
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2015

The Effects of the Marzano Observation System Training on the Self-Efficacy of Teacher Observers

Samuel Ashley
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Ashley, Samuel, "The Effects of the Marzano Observation System Training on the Self-Efficacy of Teacher Observers" (2015). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 1200.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/1200>

THE EFFECTS OF THE MARZANO OBSERVATION SYSTEM TRAINING ON THE
SELF-EFFICACY OF TEACHER OBSERVERS

by

SAMUEL ALVIN ASHLEY III
B.A. Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, 2004
M.Ed. University of Central Florida, 2008
M.Ed. Stetson University, 2010

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Teaching, Learning and Leadership
in the College of Education and Human Performance
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2015

Major Professor: Kenneth T. Murray

© 2015 Samuel Alvin Ashley III

ABSTRACT

This research analyzed the effects of the Marzano Teacher Observation training on the self-efficacy of teacher observers. In this study, seventy-four teacher observers reported their self-efficacy in the areas of evaluating student engagement, evaluating classroom management, and evaluating instructional strategies in pre and post surveys. The results of the surveys were analyzed with a paired samples t-test. This study found that the Marzano Teacher Observation system increases the self-efficacy of teacher observers. This study was delimited to participants of a Marzano Teacher Observation training conducted in the fall of 2014. The findings of this study will inform executive school leaders of the impact Marzano Teacher Observation training has on the self-efficacy of teacher observers.

To my daughter, Lily - The most caring, beautiful and wisest young lady I know

To my son, Mason - the most tenacious, unselfish, and wisest young man I know

To my wife Christine – the friend of my soul

I love you

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writing of this dissertation would not have been possible without the support and guidance of many people.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my dissertation chair, Dr. Ken Murray for his wise counsel and guidance through this process. Without his support, the writing of this dissertation would not have been possible.

I would also like to thank my committee, Dr. Barbara Murray, Dr. Lee Baldwin, and Dr. Larry Holt for their guidance and feedback.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. M.H. Clark and Dr. Shiva Jahani of the Castle Lab for their assistance with this dissertation's statistical analysis.

I am very grateful to the brethren of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, for their financial support that allowed me to pursue my doctorate degree.

I have been blessed with friends and family that have stood by me through the years while I pursued this degree. I am grateful to Dr. Antman and Dr. McHale for their friendship through this process. I thank my cohort for the journey that we shared together. I thank my brothers of the Scottish Rite, Orange Blossom 80, and Bahia Shrine for always being a phone call away.

Lastly, I am grateful to Rod and Pat for their understanding and unwavering support of my goals. I am most grateful to Lily, Mason, and Christine who have sacrificed so much while I pursued this degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Bridge Leadership Grant.....	3
Theoretical Framework.....	4
Problem Statement.....	6
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Significance of Study.....	7
Research Questions and Hypothesis	7
Research Variables.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	9
Delimitation	9
Limitations	9
Assumptions.....	10
Overview of Methodology.....	10
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Historical Education Legal Cases	14
Roberts v. City of Boston, 1849.....	14
Equal Protection Clause of the 14 th Amendment, 1868.....	15
Civil Rights Act of 1875	16
U.S. v. Singleton (Civil Rights Cases of 1883)	16
Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896	17
Cumming v. Board of Education in Richmond County, 1899.....	17
Gong Lum et al. v. Rice et al., 1927	18
Belton v. Gebhart, 1952.....	19
Briggs v. Elliott, 1952.....	20
Davis v. School Board of Prince Edward County, 1952.....	21
Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1951	21
Bolling v. Sharpe, 1954	22
Brown v. Board of Education, 1954	23
Cooper v. Aaron, 1958.....	23
Griffin v. School Board of Prince Edward County, 1966.....	24
History of Supervision and Evaluation in the United States.....	25
The Community Accountability Phase	25
The Professionalism Phase	28
The Scientific Phase.....	28
The Human Relations Phase	30

The Second-Wave Scientific Phase	31
The Second-Wave Human Resources Phase	31
The Human Development Phase.....	32
National Board Certification.....	32
Student Engagement	36
Emotions	37
Interest.....	38
Perceived Importance.....	40
Perceptions of Efficacy	40
Classroom Management.....	41
Rules and Procedures	42
Discipline and Consequences	44
Teacher-Student Relationships	46
Mental Set	47
Student Responsibility	51
Getting off to a good start	53
Management at the School Level.....	54
Florida Teacher Evaluation Models, Race to the Top and the Student Success Act	55
Florida School Districts and the Marzano Observation Model	56
Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model.....	56
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	64
Problem Statement	64
Purpose of the Study	64
Significance of Study.....	64
Research Questions and Hypothesis	65
Research Variables.....	66
Sample and Accessible Population	66
Data Sources	66
Instruments.....	67
Demographic Questionnaire	68
Procedure	68
Data Analysis	69
Ethical Considerations	69
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	70
Introduction.....	70
Descriptive Statistics.....	70
Research Question 1	74
Research Question 2	77
Research Question 3	80

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	84
Introduction.....	84
Summary of the Study	85
Conclusion	86
Implications for Practice.....	86
Recommendations for Practice	87
Recommendations for Further Research.....	87
Conclusion	89
APPENDIX A: EVALUATOR’S SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE	90
APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE.....	92
APPENDIX C: PERMISSION LETTER, TEACHERS SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE	94
APPENDIX D: TEACHERS’ SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE (SHORT FORM)	96
APPENDIX E: DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING THE TEACHERS’ SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE.....	98
APPENDIX F: DISSERTATION PROPOSAL APPROVAL	100
APPENDIX G: ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS RESEARCH REQUEST	102
APPENDIX H: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	105
APPENDIX I: DISSERTATION DEFENSE ANNOUNCEMENT	107
LIST OF REFERENCES	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Research Questions and Data Sources	12
Table 2 Respondents' Highest Degrees Earned	70
Table 3 Respondents' Highest Degree Earned in Curriculum and Instruction	71
Table 4 Respondents' Current Position	72
Table 5 Years in Current Position.....	73
Table 6 National Board of Professional Teaching Standards	73
Table 7 Comparison of means for items pertaining to research question one	74
Table 8 Paired Samples t-test comparing items relevant to research question one	76
Table 9 Comparison of means for items pertaining to research question two.....	78
Table 10 Paired Samples t-test comparing items relevant to research question two	79
Table 11 Comparison of means for items pertaining to research question three.....	80
Table 12 Paired Samples t-test comparing items relevant to research question three	82

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Great Recession was a period of time that lasted from December of 2007 – June of 2009 (Luttrell, Atkinson, & Rosenblum, 2013). This period of time was difficult for various sectors of the economy, including education. In 2008, the government tried to pull the United States out of the recession with multiple methods including lowering interest rates and establishing the Troubled Asset Relief Program or TARP (Blinder & Zandy, 2010).

In 2009, United States House Representative Obey introduced H.R.1 otherwise known as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (The Library of Congress, 2009). According to the U.S. Department of Education (2009), the purpose of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was to “...stimulate the economy, support job creation, and invest in critical sectors, including education.” The president urged Congress to pass the legislation. Four days after Congress passed the legislation, President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Board, 2014). Authorized under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the Race to the Top program was initiated (U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

The Race to the Top initiative is a competitive grant program that was designed to provide incentives to states to implement education reform in four key areas (U.S.

Department of Education, 2010). One of the four areas was to support both teachers and administrators to become more effective (White House, 2014).

As a result, states were required to develop evaluation systems that were intentionally designed to provide support for both teachers and administrators. Moreover, the evaluation systems were also required to reflect the teachers' impact on student growth (Scott, 2013).

The development of the evaluation systems raised concerns for some teachers. State officials reported that many teachers voiced concerns regarding the consequences that were being tied to the new evaluation systems (Scott, 2013). By September 2013, only six states had fully implemented the new evaluation systems.

In Florida, S.B. 736, mandated that all Florida school districts develop or adopt an evaluation system that provides that a minimum of 50 percent of a teacher's final evaluation is based on statewide performance indicators such as the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. For subject areas that do not have a statewide assessment, a district-wide assessment must be used (The Florida Senate, 2011). To meet part of this requirement, the Florida Department of Education adopted the Value Added Model. The Value Added Model was designed with the intention of giving all teachers a level playing field when they are evaluated (Florida Department of Education, 2014).

The Value Added Model is controversial amongst some teachers. The Florida Education Association asserts that the Value Added Model is flawed and does not take all factors affecting a student's performance on standardized tests into consideration (Florida

Education Association, 2014). In 2011, in an effort to nullify the Value Added Model, the acting Florida Education Association president wrote a letter to Governor Scott requesting that he use his executive power to suspend the statutory obligation that school districts use the Value Added Model as part of teachers' final observations (Ford, 2012). In response, Governor Rick Scott wrote that the Value Added Model was a key component of "President Obama's Race to the Top program." He then wrote that he supported the Race to the Top program (Scott., 2012).

In Orange County Public Schools, located in Orlando, Florida, the Marzano evaluation model was adopted (Orange County Public Schools, 2014). According to Marzano (2012), evaluations serve two purposes: measuring teachers and developing teachers. To assist administrators and teacher leaders in correctly utilizing the Marzano evaluation model, Orange County Public Schools offers training in using the Marzano evaluation model (Orange County Public Schools, 2011).

Bridge Leadership Grant

The U.S. Department of Education is currently dispersing grant funds for the School Leadership Program (SLP). The School Leadership Program was initiated to support the "development, enhancement, and expansion of innovative programs to recruit, train, and mentor principals and assistant principals for high-need schools and districts. (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). The program's intended recipients for the grants of the SLP are high-need local education agencies (LEA). In fiscal year (FY) 2009, the School Board of Orange County was awarded a \$3,670,603.00 grant from the

SLP. The program title of the grant was “The BRIDGE Leadership Program: Building Rigor into Developing Great Educational Leadership” (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

The Bridge Leadership Program has four components. The components are Principal Leadership Academy (support for newly appointed principals), Preparing New Principals Program (support for newly appointed assistant principals), Aspiring Leaders Program (support for “up-and-coming” school administrators) and the Stetson Cohort (a university partnership for up-and-coming school administrators).

Teachers employed by the School Board of Orange County may apply to the Aspiring Leaders Program. The Aspiring Leaders Program was initiated to identify and develop administrative talent within the school district (Orange County Public Schools, 2010). This study will investigate how the Marzano observation training affects teacher-observers’ self-efficacy. Many of the teacher-observers in this study are aspiring leaders.

Theoretical Framework

Currently, multiple agencies including federal, state, and local have dedicated funds and other resources to the identification and development of school leaders. Research has shown that principals that demonstrate characteristics attributed to instructional leadership are more likely to have a positive effect on student achievement (Hattie, 2009). Originally, the title of instructional leader was bestowed upon effective school leaders that led their schools as a “principal teacher” and spent their time

mobilizing schools towards effective instruction (Neumerski, 2013; Tyack & Hansot, 1982 as cited in Neumerski, 2013).

One of the key motivators for a person to exhibit certain behaviors is his or her perceived self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1977, p. 194), people will avoid situations that are beyond their perceived self-efficacy. In other words, if an instructional leader has a low perceived self-efficacy in the area of instructional leadership, he or she is less likely to exhibit characteristics associated with instructional leadership.

According to Bandura, Adams, & Beyer (1977), an efficacy expectation is "...the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes." Self-efficacy not only influences an individual's choices, but it also serves as a source of comfort that helps them cope and persist through obstacles (Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977).

In their research investigating snake phobias, Bandura, Adams, & Beyer (1977) found that self-efficacy correlated to the approach behavior of their subjects. In other words, people will often avoid tasks that exceed their self-efficacy (Bandura, 1980). Bandura (1977) states that self-efficacy stems from four sources of information:

1. Performance Accomplishments
2. Vicarious Experience
3. Verbal Persuasion
4. Physiological States

Bandura (2011, p. 19) states that students that have a high sense of self-efficacy “...manage their time better, are more persistent, and are less likely to reject good solutions prematurely.” On the other hand, when an individual’s efficacy has been damaged, the said individual is less likely to attempt new challenges and challenges that he or she was previously successful at (Bandura, 2011).

In a study that examined the impact of family efficacy, Bandura et. al (2011) found that the group efficacy of the family had a positive correlation to family satisfaction. Moreover, they found that the family efficacy also correlated to open communication and trust.

According to Bandura (1980), the consequences of a person overestimating their self-efficacy can also be damaging. When people overestimate their self-efficacy for a particular task or situation, they often suffer needless consequences and strife (Bandura, 1980). Lastly, one way that a person’s self-efficacy improves is through skill acquisition (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). However, low self-efficacy “...hinders adept execution of acquired capabilities (Bandura, 1982).”

Problem Statement

Currently, many counties within the state of Florida are using the Marzano observation system to evaluate teachers. In order for the Marzano observation system to be effective, the evaluators must be efficacious in the observation strategies. To date, there has been insufficient research regarding the effects of the Marzano observation system on the self-efficacy on trained observers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceived self-efficacy of administrators and instructional personnel in Orange County Public Schools before and after they receive training in the Marzano observation system. The study attempts to determine if participation in the Marzano observation system increases the evaluation self-efficacy of administrators and instructional personnel.

Significance of Study

This study will inform educational leaders on the impact that the Marzano observation training has on the self-efficacy of teacher-observers, including instructional personnel and administrators. Moreover, this study will provide the data necessary for educational leaders to make informed investments in professional development that has the potential to impact the self-efficacy of teacher-observers.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

This research will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^1 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

2. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^2 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

3. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^3 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

Research Variables

The independent variable for this study will be the Marzano observation trainings. The dependent variable will be the self-efficacy of the participants. The extraneous variables for this study (for the four-day training) include the time lapse between sessions one and two. The Leaders of Learning Marzano training is conducted over four days. However, in certain situations the four days are broken up into two sessions of two days each. In other situations, the training is conducted in a continuous four-day period.

Definition of Terms

Classroom management – the use of available resources to encourage adherence to classroom rules and procedures designed to maintain student on-task engagement (Brophy, 2006 as cited in O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012)

Instructional strategies – methods used to ensure that learning objectives are met (Florida State University, 2010)

Self-efficacy – the belief one has about their ability to successfully overcome an obstacle or challenge (Bandura, 1977)

Student engagement –the students' attractiveness to their work, persist through challenges, and enjoyment in accomplishing work (Schlechy, 1994 as cited in Strong, Silver, & Robinson, 1995).

Delimitation

This study was delimited to participants in a Marzano Observation training held in Orange County Public Schools during the Fall of 2014.

Limitations

This study had the following limitations:

- The data for this study was collected from a single training.
- The data for this study was collected from a training that occurred after the start of the school year.
- All participants in this study were employed by the same school district.

Assumptions

This study assumed the following:

- All participants will complete the self-efficacy and demographic questionnaire.
- All participants will have a working knowledge of the terminology used in the questionnaires.
- Some participants may have evaluator training prior to receiving the Marzano training. Examples may include but are not limited to university face-to-face courses and department of education clinical education training

Overview of Methodology

The population for this study will be delimited to the participants in the Marzano observation training during the fall semester of 2014. The research will be conducted on all willing participants. Prior to the training, participants will complete a demographic survey provided to them on paper. Before and after the training, participants will complete a paper copy of the Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale. The Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale was developed and validated to determine self-efficacy in three major categories, which are: efficacy in evaluating student engagement, efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies, and efficacy in evaluating classroom management. The Evaluator Sense of Efficacy scale was designed to closely resemble the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale developed by Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2001).

After the Marzano observation training for the fall of 2014 has been completed, the data will be collected and a paired-samples t-test will be conducted. The paired-sample t-test will inform the researcher of the effect that the treatment (Marzano observation training) had on the evaluators' self-efficacy of various subpopulations of the participants. The data sources for the research questions are found in Table 1.

Table 1 *Research Questions and Data Sources*

Research Question	Data Sources	
	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables
1. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?	Demographic Questionnaire	Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale, Items 2, 3, 4, 11
2. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?	Demographic Questionnaire	Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale, Items 5, 9, 10, 12
3. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?	Demographic Questionnaire	Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale, Items 1, 6, 7, 8

After data was collected, a paired-samples t-test was conducted. The paired-samples t-test was chosen to analyze the data because the exact same survey was given to the same participants before and after the Marzano observation training.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review begins with the history of education in the United States explained within a legal context. Afterwards, literature pertaining to supervision and evaluation will be reviewed.

Historical Education Legal Cases

Roberts v. City of Boston, 1849

In 1845, a law existed in Massachusetts that stated that it would be unlawful for anyone to be excluded from a public education (Sarah C. Roberts v. The City of Boston, 1849). Moreover, the law provided that a plaintiff would be allowed to collect damages if he or she were unlawfully denied a public education.

An African American father attempted to enroll his five-year-old daughter in school. The school for black students was a greater distance from their house than a local school for white students. Therefore, the father attempted to enroll his daughter in the local white school. They were denied admission into the white school on the basis of race. His five-year-old daughter met all of the other criteria for admission into the white school. Because his daughter was denied admission, he sought damages under Massachusetts's law.

The Court of Common Pleas and the Court of Appeals supported the school district in their decision. The case was then sent to the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.

The plaintiff argued that since the separate colored school was not established by law, it could not be considered a legal equivalent to the white school (*Sarah C. Roberts v. The City of Boston*, 1849).

The Massachusetts Supreme Court also supported the school district in their decision. The opinion of the court is considered by some to be the inspiration for the separate but equal doctrine in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (Massachusetts Historical Society, 2013). In fact, during the *Plessy v. Ferguson* case, the *Roberts v. Boston* case was mentioned by Justice Brown when he delivered the opinion of the court (*Plessy v. Ferguson*, 1896).

Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, 1868

The Equal Protection Clause strictly prohibits the unequal treatment of people based on protected classes (Alexander & Alexander, 2012). For example, a person who does not hire a teacher based on his or her race would violate the Equal Protection Clause. The Equal Protection Clause is a part of the 14th Amendment and was instituted in 1868 (Alexander & Alexander, 2012). The Equal Protection Clause was created to protect the rights of former slaves across the United States.

The Supreme Court has created three separate tests to determine if the Equal Protection Clause has been violated. The three tests are: Strict Scrutiny, Intermediate Scrutiny, and Rational Basis (Alexander & Alexander, 2012).

Civil Rights Act of 1875

In 1870, a Civil Rights Act was introduced in the United States Senate (The United States Senate, 2013). The Civil Rights Act of 1875 was an attempt to give equal rights to all United States citizens regardless of their race or previous status as a slave. The bill was presumed to be authorized under the 14th Amendment. This legislation would have prohibited segregation in schools, and any other place enjoyed by the public including inns and theaters (The United States Senate, 2013).

However, the provision that schools could not be segregated was a sticking point for the bill. Therefore, the provision to desegregate schools was dropped from the bill. After the bill was modified, it passed with a 38 – 26 vote. On March 1st, 1875, the bill became law (The United States Senate, 2013).

U.S. v. Singleton (Civil Rights Cases of 1883)

In 1883, the Supreme Court of the United States consolidated five separate cases. These cases included violations to the Civil Rights Act of 1875 for things such as a theatre prohibiting African Americans from attending and a restaurant prohibiting African Americans from dining in their establishment (U.S. v. Singleton, 1883). When the Supreme Court delivered the opinion of the court, they stated that the Civil Rights Act of 1875 was unconstitutional and was not authorized under the 14th Amendment. This decision reversed the civil rights progress made with the Civil Rights Act of 1875.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896

In 1896, the Supreme Court heard the case of Plessy v. Ferguson (Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896). In this case, a man (Plessy) in Louisiana was arrested for traveling in a “white” railroad car. Plessy looked like a white man and was 7/8 white and 1/8 black (Wormser, 2002). Plessy’s incident was not an accident. In fact, Plessy deliberately sat in the “white” car and identified himself as black. He did this so that his lawyers could argue that the separation of races in the railroad cars was a violation of the 13th and 14th Amendments (Wormser, 2002).

When the Supreme Court returned the verdict, it had ruled in favor of the defendants. The Supreme Court ruled that as long as the facilities were “equal,” separate facilities were permissible under the 13th and 14th Amendments (Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896). There was one dissenting opinion in this ruling. Justice Harlan, in his dissent, stated that in the eye of the law and under the United States Constitution, there is not a dominant class of citizens and that under Civil Rights, all citizens are equal.

Cumming v. Board of Education in Richmond County, 1899

In 1899 the Supreme Court heard the case of Cumming v. Board of Education in Richmond County. In this case, separate educational facilities were being maintained for white and black students. However, when the school board needed to conserve funds, they closed the school for the black students (Cumming v. Board of Education, 1899). The Board of Education in Richmond County continued to levy a tax on the black population even though they were not providing equal facilities to their black students.

The plaintiffs argued that the tax was unconstitutional because the funds were being used for the benefit of only the white population. Therefore, the plaintiffs argued that the actions of the Board of Education in Richmond County violated the 14th Amendment's equal protection laws.

In this case, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the defendants. Meaning, the Board of Education was allowed to tax the African American community without providing them with educational facilities equal to those that were provided to the white population. While this ruling built on the Plessy v. Ferguson case, it was unique because it was specific to education.

Gong Lum et al. v. Rice et al., 1927

In this case, a student of Chinese descent attempted to enroll in a white school. The schools were segregated at the time. School officials ordered that the student attend the "colored" school (Lum v Rice, 1927). At the time, there were not any schools for children of Asian descent. The father maintained that his child was not "colored" and therefore he had the right to send his child to the "white" school. Prohibited by the school district to attend the white school, the father of the student appealed to the state courts for assistance. Lum stated that their inability to attend a white school was a violation of the Mississippi Constitution.

This case made it to the Mississippi State Supreme Court. The Mississippi State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the defendants. In their ruling, the Mississippi Supreme Court recognized a law from 1890 that stated that schools shall be provided for the white

race and a school for all other “colored” races. In the opinion of the court, Judge Ethridge stated that while the student has a right under the Constitution of the United States to attend a public school, she is not entitled to attend a white public school. In the opinion of the court, it was stated that the purpose of the 1890 Mississippi Constitutional provision was to “preserve the integrity and purity of the white race (Lum v. Rice, 1925) The court used Plessy v Ferguson as a reference in their opinion.

This case then went to the Supreme Court of the United States. At the time, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was William Howard Taft. Justice Taft was formally the 27th President of the United States. Chief Justice Taft delivered the opinion of the court. Justice Taft stated that having a separate school for white children and a school for all other children was not a violation of the 14th Amendment and in doing so the state of Mississippi was acting within their discretion to regulate public schools within their jurisdiction. He then affirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Mississippi.

Belton v. Gebhart, 1952

In this case, it was argued that the Delaware law that mandated racial segregation in public schools was a violation of the 14th Amendment. The Plaintiffs of this case claimed that the educational facilities maintained for African American students were inferior to the facilities maintained for the white students (Belton v. Gebhart, 1952). The Court of Chancery held that the law that mandated racial segregation was legal.

This case was appealed to the Supreme Court of Delaware. Chief Justice Southerland delivered the opinion of the court. In his statement, he wrote that numerous

cases have confirmed the principal that while the 14th Amendment gives equal protection, it does not prohibit the creation of separate schools for different races so long as they are equal. Therefore, the court affirmed the decision of the lower court. This case later became one of the five cases decided in the Supreme Court of the United States: *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Briggs v. Elliott, 1952

In 1952, this case was heard by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina. This case was very similar to the *Belton v. Gebhart* case in that the plaintiffs claimed that the South Carolina state statutes mandating the racial segregation of public school facilities was a violation of the 14th Amendment (*Briggs v Elliott, 1952*). Moreover, the plaintiffs claimed that South Carolina's educational facilities for black students were inferior to those afforded to white students.

The defendants claimed that the curriculum in the black schools had already been made equal to the curriculum in the white schools. Moreover, the defendants asserted that the facilities in the black schools were being upgraded as quickly as possible.

In the opinion of the court, Judge Parker wrote that he felt the law was valid and that the damages suffered were not a result of the law, but rather the way the law was being administered (*Briggs v Elliott, 1952*). Therefore, the court would not administer an injunction desegregating the schools. Instead, the court granted an injunction to equalize the educational facilities and opportunities for white and black students. This case later

became one of the five cases decided in the Supreme Court of the United States: *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Davis v. School Board of Prince Edward County, 1952

In 1952, this case was brought before the United States District Court for the Eastern District in Virginia (*Davis v. Prince Edward County, 1952*). In this case, the plaintiffs sought an injunction to desegregate their schools. The plaintiffs claimed that the educational facilities and curriculum were unequal to those of the white schools. The plaintiffs claimed that the unequal opportunities amounted to a violation of the 14th Amendment.

The defendants acknowledged that the facilities and curriculum were unequal and resolved to correct it. In the opinion of the court, Judge Bryan noted that in multiple areas of educational operation, the white schools were better equipped to serve their students. For example, new school buses went to white schools and the curriculum offerings were more plentiful at the white schools. While the court would not supply an injunction desegregating the schools, they did order that the inequalities be corrected immediately. This case later became one of the five cases decided in the Supreme Court of the United States: *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1951

In 1949, Kansas passed a law that allowed for the segregation of students based on race. A group of African American parents filed a suit in the United States District

Court for the District of Kansas to cease the enforcement of the law. The African American parents asserted that educational facilities, curriculum, personnel, and other educational resources that were provided to the African American students were inferior to those provided to the white students. The inequality of the segregated educational facilities, the parents argued, resulted in a due process violation of the 14th Amendment. When the opinion of the court was delivered, Judge Huxman stated that the Plessy v. Ferguson and Lum v. Rice cases are still the “...authority for the maintenance of a segregated school system (Brown v Board of Education, 1951).” Judgment was then found for the defendants.

Bolling v. Sharpe, 1954

In this case, the plaintiffs alleged that the inability for black students to attend white schools within the District of Columbia resulted in a violation of their 5th Amendment rights of due process (Bolling v. Sharpe, 1954). The district court had dismissed their complaint.

On the same day as the Brown v. Board of Education decision, the Supreme Court delivered an opinion on the Bolling v. Sharpe case. In the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Warren, the Court stated that the Bolling v. Sharpe case was unique. Whereas the Brown v. Board of Education case pertained to the 14th Amendment, the 14th Amendment does not pertain to the District of Columbia. Therefore, the claim brought by the plaintiffs was not in response to a violation to the 14th Amendment. Rather, it was in response to a violation of the 5th Amendment.

In the opinion of the Court, Chief Justice Warren held that racial segregation in the District of Columbia is a denial of due process as guaranteed by the 5th Amendment.

Brown v. Board of Education, 1954

In 1954, the Supreme Court heard the case of Brown V. Board of Education (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954). This case was actually the result of consolidating five separate cases from five separate states. The cases that were consolidated in this case were: Briggs et al. v. Elliott; Brown v. Board of Education, Davis v. School District of Prince Edward County, Bulah v. Gebhart, and Beltan v. Gebhart (Smithsonian, 2013). With the consolidation of the five cases, Brown v. Board of Education had a sum of over 150 plaintiffs (Smithsonian, 2013).

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the unanimous opinion of the court. In this opinion, he overturned the previous precedent of Plessy v. Feruson. He also stated that separate is not equal and therefore segregated schools violate the 14th Amendment. With this decision, the states could no longer create laws that allowed or mandated segregation.

Cooper v. Aaron, 1958

After the Brown v. Board of Education ruling, the Little Rock School Board and school superintendent sought to postpone the desegregation order. They sought to postpone the desegregation order by 30 months. The school superintendent felt that the ruling in Brown brought public outrage and hostility. The broader question before the court was if the states had the authority to refuse or postpone the desegregation order.

The District court allowed the requested relief. However, that decision was overturned the next day by the Appeals Court (Cooper v. Aaron , 1958).

In the Supreme Court's opinion, Justice Warren stated that constitutional rights are not to be "sacrificed or yielded" (Cooper v. Aaron , 1958). He went on to remind the defendants that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and that public officials take an oath to uphold it.

Griffin v. School Board of Prince Edward County, 1966

This case was brought in response to resistance to desegregate after the Brown v. Board of Education decision (Griffin v. School Board of Prince Edward County, 1966).

To avoid the desegregation order, the School Board of Prince Edward County closed their school system. The schools remained closed for five years. Private schools were formed with grants and tax credits to educate the county's white children (Virginia Historical Society, 2004).

In the opinion of the Court, Justice Black stated that the closing of public schools, while all other counties were open, amounted to a violation of the 14th Amendments right to due process.

History of Supervision and Evaluation in the United States

According to Tracy (1995), the history of supervision and evaluation in the United States can be divided into seven phases. The seven phases of supervision and evaluation in the United States are:

- The Community Accountability Phase
- The Professionalism Phase
- The Scientific Phase
- The Human Relations Phase
- The Second Human Relations Phase
- The Second Wave Scientific Phase
- The Human Development Phase (Tracy, 1995)

The Community Accountability Phase

In 1642, Puritan leaders in Massachusetts were concerned that non-puritan students were not receiving instruction on how to read. Ultimately, their concern for students' inability to read stemmed from their concern that students would not be able to read the Bible. For this reason, the Massachusetts Act of 1642 was passed (Gelbrich, 1999). The Massachusetts Act of 1642 made oversight of education the state's responsibility and required that parents teach their children how to read and write (Gelbrich, 1999).

Prior to the Massachusetts Act of 1642, parents taught their children how to read and write out of tradition or as Katz (1976) describes it, a “moral obligation,” (Katz, 1976). Therefore, until the passage of the act, there was not a legal requirement for parents to see that their children were educated. Once the act was passed, the court appointed “selectmen” to oversee and audit the education of children in their jurisdiction (Katz, 1976). In other words, the Massachusetts Act of 1642 brought the first requirement that education be formally supervised. When the selectmen found parents that were not properly educating their children, they were empowered to issue fines (Altenbaugh, 1999).

The Massachusetts School Law of 1647 expanded on the previous act by requiring that townships of fifty or more children appoint a person to teach their children how to read or write. Townships of one hundred or more students were required to assure that their children were also taught grammar (Katz, 1976). During this era, the community leaders including clergy, professionals, etc., developed the guidelines and rules for the education in their townships. To assure that the guidelines and rules were being implemented, the schools were periodically visited by a “school visiting committee” (Tracy, 1995). According to Tracy (1995), the visits from the school visiting committee represented the earliest record of classroom observations. Moreover, the visiting committee also viewed one of their responsibilities as helping teachers improve their instructional practice (Tanner & Tanner, 1987 as cited in Tracy 1995).

The Massachusetts School Law of 1647 was also named The Old Deluder Satan Law. This name was attributed to the law due to the first few lines in the law. Those lines are:

“It being one chief project of that old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures, as in former times keeping them in an unknown tongue, so in these later times by persuading from the use of tongues, that so at least the true sense and meaning of the Original might be clouded by false glosses of Saint-seeming deceivers; and that Learning may not be buried in the graves of our fore-fathers in Church and Commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors: it is therefore ordered by this Court and Authoritie therof” (Constitution Society, 2014).

While the visiting committee did not have extensive training in pedagogy, there was a need for them to understand the morals and values of the community to assure that the values that were being transmitted (Tracy, 1995). The first few lines of the law indicate that religion was one of the primary values of the community. In 1648, the law was revised and reflected higher and stricter standards that were to be taught (Katz, 1976). For example, one of the standards was that students would know “catechism without a book (Katz, 1976).”

The Professionalism Phase

According to Tracy (1995), the professionalism phase is marked by the beginning of assisting and accessing and lasted throughout the 1800s. Moreover, administrative positions such as principal and superintendents were also developed during this era. This phase was also notable because it represented the time when the public began to believe that “laypersons” could not successfully teach (Tracy, 1995).

The title “principal” was used in the Common School Report in 1838 (Grady, 1990). At that time, the principal was also known as the principal teacher as they were teachers with administrative responsibilities. However, by 1860, teaching responsibilities were beginning to be replaced with supervision responsibilities (Pierce, 1935 as cited in Grady, 1990). Even though the principal was tasked with supervising the other teachers, the evaluations were typically informal and were without written procedures (Liu, 2010).

The Scientific Phase

The scientific phase, according to Tracy (1995), lasted from 1900 to 1920. This period was marked by a move towards integrating the business practices of the era into the supervision of teaching (Tanner & Tanner, 1987 as cited in Tracy, 1995). According to Pollock & Ford (2009), during this phase, school leaders were “firmly entrenched” as organizational managers. Also in this period, Fredrick Taylor published *The Principals of Scientific Management*. Taylor’s management principles were embraced by many managers in factories. The implementation of Taylor’s methods was known as

“Taylorism” (Backer, 1998). According to Druker (1967b as cited in Backer, 1998), factories that implemented Taylor’s methods reduced the cost of manufactured goods from between five and ten percent.

Taylor advocated for managers to control their workers and their methods of production (Backer, 1998). This thought process is illustrated in J.F. Bobbit’s book: *Some general principles of management applied to the problems of city-school systems* (1913). In his book he writes:

“Teachers cannot be permitted to follow caprice in method. When a method which is clearly superior to all other methods has been discovered, it alone can be employed. To neglect this function and to excuse one’s negligence by proclaiming the value of the freedom of the teacher was perhaps justifiable under our earlier empiricism, when the supervisors were merely promoted teachers and on the scientific side at least knew little more about the standards and methods than the rank and file. Today it is an excuse that appears fair but is in part but a respectable cover for ignorance and indolence (p. 95).”

To implement scientific management, educational leaders began using scales to rate teachers’ performance. According to Pollock & Ford (2009), the educational leader’s role changed to that of an “authoritarian inspector.” Taylorism was met with controversy. Taylor was known for telling workers, “You are not supposed to think” (Fusch, 1997). In fact, Taylor himself reported that his methods immediately started a war between

management and the workers (Backer, 1998). Others argued that teaching couldn't be managed the way other labor-intensive professions are managed (Pollock & Ford, 2009).

The Human Relations Phase

The human relations phase took place between the 1930s and 1940s and was in partial result of the Hawthorne studies (Tracy, 1995). According to Sonnenfeld (1985, p. 115), the Hawthorne studies resulted in the following five general conclusions:

- Work behavior is the result of various complex factors
- The work group mediates the needs of individuals in the work setting
- The social structure of informal work groups is maintained through symbolism representing prestige and power
- Managers should listen to employees so that they can understand each employees unique needs
- When managers understand employee viewpoints, they can reduce resistance to change

In this phase, educational leaders took the role of coach and strived to help the teachers improve. Jacobson & Cyprus (2012, p. 219) assert that the second quarter of the 20th century brought the introduction of social sciences into educational leadership. Moreover, due to the research current at the time, school administrators focused on building positive relationships with teachers (Tracy, 1995).

The Second-Wave Scientific Phase

According to Tracy (1995), the second-wave scientific phase took place between the 1940s and 1960s and was not a completely new phase. Rather, this phase was simply a continuation of the first scientific phase. As with the first scientific phase, the second-wave scientific phase again focused on integrating business principles into educational leadership. Jacob and Cypres (2012, p. 219) state that by the 1950s, the training of administrators would be "...on a rough par with business management and public administration studies."

The Second-Wave Human Resources Phase

The second-wave human resources phase manifested in the 1960s and combined the human relations aspects of the first-wave human resources phase with the techniques of the scientific phases (Tracy, 1995). Pollock & Ford (2009) assert that 1960s brought the emergence of clinical supervision.

Clinical supervision is the process whereby a teacher's colleague observes their teacher practice and then assists him or her in reflecting on his or her own professional practice (Pajak, 2003). Pheifer (2011, p. 30) asserts that the clinical supervisor "provides education, facilitates learning, and inspires." Revis (1976) points out that clinical supervision requires that the teacher receive direct feedback from his or her observation. Pajak (2003), outlines the following five stages to the clinical supervision model:

1. Pre-observation conference
2. Observation

3. Data Analysis
4. Conference
5. Post-Conference

The Human Development Phase

The current phase of supervisory practice, starting in the 1980s, is the human development phase (Tracy, 1995). Tracy (1995) notes, “the development phase combines the concern for a teacher’s personal needs with the concern for the productivity for the organization” (p. 324). Further characteristics of the human development phase include a focus on teacher growth and an acknowledgement that teachers may have different growth needs (Tracy, 1995).

National Board Certification

After the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy formed a task force to address the issue of teacher quality (National Center on Education and the Economy, 2014). Based on the recommendation of this task force, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards was founded (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2014).

The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (2014) lists five propositions that teachers must master prior to them being awarded a National Board teaching certificate. The five propositions are:

Teachers are committed to students and their learning.

Teachers know the subjects they are to teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.

Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

Teachers are members of learning communities (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2014).

After the establishment of the five propositions, the National Board of Professional Standards created the National Board Standards. The National Board of Professional Standards was based on the five propositions (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2014). Research has shown that a correlation exists between teacher attainment of National Board status and student achievement (Cavaluzzo, 2004; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2004; Vandevort, Amrein-Beardsley, & Berliner, 2004 as cited in Lustick & Sykes, 2006).

When articulating the reasons for the success of Nationally Board Certified teachers, Lustick and Sykes (2006) note teachers that undertake the initiative to obtain National Board status undergo “self selection.” They further state that often teachers that choose to pursue National Board status were already good teachers. That said, only about 40% of teachers that apply for National Board status achieve certification (State of Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2014). Moreover, in a study that analyzed principals’ perception of Nationally Board Certified teachers, Okpala, Ioney, & Hopson (2009) found that principals generally found nationally board certified teachers to be highly effective teachers.

According to Holding & Frasier (2012), teachers that choose to pursue National Board Certification understand that they will need to do the following:

- Undertake a minimum of 200 hours of professional development
- Complete six assessments
- Complete four portfolio entries

It is argued that much of the value of the National Board credential results from the professional development that is required to obtain the National Board Certification (Lustick & Sykes, 2006).

While millions of dollars have been spent on researching, developing, and evaluating the correlation of National Board Certification and student achievement, researching the success of National Board Certification on a national level remains difficult. Part of the difficulty in evaluating the National Board Certification results from the absence of a national value added model that links student achievement to specific teachers (Smith & Colby, 2010). Regardless, many states have implemented incentives for teachers to obtain National Board Certification. For example, North Carolina increases the salary of teachers that obtain the certification by 12%. In Florida, teachers were previously offered a bonus of 10% of their salary (Southern Regional Education Board, 2001)

However, not all of the literature firmly states that National Board Certified teachers always outperform their non-National Board certified colleagues. For example,

in a study regarding the correlation between North Carolina teachers that are nationally board certified and student achievement on high stakes tests, Rouse (2018) concluded that:

“...the academic achievement of mathematics elementary students in this study who are taught by National Board Certified Teachers and non-National Board Certified Teachers is comparable on the North Carolina End of Course tests” (p. 81).

In 2005, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards requested a study and analysis of the effects of National Board Certification status on the academic progress of students. In this study, Sanders, Ashton & Wright (2005) found that National Board Certified Teachers did not have a greater effect on student progress than non-National Board Certified Teachers. (Sanders, Ashton, & Wright, 2005).

Likewise, Stronge et al. (2008) in a study taking place in three North Carolina school districts comparing Nationally Board Certified Teachers and non-Nationally Board Certified Teachers found that National Board Certified Teachers did not outperform their colleagues that were non-National Board Certified in terms of student achievement. In their findings, they wrote:

“Current policies in many states are based on the underlying assumption that the National Board certification process identifies highly qualified teachers who effect better than average student achievement gains. This assumption is not

supported by the findings of this study” (Stronge, Ward, Tucker, Hindman, McCoksky, & Howard, 2007, p. 204).

Lastly, while some of the research regarding Nationally Board Certified Teachers and student achievement shows no clear correlation, there can be other benefits from Nationally Board Certified Teachers that are not measured on standardized testing. For example, Nationally Board Certified Teachers are able to share information with their non-National Board Certified Teacher colleagues; thus, improving the teaching ability of the non-National Board Certified Teachers (Keller, 2006).

Student Engagement

Student engagement is a component of effective teaching. When students are engaged, they are more likely to retain the information they are taught (Hancock & Betts, 2002 as cited in Bowen, 2003). Marzano and Pickering (2011) state, “engagement is obviously a central aspect of effective teaching. If students are not engaged, there is little, if any, chance that they will learn what is being addressed in class (p. 1).” While it can be difficult to define student engagement, Schlecty (1994 as cited in Strong, Silver & Robinson, 1995) offers three characteristics of engaged students:

1. The students are attracted to their work.
2. The students persist despite challenges.
3. They enjoy accomplishing their work.

Skinner, Kindermann, Connell, and Wellborn (2009 as cited in Marzano & Pickering, 2011, p. 3) state that engagement is not easily defined and actually the overlapping of the constructs “motivation, engagement, attention, interest, effort, enthusiasm, participation, and involvement.”

To understand why some students are engaged whereas other students are not, Strong, Silver & Robinson (1995) propose four goals that engaged people are driven by:

1. Success
2. Curiosity
3. Originality
4. Relationships

These four goals, they argue, satisfies essential human needs (Strong, Silver, & Robinson, 1995).

Marzano & Pickering (2011) suggest that there are four areas of study that are the cornerstone of engagement. Those four areas are:

1. Emotions
2. Interest
3. Perceived Importance
4. Perceptions of Efficacy

Emotions

In a longitudinal study involving more than 1000 children over four years, Skinner, Kinderman, & Furrer (2009) investigated the effects of emotions on student

engagement. In their study, they found that children's emotions are correlated with their level of academic engagement. Skinner et. al. (2009 as cited in Marzano & Pickering, 2011) associated the emotions of enthusiasm, interest, enjoyment, satisfaction, pride, vitality, and zest with high engagement. Moreover, they associated the emotions of boredom, disinterest, frustration, anger, sadness, worry, shame, and self blame with lack of engagement (p.4).

Interest

In 1896, John Dewey wrote:

“... ‘Genuine interest in education is the accompaniment of the identification, through action, of the self with some object or idea, because of the necessity of that object or idea for the maintenance of self-expression” (Dewey, 1896 as cited in Jonas, 2011).

Jonas (2011) explains Dewey's quote as meaning that students become interested in something when it is so important to them that without it, they will be unable to feel whole (p. 115). Therefore, to develop interest, according to Dewey, teachers are not required to “put on a show” or entertain their students (Jonas, 2011).

Naceur & Schiefele (2005) assert that research pertaining to students' interest can be divided into three categories:

- Research on situational interest

- Research on individual interest
- Research on the instructional facilitation of interest (p. 155)

Rotgans & Schmidt (2011) define situational interest as:

“...an immediate affective response to certain conditions and/or stimuli in the learning environment that focuses one’s attention on the task, which may or may not last over time” (p. 58).

Likewise, Linnenbrink-Garcia, Durik, Conley, Barron, Tauer, Karabenick & Harackiewicz explain that situational interest results from students’ response to stimuli in their environment (p. 648).

On the other hand, individual interest is an interest that is intrinsic to the individual and transcends various types of environments. (Linnenbrink-Garcia, et al., 2010). In other words, situational interest is dependent on the environment and can be considered fickle and temporary. Whereas individual interest is more permanent and is not subject to the ebbs and flows of the environment (Patall, 2013).

Marzano and Pickering (2011) explain that “..students will attend to activities in the classroom if they can affirmatively answer the question: am I interested?” (p.57). Marzano & Pickering (2011) continue by informing the reader of multiple ways to capture a student’s situational interest. The examples they provide include: academic games, inciting controversy, voting, debates, and presenting unusual information (pp. 57-65).

Perceived Importance

Marzano & Marzano (2009, as cited in Marzano & Pickering, 2011, p. 12) explain that the human brain contains a hierarchy of goals. While lower goals address basic needs such as those things essential to survival, upper goals address things that could be considered “life-long goals.” Marzano & Pickering (2011) argue that when a student focuses on upper level goals, they are innately more engaged.

Perceptions of Efficacy

Moreover, Skinner & Chi (2012) state that “self-perceptions predict engagement.” After conducting a meta-analysis of over thirty studies, Multon, Brown & Lent (2009, as cited in Marzano & Pickering, 2011, p. 16) found that the effect size of self-efficacy translated to a 29-percentile point gain. Therefore, while this study is focused primarily on the self-efficacy of teacher evaluators, the importance of self-efficacy in students is also relevant.

In a correlational study investigating the self-efficacy of students between grades 6-8, Arslan (2012) found that students’ self-efficacy beliefs were most influenced by their personal accomplishments and “verbal persuasion.” On the opposite end of the spectrum, Bandura (1986, as cited in Griggs, Rimm-Kaufman, Merritt, & Patton, 2011), found that when students are faced with academic challenges and they have negative emotional states such as anxiety, the students’ self-efficacy for that task would be low.

The current literature is rich with suggestions to increase student engagement. In a study investigating ways to increase student engagement in an orchestra classroom, Scruggs (2003) suggests using social constructivist strategies based on the work of Lev Vygotsky.

Classroom Management

The importance of effective classroom management cannot be underestimated. As McLeod, Fisher & Hoover (2003) put it: "...the teacher's job is not to control, but to teach; not to command, but to influence" (p.61).

Marzano (2003, as cited in Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid & Marzano, 2005) identified seven areas of classroom management, after an analysis of over 100 studies, which contribute to effective classroom management. Those areas are:

- Rules and Procedures
- Discipline and Consequences
- Teacher-Student Relationships
- Mental Set
- Student Responsibility
- Getting of to a good start
- Management at the school level (p.1)

Rules and Procedures

In a study investigating the types of classroom rules, Thornberg (2008) was able to classify rules into five distinct categories. Those areas are:

- Relational Rules
- Structuring Rules
- Protecting Rules
- Personal Rules
- Etiquette Rules (p. 25)

Relational rules dictate how the students should interact with one another. For example, a rule stating that students should not invade another student's space might be considered a relational rule (Thornberg, 2008).

Structural rules provide a framework for classroom procedures (Thornberg, 2008). For example, the use of Kagan cooperative learning strategies would constitute the implementation of structural rules.

Protecting rules are rules that teachers implement to protect the welfare and safety of people in the classroom. An example of protecting rules would be the various requirements that science teachers implement during laboratory experiences such as wearing goggles and gloves. Thornberg (2008) provides the example of students not being allowed to yell due to the risk of harming students' and teachers' hearing.

Personal rules are rules that provide a framework for students to think about their behavior. Thornberg (2008) states that rules such as “think before you speak” and “do your best” are examples of personal rules.

Lastly, etiquette rules pertain to rules that extend cultural courtesy. Examples of etiquette rules would be “always hold the door for the next person” or “don’t wear your hat indoors” (Thornberg, 2008).

There are different philosophies when it comes to the amount of rules and procedures teachers should implement for effective classroom management. For example, the New York Times bestselling book, *The Essential 55* describes how Ron Clark was able to successfully manage a group of students in inner-city Harlem after he implemented 55 classroom rules and procedures with his students (Clark, 2003). On the other hand, Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano (2005) state that:

“...Inundating students with rules and procedures for every aspect of the classroom clearly is not a good idea. Rules, particularly young students, should be few – for most grades, no more than eight” (p. 6).

Lastly research shows that an effective practice is to include students in the development of the classroom rules that are to be implemented (Buluc, 2014). In a study designed to analyze the planning and implementation process for classroom rules, Buluc (2014) concluded that “...rules that have been developed democratically help create ethical criteria which aid the learning and assimilation of the term democracy” (p. 49).

Discipline and Consequences

One definition of discipline is “training that corrects, molds, or perfects the mental faculties or moral character” (Merriam-Webster, 2014). An important distinction can be made between consequences and punishment. McLeod, Fisher & Hoover (2003) describe consequences as something that teaches appropriate behavior whereas punishments only suppress the behavior (p.113). Consequences are tied to the inappropriate behavior whereas punishments are not. McLeod, Fisher, & Hoover (2003) provide the example that when students do not bring a pencil to class and they must borrow one from other students, an appropriate consequence would be that they must replace the pencils that they had borrowed. A punishment, on the other hand, might be that they are excluded from recess or some other activity (p.113). Glasser (1977) concludes that discipline plans should not include punishments because punishments remove responsibility from the students.

Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano (2005) state that:

“...in well managed classrooms, teachers simultaneously develop a set of rules and procedures and a companion set of consequences and rewards related to discipline” (p.37). One type of discipline policy that is controversial because it is considered by some to be too severe is zero tolerance policies (Mongan & Walker, 2012).

Prior to zero tolerance policies that prompted law enforcement intervention, schools were most commonly self-reliant and administered their own forms of discipline. Amongst the forms of discipline commonly used were teacher detentions, administrative disciplines (suspension, expulsion, etc.), and corporal punishment (Hanson, 2001).

The use of the term “zero tolerance” can be traced back to 1989 where it was introduced to selected districts in California, Kentucky, and New York (American Psychological Association, 2006). The introduction of zero tolerance policies was a response to drug use and gang membership concerns amongst the student body (American Psychological Association, 2006).

Despite the intention to curb drug use and gang membership, there is little evidence that these efforts could be considered successful (Skiba, 2000). Some of the students that have been subjected to zero tolerance policies have committed offenses such as: possession of a squirt gun, possession of nail clippers and the possession of a plastic firefighters axe while wearing a plastic firefighters outfit for Halloween (the student was five years old) (Skiba, 2000), When the five year old student was suspended for wearing a plastic axe as an accessory to his firefighters outfit, it created a public outrage and the school apologized to firefighters for associating their axe with a weapon (Skiba, 2000) (Rittmeyer, 2011).

Due to the public outrage surrounding some of the negative and highly publicized cases regarding zero tolerance policies in action, some states have begun to put restrictions on zero tolerance policies.

For example, in Arundel County, Maryland, a seven-year-old boy went to school with a pop tart to eat. While at school, the student chewed the pop tart into the shape of a gun. The student was then suspended for the action (Allard, 2013). The student did not point the pop tart and pretend that it was a gun. Rather, the student “nibbled” the pastry

into what was believed by the teacher to be something in the shape of a gun (Burris, 2013). The father of the student reported that his son was attempting to make a mountain with the pop tart (Burris, 2013).

Afterwards, Maryland State Senator Jennings introduced Senate Bill 1058. Senate Bill 1058 has the purpose of preventing school administrators from suspending or expelling a student that brings to school or actively poses while at school any sort of image of a gun. The bill also prohibits school administrators from suspending or expelling students that make “hand gestures” in the shape of a gun.

Moreover, the bill goes on to state that there will be the establishment of discipline for any “...principal, vice principal, teacher, or any other employee that violates a certain provision of law” (Jennings, 2013). Therefore, the bill not only allows school administrators to use common sense when dealing with zero tolerance issues pertaining to fake guns, it forces them to do so. In an interview, Jennings stated that he is not trying to attack the teachers. Rather, he is trying to give them more power so that they can handle it at the school level (Burris, 2013).

Teacher-Student Relationships

Interactions between teachers and students can be both physical and verbal. For example, when a teacher pats a student on the back, they are engaging in a physical interaction. Likewise, when a teacher provides praise to a student, they are engaging in a verbal interaction (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005). Giles (2012) explains:

“Relationships are at the heart of educational encounters. When a teacher stands in front of students, they relate. When a student meets with a teacher, they relate. Remembering teacher-student experiences brings back memories of feeling inspired, bored or perhaps over- looked” (p.215).

Mental Set

Mental set refers to teachers’ readiness to manage their classrooms (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005). Marzano et al (2005) identifies two parts of mental set, withitness and exhibiting emotional objectivity (pp. 84-100).

Withitness is a construct that has been investigated since the early 1970s (Irving & Martin, 1982). Based on Jacob Kounin’s concept of withitness, withitness indicates the level of awareness a teacher has about his or her students in all parts of the classroom, at all times (Marzano & Brown, 2009). According to Marzano (2007):

“Teacher awareness of potential problems and quick attention to those situations are at the core of effective classroom management. Such behavior defines withitness. Four general actions constitute withitness: being proactive, occupying the entire room, noticing potential problems, and using a series of graduated actions” (p. 140).

Lastly, the final action associated with withitness is “forecasting problems” (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005). For example, a teacher might be able to curb potential disruptive behavior by arranging the classroom in a particular fashion (McLeod,

Fisher, & Hoover, 2003). It is the teacher's withitness that enables them to be able to forecast how the room should be arranged.

According to Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano (2005), emotional objectivity is composed of six elements. Those elements are:

- Recognizing that you are an emotional person
- Self-monitoring of thoughts and emotions
- Reframing
- Maintaining a cool exterior
- Taking care of yourself
- Preventing and recuperating from burnout (p.87)

Teaching is considered to be an “emotional labor” (Hochschild, 1983 as cited in Kimura, 2010). Research has shown that a teacher's emotional state does not only affect the teacher, but also his or her relationships with others (Hargreaves, 2000 as cited in Yin & Chi-Kin Lee, 2011). While emotional responses are sometimes beneficial, there are times when emotional responses are inappropriate and hold the potential to be destructive (Fried, 2011). Fried (2011) advocates for teaching teachers to use “emotional regulation,” when their emotional response would be counter-productive.

The importance of regulating emotions was recognized in a study conducted by Sutton in 2004. In their study, teachers correlated teacher effectiveness with the ability to “down-regulate” negative emotions and “up-regulate” positive emotions (Sutton, 2004 as cited in Fried, 2011).

Likewise, in a study designed to analyze Japanese school teachers emotional expression during teacher-student discourse, Kimura (2010) found that teachers would intentionally over-emphasize positive emotions in an effort to motivate students to learn the prescribed material. In regards to the negative emotions observed, Kimura (2010) wrote:

“Although it is apparent that teachers expressed negative emotions in response to violations of class rules and impolite attitudes by students, as seen in the former part of the previous case, teachers also attempted to control those emotions as much as possible (p. 72).”

However, the study concludes that it is sometimes appropriate to express negative emotions such as anger and irritation because it can sometimes help to maintain their students’ behavior (Kimura, 2010, p. 76)

Reframing results when a teacher understands and articulates negative student behavior in a positive light (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005). One method to accomplish this is to focus on behaviors and not feelings (Glasser, 1977).

There are many methods for maintaining a cool exterior. Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano (2005, p. 89) explain that teachers can maintain a cool exterior by paying attention to their non-verbal communication with students. In 2012, Benzer conducted a study involving one-hundred teachers and analyzed their perceptions of the importance of body-language when communicating with students. In his study, he states that teachers use body language for

“making emotions concrete, the revival of knowledge in mind, to increase interest, to attract attention, to eliminate the monotony, to increase motivation” (Benzer, 2014, p. 470).

In a study that examined preservice teachers’ anger expression styles and their emotional intelligence, Baltaci & Demir (2012) found that people with a high level of emotional intelligence are better able to control their emotional outbursts.

When Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano (2005) mention taking care of yourself as one of the six components of emotional objectivity, they are referring to the things teachers can do to emotionally recuperate after they have a negative encounter with students (p. 90-94). Examples provided include breathing exercises and guided imagery.

Preventing and recuperating from burnout has been proven to be an important aspect of the mental set (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005). According to Leiter (1992, as cited in Brouers & Tomic 2000), burnout is “a crisis in self-efficacy.” Burnout has been defined as a construct happening in a work place and contains three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996 as cited in Hultell, Merlin & Gustavsson, 2013). Burnout is considered to be a result of chronic workplace stress (Fernet, Guay, Senecal, & Austin, 2012). That said, it should be noted that in a study encompassing forty-nine student teachers, it was concluded that burnout can begin as early as a teacher’s student teaching experience (Fives, Hamman, &

Olivarez, 2007). Burnout is a serious concern in education as it is a factor contributing to teacher retention (Hultell, Merlin, & Gustavsson, 2013).

In their longitudinal study investigating teacher self-efficacy and the dimensions of burnout, Brouers & Tomic (2000) concluded:

“...in educational settings perceived self-efficacy in classroom management has a longitudinal effect on the depersonalization dimension of burnout and a synchronous effect on the personal accomplishment dimension. So, it is important to take perceived self-efficacy in classroom management into consideration when devising interventions to prevent and to treat burnout among secondary school teachers” (p. 250).

Methods for reducing or reversing burnout amongst teachers are known. Methods for reversing burnout include: providing professional development to increase the teacher’s perceived self-efficacy in classroom management (Fernet, Guay, Senecal, & Austin, 2012), decreasing time pressures (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010), and maintaining and supporting the teacher’s support network (Bataineh, 2009).

Student Responsibility

Student responsibility refers to the act of students being responsible for their own behaviors. To assist students in understanding the nature of responsibility, two recommendations for increasing student responsibility include helping students understand what responsibility is and helping students differentiate facts from interpretations (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005).

Students may not know what it means to “take responsibility for their actions.” Therefore, by defining responsibility, teachers are able to orient their students to that construct (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005).

Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano (2005) also highlight the importance of helping students develop their sense of self-awareness. They explain that self-awareness involves understanding how a person’s thoughts and emotions can affect them and others (p. 113) Related to this concept, Salovey & Mayer (1990) define emotional intelligence as the:

“ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p.189).

The importance of emotional intelligence comes to light in the argument that it is a predictor of health and work-related outcomes (Pool & Qualter, 2012). Emotionally intelligent people are often regarded as well adjusted and genuine (Ivcevic, Brackett & Mayer, 2007 as cited in Goroshit & Hen, 2012).

Interestingly, emotional intelligence, it is argued, cannot be taught through traditional means. Rather, the act of improving one’s emotional intelligence requires on-going cognitive efforts to change their habits and “hard-wired behaviors” (Goroshit & Hen, 2012). In a study investigating the effects of mediation on the emotional intelligence of adult males, it was found that the process of mediation helped the participants develop their emotional intelligence (Lomas, Edington, Cartwright, & Ridge, 2014).

Getting off to a good start

According to Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano (2005) getting off to a good start means the planning and implementation of classroom management practices that occur before the school year begins, one the first day of school, and the first two weeks of school (p.132).

Prior to school beginning, it is important that teachers make adequate preparations including designing their classroom rules and procedures (as discussed earlier) and organizing the physical layout of the classroom (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005).

When arranging the physical layout of the classroom, effective teachers take into consideration not only the aesthetics of the classroom, but also the traffic patterns and student opportunities to interact with their learning environment (McLeod, Fisher, & Hoover, 2003; Wong & Wong, 2001). It is also suggested that classrooms provide students with a “quiet space” for them to sit and avoid emotional outbursts (Quinn, Osher, Warger, Hanley, Bader, & Hoffman, 2000). According to Marzano, Marzano & Pickering (2003), the effort that a teacher expends in preparing his or her classroom may be subtle, but it will be the first impression that students have of their classroom and it will set the stage for the year of learning.

In a study analyzing the first day of school for six primary education teachers (two very effective and four less effective teachers), it was found that there were notable differences between the very effective and less effective teachers in regards to their instruction on the first day of school (Bohn, Roehig, & Pressley, 2004). For example, the

very effective teachers used the first day of school to explain the rules and procedures of the classroom. These rules and procedures were important for the two very effective teachers because it allowed their students to have self-regulated behavior (Bohn, Roehig, & Pressley, 2004).

Another effective practice for the first day of school is to allow students to get to know one another with ice breaker type activities (Marzano, Gaddy, Foseid, Foseid, & Marzano, 2005). However, Cullen (2014) advocates for going beyond icebreaker activities on the first day and diving into empowerment activities that will set the stage for an inclusive learning environment.

Management at the School Level

As the name implies, the area of management at the school level involves the management of all of the school spaces collectively (Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003). One way to manage student behavior at the school level is to implement a school-wide positive behavior support system. School-wide positive behavior support systems are systems that communicate and teach rules then reward students for following them (Osher, Bear, Sprague, & Doyle, 2010). One type of school-wide positive behavior support system is the School wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010).

In a study analyzing the effectiveness of the School wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports program, it was concluded that it was successful in reducing suspension rates amongst students school wide (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010).

Florida Teacher Evaluation Models, Race to the Top and the Student Success Act

Senate Bill 736, also known as “The Student Success Act” became effective on July 1, 2011. The law requires the Florida Department of Education to approve the teacher evaluation models adopted by each school district (The Florida Senate, 2011).

Each evaluation model must:

- Differentiate among four performance levels: Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Effective and Highly Effective (Florida Department of Education , 2014)
- The Florida Department of Education Commissioner must consult with school administrators, teachers and experts in the development of criteria for the performance levels (Florida Department of Education, 2014).
- The State Board of Education must establish student growth standards (ranges) for each performance level (Florida Department of Education, 2014).

Moreover, the new evaluation models must attribute 50% of the teacher’s evaluation score from student growth and 50% from observed teacher practice (Florida Department of Education, 2014).

As of September 1, 2014, the Florida Department of Education (2014) has approved evaluation models that fall into four broad categories. Those categories are:

- State model (n=29) – based upon the work of Robert Marzano
- Danielson (n=18) – based upon the work of Charolette Danielson

- EMCS (n=14)– based upon the work of the Educational Management Consultant Services
- Other (n=11) – districts that adopted a model that did not fall into one of the other three broad categories

Florida School Districts and the Marzano Observation Model

Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model

The Marzano Teacher Framework is based on the work of Robert Marzano. Dr. Marzano has authored more than 150 articles and 30 books on the broad subject of education (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2014). According to Marzano (2012), teacher evaluation models have two primary purposes. Those purposes are to:

- Evaluate teachers
- Develop teachers

The Marzano Teacher Framework was designed to address both purposes of evaluation. According to Marzano (2007, p 7), the framework is divided into ten design questions:

1. “What will I do to establish and communicate learning goals, track student progress, and celebrate success?”
2. What will I do to help students effectively interact with new knowledge?
3. What will I do to help students practice and deepen their understanding of new knowledge?

4. What will I do to help students generate and test hypothesis about new knowledge?
5. What will I do to engage students?
6. What will I do to establish or maintain classroom rules and procedures?
7. What will I do to recognize and acknowledge adherence and lack of adherence to classroom rules and procedures?
8. What will I do to establish and maintain effective relationships with students?
9. What will I do to communicate high expectations for all students?
10. What will I do to develop effective lessons organized into a cohesive unit?"

As of March 10, 2014, twenty-nine school districts adopted the state model based upon the work of Robert Marzano (Florida Department of Education , 2014). The school districts that adopted the Marzano Observation model include:

1. Bradford County School District
2. Broward County School District
3. Calhoun County School District
4. Charlotte County School District
5. Collier County Public Schools
6. Franklin County District Schools
7. Gadsden County Schools
8. Gilchrist County School District
9. School District of Indian River County
10. Jackson County School District
11. Lafayette District Schools
12. Lake County Schools
13. Leon County Schools
14. Martin County School District
15. Nassau County School District
16. Orange County Public Schools

17. Osceola County Public Schools
18. Pasco County Schools
19. Putnam County School District
20. Santa Rosa District Schools
21. Seminole County Public Schools
22. St. Johns County School District
23. St. Lucie Public Schools
24. Union County Schools
25. Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University Lab
26. Florida Atlantic University Lab
27. University of Florida Lab
28. School District of Palm Beach County
29. Florida State University Lab

Broward County Public Schools developed an observation system that is based on the Marzano Framework. The Marzano Framework was chosen as the evaluation model after a union representative and district observation coordinator met twenty-three times (Broward County Public Schools, 2014).

Calhoun County School District developed a teacher evaluation system based on the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. To measure the standard of teaching, the district chose to use the Marzano Framework. The evaluation system was developed with

the input of eight school and district administrators (Calhoun County Public Schools, 2014).

Charlotte County Public Schools developed an observation model titled Professional Accountability for Charlotte’s Educators PACE (Charlotte County Public Schools, 2014). The PACE system is based on the Marzano Framework (Charlotte County Public Schools, 2014). According to Charlotte County Public Schools (2014), the evaluation model was designed to support the three purposes of self-reflection, feedback, and to serve as the annual summative evaluation (p.16).

The School District of Collier County adopted the Marzano Framework as their instructional evaluation model with the expressed goal that “teachers will increase their expertise from year to year, which will produce gains in student achievement from year to year with a powerful cumulative effect (Collier County Public Schools, 2014, p. 2)

Gadsden County implements the Gadsden County Teacher Evaluation model with expressed rationale to “shape, form, and improve teacher practices and to ensure that students are receiving high-quality instruction” (Gadsden County Public Schools, 2014, p. 6). Gadsden County Public Schools elected to use the Marzano Framework to evaluate their teachers.

Gilchrist County Public Schools elected to use the state’s Marzano Framework after stakeholders met in the summer of 2011 (Gilchrist County Public Schools, 2014).

The Jackson County School District adopted the Marzano Framework after a committee composed primarily of teachers chose the model. Interestingly, the evaluation

model states that while parental input will not effect the score of instructors, parental input in the form of climate surveys is included in the evaluation model (Jackson County School District, 2014).

Lake County Schools adopted the Marzano Framework as the model for evaluating teachers at the recommendation of the Lake County Education Association and the School Board Teacher Evaluation Committee. The stated goals for the evaluation system in Lake County Schools are:

- “Teacher growth assessed using research based strategies
- Professional development rigorously aligned with what teachers are working on to improve
- Deliberate Practice with a professional growth plan
- Connections to student growth through classroom strategies designed to increase student learning” (Lake County Schools, 2014)

Leon County Schools adopted the Leon Educator Assessment and Development System (LEADS). The LEADS program is based on the Marzano Framework (Leon County Schools, 2014).

The Martin County School District adopted the Marzano Framework for the purpose of evaluating their teachers. One unique aspect of the Martin County Teacher Evaluation model is that teachers cannot be evaluated by the same administrator for two consecutive years (School Board of Martin County, 2014).

Nassau County School District developed their teacher evaluation system with the following goals:

- Promote teacher effectiveness resulting from incremental instructional improvements
- Improve student performance
- Improve staff development needs
- Promote professional growth
- Provide information to support decisions regarding promotion, transfer, reappointment and termination
- Build teacher morale (Nassau County School District , 2014)

To that end, the Nassau County School District adopted the Marzano Framework for their teacher evaluation system.

Osceola County Public Schools adopted the Marzano Framework for the purpose of evaluating teachers. In a letter to the teachers, the Osceola County Education Association's president wrote a letter to the teachers stating that the "system is not perfect and much work remains to be done." Moreover, she wrote that the goal was to develop a "fair, valid and reliable evaluation system" (Osceola County Public Schools , 2013).

The District School Board of Pasco County has implemented the Marzano Framework for their teacher evaluation system. An interesting inclusion to their "Race to the Top evaluation system" is that the "district reserves the right, as additional applicable

data is received, to amend the evaluation process within the guidelines set forth in the Florida statute (District School Board of Pasco County, 2014, p. 9)

The Putnam County School District adopted the Marzano Framework for their teacher evaluation system. Prior to implementation of the evaluation system, teacher observers were provided eight days of training (Putnam County School District, 2014).

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Problem Statement

Currently, many counties within the state of Florida are using the Marzano observation system to evaluate teachers. In order for the Marzano observation system to be effective, the evaluators must be efficacious in the observation strategies. To date, there has been insufficient research regarding the effects of the Marzano observation system on the self-efficacy on trained observers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceived self-efficacy of teacher-observers in Orange County Public Schools before and after they receive training in the Marzano observation system. The study attempted to determine if participation in training for the Marzano observation system increases the evaluation self-efficacy of administrators and instructional personnel.

Significance of Study

This study will inform educational leaders on the impact the Marzano observation training has on the self-efficacy of evaluators, including instructional personnel and administrators. Moreover, this study will provide the data necessary for educational

leaders to make wise investments in professional development that impacts the self-efficacy of evaluators.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

This research will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^1 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

2. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^2 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

3. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^3 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

Research Variables

The independent variable for this study will be the Marzano observation training. The dependent variable will be the self-efficacy of the participants. The extraneous variables for this study (for the four-day training) include the time lapse between sessions one and two. The Marzano observation training is conducted over four days.

Sample and Accessible Population

This study was conducted in Orange County Public Schools located in Orange County, Florida. Orange County is currently the tenth largest school district in the nation with over 187,000 students (Orange County Public Schools, 2013). Orange County Public Schools employs over 13,000 instructional personnel and over 900 administrators (Orange County Public Schools, 2013).

To meet the need of having teacher-observers trained in the Marzano evaluation model prior to evaluating teachers, Orange County Public Schools regularly offers training in the model. The sample for this study included participants in Domain 1: Leaders of Learning evaluation training that was offered in the fall of 2014.

Data Sources

The data sources for this study will consist of information obtained from an extensive literature review, a demographic questionnaire, and the Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy scale that was developed and reviewed by a panel of experts trained in the Marzano observation system. The Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy scale is based on the

Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale developed by Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2001). Table 1 lists the data sources for each research question.

Instruments

The primary instrument for this research is the Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale (Appendix A). The Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale is based on the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Appendix D) developed by Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2001). Previously, the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale was known as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The instrument was examined in three separate studies. Construct validity for this instrument was established by comparing its results to existing instruments (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001, p. 801). Based on the results of their study, the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale is considered reasonably valid and reliable (Tschannen-Moran & Howy, 2001, p. 801). The validity of the Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale was determined by a panel of experts that regarded the instrument as valid.

The Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale measures three subscales of efficacy: efficacy in evaluating student engagement, efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies and efficacy in evaluating classroom management. The subscales are measured by the following items:

- Efficacy in evaluating classroom management: items 1, 6, 7, 8
- Efficacy in evaluating student engagement: items 2, 3, 4, 11
- Efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies: items 5, 9, 10, 12

Demographic Questionnaire

To determine how the Marzano Evaluation Training affects the subpopulations of participants, a demographic questionnaire was provided at the same time as the Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale (short form). Validity for the instrument was determined with a panel of experts. The panel of experts regarded the demographic questionnaire as a valid instrument for recording the participants demographic information.

Procedure

Prior to the participants engaging in the Marzano Observation training, the participants were provided both the demographic questionnaire and the Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale. The participants wrote a unique identification number on both the demographic questionnaire and the Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale so that the two questionnaires could be matched to each other.

After the participants finished answering the items on the questionnaires, the questionnaires were collected and stored. On the last day of the Marzano Observation training, the researcher returned to the training location and provided them with the same Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale that they were originally provided and were asked to complete it. The Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale provided to the participants had a space for the participants to write their unique identification number on it.

After the participants completed the survey, their questionnaires were collected and stored in a secure location. The key matching the identification numbers to the participants was destroyed.

Data Analysis

Once all of the data sheets were collected, the responses were entered into IBM's Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. A paired-sample t-test was conducted on the pre and post item responses. Using the SPSS software, it was determined if a statistically significant difference existed between the pre and post responses.

Ethical Considerations

All participants were treated ethically in accordance with the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board. All participants were volunteers and informed consent was obtained from them. Furthermore, participants' responses and identities were kept confidential.

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Data for this study was collected using a questionnaire and pre and post survey instruments. Data was collected from 74 participants in a Marzano Leaders of Learning training conducted in the fall of 2014. Originally, the training was slated to have 76 participants. However, two of the participants did not complete the training.

Descriptive Statistics

The education of participants varied with the majority of participants (n = 48, 64.86%) possessing at least a master's degree (Table 2).

Table 2 *Respondents' Highest Degrees Earned*

Degree	<i>n</i>	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Bachelor	26	35.14	35.14
Master	40	54.05	89.19
Specialist	5	6.76	95.95
Doctor	3	4.05	100.0
Total	74	100.0	

In regards to degrees held in curriculum and instruction (Table 3), only 25.67% (n = 19) of the participants held a master’s degree or higher. Moreover, 48.6% (n = 36) of the participants reported not having any degrees in curriculum and instruction (Table 3).

Table 3 Respondents' Highest Degree Earned in Curriculum and Instruction

Degree	<i>n</i>	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Bachelor	19	25.68	25.68
Master	16	21.62	47.3
Doctor	3	4.05	51.35
None	36	48.65	100.0
Total	74	100.0	

In regards to the professional backgrounds of the participants (Table 4), the majority of the participants currently work in instructional positions (n = 66, 89.1%). Instructional coaches (n = 35, 47.3%) were the most prevalent professions represented at the training. Only one school-based administrator participated in this particular training (Table 3). Moreover, the majority of participants (n = 40, 54.1%) in this training have been in their current positions for less than one year (Table 5).

Table 4 *Respondents' Current Position*

Position	<i>n</i>	Percentage
Assistant Principal	1	1.4
AVID Coordinator	2	2.7
CRT	9	12.2
Dean	4	5.4
District Administrator	7	9.5
Instructional Coach	35	47.3
MTSS Coach	2	2.7
Reading Coach	8	10.8
Staffing Specialist	5	6.8
Teacher	1	1.4
Total	74	100.0

Table 5 *Years in Current Position*

	<i>n</i>	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Zero - One	40	54.1	54.1
Two - Three	24	32.4	86.5
Four - Ten	6	8.1	94.6
> Ten	4	5.4	100.0
Total	74	100.0	

Less than 9.5% ($n = 7$) of the participants held a teaching certificate from the National Board of Teaching Standards (Table 6).

Table 6 *National Board of Professional Teaching Standards*

	<i>n</i>	Percentage	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	67	90.5	90.5	90.5
Yes	7	9.5	9.5	100.0
Total	74	100.0	100.0	

Research Question 1

What change of self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^1 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

Research question one was analyzed with a paired samples t-test. The data sources for research question one were items two, three, four, and eleven from the Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale (Appendix A). To perform the paired samples t-test, the means of the four items administered prior to the training were compared with the means of the same four items when collected after the training. There was a significant difference between the pre ($M=5.78$, $SD=1.70$) and post ($M=7.16$, $SD= 1.13$) tests for items related to research question one (Table 7).

Table 7 Comparison of means for items pertaining to research question one

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre – Research Question 1	5.7872	74	1.70197	.19785
	Post – Research Question 1	7.1655	74	1.13873	.13237

The data revealed a statistically significant increase in participant scores pre (M=5.78, SD=1.70) and post (M=7.16, SD= 1.13) as a result of attending the training; $t(73) = 8.28, p = 0.000$ (Table 8). Therefore, the null hypothesis for research question one is rejected. This data indicates that the Marzano training has a positive effect on the participants' self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement.

Table 8 Paired Samples t-test comparing items relevant to research question one

Paired Samples Test								
Paired Differences								
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Research Question 1	1.37838	1.43121	.16637	1.70996	1.04679	8.285	73	.000

Research Question 2

What change of self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^2 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

Research question two was analyzed with a paired samples t-test. The data sources for research question one were items five, nine, ten, and twelve from the Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale (Appendix A). To perform the paired samples t-test, the means of the four items administered prior to the training were compared with the means of the same four items when collected after the training. There was a significant difference between the pre ($M=5.63$, $SD=1.60$) and post ($M=7.32$, $SD=.98$) tests for items related to research question two (Table 9).

Table 9 Comparison of means for items pertaining to research question two

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 2	Pre – Research Question 2	5.6385	74	1.60806	.18693
	Post – Research Question 2	7.3243	74	.98944	.11502

The data revealed a statistically significant increase in participant scores pre (M=5.63, SD=1.6) and post (M=7.32, SD= .98) as a result of attending the training; $t(73) = 9.43$, $p = 0.000$ (Table 10). Therefore, the null hypothesis for research question two is rejected. This data indicates that the Marzano training has a positive effect on the participants' self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies.

Table 10 Paired Samples t-test comparing items relevant to research question two

Paired Samples Test								
Paired Differences								
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Research Question 2	1.68581	1.53724	.17870	2.04196	1.32966	9.434	73	.000

Research Question 3

What change of self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^3 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

Research question three was analyzed with a paired samples t-test. The data sources for research question one were items one, six, seven, and eight from the Evaluator Sense of Efficacy Scale (Appendix A). To perform the paired samples t-test, the means of the four items administered prior to the training were compared with the means of the same four items when collected after the training. There was a significant difference between the pre ($M=6.39$, $SD=1.73$) and post ($M=7.71$, $SD= .93$) tests for items related to research question three (Table 11).

Table 11 Comparison of means for items pertaining to research question three

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 3	Pre – Research Question 3	6.3986	74	1.73102	.20123
	Post – Research Question 3	7.7128	74	.93053	.10817

The data revealed a statistically significant increase in participant scores pre (M=6.39, SD=1.73) and post (M=7.71, SD= .93) as a result of attending the training; $t(73) = 7.14, p = 0.000$ (Table 12). Therefore, the null hypothesis for research question three is rejected. This data indicates that the Marzano training has a positive effect on the participants' self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management.

Table 12 Paired Samples t-test comparing items relevant to research question three

Paired Samples Test								
Paired Differences								
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Research Question 3	1.31419	1.58225	.18393	-1.68077	.94761	7.145	73	.000

Summary

This study analyzed the effect of the Marzano Observation training on teacher observers' self-efficacy in the areas of evaluating student engagement, classroom management, and instructional strategies. The data collected for this study indicate that in all three areas (evaluating student engagement, evaluating classroom management, and evaluating instructional strategies) participants had a statistically significant increase in self-efficacy as a result of attending the Marzano Observation training.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Introduction

Previously, there has been insufficient research regarding the effects of the Marzano observation system on the self-efficacy on trained observers. Currently, twenty-nine counties within the state of Florida are using the Marzano observation system to evaluate teachers. While many of the observers are experienced administrators, the observers may also be teacher colleagues. Danielson (2012) states that observers need be trained in observation strategies.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceived self-efficacy of administrators and instructional personnel in Orange County Public Schools before and after they received training in the Marzano observation system. To determine if there was a change in the self-efficacy of participants as result of the Marzano observation training, three research questions were explored:

1. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^1 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

2. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^2 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

3. What change of self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management exists before and after a participant attends the Marzano observation training?

H_0^3 : There is no statistically significant difference in self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management after the participant attends the Marzano observation training.

The data sources for each question are found in Table 1.

Summary of the Study

The data for this study was collected during a Marzano Observation training administered in the fall of 2014. The study was conducted in Orange County Public Schools, Florida. Seventy-six participants began the study by completing the questionnaire and pre-training survey. Two of those participants did not complete the training leaving seventy-four participants that contributed to the data used in this study.

After the pre and post surveys were collected from the participants, the data was analyzed using IBM's Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Using SPSS, a paired samples t-test and a descriptive analysis were conducted.

Conclusion

After the paired samples t-test was conducted, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Participants of the Marzano Observation training experienced an increase in self-efficacy in evaluating student engagement.
2. Participants of the Marzano Observation training experienced an increase in self-efficacy in evaluating instructional strategies.
3. Participants of the Marzano Observation training experienced an increase in self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management.

Implications for Practice

The Race to the Top initiative is a competitive grant program that was designed to provide incentives to states to implement education reform in four key areas (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). One of the four areas was to support for both teachers and administrators to become more effective (White House, 2014).

To participate in the Race to the Top initiative, states were required to develop evaluation systems that were intentionally designed to support both teachers and administrators. In Florida, school districts were required to have observation systems that met certain standards. One system that was proposed by the Florida Department of Education was the Marzano Observation system (Boser, 2012). The Marzano Observation system is currently being used by twenty-nine counties in Florida. Therefore,

the impact of the Marzano Observation system is widespread. This study illustrates the relationship between the Marzano Observation training and the observers' self-efficacy.

As stated by Bandura (1977, p. 194), people tend to avoid situations that they feel are beyond their perceived self-efficacy. If teacher observers working within the Marzano Observation system have a low perceived self-efficacy, they might be unlikely to follow through with portions of the observation system including coaching and providing appropriate feedback. Furthermore, the results of this study indicate that a financial investment in observer training would be a wise investment.

This study showed that the self-efficacy of teacher observers increase in the areas of observing classroom management, observing student engagement, and observing instructional strategies after they attend the Marzano Observation training.

Recommendations for Practice

This study showed that teacher observers had an increase in self-efficacy as a result of participating in the Marzano Observation training. Therefore, new and veteran teacher observers should receive adequate training in the Marzano Observation training to increase their self-efficacy in the areas of evaluating classroom management, evaluating instructional practice, and evaluating student engagement.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. The majority of participants in this study were instructional personnel with less than three years of experience as teacher observers. Only one participant

identified themselves as either an assistant principal or a principal. Therefore, the author of this study suggests that another study be conducted with school-based administrators.

2. This research studied the change in self-efficacy for teacher observers as a result of participating in the Marzano Observation training. The author of this study suggests that research is conducted that analyzes the change in self-efficacy of classroom teachers as a result of participating in Marzano Observation training.
3. Twenty-nine school districts in Florida have adopted the Marzano Observation system for evaluating teachers. The author of this study suggests that similar research is conducted in those counties to find if their results are consistent with the findings of this study.
4. This research found that participants in the Marzano Observation training experienced an increase in self-efficacy in the areas of evaluating student engagement, evaluating classroom management, and evaluating instructional strategies. The author of this study suggests that further research be conducted to determine if experienced teacher observers experience the same benefit from attending the training as non-experienced teacher observers.

Conclusion

This study sought to inform educational leaders on the impact that the Marzano Observation training has on the self-efficacy of teacher observers. The results of this research show that investment in the Marzano Observation training may have a positive impact on the participant's self-efficacy in evaluating classroom management, evaluating student engagement, and evaluating instructional strategies.

APPENDIX A:
EVALUATOR'S SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE

Unique 5 digit ID Number _____

Directions: On the scale below rate yourself for each of the questions.

Evaluator's Sense of Efficacy Scale	1 = Not at all 3 = Very Little 5 = Some 7 = Quite a bit 9 = A Great Deal
1. How well can you evaluate a teacher's control of disruptive behavior in the classroom?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to motivate students who show little interest in completing schoolwork?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to inspire students to do well in schoolwork?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to inspire students to value learning?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to craft good questions for their students?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to get students to follow classroom rules?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to calm students who are disruptive or noisy?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to establish a classroom management system?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to use a variety of assessment methods?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to reteach concepts or provide alternate explanations when students are confused?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
11. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to enlist support from families to help their children do well in school?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
12. How well can you evaluate a teacher's ability to implement alternative teaching strategies in the classroom?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

7

APPENDIX B:
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Questionnaire

Directions: Please circle the answer that you feel most accurately describes your situation.

- 1) What is your highest degree earned?
A) Bachelors B) Master's C) Specialists D) Doctorate
- 2) What is your highest degree earned in curriculum and instruction (please note that for this question, a degree in educational leadership would not be considered as a degree in curriculum and instruction)
A) None B) Bachelors C) Master's D) Specialist
E) Doctorate
- 3) Do you currently possess a certification from the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards?
A) Yes B) No
- 4) How would you describe your current position? (e.g. Dean, CRT, Assistant Principal)

- 5) How many years have you been in your current position?
A) 0-1 B) 1 - 3 C) 4-10 D) Over 10 years
- 6) How many days of training in the Marzano Evaluation System have you previously received?
A) 0 B) 1-3 C) 4-6 D) 7 or more
- 7) Have you previously received training in evaluating teachers that was not a part of the Marzano Evaluation System (e.g. Florida Performance Measurement System, Danielson Framework, etc.)
A) Yes B) No If Yes, what previous training have you received?

- 8) How many completed years of teaching experience do you have?
A) 1-3 B) 4-6 C) 7-10 D) 11 or more

APPENDIX C:
PERMISSION LETTER, TEACHERS SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE



Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Ph.D.

Professor
Psychological Studies in Education

Dear

You have my permission to use the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* in your research. A copy of both the long and short forms of the instrument as well as scoring instructions can be found at:

<http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/ahoy/researchinstruments.htm>

Best wishes in your work,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Anita Woolfolk Hoy'.

Anita Woolfolk Hoy, Ph.D.
Professor

College of Education
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1177

www.coe.ohio-state.edu/ahoy

Phone 614-292-3774
FAX 614-292-7900
Hoy.17@osu.edu

APPENDIX D:
TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE (SHORT FORM)

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale¹ (short form)

Teacher Beliefs		How much can you do?								
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.		Nothing		Very Little		Some Influence		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal
1.	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
2.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
3.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
4.	How much can you do to help your students value learning?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
5.	To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6.	How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
7.	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
8.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
9.	How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
10.	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
11.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
12.	How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

APPENDIX E:
DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING THE TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY
SCALE

Directions for Scoring the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale¹

Developers: Megan Tschannen-Moran, College of William and Mary
Anita Woolfolk Hoy, the Ohio State University.

Construct Validity

For information the construct validity of the Teachers' Sense of Teacher efficacy Scale, see:

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.

Factor Analysis

It is important to conduct a factor analysis to determine how your participants respond to the questions. We have consistently found three moderately correlated factors: *Efficacy in Student Engagement*, *Efficacy in Instructional Practices*, and *Efficacy in Classroom Management*, but at times the make up of the scales varies slightly. With preservice teachers we recommend that the full 24-item scale (or 12-item short form) be used, because the factor structure often is less distinct for these respondents.

Subscale Scores

To determine the *Efficacy in Student Engagement*, *Efficacy in Instructional Practices*, and *Efficacy in Classroom Management* subscale scores, we compute unweighted means of the items that load on each factor. Generally these groupings are:

Long Form

<i>Efficacy in Student Engagement:</i>	Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22
<i>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies:</i>	Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24
<i>Efficacy in Classroom Management:</i>	Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21

Short Form

<i>Efficacy in Student Engagement:</i>	Items 2, 3, 4, 11
<i>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies:</i>	Items 5, 9, 10, 12
<i>Efficacy in Classroom Management:</i>	Items 1, 6, 7, 8

APPENDIX F:
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL APPROVAL

APPENDIX G:
ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS RESEARCH REQUEST

APPROVAL STATUS



Approved: The research request was completed in full and the research meets all OCPS requirements. The following must be completed to meet security requirements before your research can begin:



Conditionally Approved: The research request contains one or more elements that must be clarified or are missing. However, the request has an opportunity to be approved if the following is completed:

Please make these changes within two weeks and resubmit the entire Request Form and supporting documents.



Rejected: The research request contains significant omissions and/or does not meet OCPS requirements. This research request has been rejected due to the following:

Signature of the Senior Director for Accountability, Research and Assessment



Date

October 1st, 2014

APPENDIX H:
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Sam Ashley**

Date: **September 04, 2014**

Dear Researcher:

On 9/4/2014, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: The effects of the Marzano observation system training on the self-efficacy of teacher evaluators
Investigator: Sam Ashley
IRB Number: SBE-14-10529
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 09/04/2014 06:22:42 AM EDT

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX I: DISSERTATION DEFENSE ANNOUNCEMENT

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Alachua County Public Schools . (2013). *ACPS Teacher Evaluation System Components 2013-2015* . Retrieved September 9, 2014, from Alachua County Public Schools:
http://www.sbac.edu/files/_2RKJJ_/016c45770b779c413745a49013852ec4/ACPS_Teacher_Evaluation_Components_2013-2015-1.pdf
- Alexander, K., & Alexander, D. (2012). *American Public School Law* (8 ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Allard, J. (2013, March 23). *Talbot Mom testifies in favor of "Reasonable School Discipline"* . Retrieved March 27, 2013, from Star Democrat:
http://www.stardem.com/news/local_news/article_a3dc35ae-93ec-11e2-bf9d-001a4bcf887a.html
- Altenbaugh, R. (1999). *Historical Dictionary of American Education*. Retrieved July 1, 2014, from Google Books:
[http://books.google.com/books?id=U_HSk9YheBYC&pg=PA225&lpg=PA225&dq=selectmen+The+Old+Deluder+Act+\(1647\)&source=bl&ots=p_9y_Tdvh0&sig=RAWSSVHBpZURFn5ylnF4Rwv6pXI&hl=en&sa=X&ei=DKO1U7jyL8yWqAahpYL4BA&ved=0CDUQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q=selectmen%20&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=U_HSk9YheBYC&pg=PA225&lpg=PA225&dq=selectmen+The+Old+Deluder+Act+(1647)&source=bl&ots=p_9y_Tdvh0&sig=RAWSSVHBpZURFn5ylnF4Rwv6pXI&hl=en&sa=X&ei=DKO1U7jyL8yWqAahpYL4BA&ved=0CDUQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q=selectmen%20&f=false)

- American Psychological Association. (2006, August 9). *Zero Tolerance*. Retrieved March 27, 2013, from American Psychological Association:
<http://www.apa.org/pubs/info/reports/zero-tolerance-report.pdf>
- Arslan, A. (2012). Predictive Power of the Sources of Primary School Students' Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Their Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Learning and Performance. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice* , 12 (3), 1915-1920.
- Backer, P. (1998, June 11). *Scientific Management*. Retrieved July 2, 2014, from San Jose State University: http://www.engr.sjsu.edu/pabacker/scientific_mgt.htm
- Baltaci, H. S., & Demir, K. (2012). Pre-Service Classroom Teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Anger Expression Styles . *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* , 12 (4), 2422-2488.
- Bandura, A. (1980). Gauging the Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Judgement and Action . *Cognitive Theory and Research* , 4 (2), pp. 263-268.
- Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy. *Journal of Management* , 38 (1), 9-44.
- Bandura, A. (1982, February 1). Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. *American Psychologist* , 37 (2), pp. 122-147.
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981, September 1). Cultivating Competence, Self-Efficacy, and Intrinsic Interest Through Proximal Self-Motivation . *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , 41 (3), pp. 586-598.

- Bandura, A., Adams, N., & Beyer, J. (1977, March). Cognitive Process Mediating Behavioral Change. *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , 35 (3), pp. 125-139.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G., Barbaranelli, C., Regalia, C., & Scabinni, E. (2011). Impact of family efficacy beliefs on quality of family functioning and satisfaction with family life. *Applied Psychology* , 60 (3), 421-448.
- Bataineh, O. (2009). Sources of Social Support Among Special Education Teachers in Jordan and their Relationship to Burnout. *International Education* , 39 (1), 65-78.
- Belton v. Gebhart. (1952). 344 U.S. 891; 73 S. Ct. 213; 97 L. Ed. 689; 1952 U.S. LEXIS 1503. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.
- Benzer, A. (2014). Teachers' Opinions about the Use of Body Language. *Education* , 132 (3), 467-473.
- Blinder, A., & Zandi, M. (2010, July 27). *How the great recession was brought to an end*. Retrieved June 1, 2014, from Economy: <https://www.economy.com/mark-zandi/documents/end-of-great-recession.pdf>
- Bobbit, J. (1913). *Some general principles of management applied to the problems of city-school systems*. Retrieved June 20, 2014, from Archive: <https://archive.org/stream/somegeneralprinc00bobbrich#page/94/mode/2up>
- Bohn, C., Roehig, A., & Pressley, M. (2004). The First Days of School in the Classrooms of Two More Effective and Four Less Effective Primary-Grades Teachers. *The Elementary School Journal* , 104 (4), 269-287.

- Bolling v. Sharpe. (1954). *344 U.S. 873; 73 S. Ct. 173; 97 L. Ed. 676; 1952 U.S. LEXIS 1563. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.*
- Boser, U. (2012, March). *Race to the Top: What Have We Learned from the States So Far?* . Retrieved February 27, 2015, from American Progress:
https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/03/pdf/rtt_states.pdf
- Bowen, E. (2003). *Student Engagement and Its Relation to Quality Work Design: A Review of the Literature*. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from
<http://chiron.valdosta.edu/are/ebowenLitReview.pdf>
- Bradshaw, C., Mitchell, M., & Leaf, P. (2010). Examining the Effects of Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports on Student Outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavioral Interventions* , 12 (3), 133-148.
- Briggs v Elliott. (1952). *342 U.S. 350; 72 S. Ct. 327; 96 L. Ed. 392; 1952 U.S. LEXIS 2486. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.*
- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education* , 16, 239-253.
- Broward County Public Schools. (2014, June 6). *BROWARD INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH EVALUATION SYSTEM BRIDGES* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Broward County Public Schools:

<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/talentdevelopment/news/evaluation/BrIDGES/BrIDGESDOE-Submission-2013-2014.pdf>

Brown v Board of Education. (1951). *98 F. Supp. 797; 1951 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2309.*

LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis: <http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>

Brown v. Board of Education. (1954). *347 U.S. 483; 74 S. Ct. 686; 98 L. Ed. 873; 1954*

U.S. LEXIS 2094; 53 Ohio Op. 326; 38 A.L.R.2d 1180. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.

Buluc, B. (2014). An Analysis of Classroom Rules in Secondary Schools in Turkey.

Educational Research Quarterly , 29 (3), 30-51.

Burris, J. (2013, March 20). *Jennings says bill responds to student's gun-shaped pastry incident.* Retrieved March 27, 2013, from The Baltimore Sun:

http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-03-20/news/bs-md-pastry-bill-20130320_1_school-suspensions-gun-jennings

Caldari, K. (2007). Alfred Marshall's critical analysis of scientific management. *Euro. J.*

History of Economic Thought , 14 (1), 55-78.

Calhoun County Public Schools. (2014). *Calhoun County School District Teacher*

Evaluation System . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Calhoun County School

District : http://calhounflschools.org/_cache/files/8ebffe5-c836-457a-823fd554a40a2379/13.14-calhoun-county-teacher-evaluation-system.pdf

- Charolotte County Public Schools . (2014). *PACE 2.X*. Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Charolotte County Public Schools:
<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/documents/staff/PACE2xPlan.pdf>
- Citrus County School District . (2014). *Citrus County School District Teacher Evaluation System*. Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Citrus County School District :
http://www.citruseducation.com/news/Citrus_County_Schools_Teacher_Evaluation_System_Revised.pdf
- Clark, R. (2003). *The Essential 55*. New York: Hyperion.
- Collier County Public Schools . (2014). *Contracts*. Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Collier County Public Schools:
<http://www.collierschools.com/hr/docs/contracts/CTEM-MOU.pdf>
- Constitution Society . (2014). *The Old Deluder Act (1647)*. Retrieved July 1, 2014, from Constitution Society : <http://www.constitution.org/primarysources/deluder.html>
- Cooper v. Aaron . (1958). *358 U.S. 1; 78 S. Ct. 1401; 3 L. Ed. 2d 5; 1958 U.S. LEXIS 657; 79 Ohio L. Abs. 452. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.*
- Cullen, D. (2014, August 20). *Empowerment And Accountability: Power Tools For The Teacher/Student Relationship In The Inclusive Learning Environment*. Retrieved September 13, 2014, from ASCD In-Service: <http://inservice.ascd.org/education-resources/empowerment-and-accountability-power-tools-for-the-teacherstudent-relationship-in-the-inclusive-learning-environment/>

- Cumming v. Board of Education. (1899). *175 U.S. 528; 20 S. Ct. 197; 44 L. Ed. 262; 1899 U.S. LEXIS 1580. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.*
Retrieved from <http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/175/528/case.html>
- Danielson, C. (2012). Observing Classroom Practice. *Educational Leadership* , 70 (3), pp. 32-37.
- Davis v. Prince Edward County. (1952). *345 U.S. 972; 73 S. Ct. 1114; 97 L. Ed. 1388; 1953 U.S. LEXIS 2003. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.*
- District School Board of Pasco County. (2014). *District School Board of Pasco County Race to the Top Evaluation System* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from District School Board of Pasco County:
http://www.pasco.k12.fl.us/library/hr/evaluations/dsbpc_teacher_evaluation_system_1314.pdf
- Driscoll, M. P. (2000). *Psychology of Learning for Instruction* (2 ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Pearson.
- Fernet, C., Guay, F., Senecal, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Predicting intraindividual changes in teacher burnout: The role of perceived school environment and motivational factors . *Teaching and Teacher Education* , 28, 514-525.
- Fives, H., Hamman, D., & Olivarez, A. (2007). Does burnout begin with student-teaching? Analyzing efficacy, burnout, and support during the student-teaching semester . *Teaching and Teacher Education* , 23, 916-934.

- Florida Department of Education . (2014). *Educator Quality Update on Teacher Evaluation* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Florida Department of Education :
<http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pdf/OverviewFloridasTeacherEvaluationSystem.pdf>
- Florida Department of Education . (2014). *Teacher Evaluation and Instructional Practice Models 2013-14*. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from Florida Department of Education : <http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pdf/teipm.pdf>
- Florida Department of Education. (2014). *Race to the Top*. Retrieved March 25, 2014, from Florida Department of Education:
<http://www.fldoe.org/committees/pdf/PresentationValue-addedModel.pdf>
- Florida Education Association. (2014). *FEA President Asks Governor to Suspend VAM*. Retrieved March 25, 2014, from Florida Education Association :
<http://feaweb.org/fea-president-asks-governor-to-suspend-vam>
- Florida State University. (2010). *Teaching Resources for Florida ESE*. Retrieved December 3, 2013, from Florida State University:
<http://www.cpt.fsu.edu/eseold/about.html>
- Ford, A. (2012, November 5). *FEA President Asks Governor to Suspend VAM*. Retrieved March 26, 2014, from Florida Educators Association:
http://feaweb.org/_data/files/VAM_Value_Added_Measure/11.5.12_VAM_letter_to_governor.pdf

- Fried, L. (2011). Teaching Teachers about Emotion Regulation in the Classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* , 36 (2), 117-127.
- Fusch, G. (1997). *Organizational change from scientific management to the learning organization - implications for new work systems*. Retrieved July 4, 2014, from ERIC: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED417329.pdf>
- Gadsden County Public Schools. (2014). *Gadsden County Teacher Evaluation Model* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Gadsden County Public Schools: <http://images.pcmac.org/Uploads/GadsdenCounty/GadsdenCounty/Departments/Form/Teacher%20Evaluation%20Manual%204-23-14%20Updated.pdf>
- Gelbrich, J. (1999). *Section 2 - American Education*. Retrieved July 2, 2014, from Oregon State University: <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/ed416/ae1.html>
- Gilchrist County Public Schools. (2014). *Gilchrist County Public Schools Teacher Evaluation System* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from [http://gilchristschools.schoolfusion.us/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/1559716/File/A%20-%202013-14%20EVALUATION%20SYSTEM%20COMPLETE%20\(revised%20Nov%2019%202013\).pdf?sessionid=21180711f19e7da9f759031b524d9a99&sessionid=6f81533b109e69b3f9594c252487fe96](http://gilchristschools.schoolfusion.us/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/1559716/File/A%20-%202013-14%20EVALUATION%20SYSTEM%20COMPLETE%20(revised%20Nov%2019%202013).pdf?sessionid=21180711f19e7da9f759031b524d9a99&sessionid=6f81533b109e69b3f9594c252487fe96)
- Giles, D. (2012). Exploring relationships in education: A phenomenological inquiry . *Australian Journal of Adult Learning* , 52 (2), 214-236.

- Glasser, W. (1977, February 28). *Schools Without Failure --1977. Glasser's Approach to Discipline -- Realistic and Working. Schools Without Failure* . Las Vegas, Nevada: American Association of School Administrators .
- Goroshit, M., & Hen, M. (2012). Emotional Intelligence: A Stable Change? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* , 24 (1), 31-42.
- Grady, M. (1990). The Teaching Principal . (http://jrre.vhost.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/6-3_7.pdf, Ed.) *Research in Rural Education* , 6 (3), 49-52.
- Griffin v. School Board of Prince Edward County. (1966). 363 F.2d 206; 1966 U.S. App. LEXIS 5757. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.
- Griggs, M. S., Rimm-Kaufman, S., Merritt, E. G., & Patton, C. L. (2011). To What Extent Does the Responsive Classroom Approach Modify Fifth Grade Students' Efficacy and Anxiety in Mathematics and Science? . *Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness*. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.
- Hanson, A. (2001, October 26). *Have Zero Tolerance School Discipline Policies Turned into a Nightmare? The American Dreams Promise of Equal Educational Opportunity Grounded in Brown v. Board of Education*. Retrieved March 27, 2013, from University of California at Davis : <http://jjlp.law.ucdavis.edu/archives/vol-9-no-2/02%20Hanson%20final.pdf>
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.

- Helding, K., & Fraser, B. (2012). Effectiveness of Nationally Board Certified (NBC) teachers in terms of classroom environment, attitudes and achievement among secondary science students. *Learning Environments Research* , 16 (1), 1-21.
- Hultell, D., Merlin, B., & Gustavsson, J. P. (2013). Getting personal with teacher burnout: A longitudinal study on the development of burnout using a person-based approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education* , 32, 75-86.
- Irving, O., & Martin, J. (1982). Withitness: The Confusing Variable. *American Educational Research Journal* , 19 (2), 313-319.
- Jackson County School District. (2014). *Jackson County Teacher Evaluation System*. Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Jackson County School Board:
<http://www.jcsb.org/Download.asp?L=2&LMID=395355&PN=DocumentUploads&DivisionID=7937&DepartmentID=9505&SubDepartmentID=&SubP=&Act=Download&T=1&I=383396>
- Jacobson, S., & Cypres, A. (2012). Important shifts in curriculum of educational leadership preparation. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education* , 7 (2), 217-236.
- Jennings, J. (2013, March 7). *Senate Bill 1058*. Retrieved March 27, 2013, from Maryland General Assembly :
<http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb1058F.pdf>
- Jonas, M. (2011). Dewey's Conception of Interest and its Significance for Teacher Education_543 112..129 . *43* (2), 112-129.

- Kagan, S. (1999). *Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan.
- Katz, M. (1976). *A History of Comulsary Education Laws*. Retrieved July 1, 2014, from ERIC: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED119389.pdf>
- Keller, B. (2006). NBPTS Upgrades Profession, Most Agree, Despite Test-Score Letdown. *Education Week* , 25 (40).
- Kimura, Y. (2010). Expressing Emotions in Teaching: Inducement, Suppression, and Disclosure as Caring Profession . *Educational Studies in Japan* , 5, 63-78.
- Labby, S., Lunenburg, F., & Slate, J. R. (2012). Emotional Intelligence and Academic Success: A Conceptual Analysis for Educational Leaders . *nternational Journal Of Educational Leadership Preparation* , 7 (1), 1-11.
- Lake County Schools. (2014). *Teacher Evaluation and Achievement Model (TEAM)* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Lake County Schools: <http://lake.k12.fl.us/Page/33250>
- Leon County Schools. (2014). *Leon Educator Assessment and Development System* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Leon County Schools: http://www.leonschools.net/docs/LCS_LEADS_BOOKLET_01_17_12.pdf
- Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., Durik, A., Conley, A., Barron, K., Tauer, J., Karabenick, S., et al. (2010). Measuring Situational Interest in Academic Domains. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* , 70 (4), 647-671.
- Liu, C.-W. (2010). *The implementation of teacher evaluation for professional development in primary education in Taiwan* . Retrieved July 1, 2014, from

Google Books:

http://books.google.com/books?id=M84PrrqWgeYC&pg=PA41&lpg=PA41&dq=teacher+evaluation+1800s&source=bl&ots=G55SCYOq5X&sig=Q-So_-LBU8Eu6ZvrBkTLL7T4uE&hl=en&sa=X&ei=CMa1U_ruCcSiqAbniIGwBw&ved=0CB8Q6AEwATgK#v=onepage&q=teacher%20evaluation%201800s&f=false

Lomas, T., Edington, T., Cartwright, T., & Ridge, D. (2014). Men Developing Emotional Intelligence Through Mediation? Integrating Narrative, Cognitive and Electroencephalography (EEG) Evidence . *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* , 15 (2), 213-224.

Lum v Rice. (1927). 275 U.S. 78; 48 S. Ct. 91; 72 L. Ed. 172; 1927 U.S. LEXIS 256. *LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.*

Lustick, D., & Sykes, G. (2006). National Board Certification as Professional Development: What are teachers learning? . *Education Policy Analysis Archives* , 14 (5), 1-46.

Luttrell, D., Atkinson, T., & Rosenblum, H. (2013, September). *Assessing the Costs and Consequences of the 2007–09 Financial Crisis and Its Aftermath*. Retrieved March 15, 2014, from Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas: <http://www.dallasfed.org/assets/documents/research/eclett/2013/el1307.pdf>

- Marzano Research Laboratory. (2014). *Robert J. Marzano* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Marzano Research Laboratory :
<http://www.marzanoresearch.com/authors/robert-j-marzano>
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The Art and Science of Teaching, A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2012, November 1). The two purposes of teacher evaluation .
Educational Leadership .
- Marzano, R. J., & Brown, J. L. (2009). *A Handbook for the Art and Science of Teaching* .
Alexandria , VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development .
- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2011). *The Highly Engaged Classroom*. Bloomington,
IN: Marzano Research Laboratory .
- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom Management that Works*. Alexandria , VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R., Gaddy, B. B., Foseid, M. C., Foseid, M. P., & Marzano, J. S. (2005). *A Handbook for Classroom Management that Works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Massachusetts Historical Society. (2013). *Sarah Roberts v. Boston*. Retrieved April 3, 2013, from Massachusetts Historical Society:
<https://www.masshist.org/longroad/02education/roberts.htm>

- McLeod, J., Fisher, J., & Hoover, G. (2003). *The Key Elements of Classroom Management*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development .
- Merriam-Webster. (2014). *Discipline*. Retrieved September 13, 2014, from merriam-webster: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/discipline>
- Mongan, P., & Walker, R. (2012). "The road to hell is paved with good intentions": A Historical, Theoretical, and Legal Analysis of Zero-Tolerance Weapons Policies in American Schools. *Preventing School Failure* , 56 (4), 232-240.
- Naceur, A., & Schiefele, U. (2005). Motivation and Learning - The role of interest in construction of representation of text and long-term retention: Inter- and intraindividual analyses . *European Journal of Psychology of Education* , 20 (2), 155-170.
- Nassau County School District . (2014). *Teacher Evaluation System 2013-2014*. Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Nassau County School District : http://www.edline.net/files/_0JLgA_/d5368750db4efad53745a49013852ec4/Teacher_Evaluation_System_Package_-_WEB.pdf
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2014). *National Board Standards*. Retrieved August 31, 2014, from National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: <http://www.nbpts.org/national-board-standards>

- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2014). *The Beginnings of a Movement*. Retrieved August 31, 2014, from National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: <http://www.nbpts.org/beginnings-movement>
- National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. (2014). *The Five Core Propositions*. Retrieved August 31, 2014, from National Board of Professional Teaching Standards: <http://www.nbpts.org/five-core-propositions>
- National Center on Education and the Economy . (2014). *History of NCEE*. Retrieved August 31, 2014, from National Center on Education and the Economy : <http://www.ncee.org/about-ncee/history-of-ncee/>
- Okpala, C., Ioney, J., & Hopson, L. (2009). The Effectiveness of Nationally Board Certified Teachers: Policy Implications . *Journal of Instructional Psychology* , 36 (1), 29-34.
- Orange County Public Schools. (2010, July). *Human Resources Management and Development*. Retrieved December 2, 2013, from Orange County Public Schools: https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/leadership/HRMD/Documents/HRMD_2010.pdf
- Orange County Public Schools. (2013). *Pocket/Budget Guide*. Retrieved June 1, 2014, from Orange County Public Schools: https://www.ocps.net/es/cr/Documents/PocketBudgetGuide2013_14.pdf
- Orange County Public Schools. (2014, March). *RACE TO THE TOP TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM PROPOSAL Orange County Public Schools REVISED* . Retrieved May 20, 2014, from Orange County Public Schools:

https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/assessment/Documents/2014_TEACHER_EVALUATION_SYSTEM_PROPOSAL.pdf

Orange County Public Schools. (2014, January 14). *Settlement Agreement Report*.

Retrieved from Orange County Pubic Schools:

<https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/employ/Documents/Settlement%20Agreement%20Report%202013-2014%20FINAL.pdf>

Orange County Public Schools. (2011). *TEACHER EVALUATION FREQUENTLY*

ASKED QUESTIONS 2011- 2012. Retrieved May 25, 2014, from Orange County Public Schools:

<https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/assessment/Additional%20Information/Teacher%20Evaluation%20-%20Frequently%20Asked%20Questions.pdf>

Osceola County Public Schools . (2013, October 3). *2013-2014 INSTRUCTIONAL*

EMPLOYEES' EVALUATION HANDBOOK . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Osceola County Public Schools:

http://www.osceola.k12.fl.us/Resources/Employee_Resources/documents/Instructional_Employees_Evaluation_Handbook_100313.pdf

Osher, D., Bear, G., Sprague, J., & Doyle, W. (2010, February 11). How can we improve school discipline . *Educational Researcher* .

Pajak, E. (2003, May). *Honoring Diverse Teaching Styles*. Retrieved July 4, 2014, from Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development :

<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/103012/chapters/Understanding-the-Clinical-Cycle.aspx>

Patall, E. (2013). Constructing Motivation through Choice, Interest, and Interestingness. *Journal Of Educational Psychology*, , 105 (2), 522-535.

Pheifer, D. (2011). Transforming staff through clinical supervision. *Reclaiming youth and children* , 20 (2), 29-33.

Plessy v. Ferguson. (1896). *163 U.S. 537; 16 S. Ct. 1138; 41 L. Ed. 256; 1896 U.S. LEXIS 3390. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.*

Pollock, J. E., & Ford, S. (2009). *Chapter 1. From Inspection to Improvement*. Retrieved July 1, 2014, from Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/109006/chapters/From-Inspection-to-Improvement.aspx>

Pool, L. D., & Qualter, P. (2012). Improving Emotional Intelligence and Emotional Self-Efficacy through a Teaching Intervention for University Students. *Learning and Individual Differences* , 22 (3), 306-312.

Putnam County School District. (2014). *Evaluation Systems for Instructional Personnel* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from Putnam County School District : http://www.putnamschools.org/dynimg/_2fAAA_/docid/0x0E4A0635DCC9FB64/8/Evaluation+Systems+for+Instructional+Personnel+PUTNAM+Updates+-+June+2014.pdf

- Quinn, M. M., Osher, D., Warger, C. L., Hanley, T. V., Bader, B. D., & Hoffman, C. C. (2000). *Teaching and Working with Children who have Emotional and Behavioral Challenges* . Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Recovery Board. (2014). *The American recovery and reinvestment act*. Retrieved June 3, 2014, from The recovery act:
http://www.recovery.gov/arra/About/Pages/The_Act.aspx
- Revis, C. (1976, February). Clinical supervision: a timely approach. *Educational Leadership* .
- Rittmeyer, B. (2011, June 13). *Deer Lakes Suspension for 5-year-old caused rethinking of zero tolerance policies*. Retrieved March 27, 2013, from TribLive News:
http://triblive.com/x/valleynewsdispatch/s_741868.html#axzz2PoAhscnf
- Rotgans, J., & Schmidt, H. G. (2011). Situational interest and academic achievement in the active-learning classroom . *Learning and Instruction* , 21, 58-67.
- Rouse, W. (2008). National Board Certified Teachers are making a difference in Student Achievement: Myth or Fact? . *Leadership and Policy in Schools* , 7 (1), 64-86.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). *Emotional Intelligence* . Retrieved September 13, 2014, from University of New Hampshire :
http://www.unh.edu/emotional_intelligence/EIAssets/EmotionalIntelligencePropert/EI1990%20Emotional%20Intelligence.pdf

Sanders, W., Ashton, J., & Wright, S. P. (2005). *Comparison of the Effects of NBPTS Certified Teachers with Other Teachers on the Rate Of Student Academic Progress* . Arlington : National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Sarah C. Roberts v. The City of Boston. (1849). Retrieved from 59 Mass. 198; 1849 Mass. LEXIS 299; 5 Cush. 198. LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.

School Board of Martin County . (2014). *The School Board of Martin County, Florida, Teacher Evaluation System* . Retrieved September 10, 2014, from School Board of Martin County :
http://www.martinschools.org/files/_zRKiy_/c0a0a920468591613745a49013852ec4/MCSD_2012-2014_Teacher_Evaluation_Document.pdf

Scott, G. (2013). *ACE TO THE TOP States Implementing Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems despite Challenges*. Washington D.C.: Government Accountability Office.

Scruggs, B. (2009). Constructivist Practices to Increase Student Engagement in the Orchestra Classroom. *Music Educators Journal* , 95 (4), 53-59.

Skaalvik, E., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education* , 26, 1059-1069.

Skiba, R. J. (2000). *Zero Tolerance, Zero Evidence*. Indiana University, Indiana University Education Policy Center. Policy Research Report.

- Skinner, E., & Chi, U. (2012). Intrinsic Motivation and Engagement as "Active Ingredients" in Garden-Based Education: Examining Models and Measures Derived from Self-Determination Theory . *The Journal of Environmental Education* , 43 (1), 16-36.
- Skinner, E., Kindermann, T., & Furrer, C. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and dissatisfaction: conceptualization and assessment in children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* , 69 (3), 493-525.
- Smith, T., & Colby, S. (2010). Perspectives on decisions of researchers who examine the efficacy of the advanced certification system of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards . *Studies in Educational Evaluation* , 36, 143-152.
- Smithsonian. (2013). *Brown v. Board of Education*. Retrieved March 28, 2013, from Smithsonian: <http://www.americanhistory.si.edu/brown/history>
- Sonnenfeld, J. (1985). Shedding light on the Hawthorne studies. *Journal of Occupational Behavior* , 6 (2), 111-130.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2001). *SREB States lead the way in National Board Certification for Teachers*. Report - Descriptive, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta.
- Spring, J. (2001). *The American School 1642-2000* (5 ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

- State of Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2014). *National Board Certified Teachers*. Retrieved August 31, 2014, from Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction:
<https://www.k12.wa.us/certification/nbpts/Candidacy/default.aspx>
- Strong, R., Silver, H., & Robinson, A. (1995, September). Strengthening Student Engagement: What Do Students Want (and what really motivates them)? *Educational Leadership* , 53 (1), pp. 8-12.
- Stronge, J., Ward, T., Tucker, P., Hindman, J., McCoksky, & Howard, B. (2007). National Board Certified Teachers and Non-National Board Certified Teachers: Is There a Difference in Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement? . *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* , 20 (2-4), 185-210.
- The Florida Senate. (2011). *CS/CS/SB 736: Education Personnel*. Retrieved March 25, 2014, from The Florida Senate:
<http://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2011/0736/BillText/er/PDF>
- The Library of Congress. (2009). *Bill Summary & Status 111th Congress (2009 - 2010) H.R.1*. Retrieved March 20, 2014, from The Library of Congress Thomas:
[http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d111:H.R.1:](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d111:H.R.1)
- The United States Senate. (2013). *Landmark Legislation: Civil Rights Act of 1875*. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from United States Senate:
[http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/generic/CivilRightsAct1875](http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/generic/CivilRightsAct1875.htm)
 .htm

- Theodore, P. (2014). *Curriculum Theory*. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville:
<http://www.siue.edu/~ptheodo/IT560/currtheory.html>
- Thornberg, R. (2008). A categorisation of school rules. *Educational Studies* , 34 (1), 25-33.
- Tracy, S. J. (1995). How Historical Concepts of Supervision Relate to Supervisory Practices Today. *Clearing House* , 68 (5), 320-325.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing and elusive construct. . *Teaching and Teacher Education* , 17, pp. 783-805.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2013, September 27). *Education Department Awards \$13.3 Million in Grants to Support Principal Development*. Retrieved December 2, 2013, from U.S. Department of Education: <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/education-department-awards-133-million-grants-support-principal-development>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *RACE TO THE TOP ASSESSMENT PROGRAM*. Retrieved March 15, 2014, from U.S. Department of Education:
<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment/index.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2010, May 27). *Race to the Top FAQ*. Retrieved March 15, 2014, from U.S. Department of Education:
<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/faq.pdf>

- U.S. Department of Education. (2010, September 13). *School Leadership Program - 2009 Awards*. Retrieved December 3, 2013, from U.S. Department of Education:
<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/leadership/2009awards.html>
- U.S. v. Singleton. (1883). *109 U.S. 3; 3 S. Ct. 18; 27 L. Ed. 835; 1883 U.S. LEXIS 928*.
LexisNexis Academic. Web. Date Accessed: 2013/04/21.
- Urban, W., & Wagoner, J. (2000). *American Education, A History* (2 ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill .
- Virginia Historical Society. (2004, February 7). *The Closing of Prince Edward County's Schools*. Retrieved April 4, 2013, from The Civil Rights Movement in Virginia:
<http://www.vahistorical.org/civilrights/pec.htm>
- Wong, H., & Wong, R. T. (2001). *The First Days of School*. Mountain View, CA: Harry K Wong Publications .
- Wormser, R. (2002). *The Rise and Fall of Jim Crow*. Retrieved April 5, 2013, from PBS:
http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/stories_events_plessy.html
- Yin, H.-B., & Chi-Kin Lee, J. (2011). Emotions Matter. *Chinese Education and Society* ,
44 (4), 82-97.