation even though they are, they're a great portion of it.

These examples of the role socioeconomic status plays demonstrate the potential impact on students' abilities within an active arena such as physical education.

Other educators discussed contextual factors further. Kara's school dealt with multiple uncontrollable factors: "We get students that are very transient who come in one day, leave three weeks later, and come back in six weeks. I mean literally everything you read in the news is what's happening at that school." Kara's situation showed how students can move in and out of a school corporation throughout the year, which can be disruptive to content delivery and activity time for physical educators. Grace recognized another component of the psychomotor domain that physical educators have no control over, stating, "We certainly are not in control of nutrition and diet."

Both Neil and Rick recognized an uncontrollable student characteristic in the elementary setting. Related to fitness testing, student in the elementary are growing and maturing due to their ages. Rick explained, "The growth factor helps me. Kids grow and they get stronger, so their times get faster. The beauty for my job is that I'm always going to have some pretty good increases every year, every semester." Likewise, Neil conveyed that his posttest occurs in late spring: "Maybe they're a little more mature, which means maybe in April or May, even, they are a little more stronger. Maybe they're playing sports all fall and winter; there's a lot of variables that could help to show improvement."

These two individuals both expressed the importance of developing and implementing lessons with high levels of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity, yet also understood the outside factors that could contribute and potentially assist them in their student learning data collection. Student growth highlighted one of the few times where elementary teachers face different circumstances than their high school peers. Other

factors, such as transient students, socioeconomic status, and nutritional diets, are designated student characteristics.

Contact Time

Another contextual factor considered by the educators that differed between elementary and high school was contact time and class length. Both Jen and Bob were happy with their elementary teaching opportunities to educate students within their separate corporations. Bob stated, “Fortunately for me, I’m at a place where the elementary embraces it. Every student has P.E. twice a week so that’s kind of nice because they’re getting activity.” Similarly, Jen’s students “have PE more than once a week. Once again, we have an awesome superintendent, so our school system really is visionary and continues to look forward and realizes that body movement plays a role in academic performance.” On the opposite end of the spectrum, other elementary educators struggled with the lack of contact time or class length. Neil said, “Let’s get real. Half an hour a week? And that’s if there’s no complications. No snow days, no holidays, no field trips, and that’s if a student’s not absent.” Lydia described her scenario in more detail:

We only get our kids once a week for half an hour. So if you’re specifically testing two standards, you only have them nine times in one quarter. But really, if they have a Monday class you only have them seven times or eight times, and there could be a field trip or they could be absent another day, so some of the kids you only have six times for half an hour. And you can teach them a lot of things, but there are certain things that you can’t teach them in a half an hour, for six times per quarter.

Marty stated he is “trying to rate students on their physical performance, yet we're not giving students enough time to do or learn anything.” The elementary teachers recognized a disadvantage with their contact time and class length; especially regarding their ability to effectively help students improve in their fitness testing. Meanwhile, these scores contributed to teachers’ observation evaluation scores, and for many, their bonus money tied to evaluations.

Space Availability

Other educators recognized how PE teachers need to be extremely flexible in a school setting. Eva explained, “there are days when we have a pep session, so we can’t be in the gym. Or you can’t have your gym because we’re setting up for a concert or a show.” Tara also had similar thoughts on availability of space. She said:

We have had issues about respect to our space, having students just come down to and walk in the gym, teachers writing passes for kids to come to the gym for us to babysit, and using our gym space for testing. We've actually had the maintenance crew just show up and start fixing the lights in the gym. They didn't even ask if we needed the gym or not, and then told us to get out. In that respect, they don't see the gym as our classroom. They don't. We always say P.E. people have to be the most flexible.”

Anne echoed these comments by stating, “You need to be flexible, especially in PE. Sometimes [administrators will] come in and say, ‘someone needs the gym today.’” These high school teachers described scenes familiar to physical educators, who need to be flexible and adapt lessons to various class settings depending on gym availability, weather, or other space issues that might occur during the academic year.

Evaluation Differences: Physical Education in a Unique Setting

Most of the educators recognized that due to the setting and location of observations, which is typically a gymnasium, evaluations tend to look and feel differently than in other subjects. Tara summarized by saying, “Our classroom is a very different environment. Most administrators’ experience is in the traditional classroom, so they’re not even sure what they’re supposed to even be looking for.” Trent explained other differences: “I had to be creative when I looked on PE side of things because I’m not in the classroom, so what different things might apply to PE as far as what my evaluation is looking for.” To this similar point Travis admitted, “it’s difficult. [My administrator] really wanted to do my health class because he thought it would be easier than to [evaluate] in the gym.” He continued:

Evaluations seem to be geared more for core subjects and I don’t know how to change it, because were not paper and pencil or desk or classroom. A lot of the terms used are classroom and notes driven and it’s like are you kidding me right now. This doesn’t apply.

Interestingly, Carl viewed the evaluation differences in a unique and positive perspective. He explained:

I think PE gives me the opportunity to have some of the freedom from the microscopic management. I think there’s a little less of a big hand on top of me telling me what to do and how to do things. It is one of the biggest positives of being in this position. I’ve had teachers say, ‘Man, I just wish I could be in your shoes right now,’ especially around testing time.

These perspectives from physical educators at both teaching levels helped illustrate some of the differences experienced in the gymnasium compared to a classroom.

To provide perspective in terms of limited contact time for physical educators, Neil provided the following example for teaching a different subject in a classroom in comparison to physical education:

I always tell my classroom teacher peers, 'Okay, here's what I want you to do. I want you to teach math for half an hour a week. That's all. Just half an hour a week, and then I want you to show improvement. I want you to show me how much they improve on their math skills. Realistically, could that be done?' I think not. If an administrator said, 'Okay you have a half hour a week, you have what you have, now work with what you've got.' Figure out how you can show improvement. Well, okay. Realistically, you don't run a marathon by running a half an hour each week or working out once a week.

Kurt explained his thoughts on the evaluation differences administrators face in a school environment:

I feel like the evaluation process is more geared towards classroom teachers and not physical education. I feel [evaluators] do an okay job but I just don't think it's specialized enough for physical education. It's definitely difficult. PE and the core subjects, they're different animals. Assessing them is two different assessments.

My administrator's got a tough job.

These perspectives demonstrated some of the evaluation differences and challenges physical educators face relative to their classroom peers.

Eva had a unique experience as a former classroom teacher who converted to a PE teacher later in her career. She was used to classroom management in a formal classroom setting, where students sit quietly in desks and interact as directed. Eva explained further:

Teaching alone was very tough my first year teaching PE, and for the administrators who evaluate us, I don't think they've ever taught in the PE classroom. Discipline is very different because a lot of it is prevention within the regular classroom where the kids know what to expect in the classroom, you put them into a gym and they go wild. And, we try to structure that into organized chaos.

Rick recognized some of the issues related to evaluation differences in physical education, and described his school's evaluations:

The process in our school is really a blanket program where the evaluation is set up more for a classroom setting. It's kind of hard for physical educators to meet a lot of their domains. I think [all subjects] needs to be treated equally overall, it just can't be certain [core subjects]. Currently, I think that's unfair, especially for a physical educator.

Rick felt the unique setting and content in physical education differed enough to place the subject at a disadvantage compared to teachers in traditional classroom subjects. In contrast, Jordan enjoyed the flexibility to help his students develop by stating, "I think PE is different, again I think for me it benefits [as far as evaluations], because we probably work a little bit more [to help students develop skills]." Jordan took advantage of this difference and applied this opportunity to set his students up for success in his classroom.

Dan was critical on the perception his subject received compared to lessons taught in a traditional classroom setting. He responded:

Classroom teachers tell me, 'I should have done what you've done. I mean, you just get to go play all day.' They don't realize that I don't have the students sitting in front of me at a desk the entire time. I have them up, they're moving, they're throwing things around, and they're not always in front of me because they're getting dressed in the locker. There's a different kind of stress involved being a PE teacher versus English or math where they're sitting in front of you.

Furthermore, while reflecting on PE teachers' involvement of their test creation, Dan communicated "some teachers are going to make a test [students] can easily pass and it's a joke to me when other teachers are required to do ISTEP. Teachers look down on PE teachers anyway, that's a hell of a problem." Dan's experiences highlight a potentially problematic scenario where teachers aiming for the same bonus money compare evaluations, and where negative feelings can diminish collegiality.

The various characteristics described help physical educators identify differences from their evaluations relative to other subjects. While some administrators were able to successfully navigate evaluations in physical education, many lacked the necessary skillset according to the physical educators interviewed. Evaluations were created with the classroom and core subjects in mind, and the majority of interviewees felt this placed physical education at a disadvantage.

Physical Education Status

Physical educators commented on the status of the subject within the schools and corporations they teach. Interviewees were essentially divided into two different camps:

those who felt positive and equal to their peers and those who had negative experiences within their schools.

Positive Status

When asked if PE was treated any differently compared to other subjects, Rick stated “none, whatsoever.” Similarly, Trent explained, “the administration treat everybody the same. PE doesn’t have state tests but I’m in the building, I’m helping the students by exercising and activating their brains, so I’m part of the piece that helps with the state scores.” Kara acknowledged the content transition in her classes and thought:

We're moving in the right direction. I think PE has become more of a wellness health and PE as a whole versus sport-oriented, which is nice. I think the shift from learning all the rules of the sport has transitioned, and I can only speak for my district, but has transitioned into more lifelong skills.

Anne summarized the status of PE well, commenting, “It really depends on your administration's attitude toward how important the subject is. I think we're all here we're all treated the exactly the same.” Of the 10 high school interviewees, the only teacher to respond positively when asked if PE was treated any differently than other subjects was Grace, who said, “not at all.” Grace felt her subject area was treated like every other school subject, which created an equal playing field. The other physical educators who had positive experiences regarding equal school status were all elementary teachers. This is possibly due to the increased interactions and collegiality elementary teachers have with one another. One example of elementary interactions includes classroom teachers dropping off and picking up students for physical education, whereas students in a high school setting travel from subject to subject unsupervised. Other shared interactions and

time spent together includes recess, lunch, or bus duties, which are typically only elementary roles. Positive physical education status was one of the few instances where teacher experiences appeared to vary by teaching level.

Negative Status

Conversely, many educators had more challenging experiences regarding physical education status. Travis, teaching in the high school setting, had a variety of thoughts on the issue. In his current setting, he expressed, “to be honest, they wouldn't give us the time of day. We don't see administration unless something stupid happens [concerning safety]. I think PE is under appreciated, undervalued. We're looked at as babysitters and recess time.” Commenting further on status related to parents, he commented:

Parents don't see the value of it, and I think a lot of it has to do with their experiences in PE and how their PE classes were. It's changed; it's not 1985 PE class anymore, we're working on fitness components and lifelong learning activities. If parents were on board, that would fix everything.

In a similar thought and using her experience as a former classroom teacher, Eva mentioned:

When I moved from the classroom to PE, I noticed the respect that you got from students and parents was very different. I taught a subject where all the parents were very supportive and wanted to talk during parent teacher conferences. But students need to pass two PE classes to graduate just like other subjects, and I had parents flat-out tell me ‘it doesn't matter, it's only PE’, now because of my unique perspective that kind of makes my blood boil.

While both Eva and Travis expressed concerns from a high school level, Dan struggled with the lack of respect for not only physical education, but for all other “specials” classes. He said of his K-12 experiences:

We're just a way for classroom teachers to get a break. That's really all specials teachers are there for, at least how we kind of feel around here. The specials are the first things to always go. We're in a budget crunch here; it's a small school. We're not [large school A or B], so our budget continues to get cut and the first thing they're talking about cutting next year is elementary specials. It's just a shame.

These educators lacked professional support from their individual school experiences, which can adversely affect morale and productivity in the workplace. Unfortunately for these physical educators, their experiences were not unique.

Continuing thoughts on low status in physical education, Marty described his elementary setting and stated, “As far as what our corporation provides, I don't think they're really concerned about us right now. They have other things on their agenda. I don't see them supporting our discipline.” Tara was critical in her thoughts, responding, “P.E. is constantly downgraded. The integrity is always challenged. That's just where we're at; people are constantly looking how to cut it.” While not as condemning, Carl recognized and observed “PE is one of the least overseen subjects aside from Art and Music, at least in our corporation.” In a reflective approach related to physical education status, Michael felt the subject area has suffered from teaching approaches in the past. He said:

I would say [PE treated differently than other subjects], although there are probably some people who'd never openly admit it. I think you'll always have that; everybody feels their subject area is better than the others. PE has a bad rap and a lot of it is because of what teachers were doing for years. Current teachers didn't have good PE experiences when they were in school, and they assume that's still going on.

In a similar vein, Joel summarized his thoughts using a quotation from a movie:

There's a line from Jack Black in School of Rock that says 'those who can't do teach, and those who can't teach, teach P.E.' At the end of the day, we're really trying to make that change from the past and promote what we're adding to our classes. It still comes down to the ongoing, lingering [identity] over the decades.

Thoughtful summaries and reflections such as these highlight some of the lingering issues physical education teachers experience both past and present.

Theme Summary

As described by the physical educators in this study, physical education is a unique subject within the school setting. Overall, the variety and range of contextual factors plays a large role in a physical educator's effectiveness not only in the gymnasium, but in evaluations as well. These factors include student characteristics, contact time, space availability, and evaluation differences in a physical education setting. The educators in this study recognized a variety of differences that physical education faces in the evaluation environment, and the teachers were quite aware of their status within individual corporations. Evaluations are designed for classroom subjects, and most of the physical educators were marginalized are relegated to low school status in some manner.

Theme Four: Administration/Evaluators

This theme focuses on the role and impact administration play in a physical educator's evaluation experience. As the primary evaluator, administrators are key players in evaluation. The development of trust and support, or lack thereof largely falls on the school building principal. Additionally, thoughts and experiences relating to evaluation subjectivity were expressed, as well as the communication between both parties concerning evaluation. Subthemes include: Trust and Support, Subjectivity, and Communication.

Trust and Support

Trust and support are key components to any job or profession. Administrators, as leaders in education, face a balancing act of traditional job requirements and tasks within the extra burden of Indiana's current state mandates on the teacher evaluation process. The climate administrators create, as discussed by the physical educators, plays a large role in a teacher's acceptance or rejection of the evaluation system. Anne responded, "the current principal looks for things that we're doing right, to highlight them and talks about to us about how we can improve what we're doing. Which is what an evaluation should be, in my mind." She continued, "It's key as to how the administrator handles evaluations. In all my years of teaching, this has been the most informative evaluation system that we've used, as far as helping you to be a better teacher."

Comparatively, Grace agreed with the idea of Anne's sentiment and explained, "we're a close group of faculty members, we know we have the support of our administrators. It makes for a lot better working environment, for sure." Sookhen,

agreeing with the previous two high school teachers, echoed similar thoughts from an elementary teacher perspective by stating his thoughts about trust:

It's huge. If you don't trust your boss, it's a real problem. What [the administration] tell me all the time is that 'we hired you because we like what you bring to the table. We see you all the time do your job, so this is no different.' So I never really feel sweated or worried about it.

These examples emphasize the positive influence an administrator can have on a school setting, regardless of teaching level.

Lack of Support

While many of the physical educators felt supported by their administration, others described situations where trust was somewhat to completely lacking. Kurt described his elementary school involving conflicting opinions. He said, "My principal's supportive of PE and he'll tell you face-to-face that he loves the subject. But if his arms were tied, I don't know if he would fight for PE because that's not what the state looks at." Dan, who teaches at multiple buildings in a K-12 setting, had an interesting situation of balancing between multiple evaluators. He explained, "Last year, my administrator at the [first building] told me that I had to do [my evaluation] at the [second building], and I had to remind her that we're allowed to choose whichever building we want." When asked why he thought the exchange occurred, he replied, "Because she didn't want to mess with me is what it basically boils down to. She said that she does more evaluations than the other principal, and I should do it there, so there's a little bit of contention."

Kara described a grim meeting her corporation had at the beginning of the state mandates. The entire corporation met for in-service meetings prior to the beginning of the

academic year, where she explained, “The [superintendent] in our district-wide meeting from the very beginning, and it was repeated to us year after year that, either jump aboard the train or get off the tracks [concerning evaluation implementation].” She described further, “At my school, they were putting their thumb on you and I just never understand why you'd want to make it look like your coworkers don't know what they're doing.”

Further highlighting a lack of support and trust, three physical educators were passed over on even being evaluated once throughout an entire academic year. The most egregious example was that of high school teacher Joel, who communicated:

The first year was [the principal] literally coming in the last day of school and saying ‘Hey, I observed you right after I observed Seth. Wink, wink.’ And sign off with the idea. That’s how it was going to be, so that’s all supposed to be complicit with those [mandates] and they are not making it work. Their duty is to take the time to make that happen.

Jason, who teaches in an elementary setting, faced a similar experience by voicing his irritation: “My biggest frustration was last year I when I was supposed to be observed, but no one ever came in at all, which is fine. It just makes me feel like he doesn't care.” Furthermore, he stated:

It’s also frustrating because I'm the gym teacher and just because I teach gym, he doesn't care or have time for it. I've chosen to think that it's because I know what I'm doing and that he trusts me, (Laughter) but I don't know if that's realistic.

Finally, Trent experienced the same situation, saying “last year I was actually observed zero times, so when it came to the end of the year evaluation, how can my principal see that I did certain things without even coming in to my gym?” He followed with,

I think that's why a lot of people complain because a lot of people who scored as proficient or developing and they weren't evaluated. At the end of the year, nothing moved or changed on my evaluation scores.

One has to wonder if the evaluators in these scenarios value physical education, if they were lazy, or perhaps even good friends with the educators.

Providing a contrasting view yet also having the opportunity to be observed, Marty described lack of support by stating that the new state mandates impact schools:

We're treated like they don't trust us anymore to do the right thing. I guess that's the biggest frustration is that they lump everybody in the one category and make us do all these things, like paperwork [and documentation] to try and create an evaluation to see if you're teaching correctly.

These individuals demonstrate the negative aspect of an administrator's inability to garner trust and support from her or his staff.

Administrator Demand

Many of the physical educators recognized the arduous task administrators faced when the mandates were handed down. Jason said, "The thing I'm more concerned with is the time [administrators] have to spend than what it does to me. I don't feel sorry for me as much as I do the administrators who have to do all the evaluations." Sookhen felt that administrators were overworked in terms of volume of evaluations. "I think [administrators] have ton of evaluations to do. They're doing roughly forty to sixty long evaluations a year." Tara felt that the current system is quality versus quantity. She stated "this is quantity over quality." Grace concluded with "it's putting a lot on our administrators that are busy enough, I don't think they need all that extra time

[concerning all the full evaluations].” While there are many challenges educators face with evaluations, the time administrators dedicate was not lost on the physical education teachers.

The contrast of teaching environments from both sides of trust and support demonstrate the importance these educators place on the issue. While of high importance, Travis provides great perspective by commenting on how patience is necessary in this ever-changing evaluation cycle: “The administration is pretty patient with us because they’re on a learning curve too. As of now, everyone is patient with each other, so I have no complaints yet because we’re all getting along at it. How about that?”

Subjectivity of Teacher Evaluation

Subjectivity in evaluations was another subtheme that emerged through the data analysis of administrations. The participants in this study recognized that administrators, as powerful socializing agents, might be biased and evaluate individuals for who they are as people as opposed to their teaching ability. Additionally, they felt subjectivity could occur between subjects or within observations as well. Dan teaches in a smaller community and works in multiple buildings as a K-12 physical educator. He was candid in his thoughts, stating:

Evaluation scores from school to school are just so skewed, because you have different administrators who aren't properly trained in evaluating teachers. It's a joke to me. Especially here in a small community, everybody knows everybody, so to have your principal that's probably your friend coming in to evaluate you, you can't tell me that there's not going to be a little bit of leniency there as

compared to a teacher that's not from the area or somebody you might have a problem with.

Trent was in agreement by communicating that his elementary school's evaluation system is "effective but it can also be pretty biased too." Neil thought along the same lines as the others by asking:

Does the evaluator like you? If it comes down to where a principal just doesn't really like you, I wonder how much that plays in the evaluation? And vice versa, if my principal thinks I'm the greatest, and I'm not the greatest, but I get free pass by receiving a high evaluation, I just wonder how accurate that is compared to other teachers who do a really good job and maybe the principal doesn't like them very much, or they don't believe in the same philosophies, or maybe it's a teacher that bucks the system. This happened at our school. We have a kindergarten teacher who I thought was absolutely outstanding, and she got put on probation and I think it came down to the principal didn't like her.

These are powerful quotes that highlight some of the potential subjectivity issues experienced from physical educators across the state. Anne, teaching in a high school setting, summarized many of the educators' thoughts by stating, "the administrator that is doing the evaluation is a huge part of it. How your administrator approaches it is key to making it a good system or a bad system."

Other educators had general thoughts related to subjectivity of administrators' approach to teacher evaluations. Eva said that her administrators "are doing a decent job, they try and keep us informed, but it's frustrating because there is some bias in there, and it's not a cut and dry." Rick took exception with the timing of the informal evaluations,

which he felt detracted from the opportunity to receive a fair observation. He said, “I think they see enough and do enough and that's good, but what I don't like about the informal observations that don't show the whole picture. For instance, I had one evaluator come in the day before Christmas break.” In this particular instance, he received lower scores in what he perceived as a timing issue related to the last day of the semester, as opposed to his actual teaching ability.

In yet another form of subjectivity, Joel recognized the differences in observations between subjects:

When talking to other department leaders and to hear how different their evaluations process is different than ours, I'm concerned across the board in different disciplines that there is a great deal of difference with how they are evaluated. We're putting evaluations in and putting dollars next to it, I think that's a major concern.

Finally, Jordan hoped for more objective evaluations within physical education. He offered a potential resolution within the subject by stating, “The only issue as PE teachers is that we don't all have the same evaluator. I've suggested that an evaluator observes my class, she should do all P.E. teachers at the elementary level so you're comparing apples to apples.” Subjectivity appears to take many forms within a school corporation, and administrators need to minimize as much as possible in order to create fair evaluation across all subjects.

The variations of subjectivity demonstrate some of the occurrences that can cloud or hinder evaluations. As Darling-Hammond and colleagues commented (2012), education is messy and there is no magic equation to elucidate teacher effectiveness.

Ratings

Another interesting component examined by multiple educators within subjectivity was the idea of administrators only having a limited amount of “highly effective” ratings per school. Lydia summarized:

We were told [evaluators] weren't allowed to give highly effective scores. In the beginning you thought, I might not get highly effective even though my principal might think I'm highly effective, it's because she's is only allowed to give you so many highly effectives in your building.

In a similar thought and in a different corporation, Kara verbalized her agreement:

I had a lot of [evaluators] that they will literally look you in the face and say, 'That was the best lesson I have seen from anybody,' and you're thinking yes, I've got all five's. I mean they even will tell you, 'I had to search high and low to even give you an area of refinement. I really just pulled them out of thin air because I couldn't find a single thing wrong with your lesson. Then you receive threes and fours.

Joel responded, “When a supervisor tells me no one is getting a four and he's finding areas to give me a three to make it 'look right,' there's not a lot of credibility in the evaluation process.”

Finally, Marty thought:

It's the game where, I think it was Mitch Daniels that said, 'Well, everybody can't be rated excellent.' So the principals come in saying, 'Well, we'd be glad to give you the third highest rating of effective, but we can only give out highly effective to 3 people,' or something like that. I would say they're misdirected.

Summary

The idea of limiting highly effective ratings is certainly disconcerting, especially when evaluations are connected to bonus money and job security for educators of all subjects. Subjectivity might be the most alarming, as it appears the arm of the state is reaching into the schools and impacting administrators' abilities to accurately evaluate within their schools.

Communication

Many physical educators felt communication was an important piece to the quality evaluation puzzle. According to the IDOE (2012b), communication was crucial to stakeholder understanding of the evaluation system, to provide clarity and understanding about the process between administration and educators. The physical educators thought quality communication was important to bridge any potential gaps between the subject and evaluation.

Trent thought it was valuable to provide context to help bring his evaluator up to speed prior to the evaluation. He said, "[Evaluations] are tricky because [administrators] need some background knowledge, that's why I like to meet with the evaluator before, in case they're thinking about an unannounced pop in. That way they know exactly what to look for." Michael appreciated the open communication with his high school administrators; "it was an open dialogue, as long as you had that relationship with your administrator to kind of bounce back ideas." Joel had a similar experience, stating, "The good thing about our evaluator is he is very good about communicating and will ask questions. He is very open to hear about why we are doing things." The educators who discussed communication as a key component to evaluations were primarily positive.

However, Dan had experience with a lack of communication. Multiple administrators assessed him due to teaching K-12 in multiple buildings, and he felt:

There needs to be more communication between the two principals to make sure that I'm getting the correct score, because I believe I'm higher than scores I received. Last year after their evaluations, they supposedly sat and talked about me, but I highly doubt that happened.

Kurt had mixed feelings on communication, but explained:

You want to warn the administrator every time, 'you're about to walk into chaos.' But that's our organized chaos and I feel like we shouldn't have to say that anymore. That should be on the top of the evaluation rubric. 'Get ready, here comes chaos, but the teacher knows what he's doing.'

Theme Summary

Relative to communication and based on the information discussed from the educators, it appears communication plays a vital role in a teacher's successful navigation of the teacher evaluation process. Administrators have the opportunity to alleviate many teacher evaluation pitfalls and roadblocks by clearly communicating the necessary information to the schoolteachers. Quality communication seems to assist in the successful implementation of a successful and effective evaluation system. Additionally, trust and rapport are fundamental attributes to creating a successful work environment, and having administrators who can objectively execute teacher evaluations appear to be the most successful in creating a climate for success.

Theme Five: Teacher Evaluation Outcomes

This theme describes various outcomes from evaluations. Outcomes are the results related to observations and their subsequent and final evaluation scores. Teachers described a plethora of topics related to evaluation outcomes. Thoughts and quotes were broken into several subthemes, which include: Accountability and Effectiveness, Emotions, Feedback/Results, Professional Development, Financial Considerations, and Career Changes.

Accountability and Effectiveness

One of the most important outcomes within the teacher evaluation system is how accountable and effective interviewees believed their system was. Bob felt his evaluation system was effective and described his K-12 scenario:

I feel sometimes we're stereotyped as 'If you're a P.E. teacher, you're just the guy who coaches.' I've talked to several of my undergrad classmates who were PE majors also and they've kind of been forced to remake themselves, sharpen their saw and get back to teaching like they were their first years instead of veterans. I feel it holds you accountable, for sure.

Similarly, in his elementary, Kurt stated, "I think it has definitely made me more accountable for what I'm teaching and why I'm teaching." He also added that while he doesn't feel his system is perfect, "It's definitely a push in the right direction." Carl agreed and explained:

The reality is, some people do need that evaluation to push them a little further, maybe beyond what they think they can do for whatever the reason. I'm not

completely against the idea of an evaluation, but I would like to see the evaluations more building a teacher up, not trying to knock them down. Others also described this formative approach within evaluations as well. Jen's corporation used this tactic as she expressed "[Evaluations] are solely based on improvement and trying to make you a better person and a better teacher, so we're very blessed here." Similarly, Anne thought:

I've thought I was always a good teacher, I'm just more aware of what I need to do to be better, because there's always room for improvement. And I really think this was a good document [RISE Rubric] to help us get there. It's made me more effective as a teacher.

Physical educators on both teaching levels recognized the benefits of evaluations, especially in a formative manner that guides and helps teachers improve. This should be the goal of all school corporations.

Jason described evaluation effectiveness by utilizing attributes that all teachers should display. He used the following example:

You know how you teach to the test sometimes with kids, which is what we want to avoid and we hate. I think you teach to the evaluation sometimes. Most of the things they require are qualities of a good teacher anyway. Hopefully most people don't have to come up with those skills just to demonstrate on the evaluations.

Hopefully they're already doing them.

Kara's corporation prepared for evaluations by adopting their own system. She acknowledged that "[state evaluation mandates] were coming down on us regardless of

whether we were ready or not, so our evaluations were effective in getting us ready for what the state is now requiring of us as teachers.” Nathan stated:

It all goes back to the effectiveness of the teacher to begin with. I think for the majority of teachers were effective to begin with; however, I do think that one of the paradigm shifts that needed to happen was there were too many teachers sitting down in PE who were really not doing anything. So do I think it’s impacted things in that regard, yes. Now at least there’s an expectation that you adhere to some kind of standards.

On a similar thought, Michael concluded, “I did not necessarily see a huge change in performance, at least within my department, although it’s better than what we were doing before, which was nothing.” While potentially only incremental, these educators recognized the improvements in evaluation effectiveness within their teaching experiences.

While many of the educators recognized the benefits of effectiveness and accountability from teacher evaluations, some teachers felt their systems were lacking. Jason questioned the value of evaluation. He said,

I think [evaluations] help such a small percentage that it's not worth all the time put into it. I don't know how or if accountability really impacted teachers because I don't know if anybody's been fired because of it.

Travis described the situation within his corporation, “It’s definitely hoops to jump through. We need to get this thing online for the state. The state needs this or that. Our school board needs this. Our superintendent needs that. Shoot, it is all hoops.” Joel described the intended purpose versus reality within his school:

I'm not becoming a better teacher based on these evaluations. I think the whole purpose was to give valuable feedback and really help people strive to be better teachers. Instead, you have [teachers] who are just disgruntled or not doing it for the right reasons. They are doing it to check off the box without using that information or data to become a better teacher. It all backfires.

Joel's summary captures the essences of disconnect between the state mandate intent and reality. Dan was also skeptical, stating, "What they're doing now, I don't know. I think it's not really doing what they intended it to do, but I believe we need to be held accountable, but not the way they're currently doing it." Comparably, Tara doubted the state's intent and said:

I don't think it's as effective as they thought it was going to be. There still are teachers out there who aren't doing their job. The idea was, this evaluation was trying to get rid of some of those, and I think people are just afraid to do it. That's what bothers me, because there are teachers out there who still aren't. I think they're just using it as a way to limit our pay and rank us in a sense than it is being effective, to tell you the truth.

Overall, participants recognized that evaluations improved and increased accountability. However, they questioned the overall effectiveness of the system. Despite the increased evaluation enhancements, educators agree there was room for improvement concerning the evaluation implementation within their school corporations.

Emotions

Another subtheme discussed by many educators was their emotions encompassing teacher evaluation related to stress. Many of the educators interviewed described both

sides of stress, including high school teacher Grace, who said, “I’m not stressed concerning evaluations, its just part of the job.” Equally, when describing how he felt about his elementary evaluations, Kurt stated, “No. Zero stress.” Sookhen recognized that while he personally was not stressed, some of his peers were:

I know folks in the corporation that stress about it. There's stress regarding evaluations because they get nervous about it. Our corporation knows how we handle it here. You handle it as a necessary evil, do your job, and you'll be fine. In that sense, I don't think anybody that really stresses too badly about it. I don't.

Utilizing lessons taught in his high school gymnasium, Travis relieved any potential stress with exercise:

I’m not stressed at all. I won't let it. There are some people that panic and say, ‘oh, what are we going to do?’ I just kind of chuckle at them and get on the bike or go for a run. It's like really? That's all you got?

These educators felt little to no impact of stress from teacher evaluation outcomes.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, many physical educators described how much stress was induced from their evaluation experiences. When asked if evaluations add any stress to her professional or personal life, Lydia laughed and said, “I would say yes. You can write it in capital letters. A big YES!” Marty recognized stress both for his elementary colleagues and himself:

Oh I think there's definitely more stress. Maybe I don't feel the stress as much, but it's still stressful for somebody to come in, sit down and dictating things away on the computer. You don't know what they're saying. As far as classroom teachers,

you can just see it written on their faces almost who's getting evaluated today. It's definitely more stressful for them.

Nathan, teaching in the high school added his thoughts on added stress:

I feel more stressed in my career right now than I've ever felt, and I shouldn't. I should feel less stressed; I should be more competent in my abilities because of my experience. I should feel that I can come in and do the job without feeling like I'm not capable, and I think the tool sometimes makes you feel that way.

Nathan continued regarding younger teachers entering the profession:

When young people have to come into the profession and put in 12-14 hour days week after week, give up weekend time, and not expect to get a raise or be compensated, they burn out really fast. We've got some young bright teachers and we're losing them every year.

Similarly, Kara replied, "I was so burnt out last year, I didn't even want to go to school. You can only get beat down so far where you just don't care anymore. I think [teachers] are losing a lot of the passion." While many of the educators described a lack of stress related to teacher evaluation, almost every interviewee knew of peers or friends in the profession who felt increased stress. The emotional response highlights the disconnect between the original intent and the actual implementation of teacher evaluation.

Feedback/Results

Feedback and results were important outcomes as far as the physical educators were concerned. This relates to the scores and information used relative to their job retention and potential raises or bonuses. Despite their administrator's ability or inability to accurately evaluate, a majority of the physical educators received positive feedback.

This includes Jordan who said, “all my evaluators have been good, and if I received some criticism it was something I needed to work on, I’ll be receptive and try to and change based on what they say.” Similarly, Carl explained his elementary experiences in more depth and stated:

I had good evaluations, so it was great to see the administrator’s effort. I could see their hand written notes as they’re definitely taking care of having meaningful evaluations for me. They used a lot of good constructive criticism that helped me grow. I think that’s a huge benefit to have the administrators, in terms of their PE and coaching background that were able to do a good job relating with me.

Eva verbalized that in her high school setting, “I would say yes, the feedback I have received has been helpful.” Rick was also happy with his feedback and results, expressing “for the most part, every evaluator I’ve ever had is pretty good. They’re straightforward in feedback. The last couple years it’s been a little difficult here, but I really love post-op [meetings] and what they say to me.” These educators were happy with the results and feedback provided from one of their evaluation outcomes.

Dissatisfaction

While many of the educators were happy with their feedback, others were dissatisfied with the quality or specificity of their feedback relative to physical education. Sookhen thought, “Very seldom do I ever feel like there’s much to grow from it. He just tells me what he saw and what he likes. We both rate the form and just move on from it. It’s very basic.” Dan followed with “I never get anything that’s not good. I mean there’s nothing about what you need to do better. I never get any of that. It’s usually just praise

because she doesn't know what she's looking at in my classes." Kurt felt similarly, stating:

More than anything I'm looking for is quality feedback. It's okay to be evaluated by people who don't have a PE background; however, administrators who don't have experience in an active environment don't provide a lot of feedback on how you can actually progress and improve. I typically get really good scores, but I feel like everybody needs improvement and it doesn't show that in my evaluation.

Jason also struggled with his feedback and results by explaining:

I almost feel like sometimes when you go in for your meeting, you have to tell him 'these are my weaknesses and this is what I'm going to do to improve it' because he has no idea. He doesn't know what I actually do. I feel kind of like I'm directing the meeting instead of him.

These educators struggled with receiving quality feedback, which connects with the major administration theme previously discussed in terms of an administrator being able to properly evaluate physical educators.

Lydia and Tara had similar experiences at their respective schools regarding feedback relative to the sheer volume of evaluations. Lydia said:

When we first started evaluations, I would review them with a fine tooth comb and sometimes my feelings would be hurt if she gave me a lower mark, because I want to be highly effective all the time. However, I think some teachers become numb to them already; I guess I look at my evaluations now and don't go through them like I used to.

In a similar fashion, Tara replied:

You know what I do when I saw mine? I received all 3.0s and 4.0s. Done. I didn't even read it. It's too much. As long as I see my 3.0s and 4.0s, I'll glance at some of their comments just to see what they said, but I'm not going through it with a fine-toothed comb or anything. You're not going to stop unless you really see that 1.0 or 2.0. Other than that, I move on.

Finally, Kara provided insight to the fluidity of how much can change from year to year regarding evaluations. She previously discussed her concern on conjured up feedback based on 'no one can receive a 4' philosophy, but had hope for her corporation's new evaluation system to be implemented this year, stating "We're hoping it'll become a constructive feedback system, which is what it's supposed to be. Where we're all working together to benefit kids, versus feeling like you're out to get me or limit my pocket book."

Summary

Both feedback and results play a large role in an educator's life, and these teachers expressed a variety of views to help understand and process information from administration. It appears the majority of physical educators received positive feedback, although the lack of specificity in assisting their teaching improvement was the missing link in overall satisfaction.

Professional Development

Professional development was another subtheme that emerged from the data gathered from the interviews. Having completed their degrees and already working in the schools, professional development opportunities seem to provide the best opportunities for educators to increase their teaching effectiveness. Individuals in the following section

describe professional development on a school-wide level and in a general approach.

Anne discussed an evaluation coach that was helpful for her high school:

We have a teacher on staff that has [been hired as a] teaching and learning coach.

So, if anyone has issues or if the administration identifies somebody who needs to be on an improvement plan, then she works with them very closely to help them.

It's a great safety net and it's been a real benefit for our staff.

Jason's elementary school also had an instructional coach who "comes around and helps teachers improve their teaching if they're having trouble with certain aspects of teaching.

She comes in and helps them but is not an evaluator." Similar helpful professional development included Joel's corporation, who held in-house trainings that were beneficial. He explained:

Some of our younger teachers will participate in a training; it's led by department leaders who presented and it's much more as you are providing a helping hand with observations. We also have a group that can meet if someone is really struggling. I'm part of that group and we essentially have an individual growth plan, an IEP because teachers who struggle are on probation and we help out.

Sookhen concluded with "fortunately, the superintendent is really into making sure everybody gets what they need. They will send you wherever you need to go and will also work one-on-one with you. He's a sharp guy and does a pretty good job." These positive experiences solidified physical educators' evaluation experiences with clear support in a professional development approach.

While many educators discussed general professional development in a predominantly positive approach overall, others discussed professional development

specifically related to physical education. When asked about professional development opportunities, Dan's response was "As long as you're not a PE teacher, yes. I was able to participate in some online webinars, but only after I complained to the principal and explained that traditional professional development in our school didn't pertain to me." Lydia described her previous experience in a classroom background to apply lessons to physical education:

With my classroom background I can figure out how to tweak what some of the material that doesn't necessarily pertain to the specials teachers. Although I wish they would come up with more specific professional development opportunities.

Kurt needed to look for professional development outside his corporation, due to lack of relevant opportunities: "No. I do my own professional development through our national society but nothing through my school." Neil was particularly discouraged on the topic, expressing:

Isn't that ironic? One of our categories is 'Shows improvement,' or 'Shows increased knowledge in their area,' yet they won't pay for workshops like they used to. In fact, I got turned down for a [workshop] one time for a 20 dollar [cost]. So, here they want us to increase our knowledge of our subject, but they won't pay for it, and they really frown upon you taking a personal day to do that, so how, other than the weekend, how are you supposed to increase your knowledge?

While some physical educators were disappointed in their lack of opportunities, others were more fortunate. Eva felt that she "lucked out and had some teachers who were very willing to work with me, which I thought was awesome to collaborate." Grace explained there was opportunity for teachers to seek professional conferences outside the

corporation, however only a certain amount of individuals were covered financially. She said:

Our principal can only provide opportunities to so many individuals to go to [conferences]. There's more conferences that he would let us if we really wanted to, but at this point in my career, I'm in pretty good shape so I'll let a younger teacher that needs to be going attend.

Jordan sought professional development opportunities in house, and stated, "Our PE staff tries to get together at least once a semester to figure out what we can do to improve, so there's a little bit of a support group internally."

Summary

Many of the physical educators appeared to make the most of their limited opportunities related to their field. Professional development could be a rich source to help bridge the gap between issues highlighted in the teacher evaluation process.

Universities and colleges could also assist physical educators with opportunities to learn new content relative to state mandates and best practice in a K-12 setting.

Financial Considerations

Interviewees also discussed financial considerations, as most current evaluation systems are connected to merit pay. As previously discussed in chapter two, Indiana is one of seven states who directly compensate educators based on evaluations (NCTQ, 2015). Merit pay is typically distributed by an end-of-year bonus amount tacked on to the base salary. Other corporations, based on individualized compensation plans (IDOE, 2016), allow for increases in base salaries as well. A majority of the interviewed educators had bonus money connected to their evaluation ratings. An example of a school

corporation's approach in handling bonuses based on evaluation scores was Grace, who said:

You have to be rated 'effective' or 'highly effective' in order to get a raise, so if you receive a three or a four you get the same amount. The amount depends on the number of effective and highly effective teachers and then they break that down into what we're going to get as a raise.

Grace also described an interesting finding that teachers typically do not find out their bonus amount until late fall the following school year. She stated, "We don't even know what we make anymore. We don't know from year to year how much or even if we're going to get as far as a pay raise." Nathan summarized further: "bonus money doesn't come until October/November from the work you did last year. It's very much delayed gratification, you're being paid for what you did the year before, and you're never being paid for what you're doing now." The timing of when bonuses are paid and the combination of most corporations receiving bonuses when categorized as effective and highly effective were two significant findings from the interviewee data.

Concerning the dollar amount for bonuses relative to teacher evaluation, Travis joked, "[The amount] is nothing major. We kind of joked that 'now I can go for a happy meal and a tank of gas.' It's not significant and my tax bracket isn't changing or anything." Similarly, Eva stated "if you meet or exceed expectations, whatever amount they give the school corporation, there's a point system and I think the bonus the administration gave us ended up being around \$100." Some of the bonuses were in larger amounts, such as in Rick's corporation. He responded:

Our school was a low-performing school, and so that docks part of your evaluation process, and not everyone in the school is going to get their bonus or raise. That being said, for those who make it, I want to say it's about \$1,000 raise. Having taught awhile, it's only an increase of about \$20-30 a paycheck, but it does benefit our younger teachers.

Bonus money was a point of contention in Kara's school, because there was a large disparity between dollar amounts. She explained, "Bonuses could range from \$200 to \$2,000 depending on both school wide ISTEP scores as well as how your own assigned homeroom students did. That's a major difference and it became a very big force of contention." Kara's experience was unique to the others interviewed for this study due to the potentially large bonuses. Bonus monies tied to evaluations were examined by the physical educators, as they recognized the added layer of importance evaluations had on their financial livelihood.

Many of the educators discussed their desire to restore the previous traditional pay scale. Tara discussed this thought by stating, "Before at least you always got your pay bump on the pay scale. Then when they negotiated you might have got some kind of raise or something like that. Now you're not even guaranteed that." Grace also discussed the topic, stating "previously, we could read on the scale and know what to expect 15-20 years down the road, which helped us budget each year and also how to deal with the amount. We can't do that now." Marty also felt the current approach was "not an incentive for me. It may be for some, but it makes so much more sense to me to have the different lanes and ladder changes." Neil recognized that while the money is a nice

incentive, a majority of teachers did not seek the profession for financial purposes. He summarized the financial situation well:

Honestly, teachers in general don't really care about that and are not motivated by the pay raise. All they care about is their kids increasing in their learning and doing the best they can in the classroom. That's not what motivates teachers. Yeah, it's nice to have more money. But that's not my sole purpose of being a teacher. It's more like make what I can, because unfortunately we already know about lower pay for teachers in general.

This perspective helped summarize some of the educators' perspectives on teaching as a whole regardless of financial considerations.

Summary

State mandates have impacted teacher salaries and bonuses throughout Indiana. Most of the educators interviewed described a scenario where limited funds tied to evaluation bonuses or base salaries raises are minimal. Some of the educators displayed passion of the profession regardless of finances while others lamented the loss of the traditional pay scale. The educators were dissatisfied overall with financial considerations based on evaluations.

Career Changes

Career changes related to the impact of teacher evaluation were discussed with the interviewees. Some of the strongest reactions came from Kara, Michael, and Dan. When asked if teacher evaluations ever caused her to consider a career change, Kara answered:

Always. Every day of my life. I think of a new career daily. When it's a career, you don't mind a little bit extra stress, because you feel like you're making a

difference. Now I feel like I'm getting pushed and pushed, and it's become a job that's taken my passion away. I want to go clock in to a job and clock out and leave my job at the job. We take our job home with us.

Michael thought it was a tough question yet responded, "I have a bad taste in my mouth now. In all honesty, evaluations were one of the reasons I left. I need to find a job that has competitive wages where the harder you work, the more you're compensated." Dan considered a career change a few years ago when the policies were first mandated. He said:

I went back to school in another program because teaching has become a dead-end job in my eyes. You can work at McDonald's and further yourself, but now as a teacher, with all the limitations and constant cuts in budget, we're actually taking less money this year in my corporation than we did last year.

While strong opinions, the voices of these educators need to be heard. The implications on teacher evaluation reach beyond the day-to-day time spent in schools.

While there were negative responses relating to career changes, others described evaluations had no impact whatsoever. Rick enjoyed his elementary teaching experiences and declared "heck no. I love kids too much. Plus, I get paid to play every day. In all essence, there's no way I could ever change. I enjoy what I do. I love what I do. Yeah, no regrets here." Similarly, high school teacher Eva recognized her passion at an early age and evaluations had no impact. She said, "No, I knew I wanted to be a teacher back when I first started teaching swim lessons." Jordan was perfectly content in his position, verbalizing, "Not at this point in life, it's a good place to be in and again, I think it's the right way to do it. I think we do a nice job of handling evaluations just the way they are."

Evaluations also failed to deter Bob from considering a career change: “As many problems as the new evaluation tool has, I do it for the kids. I like the kids a lot. I enjoy what I'm doing.” These teachers highlight the previously mentioned passion and resolve many teachers have regardless of teacher evaluation.

Other teachers had mixed feelings on the topic of career change. Jason stated that a career change might have occurred:

If I was in my first ten years of teaching I might, but once you get so many years added up along with coaching, the money has always been good for me. Maybe going to another state has crossed my mind, for sure. Although when you're in it for so long, I still love what I do, but it is more and more demanding.

Similarly, Neil conveyed that:

Since I'm at the end of my career, no. I probably wouldn't change at all. That being said, the pay is so ridiculous. It's not even worth it. At our corporation, you'll always keep the same pay. Now, you'll get a raise according to your evaluation, but your initial rate of pay will always be the same. I feel like I say all these things to you, but I really, honestly, after 30+ years, I still love what I do. It's just so much fun.

Theme Summary

Outcomes within teacher evaluation play an important role for both evaluators and educators. These outcomes were discussed as intended, perceived, and actual outcomes throughout the various topics and subthemes. The data found that the current teacher evaluation, regardless of model used, is better at holding educators more accountable than previous past versions. However, they are still highly flawed, with added stress, unclear

financial considerations, and thoughts of possible career changes all based on evaluation. The topics discussed included: effectiveness/accountability, emotions, feedback/results, professional development, financial considerations, and career changes. Many of the educators described thoughts related to these various topics and helped provide understanding to the perceptions related to outcomes.

Theme Six: Teacher Evaluation Policy

This theme depicts educator thoughts on federal and/or state policy changes related to education. Physical educators felt the impact of evaluative policies and state mandates in the forms of added work and various other unintended consequences. They also brainstormed and developed several potential solutions to some of the issues described within this chapter. Subthemes include: State Mandates, Excessive Work, Unintended Consequences, and Potential Solutions.

State Mandates

State mandates were discussed at length throughout many of the discussions. A majority of the physical educators disagreed with the teacher evaluation state mandates both in tone and thoughts. To reiterate, most of the teachers recognized the need for evaluations, yet it was the state's approach that caused the most frustration and stress.

Jason summarized:

Teachers have to be evaluated, don't get me wrong. We have to be accountable, but it seems like the prevailing opinion from the statehouse is that we have a lot of horrible teachers and we need to get rid of them. That's supposedly why scores aren't as high as they used to be. I'm all for getting rid of bad teachers because

there are bad teachers; however, the path the state's taken has sure hurt the morale of anybody in education statewide.

Anne was slightly more understanding of the state mandates; however, she said,

I truly think [politicians] want to do the right thing, but they don't get the input from people who are functioning in the position. If they would walk a week in our shoes, I think they would understand a little bit better as far as what we deal with. It's easy to sit up in an office somewhere and say, 'Well that's just easy, here's how it should be done,' because it always looks easy from the outside. If they could actually experience it or at least have people working on [mandates] that have experienced it.

While Jen also found some positives in the mandates, she still was not satisfied with the approach, stating:

I think they have done some benefit for our schools. We've gotten teachers that shouldn't be teaching anymore out of teaching, but I think there's a lot of stress placed on some of these teacher evaluations as far as having them based solely on your pay and evaluators constantly in and out of your room.

Grace verbalized her thoughts on the topic: "Do I think things are being run well with the state? No, not at all; I don't think they're in favor of public schools, that's for sure." These experiences and thoughtful responses highlight the teacher evaluation reflection from these physical educators. It is quite evident that a majority of the physical educators do not agree with the state mandate implementation.

Nathan expressed criticism of the state mandates as a whole, and detailed his thoughts in a lengthy response:

It's unnecessary, demeaning, and it was kind of depressing. I felt that my profession was being taken from me, it felt like I wasn't being listened to, and there was no respect for the profession and unfortunately I'm not sure a whole lot of that has gotten better. The bottom line is that public employees cost money, and education is a huge part of the state budget and how do you, how do you contain your costs? Well I think they took an approach to containing their costs but they took a political approach that wasn't honest. I think they decided they didn't want to pay for it anymore. How do you dismantle it? I think they took lots of steps in terms of saying 'schools aren't doing a good job.' I think if you really looked at the data schools are doing a great job. The state took pockets of situations and said 'look how bad this school is' and I think data was misinterpreted and/or purposely misconstrued to create propaganda to say 'we need to bring in charter schools and other reform movements and we'll siphon money off that we're not going to give you now.'

Carl stated that, "I'm not a real big fan. I think the idea of having an evaluation is good, but it feels like the state's giving us all these problems without too many solutions." Carl highlights the lack of solution to state mandates, and each interviewee had the opportunity to solve various issues relative to state policies, which are detailed under the subtheme solutions. With a large cloud of negativity surrounding current state mandates, Bob nonetheless maintained a positive mindset and looked forward to the future:

As much as [the evaluation system] has been damaged, it'll come back. I believe it'll come back and education in Indiana will get back to where it needs to be.

We're kind of on the radical end of evaluations right now. Before that, we were on

the other end of the spectrum where it was nearly impossible to get rid of a teacher. There needs to be a happy medium.

Both positive thoughts, along with adverse opinions, serve educators well as they navigate the current political waters. Making informed decisions can be especially helpful in an election year where educator voices have the opportunity to be heard this fall.

Educators in this study are mostly aware of the state's intention regarding evaluation, yet they believe the implementation is lacking and potentially damaging.

Excessive Work

Within state mandates, many teachers discussed the excessive work created from evaluation policies. This included extra work in terms of both time spent as well as documentation and paperwork. Bob summarized his feelings by stating, "It's time-consuming; I think the paperwork we had to do was absolutely crazy. It's stressful putting your SLO together each year because it's a pile of paperwork and as busy as teachers are, I'm also coaching too." Marty discussed the busyness for both teachers and principals:

For a lot of teachers, it becomes so much paperwork, it's all redundant. We never know who's going to be seeing it or what they're doing with it. When we have problems in our classes, whether it's discipline or a student getting totally out of control, there's no one in the office. The secretaries have to take care of it because they're not there. I think that's another real drawback to the evaluation system, that it requires so much more time of the principal being somewhere else.

Grace also questioned the amount of work by responding, "I think they've gone extremely overboard, and I'm not sure that's helping schools. We're spending a lot of time and money trying document information whereas we should really let administrators

do their work without all the paperwork and headaches.” It appears that the extra work and documentation required are hindering teachers’ ability to effectively teach in the current state mandate form.

Relating his experiences to excessive work, Joel described his skepticism:

It’s just a matter of ultimately who is going to look at [collected student data], or is this going to end up in a file and sit on a shelf until the next evaluation process comes through. That’s one of my concerns, we could do a lot of work and no one is ever really going to look at it. That’s very frustrating; I don’t mind doing work, I enjoy doing work and investing time, but I don’t want to do it for busy work. I feel like that’s where we are in that no one is going to sit down and look at our school, with 100+ teachers’ work, and really keep at close eye. They are either going to say “looks good,” put it in the folder and that’s the last anyone will see of it.

Joel raises an interesting point related to data collection. He questioned the accountability of the evaluators, which are typically the administration. How can teachers be certain that collected information is reviewed and used year to year?

Eva felt time spent was the biggest drawback, stating, “Time, there’s not enough time, especially for the documentation. It’s frustrating, and I don’t know a fix for it, because in our evaluation process we have to document a lot and there isn’t enough time.”

Similarly, Kara explained,

For evaluations, in terms of making my curriculum better, absolutely not. I feel it created more work for me, which actually hindered me teaching my subjects the way I know and am able to teach. If the administration would have said, ‘Look,

we've learned from research that these five things don't work anymore for students. We need to eliminate those five and add five different and completely new things.' The problem is that they keep everything we're already currently doing and adding these extra 20 things.

Kara's teaching plate seemed to be overfilled with little room for error. This work overload could hinder teachers' abilities to successfully and effectively prepare and deliver lessons to her or his students. Nathan summarized many of the teachers' perspectives by simply stating, "The evaluation tool is quite frankly one big pain in the butt. We're being inundated with data collection, and while you make time for preparing for collecting information, you take a little time from something else." He continued his thoughts, "Unfortunately for a lot of us that's family. I'm still at school at six o'clock and will probably be here until eight or nine trying to do what I'm supposed to do in terms of documenting." The issues relative to excessive work are well documented from the physical educators' perspectives.

Unintended Consequences

Information discussed within state mandates were also organized into unintentional consequences. This includes results of the mandates that most politicians failed to recognize when they implemented the evaluation policies impacting educators throughout the state. They include devaluation of education, teacher shortage, complacency among teachers, and replacing a collaborative environment with a potentially ultracompetitive workplace.

Devalued Education

When the state removed traditional pay scales and placed an emphasis on bonuses connected to teacher evaluations, education was devalued according to the interviewees. Tara explained, “Education is one of the few professions that doesn't reward you for becoming more educated. What's the point of getting a Master's degree? You're not getting paid more. Now education doesn't reward teachers for continued education, it's a joke.” Similarly, Dan stated “Getting a master's degree means nothing anymore. There's no incentive for teachers, and why you would you when you're going to just end up in more debt? There's honestly no way to further yourself now in education.” Neil agreed about his interest in pursuing more education by answering:

Zero, not at all. You don't get extra pay like we used to with the pay scale. I always wondered why education never went out there and found the best. No matter what it costs. Compared to the business world, I never understood, well, I guess I do because money, but in the business world, they recruit like crazy. They want the best one. They want the best person for that job that they can find. In education, they want the guy that's the cheapest about money.

Teachers across the state recognized that unless you had extra resources or for personal gain and benefit, there was little to no benefit in continuing education professionally.

Teacher Shortage

Another unintended consequence is the current teacher shortage across the state. Physical educators interviewed believed the shortage occurred due to a loss of quality teachers via early retirement, diminished perceptions of educators throughout the state, and a lack of recruitment into the education field. Kara lamented the loss of mentors and

peers from her school due to evaluations: “I think teacher evaluations have gotten more teachers to realize the direction the state is heading, and they've since retired early. We've lost a lot of really good teachers along the way, because there's a lot of pressure.” Kara continued her thoughts on the shortage by discussing younger teachers as well. She said, “there's been a lot of young teachers, ten years experience and less that just walk away wondering ‘why am I sticking around for this when my passion's gone and my paycheck isn't paying my bills?’” Lydia had a similar experience and described the situation at her school:

When I first started there were a lot of teachers that had been teaching for a long time, and when the state started talking evaluations, a lot of them started talking retirement before they probably really wanted to retire, and I feel like we lost a lot of great teachers because of that. I also know that our profession is seeing that lack of willingness to go into teaching because I think we have a negative bubble over us, with evaluation and the whole. At one school in our corporation we've hired roughly twenty new teachers in the last three years. So I feel like the whole process itself is kind of hindering.

Sookhen painted a grim picture by stating, “The shortage is real, and it's not because we don't want to be held accountable. It's because we're disrespected. Not from parents or the public, but individuals at the state, that's a fact. We're lazy, free-loaders to those [politicians].”

Continuing thoughts on the diminished view of educators today, Joel explained, “My current big concern in education is the ability for schools to financially compensate young teachers and the limited amount teachers can make in their careers. I don't think

we're going to have people staying in education." Likewise, Jordan felt that lack of compensation was hurting educators across the state. Having taught for more than 30 years, he reflected on his earlier teaching career. While looking back, Jordan debated the following:

Honestly the pay would make me think about a different career. The kids coming in now, they're going to start at thirty-two and you might put 19 years in and you still might not be making that much. If I'm not making any amount of money, that would deter me more than the actual evaluations.

Jason also took issue with the simplicity of receiving a teaching license as a non-education degree holder: "the dumbed down process of becoming a teacher because of the state. They're accepting people on emergency contracts or just pass a test. That might be appropriate for some, hopefully not at our school corporation, but you never know."

Nathan echoed with similar comments, conveying:

Unfortunately this is affecting the teacher preparation programs because it seems like the faster we can get people programs like Teach for America or some of these 'take three classes and you can student teach then we're going to give you a license' or 'you just have a degree in some other content area, we're going to teach you how to test and give you a license', they're missing the boat, okay, those people aren't going to survive compared to kids coming through a comprehensive education program. Now we're going to create a summer studies committee to find out why we're not getting people to come into the profession. I find that to be ironic because they know the answer, it's politics.

The issues related to state mandates clearly highlight the disconnect between policymakers and educators within the teaching trenches.

Another component related to the teacher shortage is the lack of recruitment into the education field. For years, teaching was viewed as a noble and honorable profession, and often times you would see generations of teachers within families. Based on the information discussed with the educators of this study, this is no longer the case. For example, Grace described her thoughts on her children's futures:

My son's a great athlete and thinks he wants to be a PE teacher. I told him 'you can't afford yourself' and I'm discouraging him because things are so rocky right now in education. I also have a daughter who's going to school to be a teacher despite me trying to talk her out of it. I think things are absolutely going to change because they have to or we're not going to have teachers. It's already obvious that we're starting to get into a teacher shortage trend with enrollments down.

Dan described a similar scenario, stating:

You've got teachers now telling students not to become teachers. I don't ever remember that happening when I was in high school. I've got kids that come to me and say 'I want to be a teacher or an engineer.' Usually, you say, 'Do what you love.' But now I say, 'Go for the engineer. If you teach, make sure you marry rich.'

Marty expressed his feelings toward the recruitment situation: "A lot of students are not going in to teaching. Now we've got some reformers saying it's the teacher's fault because we're telling them not to go in to teaching. I'm thinking, 'You're the ones that created this.'" Clearly, some historical advocates have shifted their mindset and feelings toward

education. The reactions were quite strong relative to the upcoming state teacher shortage. Education numbers are down in universities and colleges throughout the state, decreasing 50% since 2009 (U.S Department of Education, 2013), and the physical educators in this study highlighted their reasons based on devaluing education, early retirements, and a lack of recruitment into the education field.

Complacency

The interviewees also described the idea of complacency as an unintended consequence. As previously described, many schools set their evaluations so both effective and highly effective receive the same amount of bonus. Neil communicated the scenario typical teachers face in Indiana: “Effective and highly-effective receive the same pay raise. As long as I'm effective, you know, I try to strive for higher goals in my life. But in this case, if it's going to pay the same, what's the difference?” Lydia continued a similar thought by saying “you get the same pay raise if you’re effective or highly effective, so why would you try to better yourself to be highly effective? Why even have that as a possibility if it doesn’t really matter?” Anne reacted in an opposite manner as far as her approach by utilizing her scores in the 3’s as motivation. She explained, “As driven as teachers are, if we’re not getting fours, I ask ‘why didn’t get a four? I don’t want to be a three, I want to be a four!’ It’s always helpful and constructive in motivation, for sure.” Finally, Kurt’s corporation differentiated effective and highly effective by a single dollar. He summarized his thoughts on the topic:

The \$1 pay difference between a teacher being evaluated as effective or highly effective is an embarrassment and a joke to the teaching profession. Incentivizing

educators to move from average to mastery should reflect what other noble professions do and actually reward them.

While not every educator discussed the idea of complacency, it was important and worth noting as a teacher's motivation plays a certain role in her or his effectiveness and willingness to go above and beyond for students.

School Climate

A final unintended consequence consisted of a change in school climate from a traditionally collaborative environment to one that is potentially competitive in nature. This is due to teachers attempting to score highly effective ratings and compete against their peers instead of helping them in their successes along the way. Dan described the situation as “probably not the most helpful or collaborative environment, you've got teachers fighting to get better kids in their classes. It's created more of a competitive environment. It's not collaborative whatsoever, which is the opposite of what education should be.” Lydia also added:

Education should be collaborative and you're already kind of seeing some layers of fun and that sharing environment taken away because now I'm ranking teachers and the scenario could exist where if you're a three, or I'm a four and you're a three coming behind you, how interested are you going to be to help me? That could be the mentality because you don't want [other teachers] to be highly effective because it might make you only effective because your principal is only allowed to give so many highly effectives in your building.

Other teachers talked about similar thought patterns of the unintended impact of evaluations relative to students of teachers. Kara recognized that:

Right now, you're feeling the pressure of 'I don't have that time because I've got to get through this and if I don't get through this, I'm going to get bad scores.' I feel like we've taken away a lot of the personal connections we used to have time to make with the kids, and our kids really crave the personal interactions.

Concerning evaluations, Rick made an interesting discovery and communicated, "I think our evaluation systems are just making average kids, because that's what evaluation system is leading to."

While the goals of policymakers relating to teacher evaluations seem evident from afar, there are many unintended consequences that occurred as a result of the mandates. As Nathan summarized, education is inexact yet the personal element is required: "Policymakers don't understand. Education can't be a business model, this is a people business and society has to understand if you want a better society, you have to keep the human element in education. There's no way around it."

Potential Solutions

The final policy subtheme of potential solutions was one of the most important areas discussed, as each interviewee was asked how to solve the current state evaluation mandate problems, both as a whole and relative to physical education. Solutions were an important talking point as backed by the interviewees, as most thought the current state mandates on teacher evaluations had a negative impact on education. Many of the teachers discussed having qualified evaluators used for observations. Jen thought:

I think it'd be really cool if there was someone who was trained in PE, maybe from a local college or university, to come and observe from time to time. I

realize it can't be happening all the time, but it would benefit PE teachers to know and stay up to date.

Dan agreed by stating, "I don't know if there's one best way to evaluate other than having qualified people observe us to make sure we're doing things right. I'd rather have somebody come from a university that has teaching experience in our field." Qualified evaluators were also important to Kara, who also understood the likelihood or lack thereof of this actually occurring:

I would start with the obvious; I wouldn't have anyone from our district come in to observe us. I would have an outside agency that may have a representative from every subject area, and I would have somebody that is PE or health-minded come in and observe us. It's not necessarily that our district did a bad job, it's just they don't have someone in every subject area. Of course that would require them to spend a lot of time and money, and that's not something schools are going to do.

Removing potentially subjective administrators does seem to be a solution, however the cost incurred would limit a school corporation's ability to follow through with this state-required annual mandate.

In addition to seeking a qualified evaluator, other educators desired a physical education specific evaluation tool. Sookhen described his thoughts of a specific tool:

They need to find a way to specialize evaluation systems by making a tool for every subject and level, not necessarily thinking we can just throw this single evaluation mold. I know that's going to be a big, tall glass to fill [as far as creating them all], but one tool doesn't fit all.

Trent explained his modifications to the current evaluation tool by stating, “I would change some language in the evaluation tool to apply to Indiana PE State Standards. I already plan my lessons based on the standards, and evaluators can look and see if I’m properly teaching to the standards.”

Along with adding specificity to the tool, Carl felt there were missing components as well:

One of the things that really isn't alluded to in the current RISE is the safety concerns for a classroom. I would also like to see technology emphasized more in our evaluation tool, equipment such as heart rate monitors, things like that. Organizations and transitions are important too. For me inside a PE class, organization is how you get from one activity to the next with as little down time as possible. Either way, the evaluation could be chopped up a little differently by having parts added or taken away depending on the subject. PE is so different compared to a classroom.

Rick had similar thoughts about a PE specific tool but also sought input from qualified individuals throughout the state. He said:

I think what needs to be done is a group of physical educators and faculty members from universities need to set up an evaluation system for teachers who are in physical education so they can meet certain goals and criteria for kindergarten through 12th grade. People from a kinesiology field can probably make up a pretty neat evaluation and post it to their website. If each college or university came up with their own, schools can find the tool that best fits their school.

Kurt discussed similar thoughts concerning specialized tools and teacher input in addition to the administration:

It'd be nice if PE teachers and administrators could get together and do a hybrid of our own evaluation to combine physical education with the current tool. Not only should we as PE teachers be telling administrators what they should be looking for, it could almost serve as a professional development for administrators and physical education teachers.

Michael expressed potential solutions related to communication with his administrators as well, stating:

I think that we should have evaluations tools coming from department chairs. Administrators have already recognized them as the best in the department and respected their teaching ability, now they can help in the evaluation process, especially if the evaluator doesn't have a PE background. That way an evaluator can ask, 'pick five things that you want included in your formal evaluation that are subject-related.'

Of the 22 individuals interviewed, only one physical educator was content with his current evaluation system as is. Jordan explained:

I don't really think I would change anything. I think with us they've done a really nice job at having a complete evaluation. Students hit manipulative skills; they hit motor skills, and work on their fitness. I think ours is the best. I do because you're working on skills and doing fitness for life. I really think that our corporation has done a really nice job with the evaluations.

While Jordan is the exception, the educators presented a variety of potential solutions in their ever-changing evaluative world.

Teacher Evaluation Purpose Summaries

When each interview concluded, the researcher asked physical educators to summarize the purpose of teacher evaluations in one short phrase. Educators tended to interpret the question using one of two approaches. The first was more idealistic in what the purpose of teacher evaluations should be, while the second emphasized what they currently and actually are within schools.

Idealistic Purpose

Related to what the purpose of teacher evaluations should be, Jordan stated “accountability” while Trent used the phrase “teacher growth” to summarize teacher evaluations. Kurt reviewed his thoughts by saying, “The purpose of teacher evaluations is teacher accountability to make sure they're doing their jobs. Teachers work towards their objectives but also with the students so that they're progressing to the next grade level and getting a complete education.” Finally, Jen stated, “It should be about improving your teaching and helping your students become better in education.”

Current Purpose

Associated with the actual purpose of teacher evaluation in the current interpretation, Joel said, “Teacher evaluations are supposed to help promote teacher improvement. What it actually is, is a waste of time.” Stronger yet, Dan summarized teacher evaluations as “worthless.” Sookhen replied, “Well, I don't want to use sham again, because I've used that plenty. I would say it's an opportunity for politicians to sleep at night. I'm really soured at how they really tried to screw a good thing up.”

Other educators defined the purpose of teacher evaluations in a more positive light, such as Michael, who said, “bringing credibility and accountability to what we’re doing in the classroom.” Lydia felt the weight of evaluations and responded that it is “an exhausting rollercoaster” while Travis said, “I would say teacher evaluations are a way to make it easier to remove teachers from their classrooms, and has very little to do with improving student learning.” There were a wide variety of responses from the teachers’ summaries; however, the information was valuable in gaining honest insight into their overall thoughts, especially as the interviews concluded.

Conclusion

The results presented in chapter four express the plethora of thoughts and opinions physical educators expressed over a variety of topics related to teacher evaluation. The teachers in this study agreed that evaluation is necessary for accountability, yet were dissatisfied with the overall implementation. The current evaluation systems add undue stress, strain the vitality of a long-term career in education, and potentially place a burden on the working school climate. Physical education looks unlike any other subject related to evaluations, and current evaluations are not designed for physical education. Physical educators also have the ability to modify and or create their own test for student learning measurement. Administrators appear to play a key role in a successful or negative evaluation system within the corporations, and their communication with and ability to garner trust from their teachers appears imperative. The teachers in this study were passionate and helpful in providing insight into their perceptions of and experiences with the Indiana Teacher Evaluation System. These

findings were supported through first order themes discussed and borne out by previous comments and subthemes.

CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION

This study describes physical educators' perceptions of and experiences with the teacher evaluation system in the state of Indiana. Initially, the purpose was to unfold the experiences and challenges faced by physical education teachers as they adapted to Indiana's teacher evaluation system. Moreover, the aim was to uncover factors that influence teachers in their approval or rejection of the educational reform. This was accomplished by implementing a two-part data collection process, which included in-depth interviews of physical education teachers. This research answered the following primary research questions:

1. How do physical education teachers perceive their current teacher evaluation system?
2. Does the teacher evaluation system call for some adaptations for how the teacher performs his or her role?
3. How do physical education teachers perceive the significance or importance of physical education within the school relative to teacher evaluation?
4. What are the consequences of the teacher evaluation system for Indiana physical educators?

Twenty-two physical educators participated in interviews to describe their thoughts and experiences with teacher evaluation in Indiana. The information presented in this chapter is devoted to highlighting and describing the major findings from the study, a discussion of those findings relative to the literature and the author's interpretation of the results, recommendations for future research, study limitations, and final thoughts.

A System in Need of Change

As the research in this study was investigative, there were a variety of findings related to the first order themes previously presented in chapter four. The following section provides major findings as they relate to the literature and what the researcher believes is a system in need of change. Researcher commentary is presented to further examine interpretations of the system and the critical need to alter its structure.

Additionally, comments are provided on the related processes linked to evaluation.

Improved, Yet Highly Flawed

Physical education teachers felt the current evaluation policies and mandates held teachers more accountable than past evaluations, which was a positive outcome. Their perceptions aligned with previous research on how evaluations can improve teacher quality (Donaldson, 2013; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014; Kimball, 2002; Looney, 2011). Physical educators recognized how previous evaluations were lacking, and the increased accountability helped hone their skills and improved teacher effectiveness, another intended positive outcome of the evaluative updates. However, there were repercussions to the mandates that involved doubting the overall evaluation effectiveness, as well as the added emotional stress, financial considerations, and even the consideration of or actually leaving the profession altogether. Questioning evaluation effectiveness relates to previous

research indicating that teachers do not believe evaluations are effective (Coggshall et al. 2010, Ovando, 2001). The teacher responses align with Marzano (2012), who found teacher evaluation systems have trouble discriminating between effective and ineffective teachers. As Jason mentioned during his interview, “I don’t know if anybody’s been fired because of [evaluations].” Concerns of effectiveness relate to previous studies that have shown teachers are rated highly effective more than 90% of the time (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Stoelinga, 2011), as is the case in Indiana where an extremely high percentage of teachers are rated as effective to highly effective (IDOE, 2014; 2016a).

The current status of evaluations is also suspect when viewed through the lens of financial compensation. Though a significant majority of educators receive high marks on evaluations, most still receive a seemingly low amount of income despite the state-mandated transition from incremental traditional pay scale to merit-based pay. One would think the dollar amount would be relative and that money received would add to base salaries. This is not the case for many educators, as merit-based pay often comes in the form of an annual bonus while the salary base remains constant. Additionally, due to the state budget, the timing in which the educators receive their bonuses is often well into the following academic year. This delayed gratification from a previous year’s efforts is not an ideal approach to compensation. Teachers should be rewarded financially for their work within the academic year they teach.

Career changes and the emotional turmoil described by physical educators are also a concern for the state. The Blue Ribbon Commission (IDOE, 2016c) was created to address these areas and other components related to the teacher shortage in Indiana. While evaluations were not explicitly described in the report, they are alluded to as some

of the root causes of the commission's findings, which include teacher perceptions related to job stress along with public policy, compensation, and standardized assessments for students (IDOE, 2016c). Based on the educator shortage, teachers are clearly dissatisfied with how they are currently treated, and addressing evaluation could help alleviate some of the root causes described in the report.

An interesting component of understanding evaluation perceptions was through the lens of career phases. Younger educators appear to live in a world of "this is all I know" concerning evaluation, and have little to no comparison from previous evaluative approaches. The findings associated with this career phase aligns with Murphy and colleagues (2014), who found that educators who taught less than four years were both more confident and were more positive in their feelings toward current evaluation compared to teachers with more experience. Veteran teachers, however, had experiences in both words that shifted from one extreme to another. According to Darling-Hammond (2012) and throughout their careers, educators endure copious amounts of standards and directives related both to how and what they teach. Educators in this study described the differences between the approaches. Smith (2005) also notes that teacher evaluation should take different teacher career phases into account and allow for variation of teaching styles and approaches, which is important for teacher inclusivity.

Administration is key

Physical educators felt administration was the key to effective evaluation within their individual schools. Relatedly, trust and support are vital to a successful school climate, and administrators play a key role (Ebmeier & Niklaus, 1999; Supovitz et al., 2009). Trust was important to the teachers in this research related to evaluation, as the

building principals were their evaluators. Teachers experienced either positive or negative interactions with their administrators, which solidified their thoughts on the topic. Their perceptions agreed with research demonstrating that teachers value trust and communication from their administration (Davis, 1988; Valentine, 1992). Previous research has also shown that administrators are key to setting a tone related to and successfully implementing an evaluation system (Fowler, 2013; Nicholson & Tracy, 2001). If teachers feel supported from their evaluators, they will tend to feel more positive about the evaluation experience (O'Pry & Schumacher, 2012).

Despite the fact a majority of the educators in this study recognized the importance of trust and support, many educators worked in environments where positive support did not exist. Three of the 22 educators, high school teacher Joel and elementary teachers Jason and Trent were not evaluated or observed throughout their respective school years. The experiences of these educators support with findings of Reinhorn and colleagues (2015) who found that teachers mistrusted the evaluation credibility and questioned the validity of their evaluation scores if they felt administrators did not spend enough time observing their classes. Administrators owe their full support to teachers and professionals of all subject areas, and directly neglecting state mandates relative to evaluation requirements embodies lack of support.

Administrators should focus on increasing support and trust to develop a successful school culture and climate within schools. One approach discussed by participants in this study was to increase communication between administration and physical educators. This was also accomplished in research from Padaruth (2016), who found administrators understood the importance of communication and relationship

development. The IDOE (2012b) also emphasized the importance of communication associated with evaluation, which would help provide clarity and understanding between teachers and administrators. By communicating with evaluators, physical educators can help bridge any potential knowledge gap, as well as address the unique attributes of an evaluation within a gymnasium setting. Open dialogue between the two parties will be helpful in building a successful climate and increasing trust and support.

Administrators are important evaluation socializing agents, as they hold a large influence in a school setting (Lawson, 1989; Zeichner, 1979; Zeichner & Gore, 1990). Similar to the findings of Padaruth (2016), physical educators in this study recognized the relationship influence administrators held regarding evaluations. These findings also align with Richards and colleagues (2014), who found that administration and teacher power dynamics are often unequal. As evaluations are now tied to job security and financial considerations, administrators are as powerful as ever within the state. Keeping this dynamic within teacher socialization theory in mind, it is the responsibility of administrators to care for their teachers and objectively evaluate all educators as equally as possible.

Administrators are key to effective evaluation implementation. In order to be effective, principals or evaluators must have positive relationships with their teachers (O'Pry & Schumacher, 2012). Improvement can only be made if there is a great deal of trust between both parties (Firestone, 2014). Trust and rapport are fundamental attributes to creating a successful work environment, and having administrators who can objectively execute teacher evaluations appear to be the most successful in creating a climate for success.

Physical education evaluation differences

The physical educators in this research acknowledged that physical education is a unique subject relative to the subjects taught by their colleagues in the classroom setting. Physical education is typically taught in a gymnasium, where students receive their only structured access to active instruction in the psychomotor domain. Therefore, evaluations tend to look differently than in other subjects. Most administrators derived their experience from a classroom environment, which can present difficulties in accurately evaluating physical educators in an active setting. Some administrators had coaching experience, which the teachers in this study felt helped in understanding. However, teaching physical education and coaching are separate entities and should not be confused with one another. In this regard, most of the physical educators questioned their evaluator's ability to accurately observe them in an active setting. These findings align with previous research (Firestone et al., 2013; Murphy et al., 2014) that found educators had less confidence in principals' ability to observe and rate teachers than principals' self-confidence in their observation abilities. They are also similar to Norris and colleagues (2016) who found that physical educators are not confident in their evaluators. This is a matter of concern as the evidence is building towards a knowledge gap between administrator evaluation abilities and the physical education profession.

Also comparable to the findings of Norris and colleagues (2016), current evaluations in the school corporations represented in this study are designed for classroom subjects. They tend to be a one-size-fits-all tool regardless of subject matter (Jerald, 2009), which does little in accommodating noncore subjects such as physical education. Physical educators expressed the need to become creative when adjusting their

subject into their school's evaluation tool. A simple example was when physical educators described the requirement of visibly posting their daily objectives in the classroom, where many teachers had no capacity to do so in a gymnasium. A more egregious example includes the experience of Travis, whose evaluator attempted to observe him in a health class as opposed to physical education. In the eyes of his administrator, Travis's instance illustrated how different evaluations are regarding physical education, as he attempted to shift the evaluation into a more comfortable setting.

Linked with physical education evaluation differences is the ability for physical educators to create, modify, and or use their own tests and measurements for student learning. Nineteen of the 22 teachers interviewed either contributed to the development of or chose their own student learning measurements. The additional three individuals either were not required to use student learning in their evaluations or used a different model that accounted for learning in a different fashion. Compared to their core subject peers, who are required to use the ISTEP standardized tests for their measurements, physical educators in this study chose fitness testing for their student-learning component. Educators can influence (i.e. manipulate and alter) fitness tests, which present a matter of concern. While none of the physical educators admitted to influencing scores, many recognized how easy it would be to have students apathetically attempt a pretest followed by providing great motivation for students to surpass their original scores on a posttest. Other educators were able to fitness test multiple grade-levels and then choose the grade who showed the most improvement for their scores. This is an unfair practice in an evaluation system not designed for the profession.

Time Constraints

Additionally, related to the use of fitness testing, are contextual factors that could potentially influence student scores. Contact time presented one of the biggest differences between the secondary and elementary teaching levels, and could impact student fitness scores. While a few elementary teachers instructed students multiple times a week, most had physical education one day a week for thirty minutes. Their situation becomes even bleaker when considering holidays, in-service, and snow days along with concert practices and standardized testing that limits contact time even further. Multiple elementary teachers questioned what they could accomplish within the given time frame each week. Their thoughts echoed that of Lindsay (2014), who felt time was the biggest threat to delivering effective teaching in physical education. High school teachers tend to have students for a full semester, which appears to have greater potential for positive fitness influence. None of the high school teachers discussed contact time as a limiting factor throughout their interviews, which highlights one of the few differences between teaching levels found in this research. Between waivers for extracurricular activities such as school associated sports and marching band (James, 2011), along with the limited two-semester requirement for high school students, one must wonder if physical educators have enough contact time to make a difference in students' lives physically.

Student Characteristics

Another contextual factor tied to fitness scores and an additional difference noted between elementary and high school educators is student growth and maturity. Two of the elementary teachers discussed how their students were growing and maturing throughout the school year, which inevitably helped student posttest score improvement.

Students in the upper elementary setting, where fitness testing typically takes place, were naturally getting stronger throughout the year and scoring higher scores in part due to their growth. Student growth was not discussed by any of the high school teachers, and this could be due to the fact that elementary physical education occurs all year long as opposed to a one semester setting in the high school. Physical educators of all teaching levels dealt with uncontrollable contextual factors, such as diet and nutrition, student emotions, and socioeconomic status. These factors combined begs the question if fitness testing is the appropriate student learning measurement for physical education. The researcher believes that fitness testing should be used to understand fitness levels, educate students on personal wellness, and be used to motivate and help students improve. Fitness testing should not be used for grading or assessment, and is too subjective a measurement to be utilized in teacher evaluation.

Marginalization

While discerning physical education's absence of standardized testing and designation of noncore status, one can perceive how the subject is often overlooked in the evaluative process. While physical education is a required subject and should be treated with the same respect as core subjects, it is often marginalized (Ennis, 2014; Norris et al., 2016; Prince et al., 2008; Sparkes, Schempp, & Templin, 1993). Consequently, marginalization of the subject has eroded physical educators' ability to make a strong impact on students across the state. Marginalization takes the form of reduced class time, decreased class frequencies, disparate student-teacher ratios, and budgetary restrictions (Prince et al., 2008; Sparkes, Schempp, & Templin, 1993; Sparkes & Templin, 1992). These limitations hinder the profession, yet previous research suggests the creation of

relationships with fellow teachers, administration communication, and advocating for proper resources to combat marginalization (Lux, 2011; Lux & McCullick, 2011).

Through the discussions of the educators in this study, these strategies do not appear to be occurring on a regular basis.

Along with other noncore subjects, such as art and music, physical education also frequently receives low status and priority within schools (Norris et al., 2016; Prince et al., 2008; Puhse & Gerber, 2005; Sheehy, 2011). According to Rink (2013), “More often than not, lack of accountability has reflected a status as an unimportant subject area, has protected poor teaching and poor programs, and has inhibited the incentive to do better” (p. 412). Subject status is dependent on the administration and the culture developed within individual schools. All high school educators, with the exception of one neutral teacher in this study, described negative status for physical education, citing many of the previously described features in their schools.

Of interesting note was that almost all elementary physical educators had positive comments related to subject status in their schools. Elementary teachers felt included and part of the team related to evaluations, helping students become active and emphasizing lifelong skills. The findings of this study correspond with that of Murphy and colleagues (2014), who found that teachers in kindergarten through third grade reported more favorable experiences related to evaluation. Status was another key difference between teaching levels, and could be worth exploring in future research.

Due to marginalization and a mixture of low status, and aligned with the findings of Padaruth (2016), physical educators in this study are being introduced into busy, happy, good 2.0. According to Placek’s study (1983), if students were on task, engaged, and

well-behaved, physical education was left to its own devices regarding teaching and content delivered. In the current era of evaluation, physical education is treated more or less the same. Administrators emphasized classroom management to the physical educators in this study, as well as placing a priority on student safety. Physical education seems to be minimized, and the subject acts as a break for the classroom teachers.

Administrators and parents appear uninterested in the subject as well, and evaluative systems often adversely impact physical educators (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Building principals directly influence the level of marginality experienced by physical educators (Padaruth, 2016). Therefore, administrators should be required to learn the intricacies of all subject areas to increase evaluation accuracy. They need to be adequately trained within the profession in order to increase understanding, status, and support. Physical educators are also obligated to help provide as much understanding to administrators by discussing the aims and objectives of physical education, but the overall responsibility in understanding the subject is on the administration.

Excessive work in student learning documentation

Student learning is required in Indiana (NCTQ, 2015) and is intended to be a priority for evaluation models (IDOE, 2012b). Reporting data to administrators also has the potential to act as an accountability mechanism (Rink, 2013). Unfortunately, relative to physical education, student learning does not appear to be reaching the full capacity of the original intent. Teachers in this study have been inundated with student learning documentation requirements that are time consuming with limited returns. These educators felt that student learning was important, but not necessarily beneficial for both teachers and students alike.

Some educators, such as Joel, questioned if anyone was even reviewing the student learning documentation and what would become of it. He recognized that between the high volume of teachers and the limited administration personnel, the thoroughness of reviewed materials would be minimal at best. This perspective raises the question: do administrators have enough time to accurately evaluate all educators? Previous research indicated that evaluations create a substantial burden for principals who are typically tasked with evaluating all teachers of every subject (Conley & Glasman, 2008; Edgar, 2012, Kersten & Israel, 2005; White, 2014). Ramirez and colleagues (2014) noted that principals were concerned about the increased workload tied to evaluations. A few educators in this study also recognized the administration burden and lamented for their evaluators.

One of the drawbacks in increased administrator workload is that it can limit the effectiveness of educator feedback, both in quality and quantity. Limited feedback reduces the effectiveness of evaluation, which is intended to improve teaching and ultimately student learning (Ramirez et al., 2014). Another drawback might include evaluators cutting corners on evidence gathering and report writing (Kimball, 2002), which Joel has also concluded. If educators are required to document student learning, administrators need to follow through and properly evaluate all materials to assist in teacher improvement.

Norris and colleagues (2016) found evidence of physical educators perhaps not understanding the student growth component within evaluation, which aligned with previous research (McKenzie & Lounsbery, 2013; Rink, 2013; Ward, 2013). Contrastingly, physical educators in this study were different in that they provided no

indication of lacking understanding concerning student learning. They did, however, feel the documentation requirement shifted from one extreme to another. Previously, little if any student learning documentation was required, whereas now physical educators are almost numb to the workload and very conscientious of the time consumption that accompanies it.

In the current form of teacher evaluation, documenting student learning appears to be a workaround and a necessary hoop for physical educators in this research to jump through. The interviewees discussed no substantive findings concerning the benefits of student learning documentation. One possible reason could be the newness of the evaluation implementation in the state. Teachers are still learning and gaining insight to the evaluation process itself, as opposed to growing and learning from the results. Perhaps more time will alleviate some concerns, as previous research indicated that teachers using an evaluation model for two years were more confident than those utilizing a new system for a single year (Murphy et al., 2014). Student learning should be a priority for all educators, regardless of an evaluation requirement or not. Preparation programs need to teach future educators how to both perform student-learning assessments and properly provide necessary documentation for all teaching levels. Current teachers should hone their craft and continually seek incremental improvement in student learning. As Neil mentioned, “over the years, my classes have improved. Not drastically, but enough to get you some good [evaluation] scores.”

State mandates: unintended consequences

State legislators might have had the best of intentions when creating and updating evaluation mandates, but the actual implementation was lacking based on the findings

from the interviewees in this study. Murphy and colleagues (2014) found that 50% of teachers believed Indiana evaluations needed improvement, but only 19% indicated that state mandates had an actual impact on the local level. Similarly, physical educators in this study felt that accountability needed improvement, yet evaluation implementation was lacking and potentially damaging. They also felt that state mandates created a series of unintended consequences, such as devaluing education, the teacher shortage, and complacency.

Devalued Education

Currently, pursuing a master's degree has no merit in Indiana. The state removed any awards or supplemental payments related to advanced degrees due to newly implemented compensation plan mandates (IDOE, 2016e). Historically, and as late as at least 1997 (M. Hess, personal communication, April 21, 2016), a master's degree was required for Indiana educators after their first five years teaching in the profession. City and colleagues (2010) found that student learning could be improved by increasing teacher knowledge, yet Indiana provides no incentive for educators. Physical educators in this study mentioned this fact that teacher education is currently devalued in the state.

Teacher Shortage

The previously discussed teacher shortage was identified as an unintended consequence, as educators in this study felt the shortage occurred due early retirements, diminished perceptions of education throughout Indiana, and a lack of recruitment into the education field. To reiterate, enrollment in education preparation programs decreased 50% since 2009 (U.S Department of Education, 2013). Relatedly, the amount of total initial Indiana licenses issued from 2009-10 to 2014-15 decreased from 5,685 to 3,802

(IDOE, 2016b). The interviewees noticed many veteran and quality educators deciding to retire early based on evaluation mandates, which not only hurt local schools and their students, but the state teacher pool overall as well. Teachers in this research also believe that education recruitment had decreased in recent years. Anecdotally, educators are advocates for the teaching profession who encourage students and possible recruits to pursue a career in education. Interviewees in this study, however, described the notion that teachers are no longer encouraging their students to enter the profession. Some educators even discouraged their own children from following their footsteps in education based on current state policies. These factors combine to help explain one of the reasons Indiana is facing a teacher shortage.

Complacency

A final unintended consequence described by some of the educators was the concept of complacency. Many school corporations in this research provided the same amount of financial bonus whether a teacher received an “effective” or “highly effective” rating. Despite some schools having a larger dollar incentive for highly effective teachers, in the case of Kurt, the monetary difference between the two rating tiers was a single dollar. While some teachers viewed this as a positive in maintaining collegiality and sharing the wealth, it begs the question of why attempt for a highly effective rating? If the difference between receiving an effective rating compared to a highly effective score is one dollar, extrinsic motivation is minimized. Physical education is often isolated (Lux & McCullick, 2011), and teachers are left to their own devices, which potentially add another layer to complacency. Possibly, an administrator might not have the ability to

accurately observe effective physical education, which places the impetus of the pursuit of effectiveness squarely on the physical educator.

The top down approach to evaluations have hindered their overall effectiveness and created unintended consequences. These laws and state mandates involving evaluation policies were then designed for implementation at the local level. The interpretation from each of the levels, from policymakers, to school administration, and finally to teachers, has become muddled in a high stakes atmosphere. In Indiana educators can be dismissed based on evaluations. The state indicates that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal, and teachers who are rated in the lowest two categories can be terminated if they fail to raise their evaluative ratings to effective or highly effective after two years (NCTQ, 2015). Teachers should rely on principals to interpret and protect educators as they face challenges related to evaluation (Kersten & Israel, 2005). Ramirez and colleagues (2014, p. 50) offers some sound advice:

Policy-makers, on the other hand, need to resist the urge to control the minute details of school operations by designing policies that can be implemented in a reasonable fashion. Education policies targeted at the school level that overreach and demand too much are doomed to fail. Policymakers would be well served by collaborating with practitioners in such matters as they craft new legislation on teacher evaluation.

Based on the findings of this research, it appears most politicians failed to recognize potential unintended consequences when they implemented the evaluation policies impacting educators throughout the state.

Recommendations

Many of the interviewees in this study identified potential solutions to their evaluation issues. The following section describes initial physical educator input and combines researcher organization to address evaluative shortcomings.

Physical Education Evaluation Tool Development

One potential solution would be to develop an evaluation tool that focused on physical education only. As it is a subject that differs from all other subjects, the tool would be helpful in ensuring quality evaluations that move past a simple busy, happy, good model. As local context is vital to an evaluation model, it is suggested that Indiana universities and colleges assist with the tool development. Currently, there are 24 approved teacher preparation physical education programs in the state. Colleges and universities could work regionally to develop specific plans that reach local areas. Regional schools offer greater insight to the happenings and contexts surrounding schools in their areas. Professional development and partnership opportunities could emerge due to the increased interactions between higher education institutions and their surrounding schools.

The foundation for the tool could begin with the NASPE Physical Education Evaluation Tool (2007), and then be tailored to follow state guidelines and mandates. The tool has five components, which include instruction, student learning, management, learning climate, and professionalism. Additionally, its five-level scoring guide, including various terminologies, is highly customizable. This tool is underutilized across the nation, and Indiana could implement local tools with the NASPE document as a foundation. Educators from the various institutions could also meet to modify and format

the RISE tool for physical education, as it is the predominately used model in the state. Ideally, this group of educators could create a more holistic approach to physical education evaluation rather than focusing on fitness testing only.

Qualified Evaluators

Building off the idea of utilizing physical education preparation programs at higher institutions throughout the state, some teachers recommended hiring outside evaluators who specialize in subject-specific content. K-12 schools could hire university supervisors to conduct partial or full evaluations for physical education teachers. Supervisors, whose roles include student teaching supervision, are already qualified to observe and assess, and could be credited with some teaching load for their service. Evaluators might need to tread carefully concerning age and career phases, in order to ensure respect and objectivity take place for the evaluations. This solution may also be cost prohibitive and somewhat problematic, as institutions tend to designate course loads for institution work only. However, many institutions of higher learning have service components tied to their mission statements, and this would qualify as a service to the community.

Along with strengthening community bonds, it addresses qualification issues physical educators discussed in their interviews. Other potential qualified candidates could include physical education retirees, other former physical educators, outside administrators, or other university or college pedagogy faculty. Regardless of the individual, the evaluator would need experience and background of the teaching level she or he would be evaluating for proper context. As content and pedagogical experts, quality evaluators could reshape the profession by holding current teachers to the highest

standards. As previously discussed in this chapter, physical education is often isolated and can lead to complacency. Qualified evaluators could reintroduce an undergraduate element to help in accountability and increase quality physical education throughout Indiana.

PETE Curriculum Changes

Universities should consider adapting curriculum and instruction towards evaluation to bridge the gap between preparation and practice. Currently, in physical education teacher education (PETE) programs, evaluation appears to be addressed minimally in the professional preparation process. Anecdotally, Ball State University is limited in their current evaluation preparation, and other institutions seem to be lacking as well. Students entering the profession need to be aware of evaluation expectations, as well as how to perform and document student learning. Preparation programs have an obligation to set their students up for success, and this missing component is glaring, especially in the current high stakes education environment.

Evaluation could be incorporated into portions of already established courses, such as seminars or advanced pedagogy courses, or an entirely new class could be developed based solely on evaluation. Current K-12 physical educators in the field could present experiences or lessons learned, as well as sharing examples of evaluation tools used for evaluation within school corporations. Other challenges and field experiences could be incorporated to help immerse students into the world of evaluation prior to the start of their careers. Ingersoll and colleagues (2014) stated the importance of new teachers' pedagogical training as important to educator success in the classroom. The better-trained educators are pedagogically, the less likely they are to leave the profession

(Ingersoll et al., 2014). An article in the *Economist* (2016) suggested increasing practicum experience for students would help provide context for undergraduate students, as well as emphasizing pedagogical content knowledge, maximizing time on task, and student motivation. The PETE Initial Standards, which affect program requirements, could compel PETE curriculums to be revitalized and reshaped to address evaluation and pedagogy moving forward.

Technology-related Data Collection

Another potential solution to some of the issues in physical education evaluation includes utilizing technology to track student data. Heart rate monitors and other various data tracking technologies can help physical educators objectively assess student effort and accurate data for administrators (Eberline & Richards, 2013). This also addresses some of the subjectivity issues related to tracking student learning data, as opposed to the temptation of influencing teacher-created or implemented fitness testing. Data drives decisions, and providing evidence helps prove the value of the happenings in a gymnasium. Additionally, reporting student data to administrators can increase teacher accountability (Rink, 2013), furthering the argument for technology-related data tracking. Technology can provide an outlet for student motivation, as technology is embedded in current students' lives.

Tracking data with technology also frees physical educators to teach skill development and other affective and cognitive components in their lessons as opposed to focusing squarely on fitness testing-related activities. Regardless of teacher philosophies, physical education should be well rounded for students with the goal of educating and developing passions for lifelong activity and learning. The current evaluative landscape,

combined with the minimized contact time, space availability, and other contextual hindrances, force physical educators to focus primarily on fitness. This approach waters down delivery of other rich content the profession can offer, and is not consistent with national or state standards for K-12 physical education. Using technology to track student data not only addresses some of the issues related to evaluation, but also assists in challenging marginalization of physical education in Indiana schools.

Advocacy and Policy

Physical educators within Indiana (and other states) could borrow a page from their national organization, SHAPE America, and have a state ‘Speak Out Day’ to mobilize and meet with state legislators to address the deficiencies of the evaluation system related to physical education professionals. It appears that physical educators are isolated, not only in their own schools, but as a collective group throughout the state. There seems to be little interaction other than a gathering once a year for the Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (IAHPERD) state conference. It is in the opinion of the researcher that IAHPERD needs to do more both in advocacy efforts and for professional development. Currently, the organization appears to be tired with a redundant convention that offers limited excitement or assistance with real advocacy efforts. Although the website boasts more than 1,000 members, the website is extremely outdated and minimizes the impact of a first impression for potential members or students in preparation programs.

The Illinois Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (2016) is located in a neighboring state, is organized with legislative actions members can take on their homepage. They also have three lobbyists, along with easily accessible

pages for their strategic plan, values, and purposes as an organization. While one example, it highlights the possibilities a state association can take to seek changes in physical education. IAHPERD is positioned to mobilize its over 1,000 members and increase its presence with legislators in order to create a lasting impact for the profession in Indiana. While work needs to be done and improvements are required, IAHPERD has the potential to create change and add a spark of inspiration to the profession, especially in advocacy and shedding light on the evaluation issues for physical education.

It is time to break a long chain of disdain from legislators who, based on their own school experiences, have been less than supportive of physical education. We need to set in motion a new, evidenced-based impression of physical education by our policymakers that suggest physical education is valuable for our society. Importantly, we need impress upon students who will be future legislators that physical education makes a positive difference in the lives of our children over a lifetime. Legislators who have a quality experiences in physical education may be the biggest advocates for comprehensive physical education in our country.

Grassroots Professional Development

As physical educators previously described, physical education professional development opportunities are limited (Sears et al., 2014). Building on the idea of preparation programs throughout the state becoming more involved in the surrounding K-12 schools, institutions of higher education could provide continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities to educate teachers and principals (or others who are involved in the evaluation process) about administration communication and demonstration of effective physical education. In regards to context, regional schools are

more aware of local school issues that would help customize CPD experiences. Teachers in this study desired consistency, and communicating with administrators can help build trust and support within a school setting.

The document *How Can I Demonstrate to My Building Principal That I Am an Effective Physical Education Teacher* (NASPE, 2012) is an appropriate starting point for CPD for physical educators. Student learning, evaluation tools, and teacher effectiveness are critical topics to discuss within regional professional development, which can help create partnerships and foster relationships between colleges or universities and their surrounding community schools. Proper CPD can increase student learning and improve teacher effectiveness (Donaldson, 2013; Kimball, 2002; Looney, 2011). These goals of professional development align with the values and intent of teacher evaluation (IDOE, 2013). Therefore, the two concepts should be viewed together when considering methods of improving evaluation. Teachers need to be self-motivated regarding CPD, as they cannot expect to have a full understanding from their undergraduate experiences alone. Physical educators need to seek CPD to remain current in pedagogical practices, and to improve their teaching craft (Looney, 2011).

Administration Education

Based on the findings of this research, educating school administrators about the issues related to physical education evaluation is essential. School administrators benefit from CPD and research by understanding the importance of creating an inclusive environment, and understanding the differences in physical education evaluation. Support from building principals is crucial to correcting the current evaluation implementation, and physical educators should do anything they can to avoid busy, happy, and good 2.0.

School boards and superintendents must be accountable in assuring that school administrators know and are engaged in current evaluative practices.

Connections could be made and relationships built among IAHPERD, state administration associations, and the Indiana Department of Education to help provide further understanding of the disconnect between physical education evaluation and current state mandates. One of the powers of education is the ability to make informed decisions, and it appears legislators and administrators throughout the state are unaware of the evaluative issues in the profession. The findings from this study could also be helpful for graduate programs that prepare future administrators on how to properly assess different subject areas. Administration graduate programs could have opportunities to interact with physical education pedagogy scholars to gain further assistance or knowledge in the differences between classroom evaluation and their physical education counterparts. Educating key stakeholders, such as administration, is vital to creating actual change and improving the profession in Indiana.

Limitations

There were various limitations identified prior to the onset of the study that should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results. The project as a whole was ambitious, and we were limited in our access to Indiana physical educators. Only 41 school corporations of the 310 total public school corporations (13.23%) provided access to their teachers. The limited access alone speaks to the tumultuous current nature of evaluation. This includes denied access of almost every large and urban school corporation, which limited the study further. Relatedly, the IRB process potentially hindered access due to multiple mandatory steps. These steps included seeking

permission from a corporation superintendent, who would provide an approval letter and communicate with building principals for their potential permission. Building principals would then have the option to agree or disagree, and would then notify physical educators that the research team would be contacting them. While an IRB requirement, finding a more direct access to physical educators would help alleviate this limitation in the future.

The sample size (22) was also relatively small, as the overall project only had access to 314 out of the nearly 2600 potential public physical educators across the state. This could be viewed as a representation limitation of all Indiana physical educators. One should use caution when transferring research findings to other school corporations, as transferability to other state situations would be dependent on the context similarities between schools of comparison.

This research relied predominantly on self-reported teacher evaluation interview data. Interviewees also volunteered to participate in the study, which removed any further sampling and might have also skewed results. However, the presence of negative cases appeared to have accurate result representation. There is a potential that individuals may have a selective memory or exaggeration when recalling events related to teacher evaluation. Additionally, only single interviews occurred from the participants. More interactions and interviews might have the ability to gain more access, depth, and discussion with participants. Finally, even though the researcher previously taught physical education, he was still an outsider to the interviewees and could have influenced educators.

Future Research

The research in this study was exploratory in nature. The findings in this study provided a qualitative voice for physical educators, and the research is currently one of two known qualitative studies on physical education teacher evaluation (Norris, 2016). Due to the constantly changing evaluation landscape, there are a plethora of future directions. Follow up studies revisiting and interviewing the same physical educators could shed light on any evaluation progress or regression made. If the same educators were willing, they could be interviewed annually for a longitudinal study.

Future research could also interview school officials other than physical educators, such as administrators or teachers of other subjects, to gain further insight into evaluation and physical education. Parents could also be interviewed to gain a community perspective to the impact of evaluation. Other potential participants include Department of Education officials and other legislators who influence evaluation on a state level. Interview data from these individuals could provide greater context and understanding to individual schools.

While this research focused on the qualitative approach to Indiana teacher evaluation, quantitative instruments could be utilized to gain further understanding to the process. While the research team did not accomplish the original mixed method approach, quantitative data would be helpful in uncovering more of the evaluative puzzle in the future.

Based on the emotional toll many of the physical educators experienced, future research could explore burnout related to evaluation, which could be helpful in identifying information about individuals who thought of or left the profession due to the

current teaching environment. Information in this area might also provide further insight into the teacher shortage Indiana is currently facing.

Other studies could involve a coalition of pedagogy researchers to research evaluation on a national scale. This group could participate in policy research, as it appears to be one of the fundamental issues for teachers in this study. Other topics could include PETE curriculums related to evaluation to understand how prepared future physical educators are in evaluation expectations. Working with a coalition on a larger scale could help gain greater teacher access, which limited the current study. It could also provide the ability to disseminate information to a broader audience, such as administration or policy journals.

Future research on school culture might be helpful as many of teachers were dissatisfied with their experiences. School culture research might shed light on information to address and bridge the gap for improving work environments related to evaluation. Finally, research on the same topic could be replicated in other states to gain further physical education evaluation understanding.

Final Thoughts

After completing numerous interviews, it became clear that the physical educators in this study were passionate about their profession and the students they served. Based on their perceptions and experiences, they recognized many of the weaknesses of the current evaluation processes in Indiana. Some shortcomings include heavy-handed state mandates that produce unintended consequences, administration components related to failing to fully understand evaluation in physical education, and issues related to documenting student learning. According to Marshall (2005), teacher evaluation should

be based on classroom observations, student achievement gains, and feedback from students. Popham (2013) suggested quality teacher evaluations are needed to become accurate and fair in order to help provide students with the best teachers and education possible. However, evaluation effectiveness will depend largely on how the data is used in the process (Marshall, 2005). There needs to be more accountability in physical education related to assessment and standards-based teaching. More accountability will not only to support teacher improvement, but also primarily help students learn.

Specifically related to physical education, Ennis (2014) challenged future physical educators to break the mold of busy, happy, and good on easy street. Actual change cannot occur unless there is buy in from both administration and physical educators. Collectively, everyone needs to be committed. If administrators only care about classroom management and safety as opposed to dynamic and quality physical education, current physical educators will find themselves facing busy, happy, and good 2.0. Administrators need to gain further understanding into the physical education environment, and also need to fully grasp evaluation in a gymnasium setting (Norris, 2016). Communication is of the utmost importance, as frequent communication between both parties is critical to understanding the evaluation system (IDOE, 2012a).

Given the benefits to a comprehensive education, physical education should be treated as an academic subject. The subject as a whole has a lack of consistency, ranging from teachers who put forth great effort to secure grants and equipment to ensure the highest level of instruction possible, all the way to the stereotypical “gym” teacher who rolls out the dodge balls and let students have free reign without any instruction. Technology-related data collection can assist in providing some credibility to the subject,

as a new approach is required to address concerns in physical education. Unfortunately, the current government attitude establishes the critical issue at hand: the neglect of a teacher evaluation process on noncore subjects such as physical education. While academic success is vital to helping individuals grow into productive members of society, all subjects should be given an equal opportunity to help develop a well-rounded and fully educated student. This research has clearly demonstrated a lack of attention to subject areas such as physical education, which creates a potentially bleak outlook for the future of the subject.

As the profession currently stands, physical education is at a crossroad. Physical educators need to be dynamic teachers and utilize the skills learned in their preparation programs to stand out and make a difference concerning evaluation. Having control of delivered content and teaching approach, along with principal support, can inhibit washout (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009). Complacency is no longer an option, and the profession needs to take calculated measures in changing the approach to physical education. Program advocacy, increased presence with legislators, and mobilizing as a state organization are all options for addressing the challenges and shortcomings of current evaluation in Indiana. Ultimately, it is up to physical educators to care enough to seek solutions themselves.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Armour, K. M. (2010). The physical education profession and its professional responsibility . . . or . . . why “12 weeks paid holiday” will never be enough. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 15*, 1–13.
- Armour, K.M., & Yelling, M.R. (2004). Continuing professional development for experienced physical education teachers: Towards effective provision. *Sport, Education and Society, 9*, 95-114.
- Arrighi, M.A., & Young, J.C. (1987). Teacher perceptions about effective and successful teaching. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 6*, 122-135.
- American Educational Research Association. (2015). AERA statement on use of value-added models (VAM) for the evaluation of educators and educator preparation programs. *Educational Researcher, 44*(8), 448-452.
- Bailey, R., Armour, K. Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., Sandford, R. & the BERA Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy Special Interest Group. (2009). The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review. *Research Papers in Education, 24* (1), 1-27.
- Baker, E. L., Barton, P. E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H. F., Linn, R. L., & Shepard, L. A. (2010). Problems with the Use of Student Test Scores to Evaluate Teachers. EPI Briefing Paper #278. *Economic Policy Institute*.

- Barnett, J. A. (2012). Experienced teacher evaluation through performance appraisals: Is consistency possible? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 1853-1860.
- Bechtel, P. A., & O'Sullivan, M. (2006). Effective professional development—What we now know. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 25(4), 363-378.
- Bell, C. A. (2012, September). *Validation of professional practice components of teacher evaluation systems*. Paper presented at the 14th annual Reidy Interactive Lecture Series, Boston, MA.
- Benedict, A. E., Thomas, R. A., Kimerling, J., & Leko, C. (2013). Trends in teacher evaluation: What every special education teacher should know. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 45(5), 60.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2013). Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET Project's three-year study. Bellevue, WA: Retrieved from http://metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf
- Blankenship, B. T. & Coleman, M. M. (2009). An examination of "wash out" and workplace conditions of beginning PE teachers. *Physical Educator*, 66, 97-111.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 349-378.

- Blazar, D., Litke, E., & Barmore, J. (2016). What does it mean to be ranked a “high” or “low” value-added teacher? Observing differences in instructional quality across districts. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(2), 324-359.
- Brandt, C., Mathers, C., Olivia, M., Brown-Sims, M., & Hess, J. (2007). *Examining district guidance to schools on teacher evaluation policies in the Midwest Region* (REL 2007-No. 030). Retrieved from:
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/rel_2007030.pdf
- Braun H. (2005). Using student progress to evaluate teachers: a primer on value-added models. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
<http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICVAM.pdf>.
- Braun, H., Chudowsky, N., & Koenig, J. (2010). *Getting Value Out of Value-Added: Report of a Workshop*. Committee on Value-Added Methodology for Instructional Improvement, Program Evaluation, and Accountability; National Research Council. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/12820.html>.
- Bredeson, P. V. (2000). The school principal's role in teacher professional development. *Journal of In-service Education*, 26(2), 385-401.
- Bulger, S. M., & Housner, L. D. (2009). Relocating from easy street: Strategies for moving physical education forward. *Quest*, 61, 442–469.
- Bullough, R.V., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 13–21.
- Carroll, T., & Fulton, K. (2004). The true cost of teacher turnover. *Threshold*, 8(14), 16-17.

- Cawley, J., Frisvold, D., & Meyerhoefer, C. (2013). The impact of PE on obesity among elementary school children. *Journal of Health Economics*, 32, 743–755.
- City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2010). *Instructional rounds in education. A network approach to improving learning and teaching*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Cogshall, J. G., Ott, A., & Lasagna, M. (2010). Retaining teacher talent: Convergence and contradictions in teachers' perceptions of policy reform ideas. Naperville, NY: Learning Point Associates and Public Agenda.
- Cole, C. M., Robinson, J. N., Ansaldo, J., Whiteman, R. S., & Spradlin, T. E. (2012). Overhauling Indiana Teacher Evaluation Systems: Examining Planning and Implementation Issues of School Districts. *Education Policy Brief*, 10(4). Center for Evaluation and Education Policy, Indiana University.
- Conley, S., & Glasman, N. S. (2008). Fear, the school organization, and teacher evaluation. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 63-85.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (1999). The more things change the more they stay the same: Factors influencing teachers' interpretations and delivery of national curriculum physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 4(1), 75-97.

- Curtner-Smith, M. D., Hastie, P. A., & Kinchin, G. D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(1), 97-117.
- Danielson, C. (2013). The framework for teaching. *Evaluation Instrument. The Danielson Group*. Retrieved on May 2, 2016 from <https://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/>
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. ASCD.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8-15.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Jaquith, A., & Hamilton, M. (2012). Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching. *Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE)*.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, J. (2000). Authentic Assessment of teaching in context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 523-545.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A., & Klein, S. (1999). *A license to teach: Raising standards for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, J. W. (1988). The relationship between selected performance evaluation procedures and principals' perceptions about performance evaluation. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 50, 837A.

- Davis, D. R., Ellett, C. D., & Annunziata, J. (2002). Teacher evaluation, leadership and learning organizations. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16(4), 287-301.
- Deglau, D. (2005). *Negotiating individual and district level change: A socio-cultural journey into teacher professional development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). Introduction – The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derrington, M. L., & Campbell, J. W. (2015). Implementing new teacher evaluation systems: Principals' concerns and supervisor support. *Journal of Educational Change*, 16(3), 305-326.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dodson, R. L. (2015). Kentucky principal perceptions of the state's new teacher evaluation system: a survey analysis. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 53.
- Donaldson, M. L. (2013). Principals' approaches to cultivating teacher effectiveness constraints and opportunities in hiring, assigning, evaluating, and developing teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(5), 838-882.
- Donaldson, M. L., & Donaldson Jr., G. A. (2012). Strengthening teacher evaluation: What district leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 78-82.
- Donaldson, M. L., & Papay, J. P. (2014). Teacher evaluation for accountability and development. In H. F. Ladd & M. E. Goertz (Eds.), *Handbook of research in education, finance and policy*. pp. 174 – 192. Routledge

- Doolittle, S. A., & Schwager, S. (1989). Socialization and inservice teacher education. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach* (pp. 105–121). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark.
- Eberline, A. D., & Richards, K. A. R. (2013). Teaching with technology in physical education. *Strategies*, 26(6), 38-39.
- Ebmeier, H. & Nicklaus, J. (1999). The impact of peer and principal collaborative supervision on teachers' trust, commitment, desire for collaboration, and efficacy. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14, 351–379.
- Edgar, S. (2012). Communication of expectations between principals and entry-year instrumental music teachers: Implications for music teacher assessment. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 113(4), 136-146.
- Education Reform. (2016, June 11). Teaching the teachers. *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21700385-great-teaching-has-long-been-seen-innate-skill-reformers-are-showing-best>
- Ellingson, L. L. (2011). Analysis and representation across the continuum. *Handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 595-610). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ennis, C. D. (1996). When avoiding confrontation leads to avoiding content: Disruptive students' impact on curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 11, 145–162.
- Ennis, C. D. (1998). The context of a culturally unresponsive curriculum: Constructing ethnicity and gender within a contested terrain. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14, 749–769.

- Ennis, C. D. (2012). Innovative practices and programs in physical education. In G. Theoharis & J. S. Brooks (Eds.), *Instructional leadership for social justice: What every principal needs to know to lead equitable and excellent schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ennis, C. D. (2014). The Role of Students and Content in Teacher Effectiveness. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 85(1), 6-13.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Folden, R.E. (1984). The cultures of teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 505–526). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Firestone, W. A., Blitz, D. H., Gitomer, D. K., Shcherbakov, A., & Nordon, T. I. (2013). *New Jersey teacher evaluation, RU-GSE external assessment, Year 1 report*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.
- Firestone, W. A. (2014). Teacher Evaluation Policy and Conflicting Theories of Motivation. *Educational Researcher*, 43(2) 100-107.
- Firestone, W. A., & Hirsch, L. S. (2006). *A formative evaluation of New Jersey's professional development requirements for teachers: Year 5*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Educational Policy Analysis.
- Fosnot, C. (1996). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In C. Fosnot (Ed.) *Constructivism in theory, perspectives, and practice*. (pp. 182 - 204) New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Fowler, F. C. (2013). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.

- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform* (Vol. 10). Psychology Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change personal action guide and workbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Glazerman, S., & Seifullah, A. (2010). An evaluation of the teacher advancement program (TAP) in Chicago: year two impact report. *Mathematical Policy Research, Inc.*
- Glazerman, S., & Seifullah, A. (2012). An Evaluation of the Chicago Teacher Advancement Program (Chicago TAP) after Four Years. Final Report. *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
- Glickman, C. D. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Graber, K. C. (1991). Studentship in preservice teacher education: A qualitative study of undergraduate students in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62(1), 41-51.
- Green, P., Baker, B., & Oluwole, J. (2012). The legal and policy implications of value-added teacher assessment policies. *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal*, 2012(1), 1-30.

- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2, 163-194.
- Guskey, T.R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher*, 15(5), 5-12.
- Guskey, T.R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teacher and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 8, 381-391.
- Halverson, R., Kelley, C., & Kimball, S. (2004). Implementing teacher evaluation systems: How principals make sense of complex artifacts to shape local instructional practice. *Educational administration, policy, and reform: Research and measurement*, 153-188.
- Hamilton, D. (1994). Traditions, preferences, and postures in applied qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 60–69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2010). Generalizations about using value-added measures of teacher quality. *American Economic Review*, 100, 267–271.
- Harris, D. N., Ingle, W. K., & Rutledge, S. A. (2014). How Teacher Evaluation Methods Matter for Accountability: A Comparative Analysis of Teacher Effectiveness Ratings by Principals and Teacher Value-Added Measures. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(1), 73–112.
- Hay, P. J. (2006). 4.5 Assessment for learning in physical education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O’Sullivan, *Handbook of physical education* (pp. 312-325). London: SAGE.

- Hazi, H.M., & Rucinski, D.A. (2009). Teacher evaluation as a policy target for improved student learning: A fifty-state review of statute and regulatory action since NCLB. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 17(5), 1-22.
- Hellison, D. R. (1995). Teaching responsibility through physical activity. *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J.F. (2011). The Constructionist Analytics of Interpretive Practice. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (341-357). California: Sage.
- Hill, H., & Herlihy, C. (2011). Prioritizing teaching quality in a new system of teacher evaluation. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute Policy Studies.
Retrieved from <http://www.aei.org/policy/education/k-12>.
- Hoyle, J. R. (2002). *Leadership and the Force of Love: Six Keys to Motivating with Love*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hull, J. (2013). Trends in Teacher Evaluation: How States are Measuring Teacher Performance. *Center for Public Education*.
- Illinois Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. (2016). Homepage. Retrieved from <https://www.iahperd.org/>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2012a). The Indiana Evaluation Pilot: Mid-Year Report and Recommendations. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/esea/p3/3b_attachment_8_tntp_midyear_report_risa.pdf

- Indiana Department of Education. (2012b). Summer Report: Creating a Culture of Excellence in Indiana Schools. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/evaluations/tntp-summer-report-june-2012.pdf>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2012c). RISE evaluation and development system. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/evaluations/rise-handbook-2-0-final.pdf>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2014a). Staff Performance Evaluation Results. Retrieved from http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/ER_Data_Presentation_to_SBOE_-_v._12.30.14.pdf
- Indiana Department of Education. (2014b). *A-F Accountability*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/f-accountability>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2015). History of Indiana's Accountability System. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/history-indiana%E2%80%99s-accountability-system>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2016a). 2015-2016 Evaluation Plan Index. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations/evaluation-plans>
- Indiana Department of Education, (2016b). License Verification and Information System (LVIS). Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/blueribbon/blueribboncommission-recruitment-9.24.2015.pdf>

- Indiana Department of Education. (2016c). The blue ribbon commission on the recruitment and retention of excellent educators final report. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/blueribbon/blueribbon-report-1.14.2016.pdf>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2016d). Indiana superintendent of public instruction Glenda Ritz names appointees to ISTEP review panel. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/news/indiana-superintendent-public-instruction-glenda-ritz-names-appointees-istep-review-panel>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2016e). Compensation systems. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.in.gov/effectiveness/compensation-systems>
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & May, H. (2014). *What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition?*. Research Report (#RR-82). Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Jacob, B., & Lefgremn, L. (2008). Can principals identify effective teachers? Evidence on subjective performance evaluation in education. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 26(1), 101-136.
- James, A. (2011). The marginalization of physical education: Problems and solutions—Part I: Introduction. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 82(6), 15–16.
- Jerald, C. (2009). *Aligned by design: How teacher compensation reform can support and reinforce other educational reforms*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

- Johnson, E., & Semmelroth, C. L. (2013). Introduction to AEI's Special Issue on Special Education Teacher Evaluations. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 1534508413511489.
- Kant, I. (1966). *Critique of pure reason*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. (Original work published 1781).
- Kersten, T. A., & Israel, M. S. (2005). Teacher Evaluation: Principals' Insights and Suggestions for Improvement. *Planning and Changing*, 36, 47.
- Kimball, S. M. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16(4), 241-268.
- Kimball, S. M., & Milanowski, A. (2009). Examining teacher evaluation validity and leadership decision making within a standards-based evaluation system. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(1), 34-70.
- Kretchmar, S. (2006). Life on Easy Street: The persistent need for embodied hopes and down-to-earth games. *Quest*, 58, 345-354.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. London, England: Methuen.
- Larsen, M.A. (2005). A critical analysis of teacher evaluation policy trends. *Australian Journal of Education*, 49(3), 292-305.

- Lawson, H. A. (1983a). Toward a model of teacher socialization in PE: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education (part 1). *Journal of Teaching in PE*, 2(3), 3-16.
- Lawson, H. A. (1983b). Toward a model of teacher socialization in PE: Entry into schools, teachers' role orientations, and longevity in teaching (part 2). *Journal of Teaching in PE*, 3(1), 3-15.
- Lawson, H. A. (1986). Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching in PE*, 5, 107-116.
- Lawson, H.A. (1989). From rookie to veteran: workplace conditions in physical education and induction into the profession. In T.J. Templin & P.G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach* (pp. 145–164). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.
- Leana, C. R. (2011). The missing link in school reform. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 9(4), 30-35.
- Lee, S. M., Burgeson, C. R., Fulton, J. E., & Spain, C. G. (2007). Physical education and physical activity: results from the School Health Policies and Programs Study 2006. *Journal of School Health*, 77(8), 435-463.
- Lektorskii, V.A. (2010). Realism, Antirealism, Constructivism, and Constructive Realism in Contemporary Epistemology and Science. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 48(6), 5–44.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. New York, NY: Sage.

- Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E.G. (2011). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences, Revisited. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (97-128). California: Sage.
- Lindsay, E. L. (2014). Effective teaching in physical education: The view from a variety of trenches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 85(1), 31-37.
- Little, O., Goe, L., & Bell, C. (2009). A practical guide to evaluating teacher effectiveness. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality: Washington DC. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED543776.pdf>.
- Locke, L. F. (1992). Changing secondary school physical education. *Quest*, 44(3), 361-372.
- Lodico, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtle, K. H. (2006). *Methods in educational research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Looney, J. (2011). Developing High-Quality Teachers: teacher evaluation for improvement. *European Journal of Education*, 46(4), 440-455.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loup, K. S., Garland, J. S., Ellett, C. D., & Rugutt, J. K. (1996). Ten years later: Findings from a replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in our 100 largest districts. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 10(3), 203–226.
- Lux, K. (2011). How to raise the status of physical education at your school. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 81(8), 40–42.

- Lux, K., & McCullick, B. A. (2011). How one exceptional teacher navigated her working environment as the teacher of a marginal subject. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 30*(4), 358-374.
- Macdonald, D. (2009). Evidence-based practice in physical education: ample evidence, patchy practice. In L. D. Housner, M. W. Metzler, P. G. Schempp & T. J. Templin, *Historic traditions and future directions of research on teaching and teacher education in physical education* (pp. 199-205). Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University.
- Marshall, K. (2012). Fine-tuning teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 50-53.
- Marshall, K. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(10), 727-735.
- Marzano, R. J. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 14-19.
- Maypole, J. & Davies, T.G. (2001). Students' perceptions of constructivist learning in a community college American History II survey course. *Community College Review, 29*(2), 54-79.
- McCaffrey, Daniel F., Daniel Koretz, Lockwood, J. R., & Hamilton L.S. (2003). *Evaluating Value-Added Models for Teacher Accountability*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG158.pdf.

McCaughtry, N., Barnard, S. D., Martin, J. J., Shen, B., & Hodges-Kullina, P. (2006).

Teachers' perspectives on the challenges of teaching physical education in urban schools: the student emotional filter. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 77(4), 486-497.

McGuinn, P. (2012). Stimulating reform: Race to the Top, competitive grants and the Obama education agenda. *Educational Policy*, 26, 136–159.

McKenzie, T. L., & Lounsbury, M. A. (2013). Physical Education Teacher Effectiveness in a Public Health Context. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 84(4), 419-430.

Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milanowski, A. T., & Heneman, H. G., III. (2001). Assessment of teacher reactions to a standards-based teacher evaluation system: a pilot study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 15(3), 193–212.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Murphy, H., Cole, C., Pike, G., Ansaldo, J., & Robsinson, J. (2014). *Indiana Teacher Evaluation: At Crossroads of Implementation*. Bloomington, Indiana: Center on Education and Lifelong Learning.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2013). Leading via Teacher Evaluation The Case of the Missing Clothes? *Educational Researcher*, 42(6), 349-354.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2012). How can I demonstrate to my building principal that I am an effective physical education teacher?

[Guidance document]. Reston, VA: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2010). PE metrics: assessing national standards 1–6 in elementary school (2nd ed.). Reston, VA: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2007). *Physical education teacher evaluation tool* [Guidance document]. Reston, VA: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2016). Estimated average annual salary of teachers in public elementary and secondary schools, by state: Selected years, 1969-70 through 2014-15. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_211.60.asp?current=yes

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

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2015). State of the States 2015: Evaluating teaching, leading and learning. Retrieved from <http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/StateofStates2015>

- Network for Public Education (2016). Educators on the Impact of Teacher Evaluation: Executive Summary. Retrieved from <http://networkforpubliceducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/NPETeacherEvalReport.pdf>
- Nicholson, E. W. & Tracy, S. J. (2001). Principal's influence on teacher's attitude and implementation of curricular change. *Education, 103*(1), 68–73.
- Norris, J., van der Mars, H., Kulinna, P., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Kwon, J., & Hodges, M. (In Press). Physical education teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation. *The Physical Educator*.
- Nuthall, G. & Alton-Lee, A. (1995). Assessing Classroom Learning: How Students Use Their Knowledge and Experience to Answer Classroom Achievement Test Questions in Science and Social Studies. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(1), p.185-223.
- OECD (2012). Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) Country Note: United States. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/unitedstates/PISA-2012-results-US.pdf>
- O'Pry, S. C., & Schumacher, G. (2012). New teachers' perceptions of a standards-based performance appraisal system. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 24*(4), 325-350.
- O'Sullivan, M. (1989). Failing gym is like failing lunch or recess: Two beginning teachers' struggle for legitimacy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 8*, 227–242.

- Ovando, M. N. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of a learner-centered teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15*(3), 213-231.
- Ovando, M. N., & Ramirez Jr., A. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20*(1-2), 85-110.
- Padaruth, S. (2016). Principals' experiences and perceptions of physical education teacher evaluation: a qualitative case study. (Doctor of Philosophy Doctoral Dissertation), Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Pate, R. R., Davis, M. G., Robinson, T. N., Stone, E. J., McKenzie, T. L., & Young, J. C. (2006). Promoting physical activity in children and youth a leadership role for schools: A scientific statement from the American Heart Association Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism (Physical Activity Committee) in collaboration with the councils on Cardiovascular Disease in the Young and Cardiovascular Nursing. *Circulation, 114*(11), 1214-1224.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. New York: Viking Press.
- Pike, S., & Fletcher, T. (2014). A review of research on physical education teacher socialization from 2000 – 2012. *PHEnex Journal, 6*(1), 1-17.
- Pink, D. (2011). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.

- Placek, J. H. (1983). Conceptions of success in teaching: Busy, happy, and good? In T.J. Templin & J.K. Olson (Eds.), *Research on teaching in physical education* (pp. 46-56). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Placek, J. H., Doolittle, S.A., Ratliffe, T.A., Dodds, P., Portman, P.A., & Pinkham, K.M. (1995). Teaching recruits' physical education backgrounds and beliefs about purposes for their subject matter. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 14* (3), 246-261.
- Plowman, S. A., Sterling, C. L., Corbin, C. B., Meredith, M. D., Welk, G. J., & Morrow, J. R., Jr. (2006). The history of FitnessGram®. *Journal of Physical Activity & Health, 3*, S5–S20.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology; Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 126.
- Ponticell, J. A., & Zepeda, S. J. (2004). Confronting well-learned lessons in supervision and evaluation. *NAASP Bulletin, 88*(639), 43–59.
- Popham, W. J. (1988). The dysfunctional marriage of formative and summative teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1*(3), 269-273.
- Popham, J. W. (2013). *Evaluating America's Teachers: Mission Possible?* California: Corwin (Sage).
- Preissle, J. (2006). Envisioning qualitative inquiry: A view across four decades. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education. 19*(6), 685-695.

- Prince, C., Schuermann, P., Guthrie, J., Witham, P., Milanowski, A., & Thorn, C. (2008). The other 69 percent: Fairly rewarding the performance of teachers of non-tested subjects and grades. Washington, DC: Center for Educator Compensation Reform, U.S. Department of Education.
- Prosser, J. (2011). Visual methodology: Toward a more seeing research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 479-495). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Puhse, U., & Gerber, M. (2005). *International comparison of physical education: concepts, problems, prospects*. Oxford, UK: Meyer & Meyer Sport.
- QSR International Pty Ltd. (2012). NVivo qualitative data analysis Software Version 10.
- Ramirez, A., Clouse, W., & Davis, K. W. (2014). Teacher evaluation in Colorado How policy frustrates practice. *Management in Education*, 28(2), 44-51.
- Reinhorn, S. K., Johnson, S. M., & Simon, N. S. (2015). Using Data To Drive Instruction: Teachers' Experiences of Data Routines in Six High-Performing, High-Poverty, Urban Schools.
- Richards, K.A.R., Templin, T. J., & Gaudreault, K.L. (2013). Organizational challenges and role conflict: Recommendations for the preparation of physical education teachers. *Quest*, 65, 442-457.
- Richards, K. A. R., Templin, T. J., & Graber, K. (2014). The socialization of teachers in physical education: Review and recommendations for future works. *Kinesiology Review*, 3, 113-134.

- Rink, J. E. (2013). Measuring Teacher Effectiveness in Physical Education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 84(4), 407-418.
- Rink, J. E., Jones, L., Kirby, K., Mitchell, M., & Doutis, P. (2007). Teacher perceptions of a physical education statewide assessment program. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*, 78(3), 204-215.
- Rink, J. E., & Mitchell, M. (2002). High stakes assessment: A journey into unknown territory. *Quest*, 54, 205-223.
- Rothstein, R., Ladd, H., Ravitch, D., Baker, E., Barton, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Linn, R., Shavelson, R., & Shepard, L. (2010). Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers. *Economic Policy Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.epi.org/publication/bp278>
- Rowan, B., Correnti, R., & Miller, R. J. (2006). What large-scale survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from the *prospects* study of elementary schools. *Teachers College Record*, 104, 1525–1567.
- Runyan, W. (1984) *Life Histories and Psychobiography* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Schachter, R. (2012). Brave new world of teacher evaluation. *District Administration*, 48(10), 43-47.
- Schempp, P. G. (1989). Apprenticeship-of-observation and the development of physical education teachers. In T.J. Templin & P.G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach* (pp. 13–38). Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

- Schempp, P. G. (1986). Physical education student teachers' beliefs in their control over student learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5(3), 198-203.
- Schempp, P.G., & Graber, K. (1992). Teacher socialization from a dialectical perspective: Pretraining through induction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11(4), 329–348.
- Schochet, P.Z., & Chiang, H.S. (2010). Error Rates in Measuring Teacher and School Performance Based on Student Test Score Gains (NCEE 2010-4004). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2009). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, LTD.
- SHAPE America. (2013). National Standards for K-12 Physical Education. Retrieved from <http://www.shapeamerica.org/standards/upload/National-Standards-Flyer-rev.pdf>
- SHAPE America & American Heart Association. (2016). 2016 Shape of the Nation Report: Status of physical education in the USA. Reston, VA: Society of Health and Physical Educators.
- Sears, J. V., Edgington, W. D., & Hynes, J. W. (2014). The effect of professional development on physical education instruction in middle schools: thirty middle school physical education teachers in the southwestern united states participate in a research study of professional development opportunities and deficiencies in a field not driven by high-stakes testing. *Middle School Journal*, 45(5), 25-31.

- Sheehy, D. (2011): Addressing parents' perceptions in the marginalization of Physical Education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 82(7), 42-56.
- Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport education: Quality PE through positive sport experiences*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Siegel, J. (1988). Children's target heart rate range. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 59(4), 78-79.
- Smith, K. (2005). New Methods and Perspectives on Teacher Evaluation. In D. Beijaard et al. (Eds), *Teacher Professional Development in Changing Conditions*, 95-114. Netherlands: Springer.
- Smyth, D. M. (1995). First-year physical education teachers' perceptions of their workplace. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14(2), 198-214.
- Solmon, L., White, J. T., Cohen, D., & Woo, D. (2007). The effectiveness of the teacher advancement program. *Santa Monica, CA: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching*.
- Solmon, M. A. & Garn, A. C. (2014). Effective Teaching in Physical Education: Using Transportation Metaphors to Assess Our Status and Drive Our Future. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 85(1), 20-26.
- Sparkes, A. C., & Templin, T. J. (1990). The problematic nature of a career in a marginalized subject: Some implications for teacher education programs. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 16(1), 3-28.

- Sparkes, A. C., & Templin, T. J. (1992). Life histories and physical education teachers: Exploring the meanings of marginality. In A. C. Sparkes (Ed.), *Research in physical education and sport: Exploring alternative visions* (pp. 118-145). London: Falmer.
- Sparkes, A. C., Schempp, P. G., & Templin, T. J. (1993). Exploring dimensions of marginality: Reflecting on the life histories of physical education teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12*(4), 386-398.
- Stoelinga, S. R. (2011). Pressuring teachers to leave: Honest talk about how principals use harassing supervision. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(4), 57-61.
- Stran, M., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2009). Influence of occupational socialization on two preservice teachers' interpretation and delivery of the sport education model. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 28*(1), 38-53.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research, techniques, and procedures for developing grounded theory*. London: Sage.
- Stronge, J. H. (2012). Stronge teacher effectiveness performance evaluation system. Article adapted from Stronge, J.H. (2010). *Assessing teacher effectiveness: Eight research-based standards for assessing teacher excellence*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Stroot, S.A., Faucette, N., & Schwager, S. (1993). In the beginning: The induction of physical educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12*(4), 375-385.
- Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2009). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.

- Templin, T.J. (1989). Running on ice: A case study of the influence of workplace conditions on a secondary school physical education teacher. In T.J. Templin & P.G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach* (pp. 1–11). Indianapolis: Benchmark Press.
- Templin, T.J., Richards, K.A.R., Blankenship, B.T., Smith, A., Kang, B.J., & Cory, E. (2011). Professional development and change in physical education: The experience of a teacher in her induction years. In S. Brown (Ed.), *Issues and controversies in physical education: Policy, power and pedagogy* (pp. 173–182). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.
- Templin, T.J., & Schempp, P.G. (Eds.). (1989). *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.
- Templin, T. J., Sparkes, A., Grant, B., & Schempp, P. (1994). Matching the self: The paradoxical case and life history of a late career teacher/coach. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 13(3), 274-294.
- TNTP (2012). How schools can build cultures where teachers and students thrive. Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_Greenhouse_Schools_2012.pdf
- TNTP (2015). Final Recommendations for Changes to Indiana’s Evaluation System. Retrieved from https://secure.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Board.pdf
- Todorovich, J. R. (2009). Research on Teaching Health and Physical Education. In L. J. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching* (pp. 1061-1077). New York: Springer.

- Torff, B., & Sessions, D. N. (2005). Principals' perceptions of the causes of teacher ineffectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*(4), 530.
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2011). Stimulating professional learning through teacher evaluation: An impossible task for the school leader? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(5), 891-899.
- Ulrich, D. A. (2000). *The test of gross motor development* (2nd ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-ed.
- US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, US Department of Health and Human Services, & Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. (2010). *Healthy people 2020*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthypeople.gov/2010/Document/pdf/Volume2/22Physical.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *ESEA flexibility*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *Indiana 2013 Title II Report*. Retrieved from <https://title2.ed.gov/Public/TitleIIReport13.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the top program: Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 209–261). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Valentine, J. W. (1992). *Principles and practices for effective teacher evaluation*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, S. (2014, April 7). Hoosier educators 'effective' — but is the data flawed? *Lafayette Journal and Courier*. Retrieved from <http://www.jconline.com/story/news/education/2014/04/07/hoosier-educators-effective-but-is-the-data-flawed/7415187/>
- Ward, P. (2013). The Role of Content Knowledge in Conceptions of Teaching Effectiveness in Physical Education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 84(4), 431-440.
- Ward, P., & Doutis, P. (1999). Toward a consolidation of the knowledge base for reform in physical education. In P. Ward (Ed.), *The saber-tooth project: Curriculum and workplace reform in middle school physical education* [Monograph]. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 18, 382-402.
- White, T. (2014). Adding Eyes: The Rise, Rewards, and Risks of Multi-Rater Teacher Observation Systems. Issue Brief. *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*.
- Wood, T. M. (2003). Assessment in physical education: the future is now! In S.J. Silverman & C.D. Ennis (2nd ed.), *Student learning in physical education: Applying research to enhance instruction* (pp. 187-203). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Wood, T. M. (1996). Evaluation and testing: the road less travelled. In S. J. Silverman and C.D. Ennis (Eds.), *Student learning in physical education: Applying research to enhance instruction*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Woods, A., & Lynn, S. (2014). One physical educator's career cycle: Strong start, great run, approaching finish. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 85(1), 68-80.
- Wyatt, M. (2011). Overcoming low self-efficacy beliefs in teaching English to young learners. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(2) 238-255.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press
- Zeichner, K.M. (1979, January). *The dialectics of teacher socialization*. Paper presented at the Association for Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL.
- Zeichner, K.M., & Gore, J.M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W.R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 329–348). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Zeichner, K.M. & Tabachnik, B.R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education 'washed out' by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(2), 7-11.
- Zimmerman, S. (2003). Five steps for improving teacher evaluation: Focusing on the continual improvement of teaching and learning. *The Professional Educator*, 25(2), 43-54.
- Zhu, W., Rink, J., Placek, J. H., Graber, K. C., Fox, C., Fisette, J. L., Dyson, B., Youngsik, P., Avery, M., Franck, M., & Raynes, D. (2011). PE Metrics: Background, testing theory, and methods. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 15(2), 87-99.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: School Corporation Permission Documentation

Dear Superintendent _____,

In collaboration with Andrew Eberline and Sookhen Padaruth from Purdue University, we request your assistance in the conduct of a study surveying principals and physical education teachers on your corporation's teacher evaluation system. The purpose of the study is to describe physical educators' and principals' perceptions of and experiences with the current system. This study will require the following:

- Principals and Physical Educators complete a separate 15-20 minute survey related to the teacher evaluation process.
- Participation in a face-to-face, and possible follow-up interview, with a member of the research team. Only a select number of individuals across the study will be asked to participate in the interview phase, which is voluntary.

The entire study is completely voluntary, and any information gathered by the research team will be kept confidential. The participants in this study will also remain anonymous, and any identifying information will be removed and replaced by numerical codes. Additionally, any reports or write-ups will not include any information about your school specifically. We are trying to protect any possible identification of any of the subjects by separating the demographic information from the survey. Also, we will use pseudonyms for those interviewed and the schools in which they work. We will be extremely careful not to state anything that might create an association of subject's responses to the identity of the participant or the school in which they work. For example, we will not state "this participant has one ten state championships at a suburban Indianapolis school" or "works in an affluent high school as the sole physical education teacher near a Big 10 university."

If you agree to participate, we have provided a sample letter of consent to conduct research. We ask that you please email the included letter of consent or a similar letter of approval on school corporation letterhead to any member of the research team. Additionally we would ask that you contact the principals in your corporation, who would in turn contact the physical education teachers in their schools, to inform potential colleagues of our outreach for participation in the study. Formal consent procedures will follow if we receive indication of your interest to participate in this study.

We have attached the surveys and interview schedules for both principals and physical educators for your review. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Andrew Eberline (515-864-6564 or aeberlin@purdue.edu) or Sookhen Padaruth (765-637-6654 or spadarut@purdue.edu) if you would be willing to meet with us.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas Templin
Professor
Department of Health and Kinesiology
Purdue University

Appendix B: Corporation Sample Letter of Consent

Spring, 2014/2015

The purpose of this letter is to affirm that Dr. Thomas Templin, Andrew Eberline, and Sookhen Padaruth has permission from the [*Insert School Corporation*] to recruit principals and physical educators to conduct a research study on teacher evaluations. The information collected will include separate short surveys (one for principals, one for physical educators) involving physical educators' and principals' perceptions of and experiences with the current system. Potential interviews will also occur, pending consent from individuals who participate in the survey. The information will be treated as confidential.

Sincerely,

Name,
Superintendent

Appendix C: Physical Educator Recruitment Email

Dear TEACHER,

My name is Dr. Thomas Templin, and I am a professor in Health and Kinesiology at Purdue University. As you might be aware, my doctoral students and I are carrying out a research project on teacher evaluation systems throughout Indiana. We request your help in completing this project, and are specifically interested in learning about your experiences and perceptions of your school's teacher evaluation process as a physical educator. The information we gather will be used to gain an understanding of the physical educators' evaluation processes, as well as possible research publications. All information will be kept strictly confidential and will only be accessed by the researchers. All data gathered will be destroyed after the completion of the project and publication of results. Additionally, no responses will be shared with any members of your administration. Your participation in this study is entirely optional, and you can choose to withdraw from the project at any time. However, your valuable participation will help us better understand the evaluative process and helps in providing better support to the physical education community at large.

If you agree to participate in the study, please proceed with the online Physical Educators survey. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes for you to answer 92 short questions. If you encounter a question that makes you feel uncomfortable or that you would prefer not to answer, please feel free to skip it. Additionally, completion of the items listed under the demographic information is completely voluntary. If you are uncomfortable completing any part or all of this section, that is completely your choice. Please note that by clicking the link below, you are providing consent for the research team to collect and analyze your responses. Finally, by completing the survey, you are granting your formal approval to your participation in the study.

If you have any questions regarding the survey or study please contact us either Andrew Eberline (aeberlin@purdue.edu or 515-864-6564) or Sookhenlall Padaruth

(spadarut@purdue.edu or 765-637-6654). Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Link to Online Survey: (LINK TO SURVEY INCLUDED HERE)

Sincerely,

Thomas Templin

Professor

Department of Health and Kinesiology

Purdue University

Appendix D: Interview Contact Information (Qualtrics)

Thank you for being willing to participate in our interview. As previously stated, the purpose of this study is to describe physical educators' and principals' perceptions of and experiences with the teacher evaluation system in the state of Indiana. Initially our purpose is to unfold the experiences and challenges faced by physical education teachers, as they adapt to the teacher evaluation system, and the factors that influence the teachers in their approving or rejecting the educational reform. Also we desire to learn more about principals' perceptions and experiences of the evaluative process in relation to the evaluation of physical education teachers.

You will be asked to participate in a 40-60 minute interview that will discuss your perceptions of and experiences with teacher evaluation. The purpose of the interview is to identify your perspective of teacher evaluation and how it influences your effectiveness at school. By providing your contact information, you are agreeing that it is acceptable and appropriate for the Purdue University research team to contact you for a potential interview.

Please provide the following:

First and Last Name:

Contact Email:

Contact Phone Number:

Appendix E: Physical Educator Teacher Evaluation Interview Guide

Hello _____, my name is _____, it's nice to [meet you/see you again]. Thank you for taking the time to talk with us this [afternoon/morning]. Before we get started, I want to take a minute to review the purpose of this interview: We are interested in learning more about your experiences and perceptions involving your teacher evaluation process. The information we gather will be used to gain an understanding of physical educators' evaluation processes and potentially future research publications. Anything that you say will be kept strictly anonymous. That is, we will transcribe this conversation and then remove your name and replace it with a pseudonym. All other identifying information will likewise be removed. Whatever you say will also be kept confidential, that is no one will get access to the interview apart from the investigating team and the information will be used for this research project only. Therefore, please feel free to respond candidly and honestly. The interview should not take any longer than 45-60 minutes.

I also want you to know that your participation in this interview is entirely optional. You don't have to participate and there will be no employment consequence for not participating. If you decide to start and then part of the way through change your mind, it is okay to stop at any time. During the interview you may see me taking notes – these notes help keep me on track and ensure I don't repeat questions that I would like to ask. We are also recording this conversation. The recording will be deleted after we have transcribed our conversation. In addition, if you say something during the interview and decide later that you do not want us to use it, we can redact the tape.

Does everything sound alright? [Wait for response] Is it okay to begin? [Wait for response] Do you have any questions about the interview or any other information I have given to you before we begin? [Wait for response] Okay, then let's begin.

Background Information – Before we start talking about the specifics of the teacher evaluation process, I would like to know a little about your professional background.

1. What level do you teach at?
 - a. How many years have you taught at this school? Total?
 - b. What are your teaching responsibilities at school? Coaching?
2. Tell me a bit about your Physical Education department and how you operate/teach.
 - a. Do you share a common teaching and/or office space?
 - b. Do you have the autonomy to teach as you see fit?
 - c. How often and for how long do the students have Physical Education?

Teacher Evaluation Process – The first thing I would like to talk with you about are your experiences with the teacher evaluation process in general.

3. Please describe a typical teacher evaluation for you as a PE teacher.
4. What type of evaluation system do you use at your school?
 - a. Would you categorize it as some version of RISE, a different model, or your own school-created evaluation system?
 - b. Is your school's teacher evaluation system appropriate to evaluate PE?
5. How many times were you observed in the last year, year before?
 - a. In your opinion, was your evaluator in the class or gym long enough to accurately evaluate you as a teacher?
6. Describe your thoughts on your evaluator's ability to accurately evaluate teaching in PE.
 - a. Do you feel that your evaluator is qualified to accurately observe you?
7. How is the current teacher evaluation system different from other teacher evaluation systems you have been through in the past?
8. What is your impression of your school corporation's evaluation policy? What are your perceptions of the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation system at your school?
9. If you were given the opportunity, what would you change, if any, in the present teacher evaluation system?
 - a. Could be state policies or mandates, accountability, assessment, etc.

Student Learning – Now I'd like to switch gears and talk about student learning in PE.

10. What approach did you use to evaluate and do you feel this was accurate enough or the right approach to properly evaluate student learning? How often did you assess student learning over the course of an academic year?
 - a. Was student learning used in teacher evaluations? If so, what performance measures were used for your student learning component?
 - b. Would you make any changes on student learning for PE in the future? Why or Why not?

11. In your opinion, has the emphasis on student learning through teacher evaluations had any impact on student learning in your classes? How or why not?

Teacher Evaluation Outcomes – Let's transition to some teacher evaluation outcomes and results.

12. What kind of feedback did you receive from the evaluators?
 - a. Was the feedback constructive and helpful concerning your teaching, if at all?
 - b. Was Principal feedback helpful in offering improvement suggestions? How or why not?
13. How has the teacher evaluation affected your teaching, or the teaching of P.E in general, if at all?
14. Has it in anyway affected you as a teacher or personally?
 - a. Do the evaluations add stress in your professional or personal life? If so, how? Do evaluations impact on how you reflect on teaching as a long term or your willingness to stay in the field?
15. How effective is the present system of teacher evaluation?
16. The survey showed opinions of all types concerning the effectiveness of teacher evaluations. How do we address teacher evaluations to either solve or fix them in PE?
17. Do you think the current teacher evaluation system has effect on the accountability of PE teachers?
 - a. Does the current system encourage you to be accountable? Please explain.
 - b. Does the Teacher evaluation system hold you more accountable than in the past?
 - c. Do they have a positive impact on you as a person and or teacher?
 - d. How has the evaluation system impacted your teaching? Have you improved your teaching due to teacher evaluations? Why or why not?

18. Do you think the students benefit from the present system of teacher evaluation?
And if so, how?
19. Do you think teacher evaluations help P.E teachers? If so, How?
20. Are there any post-evaluation follow-ups or support mechanisms for teachers at your school?
21. Was your teacher evaluations connected to your pay? If so, how does that make you feel or do you have any thoughts on that policy? Is this equitable and fair across subjects? Are you evaluated the same as teachers in other subjects (In your opinion, are there any differences in consideration given to PE teachers as compared to teachers of other subjects)? Is the current system better than previous systems and/or the traditional pay scale approach?
22. Have you had any opportunity for professional development since your evaluation?
 - a. This could include in-service days, conferences, continuing education, etc.
23. When thinking about professional development, can this be taken into account for evaluations or is it a separate topic? How can professional development be improved in PE?
24. What kind of support have you received from the school administration or colleagues concerning your evaluation?
25. What is the overall effectiveness of the teacher evaluation process in your school?
 - a. In P.E. specifically?
26. How have teacher evaluations affected your teaching overall?

Teacher Evaluation Policy – As we get ready to conclude the interview, I have a couple final questions related to teacher evaluation policies at the state level.

27. What is your general opinion or impression of the state educational policies and reforms?
 - a. Your personal opinion (if not provided)?

28. What is your view or opinion on the status of PE today, both in your school and across the country?
29. What changes do you foresee in the teaching of P.E or the role of P.E teachers in the next 10 years?
30. Is there anything else you would like to discuss involving teacher evaluations that we previously have not talked about?
 - a. Can you summarize the purpose of teacher evaluations in a short phrase

Thank you for taking the time to interview with us. We really appreciate your help and contribution in this project. We look forward to more collaborative endeavors for the improvement of our children's education. Thank you again.

VITA

VITA

Andrew Eberline, Ph.D.

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy, Purdue University, Health and Kinesiology, August 2016
 Major Area: Sport Pedagogy
 Committee Chair: Dr. Thomas Templin, Ph.D.

Master of Arts, University of Northern Iowa, July 2010
 Major Area: Physical Education: Teaching with Technology
 Committee Chair: Dr. Larry Hensley, Ed.D.

Bachelor of Arts, Wartburg College, May 2006
 Major Area: Elementary Education
 Endorsement: Physical Education

Professional Experience

2015-Present, Assistant Professor, Physical Education Coordinator, Ball State University,

2014-2015, Instructor, Interim Physical Education Coordinator, Ball State University,
 Muncie, IN

2011-2014, Graduate Teaching Assistant, Physical Education, Purdue University, West
 Lafayette, IN

2009-2011, Ball State University – Physical Education Technology Coordinator

2008-2009, Earlham Community School District

2007-2008, Polar Scholar & UNI Graduate Teaching Assistant, Grundy Center
 Community School District

Honors/Awards

Teaching Academy Graduate Teaching Award, Health and Kinesiology, Purdue University, 2015

Templin Graduate Student Research Award, Health and Kinesiology, Purdue University, 2014

A. A. Annarino Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award, Purdue University, 2014

Donald L. Corrigan Professional Development Grant, Health and Kinesiology, Purdue University, Fall 2013

Donald L. Corrigan Professional Development Grant, Health and Kinesiology, Purdue University, Spring 2013

Polar Scholar, University of Northern Iowa, 2007-2008

TEACHING**Courses as primary instructor****Ball State University:**

PEP 209: Introduction to Teaching Physical Education

PEP 291: Motor Development and Learning across the Lifespan

PEP 394: Teaching Physical Education in the Elementary School

PEP 400: Introduction to Curriculum Design in Physical Education

PEP 444: Developing the Health and Physical Education Classroom Environment

PEP 150: Introduction to Teaching Physical Fitness

PEP 252: Teaching Fitness Activities

Purdue University:

HK 106: Development & Analysis of Net/Wall Games (2 semesters)

HK 200: Healthy Lifestyles (3 semesters)

HK 235: Teacher Education Sophomore Seminar (2 semesters)

HK 335: Teacher Education Junior Seminar (2 semesters)

HK 326: Foundations of Adapted Physical Education (2 semesters)

Courses as a teaching assistant

Purdue University:

EDCI 429: Teaching of Physical Education in Secondary Schools (1 semester)

- Served as a college supervisor for pre-service physical education students

EDCI 435: Student Teaching in Physical Education (2 semesters)

- Served as a college supervisor for physical education and health student teachers

Ball State University

PEP 209: Introduction to Teaching Physical Education (2 Semesters)

PEP 394: Teaching Physical Education in the Elementary School (4 Semesters)

PEP 395: Teaching Physical Education in the Middle School (1 Semester)

PEP 399: Teaching Physical Education in the High School (2 Semesters)

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Thesis/Dissertation

Eberline, A. D. (2016). Perceptions of and Experiences with the Indiana Teacher Evaluation System in Physical Education. (Doctor of Philosophy Doctoral Dissertation), Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Eberline, A.D., Hensley, L. & Phillips, C. (2010). Relationship of Enjoyment, Perceived Competence, and Cardiorespiratory Fitness to Physical Activity Levels in Elementary School Children. Unpublished Master's Research Paper, University of Northern Iowa.

Peer-Reviewed Publications

Richards, K. A. R., **Eberline, A. D.**, & Templin, T. J. (2016). Secondary professional socialization through professional organization. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 35(1), 70-75.

Richards, K.A.R., **Eberline, A.D.**, Padaruth, S., Templin, T.J. (2015). Experiential Learning through a Physical Activity Program for Children with Disabilities. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 34(2), 165 – 188.

Vidoni, C., Azevedo, L., & **Eberline, A. D.** (2012). Effects of a group contingency strategy on middle school physical education students' heart rates. *European Physical Education Review*, 18 (1), 78-96.

Published Conference Abstracts and Proceedings

Richards, K. A. R., **Eberline, A. D.**, & Templin, T. J. (2013). Understanding the impact of service-learning on preservice teachers' attitudes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*.

Non-Peer Reviewed Publications

Eberline, A. D., & Richards, K. A. R. (2013). Advocacy in Action: Using technology to advocate for your physical education program. *Strategies: A Journal for Physical and Sport Educators*, 26(6), 38-39.

Publications in Review and In Preparation

Eberline, A. D., Richards, K. A. R., Padaruth, S., & Templin, T. J. (In Preparation). Dispositional changes in attitudes towards children with disabilities in a service-learning-based physical activity and aquatics program. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*.

Peer-Reviewed Presentations

Eberline, A. D., Padaruth, S., & Templin, T. J. (2016, April). *Physical Education Teacher Evaluations in Indiana*. Submitted to the Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) National Conference, Minneapolis, MN.

Eberline, A. D. & Carr, B. (2015, November). *Teaching Middle School P. E. with Technology*. Submitted to the Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (IAHPERD) State Conference, Indianapolis, IN.

Hurley, K. & **Eberline, A.D.** (2015, October). The digital natives are restless! Educators' adoption, barriers, and efficacy for technology use. Submitted to the Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE) PETE & HETE Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Richards, K. A. R., **Eberline, A. D.**, & Templin, T. J. (2014, February). *Understanding graduate students' perspective of secondary professional socialization through professional associations*. Submitted to the International Association for Physical Education in Higher Education Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.

- Eberline, A. D.**, Richards, K. A. R., Templin, T. J., & Padaruth, S. (2013, July). *Dispositional changes in attitudes toward children with disabilities in a service-learning-based physical activity and aquatics program*. Submitted to the International Association of Physical Education in Higher Education Conference, Warsaw, Poland.
- Richards, K. A. R., **Eberline, A. D.**, Templin, T. J., & Padaruth, S. (2013, July). *The outcomes of participating in a service-learning-based physical activity and aquatics program for children with disabilities*. Submitted to the International Association of Physical Education in Higher Education Conference, Warsaw, Poland.
- Hemphill, M. A., Richards, K. A., & **Eberline, A. D.** (2012, July). Using case studies to explore pre-service physical education teachers' intellectual, cultural, and moral dispositions. *International Convention on Science, Education, and Medicine in Sport*. Glasgow, Scotland.
- Richards, K. A., Templin, T. J., Hemphill, M. A., & **Eberline, A. D.** (2012, July). *Implementing sport education during a school-university partnership through the eyes of a beginning teacher*. Presented at the International Convention on Science, Education and Medicine in Sport conference, Glasgow, Scotland, UK.
- Vidoni, C., Azevedo, L., & **Eberline, A. D.** (2011, July). Effects of a Group Contingency Strategy on Middle School Physical Education Students' Heart Rates. Presented at the International Association of Physical Education in Higher Education Conference, Limerick, Ireland.

Invited Presentations

- Eberline, A. D.** (2014, April). *Perceptions of and Experiences with the Indiana Teacher Evaluation System in Physical Education*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of SHAPE America, St. Louis, MO.
- Eberline, A. D.** et al. (2014, April). *Graduate Student Forum*. Facilitator at the annual meeting of SHAPE America, St. Louis, MO.
- Eberline, A. D.**, Padaruth, S. P., Richards, K. A. R., & Templin, T. J. (2013, November). Teacher evaluation in physical education. Presented at the East China Normal University, Putuo, Shanghai, China.
- Eberline, A. D.** et al. (2013, April). *Graduate Student Forum*. Facilitator at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance Conference, Charlotte, NC.

Templin, T. J., **Eberline, A. D.**, Padaruth, S., & Richards, K. A. R. (2012, November). *Physical education curriculum in the United States*. Presented at the East China Normal University, Putuo, Shanghai, China.

Templin, T. J., Richards, K. A. R., **Eberline, A. D.**, & Padaruth, S. (2012, November). *Teacher socialization and role conflict*. Presented at the East China Normal University, Putuo, Shanghai, China.

Guest Lectures

Eberline, A.D. (2014, April). *Graduate School Prospects*. Presented in HK 135: Introduction to Health and Kinesiology.

Eberline, A.D. (2014, February). *Physical Education Overview and Introduction*. Presented in HK 135: Introduction to Health and Kinesiology.

Eberline, A. D. (2013, November). *Homeschool Physical Education Program*. Presented in HK 209: Elementary School Physical Education, Carole DeHaven.

Eberline, A.D. (2013, November). *Graduate School Opportunities*. Presented in HK 135: Introduction to Health and Kinesiology.

Eberline, A.D. (2013, September). *Introduction to Physical Education*. Presented in HK 135: Introduction to Health and Kinesiology.

Eberline, A. D. (2013, September). *Physical Education Technologies*. Presented in EDCI 429: Secondary Methods in Physical Education, Dr. Bonnie Blankenship.

Eberline, A. D. (2012, October). *Sexuality Education*. Presented in HK 320: Health Education in Elementary Schools

Eberline, A. D. (2012, October). *Physical Activity*. Presented in HK 320: Health Education in Elementary Schools (two presentations)

Eberline, A. D. (2012, September). *Post-graduation: What to expect as a new physical educator*. Presented in EDCI 429: Secondary Methods in Physical Education, Dr. Bonnie Blankenship.

Eberline, A. D. (2011, March). *Technology in Physical Education*. Presented remotely at West Virginia University, Dr. Emily Jones.

Grants

- Eberline, A.D.** (2016). *Ball State University HRT Technology Integration Project*. Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (IAHPERD), \$2,000.00.
- Eberline, A. D.** & Richards, K. A. R. (2014). *Promoting Positive Physical Activity for Children with Disabilities*. Purdue University Office of Engagement, \$1,500.00.
- Richards, K. A. R., & **Eberline, A. D.** (2013). *Physical Activity through Service-Learning for Children with Disabilities in the greater-Lafayette area*. Purdue University Office of Engagement, \$1,500.00.
- Richards, K. A. R., & **Eberline, A. D.** (2012). *Engaging local youth with disabilities in physical activity and aquatic instruction through service-learning*. Purdue University Office of Engagement, \$1,500.00.
- Eberline, A. D.** (2013). *Graduate School Summer Research Grant*. Purdue University Health & Kinesiology Department, \$2,987.26

SERVICE

Professional Committees/Offices

Department of Health and Kinesiology

2014, Department of Health and Kinesiology Website Design Committee, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN

- 2011-Present, Health and Kinesiology Graduate Student Organization (HK-GSO), Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
- 2013-2014 – HK-GSO Faculty Representative
 - 2012-2013 – HK-GSO President
 - 2011-Present – Member

Program Reviews

Richards, K. A. R., **Eberline, A. D.**, & Templin, T. J. (2013). *Graduate students' experiences with AAHPERD and the Research Consortium*. Submitted to the Research Consortium Executive Board of AAHPERD.

Professional Organizations

2014-Present, American Educational Research Association (AERA)

2014-Present, International Association for Physical Education in Higher Education (AIESEP)

2013-Present, Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE; formerly AAHPERD) America

2009-2010, 2011-Present, Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (IAHPERD)

2009-2010, 2011-2013 American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPRD)

- 2009-2010, 2011-2013 National Association for Sport and Physical Education

2007-2008, Iowa Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (IAHPERD)

REFERENCES

Thomas Templin, Ph.D., Associate Dean for Undergraduate Affairs; Professor of Health and Fitness, School of Kinesiology, University of Michigan, 1402 Washington Hts., Ann Arbor, MI 48109

- Dissertation Committee Chair and mentor

Bonnie Blankenship, Ph.D., Professor of Physical Education Pedagogy, Department of Health and Kinesiology, Purdue University, 800 West Stadium Ave., West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

- Dissertation Committee Member

Beth Kirkpatrick, Director of Education and Advocacy, Heart Zones, Inc., 2636 Fulton Ave., Suite #100 Sacramento, CA 95821

- Mentor and Colleague with the Polar Scholar program