THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN TEXAS: INTENTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Diane Davis-Frost, B.S., M.S.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2000

Approved:

Steve Tipps, Major Professor
Frank Kemerer, Minor Professor
Bill Camp, Committee Member
John Stansell, Chair of the Department of Teacher Education and Administration
M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of Education
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Davis-Frost, Diane, Intentions and Implementation of the Professional Development and Appraisal System in Texas. Doctor of Philosophy (Curriculum and Instruction), December, 2000, 95 pp., 13 tables, references, 60 titles.

The purpose of this study was to describe the intentions of the designers of the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) in Texas and the perceptions of teachers regarding its implementation. Information for the study was gathered in two phases using two methodologies. The first was a semi-structured interview with four expert informants instrumental in the design and implementation of the PDAS at the state level. The second component of the study was conducted with teachers using a 37-item Likert survey. The population for this phase of the study was 150 elementary and 150 secondary teachers chosen randomly from three school districts in North Central Texas. The districts were selected to represent a variety of sizes in regard to student population and represent diverse student population characteristics and socioeconomic levels.

Data from the semi-structured interviews and the returned surveys were analyzed to determine the designers' intentions and areas of emphasis and to describe the alignment the teachers' perceptions and the designers' intentions. Quantitative data gathered from the surveys were analyzed using descriptive statistics as well as a correlation and function analysis and analysis based on a Cronbach alpha coefficient. The analysis of data revealed the following:

1. Teachers perceived that the implementation of the PDAS has a high level of effect in the areas of learner-centered instruction; classroom management; support for all students; the professional growth of teachers; communication; learning application; and, TAAS improvement.

2. Teachers' perceptions were not affected by years of experience.

3. Teachers' perceptions were not affected by their field of instruction.

One implication of this study is that the final design represents the intentions of designers, although the area of student achievement is not weighted as heavily in teachers' evaluations as was originally intended. Furthermore, education leaders in Texas may conclude that teachers perceive a high level of impact upon their classroom practices as a result of implementation of the PDAS instrument. If future research reveals that the perceived impact is accurate and that classroom practices of teachers did change as a result of the instrument's implementation to the degree perceived, then this is a model for policy implementation at the state level that is extremely effective. Furthermore, additional researchers may investigate the link between classroom practices and student achievement. This research study is a first step toward describing effective, replicable practices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The field of education has been moving forward in reconceptualizing teacher evaluation based on new research and new goals regarding effective practices. Evaluation instruments typically specify desirable instructional pedagogy and professional practices with the assumption that their incorporation into the classroom would improve student learning. However, little research directly correlates evaluation processes or instructional processes with improved achievement (Killian and Wood, 1997; Cawelti, 1995). At one time, researchers even suggested that schools have little impact on students' success and that the factors determining achievement are the child's family background and social context (Coleman, et. al., 1966).

More recent research has discovered that several variables related to pedagogy, teacher training, and school organization do impact achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ferguson, 1991; Glass, Cahen, Smith and Filby, 1982). By specifying desired teaching behaviors which are linked by research to enhanced performance, developers of the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) in Texas attempted to ensure that teachers would be evaluated on practices that improve student learning and increase the effectiveness of their professional interactions. The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of teachers regarding the implementation of Texas'

Professional Development and Appraisal System. In doing this, factors regarding the objectives of the instrument and their relationship to teachers' years of experience and fields of instruction have been isolated and compared.

The intense focus on improvement in the education community came as a result of several nation-wide events, such as the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the election of Ronald Reagan, a conservative President with a strong interest in education, and the Education Summit in 1989. Education is not alone in seeking improved job performance and results. During recent decades, businesses, government agencies, and educational institutions analyzed, critiqued, and designed processes for improvement within their organizations. In 1997, Olsen and Epstein, writing for the *Pennsylvania Times*, analyzed case studies of changes in business and government as a result of focusing on performance management. They discovered that agencies redesigned their improvement processes to include changes in organizational structure, dissemination of best practices of specific programs or agencies, collaborating with stakeholders, and motivating employees to become more outcomes oriented. These same practices were making their way into the educational setting in the forms of "best practices," parent involvement, site-based decision making, and enhanced evaluation processes.

Developing Teacher Evaluation Systems

"The quality of teaching is the foundation that supports student success in schools" (Mitchell, 1998). State and national reform efforts call for standards that clarify the goals for teachers and raise the expectations for classroom performance. Policymakers became deeply involved in all reform efforts, including efforts to improve

the teacher assessment process with the hope of advancing the quality of teaching and learning throughout the United States. Many varieties of assessment programs were developed and implemented at district, state, and national levels in recent decades. During the 1980s, traditional forms of assessment dominated these plans. These systems were often designed as a checklist, describing teacher behaviors and steps in a lesson cycle. From this beginning, new instruments reflecting current research began to gain acceptance. Assessments such as PRAXIS by the Educational Testing Service, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) were included in the evaluation process in many states. The commonality of these programs is alignment with the instructional processes, sometimes called "best practices," and are supported by the national standards (Baker, 1998). (See Appendix A.)

The systematic evaluation of teaching provides a means for improving the quality of classroom instruction and for ensuring consistency from classroom to classroom. Parents see the review of teachers as a way of ensuring that their children are receiving excellent teaching and learning opportunities. Administrators rely on evaluations to provide information needed for staffing decisions. Whether teachers generally accept their evaluations as a part of the job requirements and value appraisals that enhance their professional growth is still subject to debate (R. Chancellor, personal communication, August 2, 1999). However, research has not investigated teachers' reactions to different types of assessments or whether or not the assessment actually encouraged teachers to modify their professional practices.

As educators look beyond the structural changes of systems into the more complex issues of what should be taught, the best instructional methods to use, and how to determine the effect this has on student achievement, a group of instructional procedures and standards emerge that are common to all disciplines. Known as "best practices," they generally describe schools and classrooms that are student-centered, active, experiential, democratic, collaborative, and yet rigorous and challenging (Zemelman, 1993). Texas educational leaders attempted to incorporate these best practices into their assessment instrument in order to ensure increased student achievement and improve effective teaching behaviors as teachers use these strategies in their classrooms. Prior to the development of the current Texas teacher appraisal instrument, the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS), the Texas Education Agency participated in researching and evaluating a collection of qualitative and quantitative research that demonstrated relationships between teacher behaviors and desired student outcomes (Texas Education Agency, 1995). Designers of the PDAS relied on this collection of research as the descriptors of effective practices when creating the instrument.

Senate Bill 1, passed by the Texas legislature in 1995, required the Commissioner of Education to develop an appraisal system to replace and improve the 1985 Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS). After two years of study, research, and collaborative meetings with constituent groups, Texas piloted the new teacher appraisal instrument, the Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS) during the 1996-97 school year with implementation statewide during 1997-98. Over 90% of the districts in the state notified the Texas Education Agency that they intended to use the instrument during the

1997-98 school year. Other districts submitted waivers to develop their own appraisal systems, which were required to include similar components to the PDAS to the Texas Education Agency for approval.

The PDAS elements support the instructional practices outlined by the National Standards and reflect the senate's requirement for a higher standard of performance. In order for a teacher to be ranked as "proficient," the quality of instruction must be such that it "exemplifies outstanding teacher behavior." Criteria not typically found in teacher evaluation instruments such as personal goal setting, participation in staff development, student achievement, professional communication, and compliance with policies, operation procedures, and requirements, are included as part of Texas teachers' appraisals. The intent of the instrument is to affect classroom and professional practices and to be more responsive to the needs of teachers and administrators, while promoting continuous professional development and improvement.

Statement of the Problem

Implicit to this study is the policy issue relating to the congruence of the intent of the designers and the perceptions and practices of teachers. Perception and implementation are the properties of individual teachers and of the group as a whole. Individual teachers make decisions concerning whether or not and at what level to implement a policy based on their beliefs regarding effective instruction, the reinforcement they receive when the practices are tested in their classrooms with their students, and the support and expectations of administration, both at the district and the state levels. Individuals are supported by the group of which they are a part, and the

groups are sustained by decisions made at the administrative level. Therefore, individual and group decisions complement each other and are supported or destroyed by policies made at higher levels. The study of teacher perceptions, then, is critical to understanding how teachers as a group regard and accept the evaluation instrument (PDAS) and whether or not the instrument has the potential to enhance instructional practices based on its level of implementation.

A truism holds that effective teachers must merge subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Recent studies have found that higher levels of student achievement are associated with teachers' opportunities to participate in sustained professional development which is grounded in content-specific pedagogy. (Cohen & Hill, 1997; Wiley & Yoon, 1995). Inherent within this evaluation system is the belief that certain teacher behaviors increase student achievement and that evaluation processes reinforce, require, and, therefore, increase the use of these critical teaching behaviors. However, little research exists at this point that directly correlates specific teaching behaviors with student achievement. Using the intent of the designers and objectives within the instrument, the teachers' perceptions regarding implementation of the instrument was measured and described. If the research on which the PDAS system is based describes teaching practices that positively impact student achievement, the use of this evaluation instrument in Texas classrooms should increase the learning of the children in those classrooms. Because teachers are the only people who know what occurs on a daily basis in their classrooms, their perceptions of implementation of this system are crucial if the impact of the system is to be positive.

As with any new process, the effectiveness of the program is dependent upon the persons responsible for its implementation and outcomes. This study provides information about the perceived impact of PDAS on the professional growth of teachers, collegial interactions, teacher-parent interactions, and teachers' classroom practices

Research Questions

Investigating the following questions provide useful descriptive data for local school districts and state agencies to use in describing the implementation of Texas' evaluation system.

(1) What are the perceptions of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the areas of
   (a) learner-centered instruction;
   (b) classroom management;
   (c) support for all students;
   (d) the professional growth of teachers;
   (e) communication;
   (f) learning application; and,
   (g) TAAS improvement?

(2) Are the perceptions related to teachers' years of experience?

(3) Are the perceptions of teachers related to their field of instruction?

Research Design and Methodology

The study is descriptive and relational in nature and employed both qualitative and quantitative data. To ensure alignment between the survey instrument, the PDAS

evaluation criteria, and the original designers' intentions, interviews were conducted using the semi-structured interview format detailed in Appendix B. The interview group was comprised of persons instrumental in the initial design of the evaluation instrument. The interview questions were designed to discover the designers' roles and intentions when contributing to the development of the instrument, to reflect the objectives which are currently a part of the instrument, and to ensure the significance of the research questions. These objectives later became the statements to which teachers responded in the pilot survey, and modifications of these questions based on statistical analysis of the pilot study data became the final survey instrument. Following the pilot study, an expert panel evaluated the survey instrument in order to determine whether or not it met the stated objectives and the desired level of content validity. Participants in the pilot test were surveyed using the instrument included in Appendix C. This first phase established the reliability of the instrument and assessed the internal consistency of the items. Modifications were made to the instrument prior to administration of the final survey.

The final research survey was conducted using a stratified random sample of elementary and secondary teachers who were selected from three school districts within North Central Texas. These data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and analysis of variance in order to describe the teachers' perceptions regarding the implementation of the instrument in regard to the objectives detailed above and to determine whether the teachers' years of experience or field of instruction were related to their perceptions.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Implemented in 1997, the Texas Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) was designed to represent the best research available at that time in the field of education. The legislature required the Commissioner of Education and Texas Education Agency officials to develop a system that would carry the state to a level higher than the Texas Teacher Appraisal System, which had been in place since 1986. This chapter presents an overview of the history of teacher evaluation throughout the past three decades in the state of Texas, beginning with a national perspective of events that led to a focus on education. Discussions describing the processes used in developing the Texas Teachers Apprsaisal System (TTAS) and the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) are included, along with an analysis of best practices research. Because the Professional Development and Appraisal System developers intended for the instrument to reflect this research, it is important to define and describe each area with an understanding of its research base.

Appraisal Systems Nationwide

The development of the PDAS in Texas represented efforts to capture much of what was known about evaluation systems in general and teacher appraisal specifically. This effort in 1997 came after almost two decades of work on teacher appraisal and evaluation. An explosion of legislative mandates in the past two decades can be attributed to three main events: (1) the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk: The*

Imperative for Educational Reform by the National Commission on Excellence in Education; (2) changes in the politics of education due to conflicts between teachers, school boards, and administrators, particularly in the area of school finance; and, (3) increased professional staffing in the legislature, along with the formation of legislative education committees which increased the legislature's ability to deal with larger numbers of educational issues (Rosenthal and Fuhrman, 1981). These developments, along with the Carnegie Forum's publication of *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, the Holmes Group, and the National Governors' Association's *A Time for Results*, all of which occurred in 1986, focused on the teaching act and teachers' responses to student needs. The reports called for comprehensive educational reforms. Prior to *A Nation at Risk*, the American population in general considered teacher evaluation as a process within the education community. Due to increased public concern, forty-five states implemented teacher assessment or assistance programs between 1970 and 1990. Prior to 1970, only four had programs in place (Valentine, 1990; ACTE, 1988; Flakus-Mosqueda, 1986). Increased legislation regarding reforms and additional policy requirements lead to increases in state funding for local schools from 40% in 1970 to 50.7% in 1993 (M. Fullan, 1993). The Center for Policy Research and Education reported in 1989 that every state addressed the concerns raised in *A Nation at Risk* (Firestone, Fuhrman, and Kirst, 1989).

The public's unease about the welfare of the nation and the status of the United States as a world power expanded the general population's concern for and focus on the quality of teaching and curriculum in the nation's schools. The Carnegie Forum established the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession in 1985. One of its most

significant recommendations, formation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), was fulfilled in 1987. The purpose of NBPTS was to set high standards for the teaching profession regarding what teachers should know and be able to do, to certify teachers who could meet these standards, and to cause continued educational reform. These goals were set forth for the purpose of increasing student achievement in the United States. The areas to be included in the certification system included standards for each teaching field, exemplary practices that measure those standards, and professional development activities that would allow teachers to develop a common understanding of the standards and exemplary practices. Field tests were planned for 1993-94 and the system was to be in place for over half the United Sates teachers by 1995-96. By the end of 1997, the thirty certification areas were to be completed or under development (Barotz-Snowden, 1993). The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards is widely supported by educational researchers as a system which codifies the knowledge teachers must have in order to be effective. Cawelti (1998) wrote that the work of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards gave direction to the creation of a knowledge base regarding effective teaching that all teachers will know and be able to utilize. PDAS criteria are aligned with the NBPTS. (See Appendix A.) The intent for this alignment is to give the Texas teacher evaluation system credibility at both national and sate levels.

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support consortium (INTASC) is a performance-based process which began in the 1980s when Connecticut and California began to work jointly to develop and validate assessments for licensing beginning teachers. In 1989, the project became known as INTASC and was sponsored by the

Council of Chief State School Officers. Over thirty-five states and professional organizations such as the National Education Association and the National Association of State Boards of Education are presently members of INTASC. The standards represent a common core of teaching knowledge and skills which were designed to be compatible with the NTBS standards. Two states currently using this evaluation process are Indiana and North Carolina, both of which have undergone significant restructuring efforts in recent years.

Since 1990, systems of teacher evaluation have moved into a new era. These attempts at more equitable means of evaluation outline new requirements regarding new teacher preparation and certification, first year teachers, and evaluation or recertification of experienced teachers.

The main purposes for evaluations were due process for possible dismissal, improved teaching, and teacher accountability, along with incentives for reaching certain levels of performance. Administrators often view the need for teacher evaluations as a means of providing evidence to parents and to the general public that teachers are effective and are becoming even more effective. Teachers view evaluations primarily as a means of accountability (Bronowski, C., Toms-Bronowski, S, and Bearden, K. J., 1993).

Some states' plans add extended hours or additional months to the contract after teachers have reached a certain level. Still others require assumption of additional or differential duties. The commonality among states is a desire for excellence in the classroom, which includes evidence of contextual knowledge and years of experience. The number of years' experience required before a teacher can reach a higher level varies from state to state. As the plans evolved, states began including student

achievement as a factor in evaluating a teacher's job performance. Texas' current plan, the Professional Development and Appraisal System, which was initially implemented in the 1997-98 school year, includes building level student achievement as one component of a teacher's evaluation.

Evolution of the Teacher Appraisal System in Texas

In June of 1984, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 72. The State Board of Education was directed to adopt an appraisal process and criteria with which to appraise the performance of teachers. Included in House Bill 72 was the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS), which included the Career Ladder Plan. Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff conducted a review of literature on teaching effectiveness, surveyed other states that were conducting statewide appraisal systems, and gathered information regarding teacher evaluation systems in place in 156 Texas school districts. Thirty thousand teachers were surveyed regarding the teacher evaluation methods currently in use in their districts. This information was used to derive a list of teaching behaviors that were later included in the instrument. Ten states, Arizona, Texas, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Nevada, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Utah now require that teachers be included in determining the type of evaluations that will be administered and the methods that will be used. Experts on professional performance such as Linda Darling-Hammond, Tom McGreal, Bruce Joyce, and Beverly Showers stress that collegial interaction and personal input into a teacher's professional development are the most effective means of causing teacher growth and professional development.

Implemented in the 1986-87 school year, TTAS was designed to be a "comprehensive and generic" system used as a vehicle to improve instruction (Texas Teacher Appraisal System Appraisers Manual. Texas Education Agency. Austin, Texas, 1989). The instrument reflected the assumption that there are common effective teaching behaviors which are observable (Texas Teacher Appraisal System Appraiser's Manual, 1989). These behaviors became the domain descriptors within the instrument.

An expert panel of nationally recognized experts, including Dr. John Goodlad of the University of Washington and Dr. Richard Monatt of Iowa State University, joined with the State Board of Education Committee on Personnel to review the draft and direct revisions. A pilot was conducted using volunteer districts throughout the state. Following the pilot, further revisions were made and data was gathered on factors such as time requirements, attitudes, and usability of performance indicators. Additional revisions were made following a public hearing which included remarks from teachers, administrators, and professional organizations.

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

Research conducted in 1995 by Runnels found that the majority of teachers (58%) agreed with the statement, "The evaluation system has progressed dramatically in the last ten years in its ability to evaluate teacher performance more reliably." Over 67% of her respondents perceived that the implementation of the TTAS improved the quality of teaching across the state. The research did not evaluate whether or not there were actual changes in instruction. The TTAS instrument was used in the state of Texas through the 1996-97 school year.

Development of the Professional Development and Appraisal System

Senate Bill 1, passed in 1995 by the Texas legislature, required the Commissioner of Education to develop a new appraisal system. Section 21.351 specified general characteristics for the appraisal system. The definitions of these characteristics grew from a study of practices in the field of education. The result is a model which incorporates National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support consortium (INTASC), and recent research. (See Appendix A.) PDAS evaluators, therefore, are trained to seek out evidence of classroom practices that the instrument's developers believed positively affect student learning.

In conjunction with publication of the PDAS instrument, the Texas Education Agency released the "Review of Literature Relating Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) Criteria to Student Outcomes." The Review of Literature was comprised of an annotated bibliography that included annotations for every objective within each domain. A total of 82 references are listed representing articles published from 1973 through 1995. Although intended to be a selected grouping of studies which,

"demonstrate a relationship between teacher behaviors and student outcomes," the majority of citations are qualitative studies, case studies, or descriptions of programs, rather than well-designed quantitative research. The articles contain information regarding methodologies and programs that enhance students' attitudes and behaviors.

This collection of resources represents a weakness that affects the entire profession of education. There is no well-researched quantifiable body of knowledge that directly correlates specific teaching behaviors to student outcomes. This is an inherent weakness in any attempt to articulate effective teaching practices. Researchers such as Darling-Hammond began the process by reviewing state policy initiatives in January of 2000. Her review clearly identifies the need for quantitative research correlating teacher behaviors and student achievement.

While developing and refining the plan, the Commissioner received input from an Appraisal Advisory Committee as well as professional associations and focus groups comprised of teachers, principals, superintendents, personnel directors, and service center training personnel. Refinements were made based on input from these groups. Along with suggestions from constituent groups, the criteria also incorporate the *Proficiencies for Learner-Centered Instruction*, which were adopted in 1994 by the Texas State Board of Education and "Best Practices" as identified by the extensive review of literature compiled by the Agency. The goals of the Professional Development and Appraisal System are:

(1) To devise a recommended system which fulfills the requirements of law found in § 21.351, TEC;

(2) To develop a fair and practical appraisal process which builds upon and makes improvements in the current TTAS;

(3) To develop a system which acknowledges and reinforces good teaching practices which are supported by research and evidenced by most Texas teachers; and

(4) To develop a system which promotes and supports quality professional development among teachers in the state of Texas (Teacher Manual: Professional Development and Appraisal System, Texas Education Agency).

The eight domains of the PDAS include fifty-one evaluation criteria. The Proficiencies for Learner Centered Instruction, input from over 10,000 Texas teachers regarding their beliefs and experiences concerning teacher evaluation, along with refined TTAS objectives are the basis for the criteria. The eight PDAS domains are:

Domain I: Active Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process

Domain II: Learner-Centered Instruction

Domain III: Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress

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

Domain V: Professional Communication

Domain VI: Professional Development

Domain VII: Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements

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

The primary means of scoring teachers is through a minimum of one 45 minute classroom observation; however, cumulative data and observations made outside the classroom may also be included if the information is shared with the teacher prior to its inclusion. Any domain not observed during the forty-five minute session may be added with additional documentation. Each domain is scored independently as exceeds expectations, proficient, below expectations, or unsatisfactory. Teachers do not receive cumulative scores that encompass the entire instrument. Any teacher who has concerns about his score may request a second appraiser or may appeal the appraisal. From there, traditional due process procedures are followed if agreement cannot be reached. For the first time in Texas, teachers are given the opportunity to give input into their own report through Domains VI, VIII, and the Teacher Self-Report by submitting examples of their work (Teacher Manual, Professional Development and Appraisal System, Texas Education Agency).

Designers focused on effective schools research and included elements within the instrument to support teachers' knowledge of effective practices. This intent is reinforced by Bandura's 1977 research regarding how people make decisions about the amount of effort they will commit to any given project. He outlines two determining factors: (1) if they believe they have the skills needed to achieve the goal, and (2) if they think application of those skills will produce a favorable outcome. These two factors effect teaching decisions which directly influence the amount and quality of student learning (Ebmeier and Nicklaus, 1999). PDAS designers built in the requirement of staff

development that is personally prescribed and designed by teachers after reflecting on their own instruction and what they know or have learned about best practices. Thus, teachers make decisions regarding their own learning and the needs of their classrooms.

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

> The PDAS incorporates the student performance link required by law. It does so in the fairest way possible for student learning. We believe the system has the potential to positively impact student achievement. The performance link focuses on TAAS-related objectives, attendance, and students in at risk situations, allowing the system to appraise all teachers on their contributions to the overall improvement of the school (April, 1997, p. 3).

Cole's 1995 research supported Commissioner Moses' intent by describing strategies and techniques that teachers should use to positively impact their classroom performance.

Another unique aspect of PDAS is the inclusion of continuous learning, professional growth, and collegiality. Fullan pointed out the need to ensure that these work together so that teachers continually seek out and strive to implement best practices

(Fullan, 1993). The evaluative nature of PDAS places the building administrator in the role of keeping the process focused on improvement. In addition to the classroom components of the PDAS, is the Teacher Self Report in which teachers set professional goals that they identify individually. Part III of the Teacher Self Report component requires a summarization of the teacher's professional development. The activities must be aligned with the need of students within the teacher's classroom. The measure of appropriateness of the selected staff development is whether or not the professional development positively impacts student success (Professional Development and Appraisal System, Update #3, Jan. 1998, TEA).

The Issue of Best Practices

"Best practices" have been the focus of extensive research and commentary in educational publications as educators define and describe these practices and attempt to link them to improved student achievement. According to research conducted by Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde, the most effective schools have classrooms that are student-centered, active, experiential, democratic, collaborative, and yet rigorous and challenging (1993). Texas' Professional Development and Appraisal System categorized the best practices research and used these as descriptors or "strands" that compose the evaluation instrument. Researchers posited that best practices include several categories of teacher behavior which are listed below and described in the following paragraphs:

(a) active, successful student participation in the learning process,

(b) learner centered instruction,

(c) evaluation and feedback on student progress,

(d) effective management of students and the learning environment,

(e) professional communication,

(f) professional development, and

(g) alignment of instruction and assessment.

(Heck and Mayor, 1993)

Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process

Active, successful student participation in the learning process requires teachers to think about students as consumers and creators of knowledge, rather than as vessels into which the knowledge is poured. Robert Slavin (1994), encourages educators to involve students in gathering information, testing hypotheses, and reporting findings using a variety of methods. Students' motivation and enthusiasm are heightened when they actively seek out, collect, and report information using a variety of resources and styles. For these reasons, Texas' PDAS includes engaged time, success, higher order thinking, student-directed learning, and connecting learning to the real world within the first strand and entitled the strand "Active, Successful, Student Participation in the Learning Process."

Learner-Centered Instruction

Alfie Kohn describes classrooms that are learner-centered as the ideal environment in which teachers support their students' desires to "find out about things" (Kohn, 1996). Teachers relate the content to students' interests and lead students to apply knowledge at higher cognitive levels. Beginning with the basic content required for students to grasp a concept, teachers move from basic knowledge to higher cognitive levels by focusing students on deep understanding of a few significant concepts, rather

than superficially "covering" many objectives. Students are actively engaged in the learning process and are provided frequent opportunities to interact with their peers and with the teacher.

Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress

As teachers and school systems redesign instruction to meet the learning needs of students, they must then develop assessment systems more appropriate to the instructional design of the lessons. Best practices in the area of student progress require teachers to remain constantly aware of their students' academic progress, ensure that the assessment is aligned with instruction, use a variety of assessment and instructional methods, and provide students with a variety of opportunities for learning. Students are given several methods to choose from in order to show what they have learned. Parents receive frequent communication regarding their child's progress and are engaged as partners in the learning process.

Effective Management of Students ant the Learning Environment

Many of the nation's restructuring programs focus on school and classroom climate. School reform initiatives support teachers who create "safe" learning environments in which students are free to take risks and explore ideas. The most readily visible evidence of an effective teacher is a classroom climate conducive to teaching and learning. The expectation has changed, however, from the notion of the traditional classroom where students sit quietly in desks, take notes, and complete work independently to classrooms which are orderly and organized, but also provide opportunities for students to interact more frequently with their peers and their teacher. In addition to the academic content of the lessons, students are guided by teachers to

learn how to make intelligent choices. Children learn how to negotiate conflicts so that they can work together effectively, respecting and appreciating each other's similarities and differences.

Professional Communication

Parents desire opportunities to be a part of the education process of their children. Nation-wide restructuring programs tap into this previously underused educational resource by implementing programs to encourage parent involvement. As teachers interact more frequently with parents, they must become increasingly aware of the effectiveness of their communication. Whether teachers and parents interact face-to-face, by phone, or through technology, parents evaluate the teachers' expertise and caring for their child by the information communicated. In 1995, Chicago schools began a "Best Practice Project" which involves parents in supporting student-centered, constructivist classrooms. This project developed teacher and parent leadership in twelve elementary and secondary schools throughout the Chicago area. Leaders based their decisions on the "unchallenged tenet" of the national school movement that parents should be more involved in all aspects of schools (Daniels, 1996).

Professional Development

Throughout the state, districts have provided staff development opportunities for teachers to expand their knowledge base concerning effective instructional strategies and how best to implement them with their students. Expanding teachers' expertise and changing the culture of schools to promote empowerment is thought to improve student achievement and result in schools in which students, community members, and parents and have a high level of confidence. If educators are going to achieve high levels of

learning for all students, quality staff development must become a part of teachers' lives. Dennis Sparks and Joan Richardson of the National Staff Development Council believe that three components must be in place in order for improved student learning to be ensured as a result of staff development. These indicators are: (1) a variety of forms of student assessment are used to evidence continuous improvement in student learning, (2) supervisors at all levels observe and report on-going improvement in the use of effective instructional practices. (3) teachers report that their staff development experiences have a positive impact upon them and their students (1997). The National Staff Development Council's mission statement reinforces the need for staff development to be based on theory, research, and proven practice by including this in their "Belief Statements" (1999).

In addition to comprehensively reviewing research related to student achievement and instructional practices, educators involved in the development of the Texas Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) incorporated staff development models which, according to their analysis of literature, changed teacher behavior and, therefore, have most positively influenced the level of student learning. Use of the most effective models of staff development enhance the potential effectiveness of the PDAS. Cawelti writes that, "In many respects, our knowledge base in education has advanced a great deal during the past fifty years, but such advances remain terribly slow in finding their way into classroom practice" (1996). PDAS encourages teachers to participate in effective staff development based on the diagnostic assessment of their own classroom performance and their students' achievement and to then implement the skills, strategies, and activities into their classrooms. Using this evaluation system, teachers identify

objectives for their own professional development based upon personal analysis of their classroom performance and the academic development of their students. In addition to professional objectives, evaluators consider teachers' participation at the campus and district levels and communication and interaction with parents.

A Proposed Theoretical Basis for PDAS

For a person to be motivated to respond in a way that is new or different, the new behavior must address some basic need or desire (Maslow, 1954; Fullan, 1991). William Glasser (1984) identified a set of motivators for human behavior. These are the need to survive and reproduce, the need to belong, the need for power, the need for freedom, and the need for fun. When people seek to meet these needs and are thwarted by a system that disallows the opportunity, they become frustrated and seek to work around the system so that the needs can be met in other ways. In developing the Professional Development and Appraisal System, designers were aware of the research on change and human behavior that would support desired responses to an evaluation system that contained domains which encouraged, required, and reinforced accomplishment of these needs. Research in the field of education identified teacher behaviors that linked the means of accomplishing these needs with effective teaching practices.

The Professional Development and Appraisal System, PDAS, evaluation model reflects William Glasser's 1986 research which he originally named "Control Theory," but now prefers to call "Choice Theory." Choice theory contends that all people are motivated by four psychological needs that are inscribed within their genetic code. These are the need to belong, the need for freedom, the need for power, and the need for

fun (Glasser, 1997). As a psychologist, Glasser advocates the use of reality therapy when dealing with his patients. He has published several books dealing with mental health and education, including Reality Therapy, Schools Without Failure, Positive Addiction, Control Theory, and Control Theory in the Classroom. As the founder of the Institute for Reality Therapy in Los Angeles, California, he applies the concepts of this model to his own patients. His study and use of the reality therapy model led him to the development of Control Theory.

Control Theory, as described by Glasser, is one method of describing human behavior and human reactions used in attempting to deal with the world. Control Theory contends that "our behavior is always our best attempt to control the world and ourselves as part of that world so that we can best satisfy our needs" (Glasser, 1986). Relying on the corroborating research of Dr. Ellen J. Langer of Harvard, as described in her 1983 book entitled The Psychology of Control, Glasser moves from theory to application as he describes the impact that control theory can make in an educational setting.

He explains that people are not controlled by external events, despite society's trend to blame events and life situations for behavior. Rather, people are motivated by forces inside themselves, and all behavior stems from attempts to control their personal lives. Glasser describes "quality worlds" in which each person designs a very specific, personal world where the people, things, and beliefs that are most satisfying live. The creation of this world begins at birth and all the people, things, and beliefs that are most satisfying become a part of the memory. As the person experiences life, the quality world is adjusted.

> This world is best thought of as a group of pictures, stored in our brain, depicting with extreme precision the way we would like things to be- especially the way we want to be treated. The most important pictures are of people, including ourselves, because it is almost impossible to satisfy our needs without getting involved with other people (1997).

Glasser contends that the basic theoretical framework for decision-making in public schools is grounded in stimulus-response theory. He theorizes that the application of stimulus-response theory to educational settings is "wrongheaded" and "totally destructive to the warm, supportive human relationships that students need to succeed in school…" (1997). By replacing stimulus-response theory with Choice Theory, human relationships improve and people are satisfied because individual needs are met. Texas designed an instrument that establishes opportunities for teachers to be reinforced for personal growth, student achievement, contributions to the organization, and interpersonal relationships. In the past, teachers have controlled their worlds by shutting their classroom doors and teaching in ways that ensure that their students were also "controlled," whether or not this led to learning and an effective classroom environment. This new model of teacher evaluation, the PDAS, integrates basic human needs and motivations with effective interactions, thus setting the stage for increased teacher effectiveness. Each of the four elements is described below along with its relationship in the assessment instrument. The elements are evident in many of the individual categories of the assessment; therefore, they are described through the PDAS instrument, rather than as the separate areas identified by Glasser.

Teaching is an isolating profession. The majority of the teacher's day occurs in an isolated classroom, alone with students. Teachers seldom have the opportunity or the time to interact with other teachers. However, researchers believe that collegial interactions enhance teachers' performance, their perceptions of the position, and their level of decision-making (Showers and Joyce, 1996; Little, 1982; Heck and Mayer, 1993). These opportunities for interactions with other adults in similar positions are included in the PDAS instrument in the areas of working with colleagues toward the overall improvement of student performance and the implementation of staff development.

Two areas within the PDAS instrument identify and describe the interactions teachers should have with other adults, parents and colleagues, when working toward the improvement of student performance. The administrative requirements of the instrument ensure that the teacher works with the evaluator to design personal and professional goals to accomplish during the school year. These goals must align with the district and campus improvement plans, thus providing the teacher the opportunity to understand the needs of the district and the campus for the year while also becoming a part of the improvement process. This component of the evaluation process is the "Teacher Self Report" and is one of the avenues of teacher input into the process. The teacher documents evidence related to criteria that may not be readily observed in the classroom. Appraisers review the evidence and make decisions regarding whether or not the information provided by the teacher affects the criteria ratings. At the summative conference, which occurs at the end of the school year, the teacher and evaluator discuss accomplishment of these objectives. This administrative component of the PDAS also

reflects Glasser's motivators of freedom and power. The freedom to identify and set personal goals empowers teachers both professionally and personally. Aligning with and reflecting both the district improvement goals and the campus improvement goals, teachers belong to the "big picture" while personally identifying and describing their contribution to the total improvement process.

The power a teacher has over the instructional decisions made for students is not without accountability. The information derived from for analyzing student test scores and classroom performance carries with it the responsibility to design lessons that meet the students' academic and social/emotional needs, both for the entire classroom and for the individual student. Building these elements into teachers' evaluations reinforces and emphasizes the decision-making authority and responsibility of each individual.

Glasser believes that students have difficulty learning in situations where there is no "play" or fun. He describes this need as a genetic preconditioning.

> If our genetic need for fun is tied to learning, and I think it is, then harder assignments and longer hours may do little to remedy the failings of our schools. When we are both learning and having fun, we often look forward to hard work and long hours; without fun, these become drudgery. Try to teach "better" procedures in a no-fun atmosphere to competent employees of any large corporation and you will soon be lecturing to empty chairs (Glasser, 1984).

This tenet directly addressed in the PDAS within several objectives:

> IIe. The teachers uses appropriate motivational and instructional strategies which successfully and actively engage students in the learning process.

IIIb. The teacher uses a variety of evaluation and feedback strategies which are appropriate to the varied characteristics of the students.

IVb. The teacher establishes a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed learning.

Vc. The teacher's interactions are supportive, courteous, respectful, and encouraging to students who are reluctant and having difficulty. (Professional Development and Appraisal System, Trainer's Manual, 1997).

Just as students learn best when they are motivated and have some level of control over their learning environment, adults also learn best in situations that are enjoyable and allow for them to make decisions regarding what and how they learn (Lieberman and Miller, 1984). Therefore, this more learner-centered approach applies to adult learners as well as students. In *Teachers: Their World and their Work*, Lieberman and Miller describe the primary positive reinforcement that the teacher receives as coming from the students. The PDAS emphasizes the need for frequent opportunities for student-directed learning in lessons that relate to the real world and culminate in learning at higher cognitive levels. Given these opportunities, students report more positive feelings for the class and a higher level of intrinsic motivation. Teachers are rewarded with more highly motivated students, fewer classroom disruptions, and students who are less likely to be absent. Even more significant, students develop the ability to think and process at higher levels (Anderson, Stevens, Prawat, and Nickerson, 1988; Gottfried, 1985; Stallings, 1974; Newby, 1991).

Educators now ask questions with more depth, define learning using a much broader perspective, and realize that teachers are an essential part of an organization within which they must function effectively in order to create the best learning environment for themselves and their students. This new definition of effective teaching and learning is much more complex; thus, teacher evaluations must focus on all the components that interact to positively impact education (Claudet, J. G. and Ellett, C. D. , 1999).

Educational researchers only recently began studying whether or not and to what degree specific teaching behaviors actually impact achievement. When the results of these studies become known, educators will be able to reevaluate evaluation instruments to include behaviors that are proven to be most effective. The issue with PDAS is whether the system causes or reinforces the effective teacher behaviors intended by the designers of the system. Determining teachers' perceptions of the PDAS provides information on whether or not PDAS is being implemented as was intended is a requisite first step in assessing its potential impact on students and learning.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

> "The core of schooling remains relatively stable in the face of often massive changes in the structure around it. Schools legitimize themselves with their various conflicting publics by constantly changing external structures and processes, but shield their workers from any fundamental impact of these changes by leaving their core intact" (Elmore, 1996).

In the design and implementation process of the PDAS, Texas' educational leaders sought to affect the core patterns of schooling by changing the daily practices of teachers through the institutionalization of a system that reinforces and supports the desired practices.

For today's educators, the process of change, continuous learning and improvement, and evaluating what works and what does not is both a desire and a mandate. Improved teacher performance is a requirement both in Texas and across the nation. This chapter describes the investigative process used to analyze the perceptions of Texas teachers regarding the implementation of their evaluation system. This research is descriptive in nature and employs both qualitative and quantitative data. Its purpose was to describe the perceptions of teachers regarding the implementation of PDAS and the relationships of years of experience and field of instruction.

Survey Development

Instrument Development

A preliminary survey instrument was developed using the objectives within the Professional Development and Appraisal System. A field of four experts in the areas of personnel management and education reviewed the instrument. Members of this panel were selected in order to establish the content validity of the document. Representatives of both the business community and education were selected. District central office administrators, an education service center director, an education service center administrator, and business personnel officers responsible for data collection served as members of the expert panel.

Interviews with Designers

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with four persons instrumental in the design of the instrument. The four informants who participated in the semi-structured interviews were selected based on their individual contributions and their interactions with groups and organizations across the state during the development process of the PDAS instrument. Nolan Wood, Texas Education Agency, Sr. Director of Educator Development Projects was instrumental in all phases of the design and implementation process. Bill Reaves, Public Education Liaison for Texas Education Agency and Texas A&M Universities, worked with the Commissioner and Texas Education Agency officials in refining the document and putting procedures in place with the intent of gaining higher levels of implementation and acceptance. Ron Simpson, Assistant Director for the Division of Administration for Region 10 Education Service Center,

worked with other service center representatives from around the state to initially formalize and structure the instrument so that they could later develop the training component. John Crain, Independent Educational Consultant and former Associate Executive Director for Education Service Center Region 17, designed the rubrics that later became the descriptors of the PDAS instrument. The content of the interviews were analyzed to determine the major areas of focus during the design process of the original PDAS instrument. This information was analyzed to ensure congruence between the objectives and the designers' intentions.

Pilot Test

The instrument was pilot tested to assess the reliability and validity of the instrument as well as the internal consistency of the items. The Professional Development and Appraisal instrument is comprised of 51 objectives on which teachers are evaluated. Prior to the initiation of the survey instrument's construction, these were reviewed in order to determine which of the objectives were appropriate for analysis through a study of this type. This resulted in identification of the 30 statements which were included on the pilot survey. To establish the reliability coefficient, the instrument was administered to a group of 100 teachers from two schools located in a North Central Texas school district. (See Appendix C.) This district was not included in the final study. One school was elementary and one school was secondary. Factor analysis was used to determine the underlying dimensions included within the structure of the instrument. This survey was comprised of thirty questions. Six components were identified with a number of items "cross-loading" between two or more components. Modifications were made in the design of the instrument with the intent of removing the cross-loadings. Each

question that cross loaded was analyzed and restructured, reworded, or divided into two questions in order to improve and clarify the meaning. Analysis of the data from the final research survey established that this attempt was successful. In addition, the statements were reorganized and the subheadings labeled to reflect the general topic of the questions under each section.

Final Survey

Instrument Design

No survey instrument is in place to measure teachers' perceptions regarding the effects of PDAS implementation; therefore, the initial survey instrument was designed based on the Domain Objectives stated in the PDAS instrument and the responses of designers as reported in their interviews. (See Appendix D.) All teachers who are evaluated under the PDAS system are trained in these components and processes which include the objectives used in the survey. This training increases the knowledge level of the respondents in regard to the statements and objectives on the instrument. Questions were extracted from the objectives in original PDAS instrument for the pilot study, then reformatted into seven new scales for the final survey.

The data from this survey were used to evaluate the instrument and were not a part of the final study. Using a principal component analysis, the questions loaded into constructs. Questions which loaded onto more than one construct were reworded and/or divided into multiple questions. Questions were analyzed to ensure that the areas of emphasis derived from the designers' interviews were included in the questions.

To reveal underlying constructs, a factor analysis data reduction technique was used. Factor analysis was selected in order to provide an empirical basis for reducing many variables to a few factors by combining variables with moderate (above.5) to high correlations (Borg, 1989). Seven components were revealed using the Principal Component Analysis method of component extraction; questions did not cross-load on any of the components. These factors are organized into the component groupings and are described in detail below. The factors answer the areas outlined in research question number 1. A test for homogeneity of variance was performed for each factor score and an ANOVA was performed to measure the differences between and within groups. Multiple comparisons were used to analyze the dependent variables of years of teaching and area of instruction with each factor. These analyses answer research question number 2.

In the final survey, the domains were labeled and the questions reorganized to reflect the components identified by the loadings; designers of the PDAS instrument intended to support classroom implementation as stated in the instrument's objectives. Using analysis of the content of the surveys completed with the designers, it was determined that the major areas of focus during the design process were represented in the survey document.

The first two questions asked teachers to describe their years of experience and fields of instruction. The categories listed are 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and 20+ years. The areas of instruction are listed as language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science; special education, bilingual education, and ESL; vocational technical education; and athletics/physical education.

Selection of Subjects

Respondents in the final survey are employed by one of three school districts purposefully selected within the North Central Texas area to represent a variety of sizes in regard to student population and to represent diverse student population characteristics and socioeconomic levels. Care was taken to ensure that the same number of elementary and secondary teachers were surveyed from each district and that an equal number of teachers from each district received the survey. The districts are very diverse, representing a variety of student populations, wealth categories, and average daily attendance. The table below represents the critical attributes of each district.

Table 1
Demographics of Participating Campuses

	Campus A	Campus B	Campus C	Campus D	Campus E	Campus F
No. of Students						
% African-Amer.	10.6%	39.7%	0%	11.4%	0.4%	49.3%
% Hispanic	25.3%	11.9%	2.3%	38.8%	3.4%	16.9%
% White	58.1%	45.8%	96.0%	45.8%	97.3%	31.6%
% Ecnon. Disadv.	29.7%	17.4%	0.5%	53.8%	2.1%	47.1%
Grade Levels	6-8	10-12	9-12	K-5	K-4	K-4

Procedures

An elementary campus and a secondary campus were randomly selected from each participating district. Subsequent meetings were held with each building principal to aid in clarification of the purpose of the research and the procedures to be used. Forty teachers from each campus were randomly selected to receive the survey instrument. The

survey instruments were delivered to each building, distributed to teachers, and collected from office personnel one week later. An overall return rate of 40% was attained.

Administration of the survey resulted in a reliability coefficient of .9702. Teachers identified their number of years in the teaching profession and their primary area(s) of instruction. These served as dependent variables in the analysis. Teachers responded to the questions on the survey using a Likert scale that measured their perceptions regarding the PDAS, its impact on them as teachers and its effects on student learning. The lowest level on the scale was "1-strongly disagree" and went to "5-strongly agree," which was the highest level. The seven domains are listed below. The domains contained from three to thirteen questions.

I. Communication

II. Classroom Management

III. Application of Learning

IV. Professional Development

V. Support for All students

VI. TAAS Improvement

VII. Learner-Centered Instruction

Data Analysis

The information derived from the survey was input and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 10.0 (SPSS). The mean, standard deviation, frequency, and per cent were calculated for each question. These statistics describe the participants' perceptions regarding the PDAS instrument's impact on the research questions. The impact of the number of years of teaching experience and area of

instruction were analyzed separately and collectively. A covariance matrix described the mean and standard deviation for each question.

Limitations of the Study

The participants in this study were limited to three school districts in North Central Texas. While these districts are diverse in the areas of student ethnicity, district wealth, and average daily attendance, many aspects of school districts in the state of Texas were not represented. Therefore, these data are only applicable for districts which closely match the demographics of the participant districts. In order to achieve a greater level of generalizability, studies should be completed with a large number of districts across the state representing a variety of demographics.

Teachers were selected randomly. Because of this, the group sizes of teachers representing each content area were not equivalent. The harmonic mean of the group size was used; therefore, Type I error levels for this question could not be guaranteed.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The Texas Professional Development and Appraisal System emphasizes educational practices that many state officials and members of the education community believe enhance the effectiveness of teachers. One intended effect of the instrument's implementation was to provide Texas' educators guidelines through which effective practices can be measured and described. In this study, both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed in order to describe the intentions of designers of the Professional Development and Appraisal System and teachers' perceptions regarding its implementation in their classrooms. Participants responded to a 37-item Likert scale which described the levels of teachers agreement with statements describing impact of PDAS in each teacher's classroom. The survey was developed using the results of interviews delving into the development of the instrument and the objectives on the instrument itself. A correlation and function analysis and analysis based on a Cronbach alpha coefficient were performed. Teachers' perceptions were analyzed and compared using the number of years experience and type of content area for which the teacher was responsible.

Analysis of Interview Data

In order to gather information regarding the intentions of persons instrumental in the design of the PDAS instrument, four semi-structured interviews were conducted. These expert informants represented a variety of state agencies and the regional service

center in which two of the three participants districts were located. All four respondents were involved at the state level in the process of creating and implementing the Professional Development and Appraisal Instrument. For purposes of confidentiality, these persons will be designed as "Designer A," "Designer B," "Designer C" and Designer D." Designations are not in the order of persons listed on the previous page. In order to evaluate the significance of each PDAS objective, each objective was listed separately. The interviews were then analyzed and each time an objective or domain was mentioned, it was tallied. The domain titles were also listed and were tallied when the interviewee mentioned the domain but was not specific concerning the objective within the domain. The interview transcripts were analyzed individually to determine the number of times that objective was discussed within the interview and then collectively to determine the degree of emphasis the designer placed on that construct. These are represented in Table 2 below.

Table 2
Designers' Areas of Emphasis

Domain	Frequency
Learner Centered Instruction	17
Classroom Management	2
Support for all Students	3
Professional Development	26
Communication	15
Learning Environment	6
TAAS Improvement	32

Each area that received significant emphasis during the interviews also loaded as a construct in the principal component analysis process. This interview data verified the

significance of the constructs and served as a means of triangulating the data. The area which was described most frequently and consistently mentioned in the designers' interviews was the professional development of teachers. All four interviewees mentioned it specifically and in detail denoting four of the five statements included within this domain specifically. These included alignment of professional development with the goals of the campus and district; correlating professional development with the subject content and varied needs of students; collaboration with colleagues; and, collaboration with other professionals. This is significant because professional development is the one component which research has linked directly with increased student achievement (Johnson, 1998; Darling-Hammond, 2000). Designer A stated that when envisioning the purpose of PDAS "…What we wanted was not another appraisal instrument, because when everybody talked about TTAS it was an instrument. What we wanted was a professional development system a part of which was appraisal." Designer C extended the intent of the system to include the professional development of administrators and counselors as well as teachers and noted that the state is in the process of implementing this component through the newly developed administrator and counselor appraisal systems.

The area of student performance (TAAS Improvement) was also significant to three of the designers. In two of the interviews, it was the most frequently mentioned component. However, each of the three discussed student performance in terms that included the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills as well as other measures of student success such as Advanced Placement examinations and achievement tests. Two of the three interviewees who discussed student achievement described this intent as the most

significant area of concern for the Texas legislature, for state education officials, and for designers of the instrument. Designer B stated,

> We took that as our perspective. If students weren't successful we didn't care what teachers did. They could look great, sound great, behave great, but if kids didn't respond to what they were doing, and didn't show demonstrated success on the objective then we wanted this instrument to reflect that. So that if there was no student success, the instrument would show that there was not student success. That is the big departure that we wanted to make and that was one of our driving themes from the very beginning so as we began to evaluate and make it more and more clear, we took each criterion and made sure that it was focused on student success first and then teacher behavior. So, that was our primary goal.

Each of the designers mentioned this area as one of concern during the initial design phases of the instrument. The legislature passed a statute requiring student achievement to be included as a part of teachers' evaluations; however, teachers' associations were adamantly opposed to adding this component. In discussing this component, a designer stated,

> …what I tried to put into, at least in the places where it was appropriate to put it, was TAAS scores and AP scores and other types of norm and criterion referenced measures. So, what I tried to do was describe things like increasing the average TLI score of students in a class and increasing the percentage of students passing, increasing the number of students who master all objectives, increasing the number of students who achieve academic recognition....We could not get that past the teacher advisory committee.

Collectively, the interviews also revealed a focus on what the legislators and the designers believed to be "best practices' based on the research available. Each objective within the instrument represents a statement of the research. The intention of developers of the instrument was to provide a body of research to educators that supported the PDAS objectives.

Description of the Respondents

The sample included 300 teachers. One half of these were elementary (grades one through six) and one half of these were secondary (grades seven through twelve). The survey included two questions that describe the respondents. The first question asked teachers to circle the item that best described their number of years' teaching experience. The fewest number of teachers had 6-10 years experience and the greatest number of teachers had over 20 years of experience; however, the overall percentages were representative. The results are found in Table 3.

Table 3
Years of Teaching Experience

	f	%
0-5 years	29	24.2
6-10 years	23	19.2
11-20 years	32	26.7
20+ years	35	29.2
Sub Total	119	99.2
Missing	1	0.8
Total	120	100.0

The second question asked teachers to circle the letter that best described their area of instruction. Over half of the participants teach in the content areas of language arts, math, science, or social studies. The second greatest area of respondents was in the area of vocational technical education. Table 4 below describes the results.

Table 4
Areas of Instruction

	f	%
language arts, math, science, or social studies	68	56.7
special ed., bilingual ed., ESL	11	9.2
vocational technical education	24	20.0
fine arts	7	5.9
athletics/p.e.	9	7.5
Sub Total	119	99.2
Missing	1	.8
Total	120	100.0

Analysis of the Final Survey

The information gathered from final survey instrument was analysis using factor analysis, a test for homogeneity of variance, and an ANOVA. Seven components were revealed using the Principals Component Analysis method of component extraction. Questions did not cross-load on any of the components.

A principal component factor analysis with a varimax orthogonal rotation yielded seven factors with loadings above .50. (Table 5) The first factor accounted for 75.762 percent of the variance. Nine items (24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33 and 34) loaded on the communication construct; five items (9, 10, 11, 12 and 13) loaded on classroom management; five items loaded on the construct of professional growth of teachers (19,

20, 21, 22 and 23); five items (14, 15, 16, 17 and 18) loaded on support for all students; three items loaded on TAAS improvements (35, 36 and 37); and three items loaded on learner centered instruction (1, 2, and 4). Question number 31 did not meet the criteria of a minimum .5 correlation; therefore, it should be omitted in future use of this instrument. The result of the Cronbach's Alpha reliability analysis was a .9702. Question number one explained 49-71% of the total variance.

Table 5
Rotated Component Matrix

	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 26	.831						
Question 27	.826						
Question 28	.814						
Question 29	.805						
Question 25	.761						
Question 30	.759						
Question 24	.718						
Question 33	.562						
Question 34	.522						
Question 31							
Question 10		.833					
Question 9		.766					
Question 11		.710					
Question 13		.618					
Question 12		.601					
Question 8			.803				
Question 7			.726				
Question 6			.668				
Question 5			.623				
Question 32			.599				
Question 22				.813			
Question 21				.767			
Question 19				.644			
Question 20				.625			
Question 23				.570			
Question 17					.742		
Question 15					.662		
Question 18					.557		
Question 16					.544		
Question 14					.506		
Question 36						.795	
Question 37						.788	
Question 35						.687	
Question 2							.745
Question 1							.788
Question 4							.619

These factors are organized into component groupings and are described in detail below. The factors answer the domains outlined in research question number 1. A test for homogeneity of variance was performed for each factor score and an ANOVA was performed to measure the differences between and within groups. Multiple comparisons were used to analyze the dependent variables of teaching and field of instruction with each factor. These analyses answer research question number 2.

Analysis of Factors Regarding Subjects' Perceptions

The research instrument was divided into seven domains. Each domain represents one of the areas included in research question number 1. In order to structure the findings of the study, each separate domain within number 1 will be analyzed independently. For each domain, descriptive statistics were used to analyze the responses by frequency and percent. Factor analytic methods were used to discern the underlying factors of the analysis of the data. Each research question is described using the information derived from the questions that loaded under that component. The responses were represented using a Likert scale with a range of 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree.

Research Question #1a: What are the perceptions and practices of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the area of communication?

The "Communication" section sought to describe the teachers' perceptions of the impact of PDAS on communication specifically detaining "appropriate and accurate" communication between teachers and students, colleagues, parents, and community members. Written, verbal, and non-verbal modes of communication were included. Question 31 loaded with the questions within the "Communication" component in the

pilot survey; however, it failed to meet the .5 correlation level required for this analysis. This set of questions contained the second highest set of mean scores and contained the largest number of questions as determined by the factor loadings. The questions within this section represented the objectives originally included in the "Professional Communication" and the "Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress" domains of the PDAS instrument. Within the survey instrument, two questions from the "Learning Environment" section loaded with the statements specifically regarding communication. Both of these questions included using strategies that are appropriate for understanding and meeting the diverse needs of students, both of which include prerequisite skills in communication; therefore, these two questions are included in the "Communications" section.

The following questions loaded on this component: 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, and 34. (See Appendix D for this survey.) Respondents perceived that the PDAS instrument impacts communication at a high level. The responses for this factor are represented in Table 6 below.

Table 6
Communication

Question #	*f* 1s	*f* 2s	*f* 3s	*f* 4s	*f* 5s	Mean	*SD*
24	2	0	18	58	42	4.1429	.7950
25	1	1	12	61	45	4.2353	.7331
26	1	1	22	59	37	4.0924	.7701
27	1	0	18	64	37	4.1345	.7240
28	1	2	18	62	37	4.1008	.7745
29	1	6	25	54	34	3.9580	.8772
30	2	1	18	64	35	4.0756	.7936
33	1	1	25	55	38	4.0672	.7997
34	1	2	19	64	34	4.0672	.7672

Research Question #1b: What are the perceptions and practices of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the area of classroom management?

The "Classroom Management" section sought to explain teachers' perceptions regarding the management of student discipline, instruction, time, and materials. These descriptors loaded in a manner very similar to those described by the PDAS instrument. Respondents gave the fewest number of 1's and 2's (strongly disagree) in this area. Only one of the instrument designers mentioned this component of the instrument.

The following questions loaded on this component: 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. (See Appendix D for this survey.) Each individual item had a response mean between 3.7899 and 4.0168. Respondents perceived that the PDAS instrument does impact classroom management, but not to the degree that it impacts communication or TAAS improvement. The responses for this factor are represented in Table 7 below.

Table 7
Classroom Management

Question #	*f* 1s	*f* 2s	*f* 3s	*f* 4s	*f* 5s		*SD*
9	2	0	18	58	42	3.789	.9904
10	1	1	12	61	45	3.874	.8383
11	1	1	22	59	37	3.831	.8764
12	1	0	18	64	37	3.924	.7936
13	1	2	18	62	37	4.016	.7810

Research Question #1c: What are the perceptions and practices of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the area of learning application?

The component matrix divided the section on the survey instrument entitled "Learner Centered Instruction" into two factors. The second factor, which included questions regarding the application of learning to life activities and critical thinking and making connections between content areas and with real-life applications, became the "Learning Application" factor. Question 32 was originally in the "Learning Environment" section. However, it loaded with this set of questions, possibly due to the alignment of its wording regarding making applications to work and life. This area contained the lowest mean scores, even though they still showed a high level of impact by the PDAS instrument on this area of a teacher's performance.

The following questions loaded on this component: 5, 6, 7, 8, and 32. (See Appendix D for this survey.) The response means for these items were between 3.6891 and 3.9328. Similar to question b, respondents perceived that the PDAS instrument does impact students' application of learning, but not to the degree that it impacts communication. Question 32 was not included in the same section of questions as 5, 6, 7,

and 8; however, it may have loaded on the same component due to its content. Question 32 includes the phrase "making connections to work and life applications" as does number 5. In the PDAS training instrument, it is not in the same domain as the other questions. The responses for this factor are represented in Table 8 below.

Table 8
Learning Application

Question #	*f* 1s	*f* 2s	*f* 3s	*f* 4s	*f* 5s	Mean	*SD*
5	1	8	41	48	22	3.689	.8806
6	0	8	31	47	34	3.890	.9000
7	0	7	29	49	35	3.932	.8804
8	2	9	39	52	18	3.621	.8925
32	2	5	23	63	27	3.899	.8576

Research Question #1d: What are the perceptions and practices of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the area of the professional growth of teachers?

The fourth loading described teachers' perceptions regarding the impact of PDAS on professional development. The questions loaded as expected and reflect the objectives stated in the state evaluation instrument. This area is critical as it reflects the one area which research has directly correlated to an increase in student achievement. (Wood, F. and Killion, J. E., 1998).

The following questions loaded on this component: 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. (See Appendix D for this survey.) Each individual item had a response mean between 3.6218 and 4.0924. Respondents perceived that the PDAS instrument does influence professional development. The responses for this factor are represented in Table 9 below.

Table 9
The Professional Growth of Teachers

Question #	*f* 1s	*f* 2s	*f* 3s	*f* 4s	*f*	Mean	SD
19	1	8	41	48	22	4.0420	.9057
20	0	8	31	47	34	3.9580	.8576
21	0	7	29	49	35	4.0924	.9566
22	2	9	39	52	18	3.9580	.8772
23	2	5	23	63	27	3.6218	1.016

Research Question #1e: What are the perceptions and practices of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the area of support for all students?

The fifth area, Support for all Students, had the highest mean scores. Questions included concepts such as respect, identifying at-risk students, and support for students with learning difficulties. These statements loaded as expected.

The following questions loaded on this component: 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. Question 15 had the highest mean score in the survey. This question stated, “Teachers respect the rights of students, parents, colleagues, and the community.” The responses for this factor are represented in Table 10 below.

Table 10
Support for all Students

Question #	*f* 1s	*f* 2s	*f* 3s	*f* 4s	*f* 5s	Mean	*SD*
14	1	6	21	62	30	3.9496	.8422
15	1	2	9	47	61	4.3697	.7687
16	1	4	22	50	43	4.0756	.8651
17	1	3	20	49	47	4.1429	.8466
18	0	2	18	46	54	4.2605	.7753

Research Question #1f: What are the perceptions and practices of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the area of TAAS Improvement?

"TAAS Improvement" was the sixth section. This area on the survey instrument is much narrower than on the PDAS evaluation guide. The questions were initially taken from the section entitled " Efforts to Enhance Academic Performance." Numbers of responses for both ends of the scale were higher than in most other components, with fewer teachers responding at the "3," or mid-range.

Three questions, 35, 36, and 37 loaded on this component. Each of these questions had a mean above 4.0; therefore, teachers believe that PDAS has a significant effect on the improvement of TAAS scores. The responses for this factor are represented in Table 11 below.

Table 11
TAAS Improvement

Question #	*f*	*f*	*f*	*f*	*f*	Mean	*SD*
35	3	4	19	41	53	4.0756	.7497
36	4	3	11	41	61	3.9664	.8227
37	4	3	15	45	53	3.8824	.9313

Research Question #1g: What are the perceptions and practices of practitioners regarding implementation of the PDAS instrument in the area of learner centered instruction?

Three of the first four questions on the instrument loaded under the section entitled "Learner Centered Instruction." (Question number 3 cross-loaded and was therefore removed from the analysis. It should be omitted or reworded in future use of

the instrument.) These questions dealt with decisions teacher make regarding learning strategies, specifying the appropriateness of learning goals and objectives, themes within the content area, and alignment of the instructional strategies with student needs, life and work experiences, and the teacher's field of instruction. This domain of learner-centered instruction reflects the research on the need for students to see relationships between the content in one area of instruction and the content in another area. (Knapp, M. S., Shields, P. M. and Turnbull, B. J., 1995) This section contained the second highest mean scores. Teachers felt very strongly that the PDAS impacted their classrooms in the area of learner-centered instruction, reflecting the high level of emphasis intended by the designers. The responses for this factor are represented in Table 12 below.

Table 12
Learner Centered Instruction

Question #	*f* 1s	*f* 2s	*f* 3s	*f* 4s	*f* 5s	Mean	*SD*
1	0	1	26	56	37	3.9496	.8422
2	1	7	21	60	31	4.3697	.7687
4	1	9	27	50	33	4.0756	.8651

Without exception, these tables represent a high level of perceived impact on the areas under consideration. There was very little variance in teachers' responses between any of the factors. For each item, the majority of teachers indicated that they perceived a high level of impact in their classrooms as a result of the PDAS instrument. Very few teachers marked a "1" or "2," strongly disagree, for any of the items. Research Question #2: Are the perceptions affected by teachers' years of experience and/or area of instruction?

Two tests for homogeneity of variance were conducted in order to test for equality of variance across groups. The independent variables were the years of experience and the area of instruction. The dependent variables are the seven factors generated from the factor analysis. The significance levels for each hypothesis were above a .1; therefore, there were no significant differences in the levels of variance between the groups, which is ideal to proceed with an analysis of variance.

An analysis for the homogeneity of variance was performed for each group in order to analyze differences between the groups within years of experience (0-5; 6-10; 11-20; or over 20) and between the groups for the area of instruction (language arts, mathematics, social studies, or science; special education, bilingual education, ESL; vocational technology; fine arts; or athletics/physical education). The first test evaluated the impact of years of teaching experience on the respondents' perceptions of PDAS implementation. The second test evaluated whether or not the teachers' area of instruction impacted the responses. The analysis found no evidence of statistical differences between the perceptions of participants for any of the areas.

An ANOVA was performed in to evaluate the interactions between groups in the categories defined by the second research question. None of the areas reached the .01 level required for significance. Table 13 (below) describes the results.

Table 13
Analysis of Variance for Years of Experience

Domain	df	F	sig.
	Between subjects		
Communication	3	1.329	.268
Classroom management	3	.957	.416
Learning application	3	.735	.534
Professional growth	3	.652	.583
Support for all students	3	.140	.936
TAAS improvement	3	1.450	.232
Learner-centered instruction	3	1.877	.137

Analysis of Variance for Field of Instruction

Domain	df	F	sig.
	Between subjects		
Communication	4	.235	.918
Classroom management	4	1.220	.306
Learning application	4	1.134	.344
Professional Growth	4	.448	.773
Support for all students	4	1.531	.198
TAAS improvement	4	2.106	.085
Learner-centered instruction	4	2.348	.059

The analysis of data supports the precept that Texas' Professional Development and Appraisal System significantly impacts the classroom practices in the areas of learner centered instruction, classroom management, support for all students, professional growth, communication, TAAS improvement, and application of learning. These identified areas support and reflect the intentions of the instrument's designers. The teachers' years of experience and area of instruction had no significant effects on teachers' responses.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined teachers' perceptions concerning the implementation of Texas' Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) and the level of its effects on their classroom practices. The findings of this study reveal that teachers perceive the implementation of the PDAS as having a significant effect upon their classroom practices, and this is not influenced by the teachers' years of experience or field of instruction. State-level leaders in the area of education began consideration of the instrument in 1989. The implementation finally occurred in 1996. The system went through many modifications and a variety of forms. According to interviews with individuals instrumental in the process at the state level, the initial system that was considered was entitled *Teacherspeak*. This instrument was mentioned favorably in each of the interviews with designers. However, after considerable consideration and conversations with focus groups, the designers determined that the state was not "ready" for an evaluation system such as this one which was significantly comprised of coaching methodologies and portfolios.

The challenge for designers was to create an instrument that met the requirements of the legislature in a way that would cause teachers to view the instrument positively and create the best conditions for classroom implementation. Using the review of literature created specifically with the intent of defining the most significant components of effective teaching, the descriptors of best practices compiled and described in *Learner-*

Center Schools for Texas, and the designers' personal knowledge and experience regarding the motivation of adult learners, *Teacherspeak* was modified to become an instrument that designers hoped would support the professional growth of teachers, provide a structure for administrators to use in evaluations, and facilitate increased student achievement. Designers were cognizant of the research regarding the motivation of adult learners and effective staff training processes. This research shows a higher level of acceptance when compared to research conducted in 1995 regarding the TTAS. Overall, teachers' perceptions were positive concerning TTAS, the progress made by Texas' evaluation system, and the instrument's effects on the quality of teaching. However, the perceptions were not as high as the levels reported in this study.

Furthermore, state officials considered the PDAS as only one component of the goals they sought to accomplish. Alignment of additional programs such as the Reading Acceleration Program and the Reading Academies created and supported by the state were placed on the agenda for implementation in subsequent years. Designer D's comments regarding the implementation of programs within the state illustrated this point by stating

> …what I discovered is that it was the whole package that's doing it. It's the accountability system, it's all of the initiatives that Commissioner Moses started, Commissioner Nelson has continued with the reading initiative, and we're starting the secondary schools initiatives this fall.

As one component of the state system, the PDAS has gained a high level of perceived effect by the teachers involved in this research study.

The Correlation Between Designers' Intentions and Teachers' Responses

Student achievement was the most controversial area within the PDAS instrument both during its design phase and during the initial stages of implementation. Results of the teachers' surveys aligned with the intentions of designers in this area to emphasize the correlation between intent and perception, even though the final document did not include student achievement as it was originally intended. The original intent was for student achievement to be measured using a variety of methods and tests, including Advanced Placement Scores, TLI scores, and achievement tests. Teachers perceived that this domain had the second highest area of impact, while the designers mentioned student achievement more frequently than any other area.

The survey instrument limited the questions to teachers' perceptions of the evaluation instrument's impact on TAAS as the only measure of student achievement specifically included in teachers' assessments. The PDAS reflects only a building's TAAS scores as a part of the accountability system; individual teachers' classes are not represented on their evaluations. Each of the designers expressed some level of frustration at the limitations placed on the instrument to reflect a teacher's effectiveness in this area. However, all of the interviewees acknowledged that this was the result of compromise that had the potential to impact the acceptance and implementation level of the instrument.

This component was mentioned in each of the interviews as a positive effect of the instrument. Designers differed in whether or not they believed that the instrument in its final form would have been more effective if student achievement had been weighted more heavily. As stated in one of the interviews,

> I think the legislature was trying to take the accountability one step down the line and align it with the appraisal process for teachers. That was clearly their intent when they did that…I talked to several legislators after I became involved with Dr. Moses. Once that was passed, as you can imagine, the teacher organizations had serious reservations about it. Many of the reservations, in my opinion, were well founded…

This interviewee met with each association with the purpose of designing an effective compromise for implementing the law. As stated by Designer A, "The Commissioner's intent fully was to implement it in the most positive way and in the most helpful way." Other designers were not as accepting of the compromise and felt that the evaluation system would have been more effective if the student achievement component had been weighted more heavily, individualized by teacher, and included components in addition to TTAS. One of the designers who advocated a higher level of focus on student achievement stated, "…that whole student achievement piece, in my opinion, got diluted…" Two of the interview participants were involved in meetings during which the Commissioner clearly stated to teacher association representatives that the achievement of students would be included in the instrument. Therefore, despite teachers' initial concerns regarding inclusion of student achievement, teachers' responses aligned with the intent of developers to reveal that inclusion of student achievement within the appraisal instrument had a significant impact on their perceptions of its implementation.

Support for all students was considered by teachers to be the most significant area of impact by the PDAS instrument, although it was not mentioned to a significant degree in the designers' interviews. The statements in this domain focused on regarding students

individually and planning for differentiation of instruction in order to meet their individual learning needs. One possible explanation for the difference between the teachers' responses and the designers' responses is that the teachers operate on a classroom, student-by student basis, and the designers focused on the creation of a state-wide system. In addition, legislation and policies at the national level, for all states, and within school districts, such as At-Risk Plans and identification of §504 students ensure that the legal requirements and programs are in place to support the learning needs of struggling students. Training for teachers and the increased focus on differentiated learning has heightened teachers' awareness of requirements and effective practices in this area.

The second most significant area in the teachers' survey, "Communication," was not a significant area of focus for the designers. The significant mean score in this area may also be related to the requirement that teachers communicate with increasing frequency with parents, particularly with the parents of students who are struggling. In addition, the influx of technological communication into classrooms has increased teachers' opportunities to communicate with parents via e-mail and has provided ready access to telephones in their classrooms.

Designers' comments also focused on staff development as a primary area of emphasis. Teachers' responses revealed that they perceived this area to be highly affected by the PDAS instrument. The one area of education in which research-based links have been established is between staff development and student achievement. Teachers who are confident that they have the knowledge, skills, and means to achieve their desired goals work to improve their own instruction and create learning

environments in which students achieve higher levels of success (Hoy and Woolfolk, 1993; Mitchell and Beaudin, 1996; Dembo and Gibson, 1985). This is evidenced in state test scores as each district involved in the survey has improved their performance on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills every year that the PDAS has been in place.

Years of Experience and Field of Instruction

Two factors, years of experience and area of instruction, were analyzed using ANOVAs in order to determine whether or not the teachers' perceptions were affected by these descriptors. Neither years of experience nor areas of instruction significantly influenced teachers' responses. The overall responses of teachers reflect that the instrument's impact is perceived as affecting their classroom practices at a high level. The findings is are not affected by years of experience. Frequently, teachers with more years of experience are perceived as reticent to implement new policies and practices; teachers with fewer years of experience are thought of as lacking the expertise to understand and carry out instructional policies at a high level. The results of this study show that teachers perceive a high level of effect in their classrooms, without regard to their years of experience. The analysis regarding teachers' field of instruction was included in order to discern the perceived impact of the instrument for teachers in all area of teaching. A stereotype of teachers in teaching fields such as athletics or fine arts is that they are not impacted by student evaluation requirements or by the need to focus on individual student's learning and ability to make connections with the information in the teacher's content area and other disciplines. This perception is not evidenced in the results of the study.

Recommendations

The development of the PDAS evaluation instrument took many years of effort, including hours of meetings to work out the details and to achieve compromise between constituent groups across the state of Texas. Designers envisioned an instrument that contained the components of the most recent research on effective teaching practices. The final document is perceived by teachers as having significant effects upon their classroom practices, their interactions with colleagues, parents and the community, and upon student learning. This is a first step toward future research which should be conducted in order to describe actual classroom practices and to then begin the process of correlating practices with student achievement. Researchers have identified this as an area of need in the field of educational research, and the state of Texas is no exception (Ebermeier and Nicklaus, 1999). Because teachers perceive that the instrument has a significant impact upon the identified research areas, they then view the instrument as having a significant impact on their lives as educators.

One aspect which was not researched specifically within this study was the process of design and implementation of PDAS. If further research shows that the perceived level of implementation found in this study is consistent across the state, then the processes used to design the systems should be studied as a policy implementation model. State level officials and district administrators should be aware of the teachers' perceptions of this instrument. The high levels of impact teachers perceive affect its usefulness as a model of desired practices and as a means of accomplishing goals set by the state, by individual districts, and by campuses.

In order to factor out the potential impact of teacher training and a high level of prior knowledge related to the objectives, the survey instrument should be modified to include counterexamples of the stated objectives. This will help to ensure that respondents consider each question carefully, rather than responding to behaviors that they have been trained "should" occur in their classrooms. Investigators may consider reducing the potential for this "halo effect" to occur by rephrasing or rewording the items so that they are phrases differently from the PDAS instrument. This will enable future researchers to broaden applicability of their findings.

In order to reach the point where an evaluation instrument can be coedited with improved student achievement, several incremental steps must be reached so that the entire process becomes linked with solid, comprehensive research base. This research shows a high level of perceived impact when teachers respond when the objectives are stated similarly to those on the actual evaluation instrument. In order to support the findings of this study, future researchers must eliminate the potential for positive responses related to training or knowledge of how they are "supposed to" respond. By doing this, the potential for describing what is actually occurring in classrooms is much greater. From this information, researchers can begin the task of linking teacher behaviors to student achievement.

Conclusion

Texas, like other states, is prone to move from program to program with changes in the governor and the make-up of the state legislature. In order to evaluate the success of programs, sustained evaluation and research must be considered. Before initiating

modifications in the evaluation system, state officials should carefully design studies based on theoretically and statistically sound research practices to determine the effectiveness of the current system, particularly in the area of student achievement. In designing policy that is responsive to legislative intent as well as feasible to be successfully implemented in a real-world situation, the designers must first give serious consideration to all of the available alternatives and to the impact that carrying out the design will have for all those involved. Furthermore, published research must be reviewed for quality of design and analysis prior to its acceptance as a worthwhile contribution to the body of literature describing effective classroom practices. Studies in the field of educational best practices range in effectiveness from those that are well designed and thoughtfully, accurately analyzed to those that are ill-conceived with calculations that are inappropriately applied. Both theoretically and in practice, good policy must be based on the definitive results of well-designed and implemented research. In their analysis of the United States' practices in the field of educational research, Mosteller, Light, and Sachs state that the

> U. S. education does not lack innovations; rather it lacks careful, long-term evaluations of their performance. In order to be evaluated well, an intervention must be implemented in enough depth so that it is well defined. Teachers must develop sufficient experience to actually deliver it. Then, after initial evaluation, one would expect adjustments and improvements, followed by further evaluation (1996).

This study is but a first step toward analyzing the effectiveness of the Professional Development and Appraisal System. It reveals that teachers perceive a high level of

impact upon their classroom practices as a result of the instrument's implementation when asked to respond to objectives closely corresponding to those in the evaluation instrument. In addition, the instrument corresponds to the intentions of the designers at the state level. Further study should focus initially on describing teachers' actual classroom practices, then on research regarding the impact of these practices on student achievement. If the "best practices' research can be quantitatively linked with improved student achievement, then the use of PDAS should improve the level of learning for Texas' students. However, the evaluation system is but one component of an effective system. Keeping this in mind, the state, districts and campuses should continue to support and align programs within this complex system in our attempts to improve the processes of teaching and learning.

APPENDIX A

COMPARISON

A Comparison of the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)

PDAS	NBPTS	INTACS
I-1. Students are actively engaged in learning.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning	5. Creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
I-2. students are successful in learning.	1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	2. Understands how children learn and develop; provides learning opportunities that support their development.
I-3. Student behaviors indicate learning is at a high cognitive level (e.g., critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving, etc.)	2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.	4. Understands and uses variety of instructional strategies.
I-4. Students are self-directed/self-initiated as appropriate to the lesson objectives.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	5. Creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
I-5. Students are connecting learning to work and life applications, both within the discipline, and with other disciplines.	2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.	1. Understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structure of the disciplines taught; creates learning experiences to make them meaningful to students.
II-1. Objectives and goals include basic knowledge/skills and central themes/concepts of the discipline.	2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.	1. Understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structure of the disciplines taught; creates learning experiences to make them meaningful to students.

II-2. Instructional content is learner centered (e.g., relates to the interests and varied characteristics of students).	1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
II-3. Instructional strategies promote critical thinking and problem solving.	1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	4. Understands and uses variety of instructional strategies.
II-4.Instructional strategies include motivational techniques to successfully and actively engage students in the learning process.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	2. Understands how children learn and develop; provides learning opportunities that support their development.
II-5. Instructional strategies are aligned with the objectives, activities, student characteristics, prior learning, and work and life application, both within the discipline, and with other disciplines.	1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	7. Plans instruction based on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
II-6. The teacher varies activities appropriately and maintains appropriate pacing and sequencing of instruction.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	4. Understands and uses variety of instructional strategies.
II-7. The teacher emphasizes the value and importance of the activity/content.	2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.	
II-8. The teacher uses appropriate questioning and inquiry techniques to challenge students.	2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.	1. Understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structure of the disciplines taught; creates learning experiences to make them meaningful to students.
II-9. The teacher makes appropriate and effective use of available technology as a part of the instructional process.	2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.	6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.

III-1. Academic progress of students is monitored and assessed.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	8. Understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies.
III-2. assessment and feedback are aligned with goals and objectives and instructional strategies.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	8. Understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies.
III-3. Assessment strategies are appropriate to the varied characteristics of sstudents.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	8. Understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies.
III-4. Student learning is reinforced.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
III-5. Students receive specific constructive feedback.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
III-6. The teacher provides other opportunities for relearning and re-evaluation of material.		3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners
IV-1. The teacher effectively implements the discipline-management procedures approved by the campus.		3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners
IV-2. The teacher establishes a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed learning.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	5. Creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
IV-3. The teacher interacts with students in an equitable manner, including fair application of rules.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.

IV-4. The teacher specifies expectations for desired behavior.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	
IV-5. The teacher intervenes and re-directs off-task, inappropriate, or disruptive behavior.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	
IV-6. The teacher reinforces desired behavior when appropriate.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
IV-7. The teacher uses instructional materials which are equitable and acknowledge the varied characteristics of all students.	1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
IV-8. The teacher effectively and efficiently manages time and materials.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	
V-1. The teacher uses appropriate and accurate written communication with students.		6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
V-2. The teacher uses appropriate and accurate verbal and non-verbal communication with students.		6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
V-3. The teacher encourages and supports students who are reluctant and having difficulty.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
V-4. The teacher uses appropriate and accurate written communication with parents, staff, community members, and other professionals.		6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.

V-5. The teachers uses appropriate and accurate verbal and non-verbal communication with paretns, staff, community members, and other professionals.		6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
V-6. The teacher's interactions are supportive, courteous, and respectful with students, parents, staff, community members, and other professionals.	5. Teachers are members of learning communities.	6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.
VI-1. The teacher successfully engages in professional development activities that positively correlate with the goals of the campus and district.	4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from their experience.	9. Reflects on teaching
VI-2. The teacher successfully correlates professional development activities with assigned subject content and the varied needs of students.	4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from their experience.	9. Reflects on teaching.
VI-3. The teacher successfully engages in professional development activities that positively correlate with the prior performance appraisal.	4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from their experience.	9. Reflects on teaching.
Vi-4. The teacher works collaboratively and constructively with colleagues and other professionals toward the overall improvement of student performance.	5. Teachers are members of learning communities.	10. Fosters relationships with colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community.

VII-1. The teacher complies with all of the policies, operating procedures, and legal requirements (national, state, district, and campus). Any lack of compliance is rare, inadvertent, and does not seriously compromise the needs of students or the effective operations of the campus/district.	5. Teachers are members of learning communities.	
VII-2. The teacher complies with all verbal and written directives. Any lack of compliance is rare, inadvertent, and does not seriously compromise the needs of students or the effective operations of the campus/district.	5. Teachers are members of learning communities.	
VII-3. Apart form classroom responsibilities, the teacher generally contributes to making the whole school safe and orderly, and a stimulating learning environment for all children.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	5. Creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
VIIIA-1. The teacher aligns instruction to include appropriate TAAS-related objectives to support student achievement in all assigned classes.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
VIIIA-2. The teacher analyzes TAAS performance data relevant to all students in assigned classes prior to beginning instruction.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	2. Understands how children learn and develop; provides learning opportunities that support their development.

VIIIA-3. The teacher adjusts the sequencing of classroom instruction to appropriately incorporate TAAS-related objectives.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	
VIIIA-4. The teacher selects/adapts instructional materials and activities which are correlated with appropriate TAAS-related objectives.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	
VIIIA-5. The teacher provides feedback to all students regarding their learning progress on appropriate TAAS-related objectives.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	8. Understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies.
VIIIB-6. The teacher monitors attendance of all students in assigned classes and contacts parents, counselors, or other school officials for students with serious attendance problems.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	
VIIIC-7. The teacher identifies and assesses the needs of assigned students who are in at-risk situations.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
VIIIC-8. The teacher meets with students who are failing or in danger of failing and develops and appropriate plan for intervention.	1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
VIIIC-9. The teacher modifies and adapts classroom materials and/or instruction for students in at-risk situations.	1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.	3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning; creates instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.

VIIID-10. The campus performance rating consists of three factors including: (a) student performance on the Texas Assessment fo Academic Skills (TAAS), (b) student attendance, and (c) drop-out rates. All teachers make contributions toward this overall performance rating of the school, and therefore this is included among the criteria for improved academic excellence.	3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.	

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Semi-structured Interview Guide

PDAS Developers

1. Describe your role in the design process of the PDAS instrument.
2. What state level concerns was the instrument designed to address?
3. How were decisions made regarding the criteria to be included in the instrument?
4. Other than the research listed in the PDAS "References" what expert opinions did you consult?
5. What were the effects that you intended for the instrument to have on
    a. students' success in the classroom?
    b. teacher-parent interactions?
    c. the professional growth of teachers?
    d. teacher-to-teacher interactions?
    e. teachers' instructional practices?
6. How do you perceive that the implementation of the instrument has affected each of these areas?

APPENDIX C

PILOT SURVEY

SURVEY

PART I

Career-related Data

Directions: Please circle the letter that best represents your job description.

1. Number of years in the teaching profession

   A. 0-5 years

   B. 6-10 years

   C. 11-20 years

   D. over 20 years

2. Primary area(s) of instruction (Mark all that apply.)

   A. language arts, mathematics, social studies, or science

   B. special education, bilingual education, ESL

   C. vocational technology

   D. fine arts

   E. athletics/physical education

Part II

Survey

Directions: The following questions are designed to assess your perceptions regarding the PDAS (Professional Development and Appraisal System), its impact on you as a teacher, and its effects on student learning. Consider each response as a reflection of the impact PDAS has on the statement, not on your district's curriculum as a whole. Please read each question and mark the response that most closely represents your opinion.

	Strongly agree----------				----------strongly disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
1. The PDAS positively impacts the quality and quantity of time in which students actively participate in the learning process.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Students are challenged by instruction and make connections to work and life applications.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Students are challenged by instruction and make connections to other disciplines.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The instructional content is based on appropriate goals and objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
5. The instructional content includes basic knowledge and skills, as well as central themes and concepts in the discipline(s) I teach.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The instructional content includes basic knowledge and skills, as well as central themes and concepts in other disciplines.	5	4	3	2	1
7. The instructional strategies are aligned with learning objectives and activities, student needs, and work and life applications in the discipline I teach.	5	4	3	2	1
8. The instructional strategies are aligned with learning objectives and activities, student needs, and work and life applications in other disciplines.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly agree				strongly disagree
9. The instructional strategies promote application of learning through critical thinking and problem solving.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Teachers use appropriate motivational and instructional strategies which successfully and actively engage students in the learning process.	5	4	3	2	1
11. Teachers align assessment and feedback with goals and objectives and instructional strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
12. Teachers use a variety of evaluation and feedback strategies which are appropriate to the varied characteristics of the students.	5	4	3	2	1
13. Teachers effectively implement the discipline-management procedures approved by the district.	5	4	3	2	1
14. Teachers establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline and self-directed teaching.	5	4	3	2	1
15. Teachers select instructional materials which are equitable and acknowledge the varied characteristics of all students.	5	4	3	2	1
16. Teachers effectively and efficiently manage time and materials.	5	4	3	2	1
17. Teachers use appropriate and accurate written, verbal, and non-verbal modes of communication with students.	5	4	3	2	1
18. Teachers use appropriate and accurate written, verbal , and non-verbal modes of communication with parents, staff, community members, and other professionals.	5	4	3	2	1
19. Teachers' interactions are supportive, courteous, respectful, and encouraging to students who are reluctant and having difficulty.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly agree				strongly disagree
20. Teachers determine and participate in professional development goals and activities that are aligned with the goals of the campus and the goals of the district.	5	4	3	2	1
21. Teachers correlate professional development activities with assigned subject content and the varied needs of students.	5	4	3	2	1
22. Teachers exhibit a willingness to collaborate with colleagues and other professionals for continuous growth and development.	5	4	3	2	1
23. Teachers correlate professional development activities with the prior performance appraisal.	5	4	3	2	1
24. Teachers contribute to making the whole school safe and orderly, and a stimulating learning environment for children.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Teachers respect the rights of students, parents, colleagues and the community.	5	4	3	2	1
26. Teachers diagnose student needs and provide performance feedback related to all appropriate TAAS-related objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
27. Teachers align the planning and delivery of instruction to all appropriate TAAS-related objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Teachers collaborate with other faculty and administration to improve TAAS-related performance of all students on the campus.	5	4	3	2	1
29. Teachers identify students who are at risk and develop appropriate strategies to assist these students.	5	4	3	2	1
30. Teachers monitor the attendance of all students and intervene to promote regular attendance.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX D

FINAL SURVEY

SURVEY

PART I

Career-related Data

Directions: Please circle the letter that best represents your job description.

1. Number of years in the teaching profession

   A. 0-5 years

   B. 6-10 years

   C. 11-20 years

   D. over 20 years

2. Primary area(s) of instruction (Mark all that apply.)

   A. language arts, mathematics, social studies, or science

   B. special education, bilingual education, ESL

   C. vocational technology

   D. fine arts

   E. athletics/physical education

Part II

Survey

Directions: The following questions are designed to assess your perceptions regarding the PDAS (Professional Development and Appraisal System), its impact on you as a teacher, and its effects on student learning. Please read each question and mark the response that most closely represents your opinion.

	Strongly agree----------				----------strongly disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
Domain I –Learner Centered Instruction					
1. The instructional content is based on appropriate goals and objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The instructional content includes basic knowledge and skills, as well as central themes and concepts in the discipline(s) I teach.	5	4	3	2	1
3. The instructional content includes basic knowledge and skills, as well as central themes and concepts in other disciplines.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The instructional strategies are aligned with learning objectives and activities, student needs, and work and life applications in the discipline I teach.	5	4	3	2	1
5. The instructional strategies are aligned with learning objectives and activities, student needs, and work and life applications in other disciplines.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The instructional strategies promote critical thinking and problem solving. process.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Students are challenged by instruction.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Students make connections from the instructional content to other disciplines.	5	4	3	2	1

Domain II-Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time, and Materials

	Strongly agree----------				----------strongly disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
9. Teachers effectively implement the discipline-management procedures approved by the district.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Teachers establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-discipline.	5	4	3	2	1
11. Teachers establish a classroom environment which promotes and encourages self-directed teaching.	5	4	3	2	1
12. Teachers select instructional materials which are equitable and acknowledge the varied characteristics of all students.	5	4	3	2	1
13. Teachers effectively and efficiently manage time and materials.	5	4	3	2	1
Domain III-Support for All Students					
14. Teachers identify students who are at risk and develop appropriate strategies to assist these students.	5	4	3	2	1
15. Teachers respect the rights of students, parents, colleagues, and the community.	5	4	3	2	1
16. Teachers' interactions with students who are reluctant learners and/or having difficulty are supportive, courteous, respectful, and encouraging.	5	4	3	2	1
17. Teachers monitor the attendance of all students and intervene to promote regular attendance.	5	4	3	2	1
18. Teachers contribute to making the whole school safe and orderly, and a stimulating learning environment for children.	5	4	3	2	1

Domain IV-Professional Development

	Strongly agree				strongly disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
19. Teachers determine and participate in professional development goals and activities that are aligned with the goals of the campus and the goals of the district.	5	4	3	2	1
20. Teachers correlate professional development activities with assigned subject content and the varied needs of students.	5	4	3	2	1
21. Teachers exhibit a willingness to collaborate with colleagues for continuous growth and development.	5	4	3	2	1
22. Teachers exhibit a willingness to collaborate with other professionals for continuous growth and development.	5	4	3	2	1
23. Teachers correlate professional development activities with the prior performance appraisal.	5	4	3	2	1

Domain V-Communication

24. Teachers use appropriate and accurate written communication with students.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Teachers use appropriate and accurate verbal communication with students.	5	4	3	2	1
26. Teachers use appropriate and accurate non-verbal communication with students.	5	4	3	2	1
27. Teachers use appropriate and accurate written, verbal, and non-verbal modes of communication with parents.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Teachers use appropriate and accurate written, verbal, and non-verbal modes of communication with other staff members.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly agree				strongly disagree
	5	4	3	2	1
29. Teachers use appropriate and accurate written, verbal, and non-verbal modes of communication with community members.	5	4	3	2	1
30. Teachers use appropriate and accurate written, verbal, and non-verbal modes of communication with other professionals.	5	4	3	2	1
31. Quantity and quality of active student participation in the leaming process is evident.	5	4	3	2	1
Domain VI-Learning Environment					
32. Students are challenged by instruction and make connections to work and life applications.	5	4	3	2	1
33. Teachers use a variety of evaluation and feedback strategies which are appropriate to the varied characteristics of the students.	5	4	3	2	1
34. Teachers use appropriate motivational and instructional strategies which successfully and actively engage students in the learning process.	5	4	3	2	1
Domain VII-TAAS Improvement					
35. Teachers align the planning and delivery of instruction to all appropriate TAAS-related objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
36. Teachers collaborate with other faculty and administration to improve TAAS-related performance of all student on the campus.	5	4	3	2	1
37. Teachers diagnose student needs and provide performance feedback related to all appropriate TAAS-related objectives	5	4	3	2	1

REFERENCES

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (1988). Teacher Education Policy in the States: A 50-state Survey of Legislation and Administrative Actions. Washington, D.C.: AACTE.

Anderson, L. M., Stevens, D. D., Prawat, R. S., and Nickerson, J. (1988). Classroom task environments and students' task-related beliefs. *The Elementary School Journal*, 88, 281-295.

Baker, Paul, (Ed.). (1998). Let's make wise use of new teacher assessments. *WCER Highlights.* Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 10(3).

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theoryof behavioral change. *Psychological review.* 84, 191-215.

Baratz-Snowden, J. (1993). Assessment of teachers: A view from the national board for professional teaching standards. *Theory into practice: assessing tomorrow's teachers.* College of Education, Ohio State University. XXXII (2), 82-85.

Bronowski, C., Toms-Bronowski, S., and Bearden, K. J. (1993). Teacher observation forms: A new look at an old technique. *NASSP Bulletin.* 77(55) 30-37.

Cawelti, G., ed. (1995). Handbook of Research on Improving Student Achievement. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service.

Cawelti, G. (1996). Conclusion: The search for a system. *Working together toward reform.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Claudet, J. G. and Ellett, C. D. (1999). Conceptualization and measurement of supervision as a school organizational climate construct. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision.* 14(4), 318-350.

Cohen, D. K. and Hill, H. (1997). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Wenfeld,F. D., York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Daniels, H. (1996).The best practice project: Building parent partnerships in Chicago. *Educational Leadership.*(53) 7, 38-43.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/.

Dembo, M. and Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. *Elementary School Journal.* 86, 173-184.

Ebmeier, H. and J. Nicklaus. (Summer, 1999) *The Impact of Peer and Principal Collaborative Supervision on Teachers' Trust, Commitment, Desire for Collaboration, Efficacy.* ASCD Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 14(4), 351-378.

Elmore, R. (1996). Getting to scale with good educational practice. Working together toward reform. *Harvard Educational Review.* 66(1), 1-27.

Ferguson, R. F. (Summer, 1991). Paying for public education: New evidence on how and why money matters. *Harvard journal on legislation.*28(2), 465-498.

Firestone, W., Fuhrman, S., and Kurst, M. (1989) *The Progress of Reform: An Appraisal of State Education Initiatives.* New Jersey: Rutgers University Center for Policy Research in Education.

Flakus-Mosqueda, P. (1986). Teacher testing and performance standards: A survey of selected state policies. *Teacher Education Quarterly.* (13), 8-27.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces.* New York: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). ASCD Yearbook. *Challenges and Achievements of American Education.* Virginia: ASCD.

Glass, G. V., Cahen, L. S., Smith, M. L., and and Filby, N. N. (1982). School Class Size: Research and Policy. Beverly Hillsl, CA: SAGE Publications.

Glasser, W. (1997). "Choice theory" and student success. *Education Digest.* (63), 16-21.

Glasser, W. (1984). *Control theory.* New York: Harper and Row.

Glasser, W. (1986). *Control Theory in the Classroom.* New York: Harper and Row.

Gottfried, A. E. (1985). Academic intrinsic motivation on elementary and junior high school students. *Journal of educational psychology*, 71, 355-361.

Heck, R.H. and Mayor, R.A. (1993) School characteristics, school academic indicators, and student outcomes: Implications to improve schools. *Journal of Education Policy.*8(2) 143-154.

Hoy, W. and Woolfolk, A. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *Elementary school journal.*93, 355-372.

INTASC Standards. http://www.ofps.dpi.state.nc.us/OFPS/hm/sp/pblintasc.htm.

Johnson, Susan. (1998). *The Relationship Between Teacher Instructional Practices and Achievement*. Unpublished manuscript. Baylor University. School of Education, Waco, Texas.

Killian, J. E. and Wood, F. H. (1997) Connections in practice: Instructional Supervision, Teacher Evaluation, and Staff Development. Unpublished manuscript. Southern Illinois University, Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the University of Oklahoma, College of Education. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Knapp, M. S., Shields, P. M., & Turnbull, B. J. (1995). Academic challenge in high-poverty classrooms. *Phi delta kappa*. 76(10) 770-776.

Kohn, A. (1996) What to look for in a classroom. *Educational leadership.* 54(1), 54-55.

Langer, E. J. (1983). *The psychology of control.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

*Learner-Centered Schools for Texas: A Vision for Texas Educators.*Adopted by the State Board of Education and published by Texas Education Agency.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1984). *Teachers, their world and their work.* Virginia: ASCD.

Little, J. W. (1882). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American education research journal*. 19(3), 325-340.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row. Mitchell, C. and Beaudin, B. (Spring 1996). Efficacy beliefs of newly hired teachers on urban schools. *American education research journal.*33, 233-257.

Mitchell, R. D. (1998). World class teachers. *Journal of staff development.* 19(2), 48-53.

Moses, M. (April, 1997). A message from Commissioner Mike Moses. As printed in *The Professional Development and Appraisal System training manual*. Texas Education Agency. 3.

Mostetler, F., Light, R. & Sachs, J. A. (1996). Sustained inquiry in education: Lessons from skill grouping and class size. *Harvard educational review.* 66(4).

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1991) Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession (2nd ed.) Washington, D.C.

NBPTS: Texas. (1999). http://nbpts.org/nbpts/where/central/texas.html

Newby, T. J. (1991). Classroom motivation: Strategies of first year teachers. *Journal of educational psychology.* 83, 195-200.

Rosenthal, A, and Furman, S. (1981). Legislative education leadership in the states. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Education Leadership.

Runnels, S. S. (1995). Self-perception of objectivity in the use of the TTAS. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 161. (University Microfilms No. 4242)

Sanders, W. L. & Horn, S. P. (1995). The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS): Mised model methodology in educational assessment, in Shinkfield, A. J. and Stufflebeam, D. L. *Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice.* Boston: Kluwer.

Showers, B. and Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership.* 53 (6), 12-16.

Slavin, R., et. al. (1994) Roots and wings: Inspiring academic excellence. *Educational Leadership.* 52(3), pp. 10-13.

Sparks, D. (1999). Improvement by design. *Journal of staff development.* 20(3).

Texas Education Agency: Division of Performance Reporting, Office of Policy Planning & Research (1997). *Snapshot '97.* Texas Education Agency.

Texs Education Agency. (1997). *Implementation manual for appraisers and teachers.* Austin, Texas.

Texas Education Agency. (1997, Aug.). Professional Development and Appraisal System: Update #2.

Texas Education Agency. (1998, Jan.). Professional Development and Appraisal System: Update #3.

Texas Education Agency, (1995). Review of Literature Relating Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) Criteria to Student Outcomes. Unpublished document created for use in development of the PDAS teacher assessment system.

Texas Education Agency. (1989). *Texas Teacher Appraisal System Appraiser's Manual.* Austin, Texas.

Valentine, J. (1990), April). A national survey of state teacher evaluation policies. Unpublished research paper. University of Mississippi, Columbia.

Webster, W. J. (1995). The connection between personnel evaluation and school evaluation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 21,* 227-254.

Wiley D. and Yoon, B. (1995). Teacher reports of opportunity to learn: Analyses of the 1993 California Learning Assessment System. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 17(3), 355-370.

Wood, F. H. and Killian, J. E. (1998). Job-embedded learning makes the difference in school improvement. *Journal of staff development.* 19(1), 52-54.

Yap, K.O. and Enocki, D.Y. (1995) In search of the elusive magic bullet: Parental involvement and student outcomes. *The school community journal.*5(2), 97-106.

Zemelman, S. Daniels, H. and Hyde A. (1993) Best Practices: New Standards for Teaching and Learning in America's Schools. New Hampshire: Heinemann.