



SCHOOL of  
GRADUATE STUDIES  
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University  
**Digital Commons @ East  
Tennessee State University**

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

---

5-2018

# Teacher Perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)

Kelley Harrell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Elementary Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Harrell, Kelley, "Teacher Perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)" (2018). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3374. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3374>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact [digilib@etsu.edu](mailto:digilib@etsu.edu).

Teacher Perceptions of the  
Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)

---

A dissertation  
presented to  
the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis  
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree  
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

---

by  
Kelley R. Harrell  
May 2018

---

Dr. Virginia Foley, Chair  
Dr. Cecil Blankenship  
Dr. Ginger Christian  
Dr. James Lampley

Keywords: Teacher evaluation, teacher quality, teacher effectiveness, TEAM

## ABSTRACT

### Teacher Perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)

by

Kelley R. Harrell

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. Participants in this study were PK-8 public school teachers from 2 districts in Northeast Tennessee who had been evaluated using the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Specifically this research was guided by 8 research questions on perceived changes in instructional strategies utilized by teachers, the perceived changes in teacher planning practices and lesson preparation, the perceived changes in professional development activities attended by the teacher and the perceived impact of teacher evaluation and feedback on teacher effectiveness. A survey instrument was used to collect data. The survey instrument consisted of 20 statements that asked the respondents to indicate their degree of agreement on a 6-point Likert scale. Quantitative data were analyzed with a series of one way ANOVA tests. Results indicated there was no significant difference in the instructional strategies or teacher planning dimensions of the TEAM Teacher Survey in relationship to years of experience or degree level. Respondents' perceptions of teacher effectiveness were not significant in relation to degree level, but

they were significant in relation to years of experience. The professional development dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey was not significant in relation to degree level but was significant in relation to years of experience.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to several family members without whom this work would not be possible. Pursuing a doctoral degree took time away from those I love most and I asked them many times for patience as I pursued my goal.

To my husband, Scotty, I am so thankful for your constant support and motivational words. Working as a school administrator and balancing other life events while pursuing a doctoral degree took a great deal of sacrifice. Your patience and understanding as we skipped many social events with friends so that I could work throughout the weekend was always appreciated. Vacations and other family events were often interrupted by program requirements and you always understood and accepted any delays or changes we had to make to our plans. Thank you for your love and support. You never fail to tell me you are proud of my work and I will be forever grateful for you.

To my Dad, Ray Hall, who is responsible for my first memories of teaching and learning. You have shaped the person I am today through your constant love and guidance. Some of my first memories of school include you teaching me special ways to complete my math problems that seemed so much easier than the way I had learned in class. I feel certain those memories pushed me into education as I hoped to make learning easier for other students. Your support, both emotionally and financially, pushed me to complete my goal of earning a doctoral degree. Thank you for being my dad and loving me unconditionally.

To my Mom, Gail Jarrett, thank you for showing me the benefit of hard work and persistence. The example you set for me has guided my path in life and is responsible

for much of my success as a student and educator. I am grateful for your constant support and love. You have always encouraged my education and supported me along the way.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my dissertation chair, Dr. Virginia Foley, who helped keep me on track to completion of my doctoral program when I didn't think it was possible. Your guidance and feedback are deeply appreciated. You believed I could complete this process, and in turn, allowed me to believe the same. Thank you for helping me make it to this stage in life. I am so thankful you were my chair!

To my committee member for research, Dr. James Lampley, who helped me make sense of statistics. Your many emails, visits and phone calls assisted me in completing the final chapters of my dissertation. Your feedback always came in a very timely manner and allowed me to make deadlines.

To my committee member and friend, Dr. Ginger Christian, for her motivation when I needed it most. I wouldn't have completed this process without our help! Thank you for being my motivation when I needed it most. Your feedback, assistance and time were greatly appreciated. Your friendship is appreciated even more!

To my committee member, Dr. Cecil Blankenship, thank you for agreeing to serve on my committee. Your suggestions for my research were appreciated.

To my dear friend, Allecia Frizzell, for her unwavering support when I needed it most. I would never have completed this process without your listening ear and sounding board! You were my motivation when I could not find my own motivation. I'm so thankful we completed this journey together.

To my former coworker and friend, Travis Thompson, for traveling this long road with me. I didn't know if I would ever make it to graduation, but you always kept the faith. Thank you for sharing the load of this program with me and for helping me to

grow as an educator and administrator.

To the faculty and staff of Ridgeview Elementary School and Boones Creek Elementary School, thank you for your patience and understanding as I completed this program. Serving as principal in your schools has been a highlight of my career. I've developed life-long friendships and learned so much from each of you. I am blessed to work with and learn from amazing educators each day. You challenge me to be better and help me continue to grow as an educator.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	2
DEDICATION.....	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	6
LIST OF TABLES.....	11
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	12
Introduction to Study.....	12
Statement of Problem.....	14
Research Questions.....	15
Significance of Study.....	16
Limitations of Study.....	17
Definitions of Terms.....	17
Overview of Study.....	18
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	19
Teacher Evaluation.....	19
Overview of Teacher Evaluation.....	19
Legislative Directives.....	27
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.....	27
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.....	28
First to the Top Act of 2010.....	31
Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015.....	32

Defining Effective Teaching.....	33
Professional Development.....	38
Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) Evaluation System.....	43
Overview of TEAM .....	43
Research behind TEAM Framework: TAP.....	47
Research Findings for TEAM.....	48
Summary.....	50
3. RESEARCH METHOD.....	51
Research Questions and Null Hypotheses.....	51
Population and Sample.....	53
Instrumentation.....	54
Data Collection.....	55
Data Analysis.....	55
Summary.....	55
4. RESULTS.....	57
Research Question 1.....	58
Research Question 2.....	60
Research Question 3.....	61
Research Question 4.....	62
Research Question 5.....	63
Research Question 6.....	65
Research Question 7.....	66

Research Question 8.....	67
Summary.....	68
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND FURTHER RESEARCH.....	70
Summary.....	70
Conclusions.....	71
Recommendations for Practice.....	80
Recommendations for Further Research.....	83
REFERENCES.....	85
APPENDICES.....	90
Appendix A: TEAM Rubrics.....	90
Appendix B: Survey.....	99
VITA.....	103

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1: Components of TEAM Evaluation Rubric.....	45
2: Distribution of Survey Respondents by Years of Experience.....	58
3: Distribution of Survey Respondents by Degree Level.....	58
4: Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 1).....	59
5: Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 1).....	61
6: Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 2).....	62
7: Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 2).....	63
8: Means, Standard Deviations, and 95% Confidence Intervals for 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 3).....	64
9: Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 3).....	66
10: Means, Standard Deviations, and 95% Confidence Intervals for 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 4).....	67
11: Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 4).....	68

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

In recent years teacher evaluation in the United States has undergone drastic changes (Darling-Hammond, 2014). The Federal Government's Race to the Top competitive grants, part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, were awarded to states who adopted more rigorous standards, built data systems to measure student performance outcomes, developed plans to recruit and retain effective teachers and principals and planned to turn around their lowest achieving schools (United States Department of Education, 2009). Another component of earning a Race to the Top grant included the linking of student performance and growth data with teacher evaluation. Tennessee was awarded a Race to the Top grant totaling over \$500 million to implement the Tennessee First to the Top Act of 2010. The state legislature outlined plans for a comprehensive teacher evaluation system that used student performance outcomes based on standardized testing (United States Department of Education, 2010b). The Tennessee legislature approved multiple evaluation models for use in the state, but the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) was the primary model chosen by the majority of school districts (Tennessee State Board of Education, 2017).

Tennessee's evaluation system, the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), was implemented in July of 2011. The Tennessee legislature required that 50% of teacher and principal evaluation be linked to student achievement and growth data. The remaining 50% of a teacher's score would be comprised of classroom evaluations utilizing two different rubrics developed to assess classroom teacher performance (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012). Tennessee partnered with

the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) to train evaluators and teachers to begin the newly implemented evaluation process.

The implementation of a different teacher evaluation model in the State of Tennessee resulted in many successes and challenges during the first year of implementation (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012). The state experienced an improvement in overall student achievement during the first year of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) usage. According to the Tennessee Department of Education even though many educators earned high marks on their initial evaluations under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) rubrics, one of the difficult challenges in year one of implementation was overcoming and addressing educators' fears about the new model.

Teacher evaluations serve two main purposes: determining teacher competence or serving as a summative assessment of a teacher's instructional performance and to guide and inform professional development and growth for teachers (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Rogers & Weems, 2010). Under Race to the Top most newly created evaluation models purported measuring teacher competence as their main purpose with guiding a teacher's professional growth falling to the background (Danielson, 2011b).

In this study the researcher investigated teacher perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Perceived changes in planning practices, instructional strategies used, and professional development opportunities experienced were examined. Teacher perceptions as they relate to the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) and overall teacher effectiveness were also examined.

## Statement of Problem

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. The researcher seeks to add to existing research concerning teacher evaluation practices and how these practices impact teacher performance.

In 2010 the Tennessee First to the Top Act required teacher evaluations and mandated specific models of evaluation that could be used throughout the State of Tennessee (Tennessee First to the Top Act, 2010). The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) was implemented in the majority of school districts across the state of Tennessee in the 2011-2012 school year. School administrators and teachers were impacted by the implementation of a different evaluation model. Evaluators were required to complete a required number of observations for teachers during each school year and teachers worked to adapt their classroom practices to meet the expectations of a different evaluation model.

Throughout this study the researcher sought to determine if the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) resulted in perceived changes in instructional practices, professional development interest and teachers planning practices. Further, this study was an investigation to determine if teacher evaluation practices and feedback positively impact teacher perceptions of their effectiveness.

## Research Questions

The following research questions guided this quantitative study:

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Research Question 4: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Research Question 6: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Research Question 7: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?



Research Questions 8: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

### Significance of Study

The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) is currently in the 7th year of implementation in most school districts across the State of Tennessee. In order to assess the perception of Tennessee teachers in reference to the effectiveness of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) more research is needed. The researcher seeks to add to current research regarding teacher perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). The purpose of this study is to analyze the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers in two Northeast Tennessee School Districts about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instruction and teacher effectiveness. The researcher seeks to determine if the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) framework is perceived to impact teaching strategies, planning practices, professional development attendance and overall teacher effectiveness. The results of the study can help determine if teachers in the selected districts perceive they have made changes to professional practices as a result of evaluation practices. The results of this study can also contribute to further modifications to the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) Evaluation Framework.

### Limitations of Study

Limitations in this study relate to the population from which research participants were chosen. The participants were limited to Pre K through 8th grade teachers in two Northeast Tennessee school districts that utilize the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Teachers who chose to participate may not be representative of the overall demographics of the State of Tennessee. The research is limited to teacher opinions and is not representative of all school staff.

### Definitions of Terms

The following definitions provide explanations for specific terms relative to this study.

1. Teacher Effectiveness: A derivative of “value-added” methodologies that estimate teachers’ contributions to their students’ learning measured by standardized testing (Goe & Stickler, 2008).
2. Teacher Evaluation: The process for determining teacher competence and guiding professional growth opportunities for teachers (Rogers & Weems, 2010).
3. Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM): A comprehensive, student outcomes-based system to measure teacher competence (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012).
4. Tennessee Value Added Assessment (TVAAS): A measure of the impact teachers and schools have on a student's academic achievement (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.a).
5. Value Added Models: Value added models enable researchers to use statistical

methods to measure changes in student standardized test scores over time while considering other factors that impact student achievement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012).

### Overview of Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, limitations of the study, definition of terms, research questions, the significance of the study and the overview of the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of literature related to teacher evaluation. This review includes an overview of teacher evaluation, a review of legislative directives that have impacted teacher evaluation, an overview of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) utilized as the main evaluation framework for the state, a review of effective teaching, a review of professional development for teachers and a review of prior research concerning the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) in Tennessee. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology utilized including the research questions and null hypotheses, population, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter 4 is an analysis of the data for each research question. Chapter 5 is a summary of the study including findings, conclusions and recommendations for further research related to this study.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this quantitative study was to analyze the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. The purpose of this literature review was to describe the history of teacher evaluation, examine legislative directives that guided teacher evaluation, review literature related to effective teaching practices and professional development, and review literature and prior research related to the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).

#### Teacher Evaluation

##### Overview of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation systems have been in place for many years. Rogers and Weems (2010) explained that two main purposes define teacher evaluations: to measure teacher competence and to guide professional growth and development in teachers. Rogers and Weems also explained that developing quality instruction in classrooms should be a main focus of teacher evaluations. Many different systems for teacher evaluation have been developed and continue to evolve.

In the 1700s, teacher supervisors or supervisory committees monitored instruction and established the criteria for effective teaching, resulting in a wide variety of practices (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Throughout the 1800s, the search

for teachers with knowledge of specific disciplines took place. At the same time, administrators were expected to fill more complex roles, and in many instances a teacher within a building assumed this responsibility. By the mid-1800s, supervisors began to focus on improving instruction.

By the later part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century John Dewey's progressive ideas for education came into play (Marzano et al., 2011). Dewey promoted a student-centered education. During this time Taylor's scientific view of management also played a part in shaping many educational evaluation systems. Taylor's view of using measurement to increase production soon flowed over into the K-12 education system. Running schools was compared with running factories and the belief that many of the same supervisory techniques applied to both industrial jobs and education took hold. It was believed that administrators should emphasize measurement and could analyze data collected to make certain teachers and schools more productive. Many of today's evaluation techniques are rooted in Taylor's view of measurement to determine productivity and success. Over the next few decades many other views shaped teacher evaluations, with student learning and academic progress becoming the main focus for evaluating teachers.

According to McWalters and Stumbo (2011) many modern evaluation systems focused less on the quality of the teacher and more on the assessment results the teacher produced. This shift focused on how well students performed, usually measured by standardized testing, as a result of a teacher's teaching ability. Measuring student outcomes came to the forefront as a result of federal stimulus programs asking states to develop and implement teacher evaluation systems that measured teacher

effectiveness using multiple data sources, such as student achievement. Darling-Hammond (2014) shared that evaluation systems that focus on results from one test combined with occasional classroom observations are not deemed helpful in promoting quality teaching.

McWalters and Stumbo (2010) provided multiple challenges for measuring teacher effectiveness based on student achievement results or value added models. Value added measures look at student growth over a period of time and aim to remove the impact of student background while focusing precisely on student growth over time (Darling-Hammond, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). McWalters and Stumbo (2010) shared student assessment data have limits and value added data have not been proven as an effective high-stakes test measure. An additional challenge is the fact that a majority of teachers do not teach content that produces value added data. In some schools, student achievement cannot be attributed to a single teacher. Teams of teachers are involved in student achievement in many instances, especially in secondary and virtual schools.

Quality teachers possess more than content knowledge (Darling-Hammond, 2014; McWalters & Stumbo, 2011). The expansive knowledge required to be an effective teacher leads to the problem of determining the wide range of practices and outcomes we need to see from quality teachers. Involving multiple stakeholders in evaluation processes could be troublesome due to the expansive knowledge needed to effectively evaluate and provide feedback to teachers. All stakeholders must take ownership in developing effective evaluation practices but the quality of evaluators can be troublesome in teacher evaluation practices. School districts typically perform

training for evaluators that covers basic processes, but this does not guarantee that evaluators are fluent in sound instructional practices (Southern Regional Education Board, 2017). Effective evaluator training offers a wide variety of strategies and techniques for evaluators to use in order to improve teacher performance. An evaluator training that includes constructive feedback, guidance for promoting professional development for teachers, information on resources for teachers, on-going training and professional collaborative experiences can lead to improved teacher and students performance. Many evaluation systems do not yet have the processes in place to provide effective training to evaluators even though research has proven that evaluations become more rigorous, reliable and relevant with quality evaluator training.

Marzano (2012) shared that teacher evaluation systems can have two purposes: measuring teacher effectiveness or focusing on improving teacher abilities. Marzano reported that these evaluation systems will look fundamentally different depending on the purpose developers have in mind. In surveying more than 3,000 educators Marzano found that the majority of teachers questioned indicated that measurement of teacher-student performance as well as teacher development should both be a focus of teacher evaluations, with teacher development taking priority. An evaluation system where measurement alone is the goal can suffice with a succinct set of indicators, however, an evaluation system that looks to grow teacher performance must have an in depth focus on teaching qualities and strategies as well as a teacher's growth.

According to Connally and Tooley (2016) federal policies planned for newly developed evaluation systems to be utilized for teacher accountability as well as support. However, many states have been so focused on creating and implementing

new evaluation systems that they are just coming around to focusing on teacher growth as a result of the evaluation systems implemented. Connally and Tooley recommended that states develop evaluation policies that insure teacher access to frequent, high quality feedback that supports teacher growth. In addition, Connally and Tooley shared that school leaders must also receive quality training and resources to assist them in overseeing teacher growth and development.

Darling-Hammond (2014) reported that teacher evaluations as they were developed did little to promote teacher learning or provide timely information for making personnel decisions. Darling-Hammond et al. (2009) indicated supports needed to foster useful professional development in collegial environments were not in place. Darling-Hammond (2014) shared that comprehensive evaluation systems must have the goal of improving the quality of teaching and depend heavily on the creation of professional development opportunities that increase teacher expertise. Darling-Hammond found that most teachers want effective evaluation systems that provide useful feedback enabling the promotion of professional development and improvement of their teaching abilities. She indicated that we must teach teachers if we want to move towards increased academic outcomes for our students.

Quality teacher evaluation systems must meet five elements to effectively support teaching and learning according to Darling-Hammond (2014). Evaluation systems must utilize common statewide standards for teaching and incorporate performance based assessments. Local or district evaluation systems must also align to those same standards. Training that properly prepares evaluators must be created. Finally professional learning opportunities that support the outcomes of teacher



evaluation must be in place. An evaluation system that meets these indicators will assist in promoting effective teaching and student learning.

School districts across the nation have been working to fix outdated and ineffective teacher evaluation systems (Aspen Institute, 2011). Teacher evaluation systems differ and should be developed to best meet the needs of students and teachers being served. At times, teacher evaluation systems are needed to significantly change the culture for teaching and learning, while in other schools or states the focus is simply on improving the effective teaching practices already in place. The Aspen Institute reported that states and districts should focus on building effective teacher evaluation systems while maintaining focus on the bigger picture of instruction and student achievement. Teacher evaluation systems should reflect the beliefs the organization holds for teaching and learning in order to promote a visionary and goal-oriented result. Once teacher evaluation systems are in place they should continually be refined and revisited. The Aspen Institute recommended that data collected must be examined and utilized to adapt the evaluation systems to help meet the needs of teachers and learners. Working to continually perfect teacher evaluation systems is essential to improved teaching and student achievement results.

Teacher evaluations should provide useful feedback to teachers in order to improve classroom instruction, provide opportunities to expand and learn new teaching strategies, and provide guidance from administrators and other teachers on how to implement classroom changes that lead to better student outcomes (Rogers & Weems, 2010). Sartain et al. (2011) indicated that teachers and principals had more meaningful conversations about instruction from feedback conferences than in former evaluation

models. Evaluation systems are ultimately designed to improve teaching practices. However, without a strong link between evaluations, feedback and prescriptive professional development, teacher evaluation models are not likely to improve classroom teaching practices in the manner desired (Smylie, 2014).

Teacher evaluations are carried out in a variety of manners. One popular method of evaluating teacher performance involves principal observations (McWalters & Stumbo, 2011). In this evaluation style, a school administrator infrequently observes for a minimal period of time in order to gain a representative sample of a teacher's teaching abilities (Schachter, 2012). Evaluations may be formal and announced to the teacher in advance, or they may be unannounced and more informal (McWalters & Stumbo, 2011). The results of these observations have historically shown mainly "satisfactory" evaluation results with occasional "unsatisfactory" ratings given to some teachers (Schachter, 2012).

Many states and districts no longer rely on one evaluator, such as the principal of the school, to evaluate teacher performance. Most states and districts now require multiple evaluators, a variety of evaluation measures and an increased number of classroom visits for observations each school year. Student achievement and student surveys are also included in evaluation measures in many places (Toch, 2016).

Ballou and Springer (2015) reported that when designing evaluation instruments, perfection is unlikely. However, Toch (2016) explained that the impact of newly developed teacher evaluation systems has been seen in many ways. The focus on classroom instruction is greater than in the past. Some low performing teachers have been removed from teaching duties but Aldeman and Chuong (2014) indicated that

some districts continue to make decisions on teacher retention without examining evaluation results. Feedback promoting quality teaching practices is becoming the new normal (Ballou & Springer, 2015). Chesasaro et al. (2016) found that teachers value feedback when it is useful to their classroom practice, they find the feedback accurate, they value the credibility of the evaluator and have access to appropriate resources needed for improvement. Effective teachers are identified and rewarded in a wide variety of ways from monetary incentives to promotion to teacher leaders, and finally new evaluation systems in many states are producing higher student achievement (Toch, 2016).

The State of Tennessee currently has five approved evaluation models in place. The five currently approved models include: TEAM (Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model), TIGER (The Teacher Growth for Effectiveness Results), Project COACH, Teacher Effectiveness Model (TEM), and The Achievement Framework for Excellent Teaching (AFET) (Tennessee State Board of Education, 2017).

The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) serves as the state's primary evaluation model, but districts, charter schools and other state agency schools may propose their own evaluation model and complete a formal request to use an alternate model (Tennessee State Board of Education, 2017). An educational organization wishing to use an alternate evaluation system must submit an application, as well as required artifacts from the requested evaluation system, to the Tennessee Department of Education prior to the academic school year beginning June 1st of any given year (Tennessee State Board of Education, 2017).

## Legislative Directives

Politicians became more involved in decision-making concerning schools and educators, creating many legislative mandates. Some mandates received harsh criticism and were eventually reversed or updated. Recent legislation continues to reform teacher evaluation models and still has strong push back from a variety of educator groups (McWalters & Stumbo, 2011).

In the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century educator evaluation has seen extensive changes in states and districts across the nation (Smylie, 2014). Federal policies regarding teachers rely heavily on teacher effectiveness, in part measured by student outcomes, as opposed to teacher quality (McWalters & Stumbo, 2011). These policies led to the development and implementation of teacher evaluation systems that also value teacher effectiveness based on student outcomes, usually gathered from standardized testing measures.

### No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) was developed and adopted with overwhelming bipartisan support as a result of concerns that the United States educational system was no longer competitive in the global market (Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 2015). NCLB required that students in grades 3-8 and high school participate in state mandated standardized testing in reading and math. In addition, NCLB required increased qualifications for teachers. NCLB mandated that all teachers be highly qualified by 2005-2006. In order to be highly qualified, a teacher must have a bachelor's degree, state certification, and proven expertise in the content

area taught (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 2006). These requirements were designed to insure teacher effectiveness, but in reality simply meeting the requirements for highly qualified status did little to improve student performance (Rogers & Weems, 2016).

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) did not mandate teacher evaluation. NCLB did, however, emphasize teacher quality as a top priority (McWalters & Stumbo, 2011; Rogers & Weems, 2016). While NCLB sought to promote teacher quality, it neglected to define teacher quality as performance versus meeting required qualifications.

NCLB faced many criticisms. Some critics spoke harshly about the increased involvement in educational matters by the federal government. The law also faced criticism for relying too heavily on standardized testing. In addition, many felt the law was underfunded and did not provide enough financial support to be implemented effectively. Finally, the requirement that all students be proficient on standardized testing measures by the 2013-14 school year was seen as an unattainable goal (Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 2015).

#### American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) was a stimulus package signed into law in February of 2009 by President Barack Obama. The ARRA allocated \$100 billion to education. Over half of those funds were assigned to prevent layoffs and cutbacks. The remaining funds were allocated to support educational reforms that would lead to improved outcomes for students while building the capacity of schools to sustain long term effectiveness (United States Department of Education,

2009).

The ARRA provided \$4.35 billion for the Race to the Top Fund (RTTT), a competitive grant from the United States Department of Education, to assist in innovative reforms in state and local K-12 education. RTTT grants were rewarded to states for past accomplishments and future improvement based on four key educational reform areas. States were asked to adopt more rigorous academic standards, create and build data systems that measure student outcomes, recruit and retain effective teachers and principals and turn around their lowest-achieving schools. In addition states must not have any regulations preventing the linking of student performance data to teacher evaluations in order to be eligible for RTTT funds (United States Department of Education, 2009).

States were able to apply for grants under RTTT and were awarded funds based on the accumulation of up to 500 points in the funding formula developed to support RTTT. Funding was awarded based on the development of plans to address six components of the RTTT program. Component D: Great Teachers and Leaders impacted teacher and principal evaluation and comprised 138 of the possible 500 points in grant application reviews. Grant winners were expected to track student and teacher performance as one of the requirements needed to earn a RTTT grant. States that did not link teacher evaluation and student performance were ineligible for funds. Data collected in relation to student growth were required to serve as a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluation systems (United States Department of Education, 2009). States acted on the requirement to raise the standards for teacher evaluation in order to qualify for large funding opportunities (Schachter, 2012).

In March of 2010 President Obama released “A Blueprint for Reform” (United States Department of Education, 2010a). This blueprint was the Obama Administration’s plan for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The blueprint built on the reforms of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. President Barack Obama shared that a world- class education was the right of every child in the United States (United States Department of Education, 2010a). President Obama set a goal that by 2020 the United States of America would lead the world in percentage of college completion. He also stated that:

This effort will require the skills and talents of many, but especially our nation’s teachers, principals and other school leaders. Our goal must be to have a great teacher in every classroom and a great teacher in every school. We know that from the moment students enter a school, the most important factor in their success is not the color of their skin or the income of their parents – it is the teacher standing at the front of the classroom. To ensure the success of our children, we must do better to recruit, develop, support, retain, and reward outstanding teachers in America’s classrooms. (United States Department of Education, 2010a, p. 1)

President Obama went on to share that the federal government was calling on states and school districts to implement reformed evaluation systems to support the growth of teachers and principals, as well as identify highly effective teachers and principals on the basis of student growth and other factors. The evaluation systems developed by each state should help to inform professional development opportunities that would lead to increased student outcomes (United States Department of Education, 2010a). To

fulfill President Obama's calling states developed evaluation systems to identify highly effective teachers and principals, most relying on the basis of students' academic growth (Schachter, 2012).

### First to the Top of 2010

Tennessee received a \$500 million grant to implement their First to the Top (FTTT) program (United States Department of Education, 2010b). FTTT was adopted by Tennessee's General Assembly and signed by Governor Phil Bredeson in 2010. The legislation mandated a comprehensive teacher evaluation system that utilized student achievement outcomes as well as educator evaluations and allowed value-added measures to be utilized to inform teacher evaluation. Since receiving the grant, the State of Tennessee has made significant progress in implementing required initiatives, including their new evaluation model (United States Department of Education, 2012).

Tennessee created the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC) to assist with full implementation of the state's new evaluation system for the 2011-2012 school year. Additionally, the state trained more than 6,000 educators on the new observation process during the first year of implementation. The Tennessee State Board of Education adopted policy 5.201, Teacher and Administration Evaluation Policy. In this policy the State Board of Education communicated that their primary purpose was to utilize annual teacher and principal evaluations to support instruction that would lead to high levels of student achievement. The policy outlined the expectations on the evaluation model and provided specific guidelines for implementation. (Tennessee



State Board of Education, 2017).

Tennessee's FTTT was designed to narrow the achievement gap between various subgroups of students, authorize Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to utilize alternative salary schedules, support pre-k through higher education longitudinal data with funds earned through the RTTT grant win, and clarify the state's policies in relation to the Complete College Act of 2010. The state's FTTT program served as a strong foundation to implement broad educational reforms across the state (United States Department of Education, 2012).

#### Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law by President Barack Obama on December 10, 2015. The act reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) enacted by President Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1965. ESEA had a provision that ensured equal opportunity and access to education for all American students. ESSA replaced NCLB that was originally adopted in 2002. ESSA continued to ensure the success of American schools and students by including the following provisions:

- Advances equity by upholding critical protections for America's disadvantaged and high-need students.
- Requires—for the first time—that all students in America be taught to high academic standards that will prepare them to succeed in college and careers.
- Ensures that vital information is provided to educators, families, students, and communities through annual statewide assessments that measure students'

progress toward those high standards.

- Helps to support and grow local innovations—including evidence-based and place-based interventions developed by local leaders and educators—consistent with our Investing in Innovation and Promise Neighborhoods
- Sustains and expands this administration's historic investments in increasing access to high-quality preschool.
- Maintains an expectation that there will be accountability and action to effect positive change in our lowest-performing schools, where groups of students are not making progress, and where graduation rates are low over extended periods of time. (United States Department of Education, n.d)

### Defining Effective Teaching

A byproduct of teacher evaluation systems has been to support teachers and administrators in learning more about effective teaching practices (Taylor & Tyler, 2012). Feedback given to teachers through evaluation measures can have a direct impact on teacher performance. A study by Taylor and Tyler found that teachers are more effective during a school year when they are being evaluated than they were previously. Their study also found the impact on student achievement increases in subsequent years after being evaluated.

A review of current literature produces many varying indicators for effective teaching. Danielson (2016) shared there was little consensus on defining effective teaching. For the purpose of tying effective teaching to teacher evaluation this review will focus on a small sampling of research addressing effective teaching. Throughout

this review several commonalities were identified that define effective teaching. These include a safe and comfortable environment for learning, clear learning goals for students, high expectations for students and utilizing well-aligned assessments appropriately (Danielson, 2011a; Danielson, 2016; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Goe & Stickler, 2008; Marzano, 2007; Rutherford, 2013)

Danielson (2011a) defined four domains that are commonplace in effective teaching in her Framework for Teaching: Planning and Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Professional Responsibilities, and Instruction. Each domain contains components to define effective teaching practices. Danielson and McGreal (2000) shared that strong teacher evaluation systems must clearly define acceptable performance, include processes for assessing all aspects of teaching and provide highly trained evaluators to judge teacher performance. In addition high quality evaluation practices are given the task of encouraging and promoting teachers' professional development while assessing and ensuring quality teaching. Danielson (2011b) shared that teaching is a complex task with many demands placed on teachers and a quality evaluation system must examine and assess all complexities of the profession.

Danielson's (2011a) Framework for Teaching had multiple connections to the importance of a safe learning environment, clear learning goals, high expectations and quality assessments for teachers. Domain two of Danielson's framework was completely devoted to the importance of the classroom learning environment. She included components such as creating an environment of respect and rapport, establishing a culture for learning, managing classroom procedures, managing student behavior and organizing physical space (p. 3). Domain three, Instruction, contained

references to clear learning goals and high expectations for students. Component 3a shared the importance of communicating with students concerning specific expectations for their learning. Quality assessments are referenced multiple times in Danielson's framework. Domain 1, Planning and Preparation, shares the importance of designing quality assessments while Domain 3, Instruction, shares the importance of utilizing assessments in instruction.

Rutherford (2013) observed over 10,000 episodes of classroom instruction. He shared that there are many of ways to be an excellent teacher, but he looked for common themes or skills of the most successful teachers. He defined 23 themes in teaching that had substantially recurring evidence throughout his data collection. These 23 themes were required to meet four criteria:

1. The theme must have utility in all content areas.
2. The theme must have utility for all ages and grade levels.
3. The theme must have a body of research and literature to support it.
4. The theme has to be observed repeatedly in the classrooms of successful teachers (p. 4).

Rutherford broke his 23 themes into three categories: technical work of teaching, scientific aspects of teaching and artistic nature of teaching. Rutherford shared that successful teachers do not employ all 23 skills at once or during one lesson, but instead utilize the themes that are of greatest strength for the teacher. Successful teachers have determined their strengths and they focus their teaching in those areas.

Rutherford's (2013) Artisan Teacher themes had clear connections to the indicators of effective teaching in this review. Rutherford referenced the importance of a

safe learning environment in multiple themes, including: Personal Presence, Delight, Neural Downshifting and Enriched Environments. Personal Presence refers to the teacher's ability to become a significant factor in a student's life. Delight refers to the teacher's ability to create learning opportunities for students that are surprising and motivating. Neural Downshifting refers to the teacher's ability to reduce threats and stress in the classroom in order to allow students to increase their higher order thinking abilities. Enriched environments refers to the teacher's ability to utilize the social and physical design of the classroom to enhance student learning. One of Rutherford's themes is named Clear Learning Goals. This theme refers to the importance of a teacher identifying what students are expected to learn and understanding how students will demonstrate their knowledge. High expectations for students is noted in Rutherford's themes of Congruency and Task Analysis. Congruency refers to the teacher's ability to design activities that accurately match learning goals while Task Analysis involves analyzing teaching strategies so that all steps for student mastery are met. Assessment is addressed through Rutherford's themes of Overt Responses and Diagnosis. Diagnosis is the ability of the teacher to diagnose student learning needs based on performance assessments while Overt Responses refers to the teacher's ability to elicit frequent evidence of student learning for the purpose of designing the next steps in learning.

Goe and Stickler (2008) referenced three of the four commonalities of effective teaching in their research analysis. They reported that clear learning objectives and performance expectations are important but noted that it is difficult to separate the components of quality teaching to allow a determination on the extent to which clear

learning goals make an impact. High expectations for students is another indicator of effective teaching according to Goe and Stickler. Again, they share that it is difficult to determine the impact of high expectations because it can be hard to separate from other qualities of effective teachers. Aligning assessments with student instruction is also noted as a best practice in research by Goe and Stickler.

Marzano (2008) indicated that clear learning goals and assessments are closely linked. He reported the importance of teachers establishing clear learning goals but added that they are only impactful when assessed appropriately. He acknowledged that assessments should not occur at the end of learning but throughout the learning process. Marzano connected his work to high expectations through teaching strategies that help student effectively interact with newly learned knowledge. He indicated that utilizing strategies such as summarizing and note taking, nonlinguistic representations and high level questioning leads to high expectations for students and their learning.

McRel International reviewed thousands of studies concerning student achievement and effective teaching strategies (Goodwin, 2010). They determined five high yield strategies for effective teaching: guaranteeing challenging instruction, ensuring pathways to success, providing support for the whole child, creating school cultures that supports and encourages high expectations, and developing reliable, data-driven systems. In order to guarantee challenging instruction systems must have teachers who challenge students with a variety of teaching strategies while also working to develop positive relationships between the teacher and students. Ensuring success for all students involves creating personalized and prescriptive learning opportunities while providing students with the academic and social resources needed to serve the

whole child. Goodwin (2010), also shared that a school culture of high expectations is a strong predictor of student achievement and success. Finally, high performing schools and teachers collect appropriate data that informs and directs instruction based on student success and failure. The strategies identified by McRel International align with each the four commonalities of effective teaching outlined in this research.

The characteristics of effective teaching defined in this research do not represent an exhaustive list of the components of high quality teaching. The four themes examined here have clear research from multiple sources citing their importance. As school systems select evaluation instruments it is important that these themes, as well as others, are addressed (Danielson, 2011a). Danielson shared that the ability to determine teacher effectiveness is critical in order for school administrators to determine and support a teacher's credibility with students and parents.

### Professional Development

One of the purposes of teacher evaluation is informing professional development opportunities for teachers (Danielson & McGreal 2000; Rogers & Weems, 2010). Effective evaluation models encourage or require teachers and evaluators to use evaluation data to develop professional growth plans that target specific areas of improvement (Southern Regional Education Board, 2016). Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (2011) acknowledged that effective professional development allows teachers to function as both learners and teachers and allows them to struggle through those roles to learn more about their practice. They indicated that teachers learn best by doing and collaborating with other teachers. Professional learning communities can

provide this professional development for teachers.

In *Learning By Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work* (2010), a professional learning community is defined as an “ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve” (p.11). Ferguson (2013) described a professional learning community as “a group of educational professionals who come together to work collaboratively with the ultimate goal of improving student achievement” (p. 57).

School teams (grade level, content area, etc.) serve as the building blocks for Professional Learning Communities (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011). These teams work together to lead to school wide or district wide improvement, based on common goals and outcomes. Collaboration is essential to effective professional learning communities. Teachers must believe in the power of collaboration as an improvement tool as they begin utilizing professional learning communities.

Professional learning communities can have a tremendous impact on teacher and student learning when they operate effectively (Danielson, 2011b). A professional learning community does not indicate that something needs to be improved, but rather realizes that teaching is a difficult job and there is always room for improvement. School leaders must be ready to engage in and communicate expectations for professional learning communities to teachers (Thessin, 2015). According to DuFour (2010) team members are required to work interdependently to achieve common goals for which all team members are accountable. School leaders had a strong impact on creating a culture that can support and sustain professional learning communities.



Professional learning communities in schools provide the structure that must exist within a school in order to become effective and school leaders must provide the structure and support teachers need to implement professional learning communities effectively (Hoaglund et al., 2014).

Professional learning communities within schools must begin with a shared mission or purpose, a clear vision with specific goals and a strong focus on student outcomes (Hoaglund et al., 2014). School leaders must provide teachers with adequate time to accomplish effective professional learning communities. School leaders must also make sure that all teachers have an in-depth understanding of what the curriculum requires. As Dufour (2004) reported merely presenting teachers with the state standards or district curriculum guides will not be enough.

DuFour (2004) provided four guiding questions that should guide the work of professional learning communities:

1. What is it we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some students do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Involving all members of a school faculty in the collaborative work of professional learning communities will assist in increasing student and teacher performance (Hughes-Hassell et al., 2012). Hughes-Hassell et al. described the following eight roles that can promote effective professional development through the use of professional

learning communities:

1. Information specialist – the article talks about the librarian filling this role, but others could do so. The information specialist gathers information for the group. For example, the librarian could gather research on a topic where teachers see many students struggling.
2. Staff Developer – Staff development is essential to effective PLCs. Educational experts in your school can help with on-going, job-embedded professional development that meets the needs of your school.
3. Teacher and Collaborator – Related arts teachers and other faculty members can work with PLC groups to support the teaching and learning taking place in content area classes. Having these teachers involved in PLC meetings will give them the knowledge needed to support content area curriculum in their classrooms.
4. Critical friend – Reflective practice is crucial to improving teacher practices and student results. Faculty members who aren't responsible for the core curriculum can help teachers see areas for improvement they may be overlooking. Being a critical eye to help improve school and teacher practices can be very helpful for improvement.
5. Leader – This role serves as the chairperson of a PLC. This person can facilitate and oversee meetings to insure they run as effectively as possible.
6. Researcher – Some personnel in your building may enjoy research more than others. Finding someone to do action research to help improve practices can have positive results.

7. Learner – Continuous learning is vital to educators. On-going professional development can continuously transform the teaching and learning that takes place in your building.
8. Student Advocate- Experts in dealing with diverse students can be critical to PLC meetings. Special education and ELL students need special considerations when planning and assessing.

With the wide variety of roles needed to successfully implement a professional learning community framework, all members of a staff must be involved. Related arts teachers, interventionists, coaches, special education teachers and therapists bring a different view to professional learning community groups that can extend success for all students.

District and building level school administrators must remove barriers preventing the success of professional learning communities and provide teachers the support and knowledge required to be successful (Hughes-Hassell, 2012). Teachers need time to collaborate and an in-depth understanding of their curriculum and desired student outcomes (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011). The professional learning community framework lends itself to a commitment of lifelong learning and improvement and provides opportunity for evaluation feedback to be addressed and improved. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin indicated that when professional learning communities are implemented with fidelity the results for schools, teachers and students will be tremendous.

## Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) Evaluation System

### Overview of TEAM

The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) was implemented in July of 2011. Tennessee's new evaluation model was adopted by the Tennessee legislature and was implemented as a component of Tennessee's Race to the Top grant. The legislation required that 50 % of teacher and principal evaluation be tied to student achievement data – 35 % of this came from student growth as reported by the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System, and 15 % was based on student achievement levels. The other 50 % of evaluation scores in Tennessee came from teacher observations (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012). Tennessee was one of the first states to implement a comprehensive teacher evaluation system that was based on multiple measures of teacher performance (Reform Support Network, 2012; Tennessee Department of Education, 2012).

Tennessee's First to the Top authorized the creation of the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC) to review four different evaluation rubrics that were field tested across the State of Tennessee during the 2010-2011 school year. TEAC was comprised of a mixture of teachers, principals, superintendents, legislators, business leaders and community members. The members met numerous times to review and determine the approach Tennessee should adopt for teacher and principal evaluation. After review, TEAC supported the use of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) and made the recommendation to the State Board of education. The State Board of Education unanimously adopted the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model

(TEAM) along with three other alternative evaluation models (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012).

The State of Tennessee partnered with the National Institute for Teaching Excellence (NIET) to prepare evaluators for the newly adopted the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation process. Evaluators attended 4 days of training developed and delivered by NIET to prepare for the impending changes to evaluation in Tennessee. After completion of required training evaluators were required to pass an inter-rater reliability exam where the evaluators put the training they received into practice. Evaluators were required to meet specific requirement on the inter-rater reliability exam in order to become a certified evaluator in the State of Tennessee (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012).

Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations required the use of a rubric that pinpointed key indicators for addressing effective instruction, effective teacher planning strategies, classroom environment, and teacher professionalism (See Appendix A). Teachers have frequent observations, some announced and some unannounced, followed by feedback from evaluators about areas of refinement or what needs improvement in the classroom as well as areas of reinforcement or what is going well in the classroom. Teachers are scored in each indicator with scores ranging from level 1 to level 5. A score of 5 represents the highest scores a teacher can earn while a score of 1 represents the lowest scores a teacher can earn. In addition, educators are provided with professional development based on classroom observations that serve to support and enhance continued professional growth for teachers. Table 1 provides each component of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) rubric and

each indicator scored within that component.

Table 1

*Components of TEAM Evaluation Rubric*

<p>Component: Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Standards and Objectives</li> <li>2. Motivating Students</li> <li>3. Presenting Instructional Content</li> <li>4. Lesson Structure and Pacing</li> <li>5. Activities and Materials</li> <li>6. Questioning</li> <li>7. Academic Feedback</li> <li>8. Grouping Students</li> <li>9. Teacher Content Knowledge</li> <li>10. Teachers Knowledge of Students</li> <li>11. Thinking</li> <li>12. Problem Solving</li> </ol>	<p>Component: Environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expectations</li> <li>2. Managing Student Behavior</li> <li>3. Environment</li> <li>4. Respectful Culture</li> </ol>
<p>Component: Planning</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Instructional Plans</li> <li>2. Student Work</li> <li>3. Assessment</li> </ol>	<p>Component: Professionalism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professional Learning and Growth</li> <li>2. Use of Data</li> <li>3. School and Community Involvement</li> <li>4. Leadership</li> </ol>

(Source: TEAM Evaluation System Handbook, National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, 2011)

Each indicator in the four components of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) rubric contains a list of strategies that determine teacher performance levels ranging from a score of 1 to 5. All scores are combined to make up 50 percent of a teacher's comprehensive evaluation score. (National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, 2011.) Data from classroom observations, student growth and student

achievement are combined to give teachers an overall level of effectiveness as follows:

- 1 – Significantly Below Expectations
- 2 – Below Expectations
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 4 – Above Expectations
- 5 – Significantly Above Expectations

Evaluators give feedback to teachers after each announced or unannounced observation aimed at improving teacher performance in specific areas and promoting professional development to improve the effectiveness of the teacher. (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012)

According to the Tennessee Department of Education (2012), the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation system had many successes and many challenges in year 1 of implementation. Some of the successes included an improvement in student achievement. Test scores improved at a faster rate than in any previous year during the 2011-2012 school year. In addition, many educators earned high marks in the first year of implementation, though the department did share that we must continue to aim for higher accuracy in our evaluations. Some of the early challenges to the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) included educator fears and communication issues in regards to informing educators fully about the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) process (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012).

## Research Behind TEAM Framework: TAP

The Tennessee Department of Education partnered with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) and used the The System of Teacher and Student Advancement's (TAP) qualitative process for teacher observations based on 10 years of available research (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b). TAP was developed in 1999 and continues to serve thousands of teachers, student and schools across the United States. Teachers working under the TAP model are evaluated multiple times each year. Qualitative data from classroom observations combined with student achievement growth data to provide a clear picture of teacher effectiveness. Based on data from TAP schools, research shows that:

- TAP teacher evaluations provide differentiated feedback on teacher performance
- TAP classroom evaluations are aligned with value-added student achievement scores
- TAP teachers become more effective over time
- TAP schools show higher retention of effective teachers, and higher turnover of less effective teachers (National Institute of Excellence in Teaching, 2011, p. 81)

TAP found that when evaluation systems are well designed and implemented in multidimensional ways, student learning and teacher improvement would occur. In addition to classroom observations and student performance outcomes, TAP focused on pairing teacher evaluation with appropriate job-embedded professional development in a teacher's specific areas identified for improvement. TAP also tied teacher evaluation to performance-based compensation. TAP's major focus was on producing



rapid academic growth towards rigorous academic standards for students while closing achievement gaps (National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, 2014). The Tennessee Department of Education wanted to replicate these practices when designing and implementing their evaluation model (Tennessee Department of Education, (n.d. b)

### Research Findings for TEAM

Multiple research studies have been conducted on issues related to the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) used in the State of Tennessee. Davis (2014) examined the relationship between overall Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) observation ratings for teachers and the growth score they received from Tennessee's standardized testing results. His findings revealed a weak positive relationship between the teacher growth score or Level of Effectiveness and the teacher's overall Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) observation score. He found statistical significance that teachers who held professional teaching licenses earned higher evaluation scores than teachers who held apprentice teaching licenses. In addition, Davis found that administrators with 11 or more years of experience tended to give higher observation scores to teachers. Davis's findings support findings from the Tennessee Department of Education (2012) regarding the need to complete in depth training with both teachers and evaluators in relation to accuracy in using the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) rubrics and evaluations.

Bryant (2013) examined the perceptions of school principals in relation to the Tennessee Education Acceleration Model (TEAM). She found that school principals

held positive perceptions of the impact Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations had on effective professional growth for teachers. The experience of the principal was not significant in their perceived abilities to implement Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) observations adequately. Bryant also found that principals perceived many positive values associated with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Some positive values included student achievement increases, professional development guidance, instructional leadership support, and enhanced communication among teachers.

Bogart (2013), examined teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation and classroom practice in Northeast Tennessee. He found no significant difference in teacher perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) and the prior evaluation system used in the State of Tennessee. He did find significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of planning processes under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) and the prior evaluation system used in Tennessee. Teachers perceived the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) required a more detailed process. Bogart also found that teachers perceived significant differences in the instructional strategies used in planning lessons for the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). In addition, teachers perceived a significant difference in the time required to plan lessons with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) versus the prior evaluation model. Bogart found that teachers perceived the time spent on planning lessons increased by more than 10 minutes.

## Summary

Chapter 2 provides a review of the related literature including an overview of teacher evaluation, a review of legislative directives that have impacted teacher evaluation, an overview of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) utilized as the main evaluation framework for the state, a review of effective teaching and a review of professional development for teachers.

Since the creation of No Child Left Behind in 2001 schools, districts and state departments of education have undergone vast changes in teacher evaluation (Darling-Hammond, 2014). Newly developed and implemented models of teacher evaluation looked at multiple data sources including student performance data, classroom observation data and in some cases portfolio development and student survey data (Toch, 2016).

Teacher evaluations served two main purposes: determining teacher competence or summative performance and guiding formative professional development needs for teachers (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Rogers & Weems, 2010). The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) was utilized to meet the purposes of teacher evaluation in Tennessee (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012). The model examined student performance data as well as classroom observation data to determine a rating of 1 through 5 for Tennessee teachers, with 1 representing teachers who are below expectations and 5 representing teachers who are above expectations.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH METHOD

The purpose of this quantitative study was to analyze the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. Specifically, this research examined the perceived changes in instructional strategies utilized by teachers, the perceived changes in teacher planning practices and lesson preparation, the perceived changes in professional development activities attended by the teacher and the perceived impact of teacher evaluation and feedback on teacher effectiveness. Chapter 3 is an overview of the design of the research, research questions, null hypotheses, population surveyed, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, and a chapter summary.

#### Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

The following questions were used to guide the nonexperimental quantitative research design:

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Ho1: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho2: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree.

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Ho3: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

Research Question 4: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho4: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree.

Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Ho5: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of

experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

Research Question 6: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho6: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Research Question 7: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Ho7: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

Research Questions 8: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho8: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree.

### Population and Sample

The population of this study included approximately 650 Pre K through 8th grade teachers from two school districts in Northeast Tennessee. One district is a county

school system comprised of approximately 450 teachers, while the second district is a city school system with approximately 200 teachers. Permission was requested to seek participation from all teachers evaluated under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model in the two participating school districts. Permission was granted by the Director of Schools or a designee in each school district. The TEAM Teacher Survey was completed by 161 teachers in the two districts surveyed.

### Instrumentation

A survey instrument was developed by the researcher based on the literature reviewed (Appendix B). The survey was distributed electronically through SurveyMonkey. The survey contained 20 declarative statements and asked for responses based on a 6 point Likert-type scale with 1 representing strongly disagree, 2 representing disagree, 3 representing somewhat disagree, 4 representing somewhat agree, 5 representing agree and 6 representing strongly agree. Demographic data were collected to insure that teachers have been evaluated under TEAM for at least one evaluation cycle. Survey items addressed four dimensions: instructional strategies, teacher planning, teacher effectiveness and professional development.

Validity of the survey was established by expert review prior to data collection. The researcher vetted the survey through the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis department at East Tennessee State University with purposefully-selected, currently-practicing Tennessee teachers. The survey was developed to yield quantitative data. Teachers in participating districts were selected because of the requirement for using the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluation

rubrics.

### Data Collection

Permission was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of East Tennessee State University before any research began. Approval was obtained from the Director of Schools for each of the school districts surveyed. Data were collected through an electronic survey. Survey links were emailed to all teachers in two school districts regardless of content area taught. Only teachers who have been evaluated under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model for at least one evaluation cycle were used for data comparisons. Participation in the survey was completely anonymous. Data collected were analyzed to determine significance.

### Data Analysis

Nonexperimental quantitative methodology utilizing a survey instrument to collect data was used for this research. All data were analyzed using IBM-SPSS to test for significance. Data collected for each research question were analyzed with a one-way Anova. The one-way ANOVA test assessed whether the means on a dependent variable are different among groups (Green & Salkind, 2010). In this study the one-way ANOVA was used to analyze the means between teacher experience groups and teacher degree levels.

### Summary

For this research the researcher used a nonexperimental, quantitative research design with a survey instrument for data collection. Teachers were surveyed for their perceptions of the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional practices, teacher planning, professional



development and teacher effectiveness. The survey instrument provided opportunity for teacher opinions and perceptions of those surveyed to be analyzed through statistical means.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

The purpose of this quantitative study was to analyze the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. The population of this study was 650 PK-12 public school teachers from two school districts in Northeast Tennessee. A survey was sent electronically to all teachers in the selected districts. The survey was completely anonymous so no records were collected to determine how many survey responses were collected from each district.

In this chapter data were presented and analyzed to answer eight research questions and eight null hypotheses. Data were analyzed from a 20 item survey measured on a 6-point Likert scale. Survey items 1-5 addressed the instructional strategies dimension, items 6-10 addressed the teacher planning dimension, items 11-15 addressed the teacher effectiveness dimension and items 16-20 addressed the professional development dimension. Data were collected through an online survey format using Google Forms. The survey was distributed two times and obtained a return rate of 25% for a total of 161 participants.

In this study 650 PK-12 public school teachers from two Northeast Tennessee school districts were asked to participate in a survey. The survey began with two demographic questions. These demographics included the years of teaching experience of the teacher as well as the degree level of the teacher. Results indicated

that 22.4% of respondents had taught from 1-5 years, 25.6% of respondents had taught from 6-10 years, and 51.9% of respondents had taught from 11 or more years. In terms of respondents, 40% held a bachelor's degree, 42.5 % held a master's degree and 17.5% held a post master's degree. Table 2 details the respondent's years of experience and Table 3 details the degree levels of the respondents.

Table 2

*Distribution of Survey Respondents by Years of Experience*

Years of Experience	% of Respondents	Total # of Respondents
1-5	21.88	35
6-10	26.25	42
11 or more	50.63	81

Table 3

*Distribution of Survey Respondents by Degree Level*

Degree Level	% of Respondents	Total # of Respondents
Bachelor's Degree	40.00	64
Master's Degree	42.50	68
Post Master's Degree	17.50	28

Research Question 1

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the

instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Ho1: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey and the years of experience of the teacher. The factor variable, years of experience, included 3 levels: 1-5 years experience, 6-10 years experience and 11 or more years experience. The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 1 (Instructional Strategies) of the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey (questions 1-5). The ANOVA was not significant,  $F(2, 155) = 2.23, p = .111$ . Therefore, Ho1 was retained. The strength of the relationship between instructional strategies and years of experience, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was .03. The results indicated reported instructional strategies were not significantly related to the years of experience of the teacher. The means and standard deviations for the three groups are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

*Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 1)*

Years of Experience	N	M	SD
1-5 Years	35	22.51	5.28
6-10 Years	42	22.86	4.35
11 or More Years	81	21.04	5.20

## Research Question 2

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho2: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the instructional strategies dimension of the teacher perception survey and the degree level of the teacher. The factor variable, degree level, included 3 levels: bachelor's degree, master's degree and post-master's degree. The dependent variable was the mean score Dimension 1 (Instructional Strategies) of the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey (questions 1-5). The ANOVA was not significant,  $F(2, 155) = 2.57, p = .080$ . Therefore, Ho2 was retained. The strength of the relationship between instructional strategies and degree level, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was .03. The results indicated reported instructional strategies were not significantly related to the degree level of the teacher. The means and standard deviations for the three groups are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

*Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 1)*

Degree Level	N	M	SD
Bachelor's Degree	64	22.55	5.19
Master's Degree	66	20.79	5.25
Post Master's Degree	28	22.75	3.75

Research Question 3

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Ho3: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey and the years of experience of the teacher. The factor variable, years of experience, included 3 levels: 1-5 years experience, 6-10 years experience and 11 or more years experience. The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 2 (Teacher Planning) of the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey (questions 6-10). The ANOVA was not significant,  $F(2, 153) = 1.53, p = .221$ . Therefore, Ho3 was retained. The strength of the relationship between teacher planning and years of experience, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was .02. The results indicated reported teacher planning was not significantly related to

the years of experience of the teacher. The means and standard deviations for the three groups are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

*Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 2)*

Years of Experience	N	M	SD
1-5 Years	35	22.97	3.79
6-10 Years	40	21.80	4.67
11 or More Years	81	21.41	4.56

Research Question 4

Research Question 4: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho4: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the teacher planning dimension of the teacher perception survey and the degree level of the teacher. The factor variable, degree level, included 3 levels: bachelor's degree, master's degree and post-master's degree. The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 2 (Teacher Planning) of the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey (questions 6-10). The ANOVA was not significant,  $F(2, 153) = 2.26$ ,

$p = .108$ . Therefore,  $H_04$  was retained. The strength of the relationship between instructional strategies and degree level, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was .03. The results indicated reported teacher planning was not significantly related to the degree level of the teacher. The means and standard deviations for the three groups are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

*Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 2)*

Degree Level	N	M	SD
Bachelor's Degree	64	22.73	4.12
Master's Degree	66	21.11	4.41
Post Master's Degree	28	21.62	5.08

#### Research Question 5

Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

$H_05$ : There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey and the years of experience of the teacher. The factor variable, years of



experience, included three levels: 1-5 years experience, 6-10 years experience and 11 or more years experience. The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 3 (Teacher Effectiveness) of the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey. The ANOVA was significant,  $F(2, 153) = 3.37, p = .037$ . Therefore,  $H_0$  was rejected. The mean scores on Dimension 3 for the three years of experience groups were not similar. Effect size assessed by  $\eta^2$  was .04. Because the overall  $F$  test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise difference among the means of the three groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference ( $p = .033$ ) in the means between teachers with 1-5 years experience and teachers with 11 or more years experience. However, there were no other statistically significant pairwise differences between the other experience groups. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

*Means, Standard Deviations, and 95% Confidence Intervals for 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 3)*

Years of Experience	N	M	SD	1-5 years	11 or More Years
1-5 Years	35	21.37	5.85		.20 to 5.99
6-10 Years	41	19.85	5.16	-4.81 to 1.77	
11 or More Years	80	18.28	6.51	-5.99 to -.20	

### Research Question 6

Research Question 6: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho6: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the teacher effectiveness dimension of the teacher perception survey and the degree level of the teacher. The factor variable, degree level, included 3 levels: bachelor's degree, master's degree and post-master's degree. The dependent variable was Dimension 3 (Teacher Effectiveness) on the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey (questions 11-15). The ANOVA was not significant,  $F(2, 153) = 2.93, p = .056$ . Therefore, Ho6 was retained. The strength of the relationship between instructional strategies and degree level, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was .04. The results indicated reported teacher effectiveness was not significantly related to the degree level of the teacher. The means and standard deviations for the three groups are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

*Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 3)*

Degree Level	N	M	SD
Bachelor's Degree	62	20.37	5.85
Master's Degree	66	18.02	6.47
Post Master's Degree	28	20.43	5.44

Research Question 7

Research Question 7: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years)?

Ho7: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey among teachers in three years of experience groups (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 or more years).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey and the years of experience of the teacher. The factor variable, years of experience, included three levels: 1-5 years experience, 6-10 years experience and 11 or more years experience. The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 4 (Professional Development) of the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey (questions 16-20). The ANOVA was significant,  $F(2, 155) = 3.10, p = .048$ . Therefore, Ho7 was rejected. The mean scores on Dimension 4 for the three years of experience groups were not similar. Effect size assessed by  $\eta^2$  was .04. Because the overall  $F$  test was

significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise difference among the means of the three groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference ( $p = .042$ ) in the means between teachers with 1-5 years experience and teachers with 11 or more years experience. However, there were no other statistically significant pairwise differences between the other experience groups. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

*Means, Standard Deviations, and 95% Confidence Intervals for 3 Years of Experience Groups (Dimension 4)*

Years of Experience	N	M	SD	1-5 years	11 or More Years
1-5 Years	34	21.53	5.54		-.05 to 5.01
6-10 Years	43	20.63	5.22	-3.74 to 1.94	
11 or More Years	81	19.05	5.11	-5.01 to .05	

#### Research Question 8

Research Questions 8: Is there a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree?

Ho8: There is not a significant difference in mean scores on the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey between teachers with a bachelor's degree, master's degree or post-master's degree.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the professional development dimension of the teacher perception survey and the degree level of the teacher. The factor variable, degree level, included 3 levels: bachelor's degree, master's degree and post-master's degree. The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 4 (Professional Development) of the TEAM Teacher Perception Survey (questions 16-20). The ANOVA was not significant,  $F(2, 155) = 2.20, p = .114$ . Therefore,  $H_0$  was retained. The strength of the relationship between professional development and degree level, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was .03. The results indicated reported professional development was not significantly related to the degree level of the teacher. The means and standard deviations for the three groups are reported in Table 11.

Table 11

*Means and Standard Deviations of 3 Degree Levels (Dimension 4)*

Degree Level	N	M	SD
Bachelor's Degree	63	20.57	5.63
Master's Degree	67	19.01	5.04
Post Master's Degree	28	21.14	4.94

### Summary

In this chapter data obtained from PK-8 teacher participants were presented and analyzed. There were 8 research questions and eight corresponding null hypotheses. Results for Research Questions 1 and 2 indicated there was no significant difference in

the instructional strategies dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey in relation to years of teacher experience or degree level. Results for Research Questions 3 and 4 indicated there was no significant difference in the teacher planning dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey in relation to years of teacher experience or degree level. Research Question 5 indicated there was a significant difference in the teacher effectiveness dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey among teacher with 1-5 years of experience and teachers with 11 or more years experience. Research Question 6 revealed no significant difference in the teacher effectiveness dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey in relation to degree level. Research Question 7 indicated there was a significant difference in the professional development dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey among teachers with 1-5 years of experience and teachers with 11 or more years experience. Research Question 8 indicated there was no significant difference in the professional development dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey in relation to degree level of the teacher.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter contains the findings, conclusions and recommendations for readers who may use the results of this study as a resource when developing, reviewing and revising teacher evaluation models. The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. This study was conducted using data retrieved from surveys completed by participating teachers in two Northeast Tennessee School Districts. Data from 161 respondents was analyzed to determine significance.

#### Summary

The statistical analysis reported in this study was based on eight research questions presented in Chapters 1 and 3. Each research question had one corresponding null hypothesis. Each research question was analyzed using a one-way ANOVA. The total number of PK-8 teacher participants in the study was 161. The level of significance used in each test was .05. Findings indicated there was no significant difference in the instructional strategies or teacher planning dimensions of the TEAM Teacher Survey in relationship to years of experience or degree level. Respondents' perceptions of teacher effectiveness were not significant in relation to degree level, but they were significant in relation to years of experience. Teachers with 11 or more years

experience produced a mean score of 18.28 while teachers with 0-5 years experience produced a mean score of 21.37. The professional development dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey was not significant in relation to degree level but was significant in relation to years of experience. Teachers with 11 or more years experience produced a mean score of 19.05 while teachers with 1-5 years experience had a mean score of 21.53.

### Conclusions

The purpose of this quantitative study was to analyze the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. Specifically, this research assessed the relationship between years of experience and degree level as it related to teacher perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) instructional strategies, teacher planning practices, professional development and teacher effectiveness.

The following conclusions were based upon the findings from the data of this study:

1. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggested no significant difference was found in the mean scores of the instructional strategies dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey based on years experience of the teacher. Teachers with 1-5 years experience had a mean score of 22.51, teachers with 6-10 years experience had a mean score of 22.86 and teachers with 11 or more years experience had a mean score of 21.04. Each experience group's perceptions



revealed they agreed that instructional strategies had changed and improved since implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Questions related to the overall perception of the instructional strategies dimension of the TEAM teacher survey were specific to the following aspects: change in instructional strategies used, improved questioning abilities, improved feedback to students, and improved used of assessment as an instructional strategy. These findings support previous research from the National Institute for Excellence in teaching (2014) that found student achievement and teacher performance improved when comprehensive, multi-dimensional evaluation models were implemented. Darling-Hammond (2014) shared that comprehensive evaluation systems must have the goal of improving the quality of teaching. Teachers who participated in this survey perceived improvements in their teaching strategies since implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).

2. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggested no significant difference was found in the mean scores of the instructional strategies dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey based on degree level of the teacher. Teachers with 1-5 years experience had a mean score of 22.55, teachers with 6-10 years experience had a mean score of 20.79 and teachers with 11 or more years experience had a mean score of 22.75. Each degree group's perceptions revealed they agreed that instructional strategies had changed and improved since implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Questions related to the overall perception of the instructional strategies dimension of the TEAM teacher

survey were specific to the following aspects: change in instructional strategies used, improved questioning abilities, improved feedback to students, and improved use of assessment as an instructional strategy. These findings support previous research from the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (2014) that found student achievement and teacher performance improved when comprehensive, multi-dimensional evaluation models were implemented.

Darling-Hammond (2014) shared that comprehensive evaluation systems must have the goal of improving the quality of teaching. Teachers who participated in this survey perceived improvements in their teaching strategies since implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).

3. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggest no significant difference was found in the mean scores of the teacher planning dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey based on years experience of the teacher. Teachers with 1-5 years experience had a mean score of 22.97, teachers with 6-10 years experience had a mean score of 21.80 and teachers with 11 or more years experience had a mean score of 21.41. Each experience group's perceptions revealed they agreed that teacher planning practices had changed since implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Teachers in the 1-5 year experience group earned the highest mean score in perceived changes to planning practices indicating they had strong opinions about the changes to their planning practices. Questions related to the overall perception of the teacher planning dimension of the TEAM teacher survey were specific to the following aspects: increased planning time, utilizing the TEAM rubric in daily planning, creation of more

detailed lesson plans, use of assessment data in planning, and increased focus on student work and outcomes. These findings support previous research from Bogart (2014) who found significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of planning processes under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) and the prior evaluation system used in Tennessee. Teachers perceived the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) required a more detailed process. Bogart also found that teachers perceived significant differences in the instructional strategies used in planning lessons for the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). In addition, teachers perceived a significant difference in the time required to plan lessons with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) versus the prior evaluation model. Bogart found that teachers perceived the time spent on planning lessons increased by more than 10 minutes. Regardless of experience, teachers in this study agreed that perceived changes to their planning practices had occurred since the implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).

4. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggest no significant difference was found in the mean scores of the teacher planning dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey based on degree level of the teacher. Teachers with 1-5 years experience had a mean score of 22.73, teachers with 6-10 years experience had a mean score of 21.11 and teachers with 11 or more years experience had a mean score of 21.62. Each degree group's perceptions revealed they agreed that teacher planning practices had changed since implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Teachers in the 1-5 year experience group earned

the highest mean score in perceived changes to planning practices indicating they had strong opinions about the changes to their planning practices.

Questions related to the overall perception of the teacher planning dimension of the TEAM teacher survey were specific to the following aspects: increased planning time, utilizing the TEAM rubric in daily planning, creation of more detailed lesson plans, use of assessment data in planning, and increased focus on student work and outcomes. These findings support previous research from Bogart (2014) that found significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of planning processes under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) and the prior evaluation system used in Tennessee. Teachers perceived the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) required a more detailed process. Bogart also found that teachers perceived significant differences in the instructional strategies used in planning lessons for the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). In addition, teachers perceived a significant difference in the time required to plan lessons with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) versus the prior evaluation model. Bogart reported that teachers perceived the time spent on planning lessons increased by more than 10 minutes. Regardless of experience, teachers in this study agreed that perceived changes to their planning practices had occurred since the implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).

5. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggested significant difference was found in the mean scores of the teacher effectiveness dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey among teachers in the 1-5 years of experience group and teachers in the

11 or more years of experience group. Teachers with 1-5 years experience had a mean score of 21.37 while teachers with 11 or more years experience had a mean score of 18.28. The mean score for teachers with 1-5 years experience indicated they agreed that teacher effectiveness was impacted by the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Teachers with 11 or more years experience indicated they somewhat agreed that the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) had impacted teacher effectiveness. Questions related to the overall perception of the teacher effectiveness dimension of the TEAM teacher survey were specific to the following aspects: accurate measurement of teaching ability, improvements in teaching quality resulting from implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), improvements in student learning resulting from implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), and increased focus on standards and objectives under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) framework. These findings for teachers in the 1-5 years experience group support previous research from Bryant (2013) who found principals perceived many positive values associated with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Some of the positive values she identified included student achievement increases, professional development guidance, instructional leadership support, and enhanced communication among teachers. Darling-Hammond (2014) found that evaluation systems that focus on results from one test combined with occasional classroom observations were not helpful in promoting quality teaching. This research aligns with the opinions of teachers in

the 11 or more years experience group.

6. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggested no significant difference was found in the mean scores of the teacher effectiveness dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey based on degree level of the teacher. Teachers with a bachelor's degree had a mean score of 20.37, teachers with a master's degree had a mean score of 18.02 and teachers with a post-master's degree had a mean score of 20.43. These results indicated teachers with a bachelors' degree and teachers with a post-master's degree agreed that the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) accurately assessed their teaching ability and led to improvements in teaching and learning. Teachers with a master's degree somewhat agreed that team accurately assessed their teaching ability and led to improvements in teaching and learning. Questions related to the overall perception of the teacher effectiveness dimension of the TEAM teacher survey were specific to the following aspects: accurate measurement of teaching ability, improvements in teaching quality resulting from implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), improvements in student learning resulting from implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), and increased focus on standards and objectives under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) framework. These findings for teachers with a bachelor's degree and teachers with a post-master's degree support previous research from Bryant (2013) who found principals perceived many positive values associated with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Some of the positive values she identified included student achievement

increases, professional development guidance, instructional leadership support, and enhanced communication among teachers. Darling-Hammond (2014) found that evaluation systems that focus on results from one test combined with occasional classroom observations were not helpful in promoting quality teaching. This research aligns with the opinions of teachers in the master's degree group.

7. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggested significant difference was found in the mean scores of the professional development dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey among teachers in the 1-5 years of experience group and teachers in the 11 or more years of experience group. Teachers with 1-5 years experience had a mean score of 21.53 while teachers with 11 or more years experience had a mean score of 19.05. The mean score for teachers with 1-5 years experience indicated they agreed that professional development was impacted by the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Teachers with 11 or more years experience indicated they somewhat agreed that the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) had impacted professional development for teachers. Questions related to the overall perception of the professional development dimension of the TEAM teacher survey were specific to the following aspects: the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) framework is used to guide selection of professional development activities, refinements from the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) are used to guide professional development, specific suggestions for professional development are received in post conferences, consistent reflection on

Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations is used to guide professional development, and teachers discuss how to best meet the requirements of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). These findings for teachers in the 1-5 years experience group support previous research from Danielson and McGreal (2000) and Rogers and Weems (2010) who shared that informing professional development is one main purpose of teacher evaluations. Research from Darling-Hammond indicated that supports needed to foster professional development were not in place. This research supports the opinions of teachers with 11 or more years experience in their belief that professional development is not significantly impacted by Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations.

8. The results of a one-way ANOVA suggested no significant difference was found in the mean scores of the professional development dimension of the TEAM Teacher Survey based on degree level of the teacher. Teachers with a bachelor's degree had a mean score of 20.57, teachers with a master's degree had a mean score of 19.01 and teachers with a post-master's degree had a mean score of 21.14. These results indicated teachers with a bachelors' degree and teacher with a post-master's degree agreed that professional development was impacted by the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Teachers with a master's degree indicated they somewhat agreed that the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) had impacted professional development for teachers. Questions related to the overall perception of the professional development dimension of the TEAM teacher survey were specific



to the following aspects: the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) framework is used to guide selection of professional development activities, refinements from the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) are used to guide professional development, specific suggestions for professional development are received in post conferences, consistent reflection on Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations is used to guide professional development, and teachers discuss how to best meet the requirements of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). These findings for teachers with a bachelor's degree and teachers with a post-master's degree support previous research from Danielson and McGreal (2000) and Rogers and Weems (2010) who shared that informing professional development is one main purpose of teacher evaluations. Research from Darling-Hammond (2014) indicated that supports needed to foster professional development were not in place. This research supports the opinions of teachers with a master's degree in their belief that professional development is not significantly impacted by Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations.

### Recommendations for Practice

The findings and conclusions of this research established a foundation for the following recommendations for the State Department of Education, school districts, school personnel and PK-8 teachers evaluated under the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) framework:

1. Teachers who participated in this study, regardless of years of experience or

degree level, agreed that instructional strategies have changed and improved since implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). It is recommended that district and school administrators capitalize on these changes by forming collaborative communities where teachers share instructional strategies that best meet the needs of students while also meeting the expectations of the TEAM rubrics. Collaborative professional learning communities provide all teachers with avenues for improvement of the instructional strategies used in their classrooms (Danielson, 2011b).

2. Teachers who participated in this study, regardless of years of experience or degree level, agreed that planning practices have changed since implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). It is recommended that district and school administrators identify these perceived changes and determine if they are significantly impacting classroom instruction and student achievement. Collaborative conversations concerning planning practices and the creation of effective lessons and strategies can build capacity among teachers of all ability levels. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (2011) shared that teachers need time to collaborate and develop an in-depth understanding of their curriculum and desired student outcomes. Providing time for collaborative conversations around planning practices can support teachers in increasing effective planning practices.
3. Some teachers surveyed only somewhat agreed that the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) had impacted teacher effectiveness. Taylor and Tyler (2012) shared that providing teachers with increased knowledge of effective

teaching practices should be a byproduct of teacher evaluation systems. It is recommended that state, district and school administrators continue to discuss with teachers specifically how and why the indicators in the TEAM rubrics are effective practices for successful instruction. These discussions or trainings could help gain buy-in from teachers who are unsure of utilizing TEAM indicators to increase teacher effectiveness.

4. Some teachers surveyed only somewhat agreed that the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) impacted professional development. Rogers and Weems (2010) shared that guiding professional development for teachers should serve as one of the main purposes for teacher evaluation. State, district and school administrators should revisit the process utilized to drive professional development for teachers in relation to Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations.
5. It is recommended that evaluators receive additional training in providing clear, high quality and specific feedback to experienced and highly effective teachers. Teachers with less than 11 years experience agreed that the TEAM process had a positive impact on teacher effectiveness and professional development while teachers with 11 or more years experience only somewhat agreed that the TEAM process had impacted teacher effectiveness and professional development. Improved feedback from administrators should help veteran and highly effective teachers find increased value in TEAM evaluations that provide specific feedback and opportunities for continued growth.

## Recommendations for Future Research

The following are recommendations for future research which may add to the body of research on teacher evaluation and more specifically the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) framework in the State of Tennessee:

1. This study could be replicated in other regions of Tennessee in order to provide more extensive data collections and determine if the findings in this study remain true for a different or larger sample.
2. Replicating this study with a qualitative design could provide greater details of teacher perceptions in relation to the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).
3. Conducting a similar study with administrators or other educators involved in executing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) would help determine if the findings in this study hold true for a broad group of educators.
4. This study included teachers from one county and one city school system. Replicating this study in only county districts or only city districts could provide additional insight into teacher perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).
5. Expanding this study to evaluate teacher perceptions in Title I versus non-Title I could provide additional insight into teacher perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).
6. A study to compare student achievement changes across the state since implementing the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) could help determine the impact of a changed evaluation model.

Teacher evaluation plays a vital role in education across the state of Tennessee. Changes implemented throughout the last decade have impacted the process for performing teacher evaluations. This study examined the perceptions of Pre K through 8 teachers about the impact the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) had on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. Continued research on the topics mentioned above will add to the existing body of knowledge and assist with continued improvement to teacher evaluation practices.

## REFERENCES

- Aldeman, C., & Chuong, C. (2014). Teacher Evaluations in an Era of Rapid Change: From "Unsatisfactory" to "Needs Improvement". *Bellwether Education Partners*.
- Aspen Institute. (2011, March). Building teacher evaluation systems: Learning from leading efforts. Retrieved October 1, 2017 from <http://www.aspendri.org/portal/browse/DocumentDetail?documentId=557&download>
- Ballou, D., & Springer, M. G. (2015). Using student test scores to measure teacher performance: Some problems in the design and implementation of evaluation systems. *Educational Researcher*, 44(2), 77-86.
- Berry, B. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Highly qualified teachers for all. *Educational Leadership*, 64(3). Retrieved June 12, 2016 from <http://www.csun.edu/~krowlands/Content/SED610/NCLB/NCLB from 2007/highly qualified teachers.pdf>
- Bogart, C. D. (2013). Teacher evaluation and classroom practice: Teacher perceptions in northeast Tennessee- a dissertation. (Doctoral Dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 2013). Retrieved August 7, 2017 from <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1177>
- Bryant, C. B., (2013). *Perceptions of Tennessee school principals about the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)- a dissertation*. (Doctoral Dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 2013). Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1120>
- Cherasaro, T. L., Brodersen, R. M., Reale, M. L., & Yanoski, D. C. (2016). Teachers' Responses to Feedback from Evaluators: What Feedback Characteristics Matter? REL 2017-190. *Regional Educational Laboratory Central*.
- Connally, K., & Tooley, M. (2016). Beyond Ratings: Re-Envisioning State Teacher Evaluation Systems as Tools for Professional Growth. *New America*.
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Ascd.
- Danielson, C. (2011a). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. ASCD.
- Danielson, C. (2011b). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational leadership*, 68(4), 35-39.
- Danielson, C. (2016). Charlotte Danielson on rethinking teacher evaluation. *Education Week*, 35(28), 20-24.

- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. *Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council.*
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi delta kappan*, 76(8), 597.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8-15.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). One piece of the whole: Teacher evaluation as part of a comprehensive system for teaching and learning. *American Educator*, 38(1), 4.
- Davis, J. B. (2014). *The relationship between the growth score and the overall TEAM observation rating for teachers in Tennessee- a dissertation.* (Doctoral Dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 2014). Retrieved August 9, 2017 from <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2432>
- Ferguson, K. (2013). Organizing for professional learning communities: embedding professional learning during the school day. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 142, 50-68.
- Goodwin, B. (2010). *Changing the odds for student success: What matters most.* Denver, CO: McREL International.
- Goe, L., & Stickler, L. M. (2008). Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: Making the Most of Recent Research. TQ Research & Policy Brief. *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.*
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data.* Prentice Hall Press.
- Hoaglund, A., Birkenfeld, K., & Box, J. (2014). Professional learning communities: Creating a foundation for collaboration skills in pre-service teachers. *Education*, 134(4), 521-528.
- Hughes-Hassell, S., Brasfield, A., & Dupree, D. (2012). Making the most of professional learning communities. *Knowledge Quest*, 41(2), 30-37.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction.* Ascd.
- Marzano R. J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). Effective supervision supporting the art and science of teaching. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.
- Marzano, R. J. (2012). Teacher Evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 14-19.

- McCabe, M. (2011). Issues A-Z: Teacher quality. *Education Week*. Retrieved October 20, 2017 from <https://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/teacher-quality/index.html>
- McWalters, P., & Stumbo, C. (2011). Measuring Effectiveness: What will it take? *Educational Leadership*, 68(4), 10-15.
- National Institute for Excellence in Teaching. (2011). *Tennessee educator acceleration model evaluation system handbook*. Nashville, TN: Department of Education.
- National Institute for Excellence in Teaching. (2014). TAP research summary examining the evidence and impact of TAP: The system for teacher and student advancement. Retrieved October 29, 2017 from <http://www.niet.org/assets/Publications/tap-research-summary-0314.pdf>
- Reform Support Network. (2012). Transition to TEAM first year reflections on implementing a new teacher evaluation system in Tennessee. Retrieved August 27, 2016 from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/tle-sap-tn.pdf>
- Rogers, C. B. H., & Weems, D. M. (2010). Are US teachers making the grade? A proposed framework for teacher evaluation and professional growth. *Management in Education*, 24(1), 19-24. doi:10.1177/0892020609354959
- Rutherford, M. (2013). *The artisan teacher: A field guide to skillful teaching*. Rutherford Learning Group.
- Sartain, L., Stoelinga, S. R., Brown, E. R., Matsko, K. K., Miller, F. K., Durwood, C. E., & Glazer, D. (2011). Rethinking teacher evaluation in Chicago. *Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research*.
- Schachter, R. (2012). Brave New World of Teacher Evaluation. *District Administration*, 48(10), 43-47.
- Smylie, M. A. (2014). Teacher Evaluation and the Problem of Professional Development. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 26(2).
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2016). State actions to advance teacher evaluation. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2017). Evaluator training: A guide for states. Atlanta, GA: Author.



- Tennessee State Board of Education. (2017). 5.201 Teacher and principal evaluation policy. Retrieved October 1, 2017 from [https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/5.201\\_Teacher\\_Principal\\_Evaluation\\_Policy\\_7-28-17.pdf](https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/stateboardofeducation/documents/5.201_Teacher_Principal_Evaluation_Policy_7-28-17.pdf)
- Tennessee Department of Education. (n.d.a). <http://team-tn.org/data/tvaas/>
- Tennessee Department of Education. (n.d.b). TEAM Tennessee educator acceleration model teacher evaluation. Retrieved October 29, 2017 from <http://team-tn.org/evaluation/teacher-evaluation/>
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2012). Teacher evaluation in Tennessee: a report on year 1 implementation. Retrieved August 27, 2016 from <http://team-tn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Year-1-Evaluation-Report-TNDOE.pdf>
- Thessin, R. (2015). Learning from one urban school district: planning to provide essential supports for teachers' work in professional learning communities. *Educational Planning* 22(1), 15-27.
- Toch, T. (2016). A report on teacher evaluation reform in public education. Retrieved October 1, 2017 from [https://www.future-ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/TeacherEval\\_170105\\_v2.pdf](https://www.future-ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/TeacherEval_170105_v2.pdf)
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2011). Stimulating professional learning through teacher evaluation: An impossible task for the school leader, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2011), 891-899, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2011.02.004
- United States Department of Education. (2009, November). Race to the top program. Retrieved August 4, 2017 from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf>
- United States Department of Education. (2010a). A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act. Retrieved August 4, 2017 from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/blueprint.pdf>
- United States Department of Education. (2010b). Delaware and Tennessee win first to the top grants. Retrieved October 28, 2017 from <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/delaware-and-tennessee-win-first-race-top-grants#page-header>
- United States Department of Education. (2012). Race to the top Tennessee report year 1: school year 2010-2011. Retrieved August 27, 2016 from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/performance/tennessee-year-1.pdf>
- United States Department of Education. (n.d.). <https://www.ed.gov/esea>




Wallace Foundation. (2013, January). The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning. Retrieved July 15, 2016, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning-2nd-Ed.pdf>

# APPENDICES

## Appendix A



### TEAM Rubrics

#### General Educator Rubric: Instruction

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)
<b>Standards and Objectives</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All learning objectives are clearly and explicitly communicated, connected to state standards, and referenced throughout lesson.</li> <li>Sub-objectives are aligned and logically sequenced to the lesson's major objective.</li> <li>Learning objectives are: (a) consistently connected to what students have previously learned, (b) known from life experiences, and (c) integrated with other disciplines.</li> <li>Expectations for student performance are clear, demanding, and high.</li> <li>There is evidence that most students demonstrate mastery of the daily objective that supports significant progress towards mastery of a standard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most learning objectives are communicated, connected to state standards, and referenced throughout lesson.</li> <li>Sub-objectives are mostly aligned to the lesson's major objective.</li> <li>Learning objectives are connected to what students have previously learned.</li> <li>Expectations for student performance are clear.</li> <li>There is evidence that most students demonstrate mastery of the daily objective that supports significant progress towards mastery of a standard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few learning objectives are communicated, connected to state standards, and referenced throughout lesson.</li> <li>Sub-objectives are inconsistently aligned to the lesson's major objective.</li> <li>Learning objectives are rarely connected to what students have previously learned.</li> <li>Expectations for student performance are vague.</li> <li>There is evidence that few students demonstrate mastery of the daily objective that supports significant progress towards mastery of a standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Motivating Students</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher consistently organizes the content so that it is personally meaningful and relevant to students.</li> <li>The teacher consistently develops learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration are valued.</li> <li>The teacher regularly reinforces and rewards effort.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher sometimes organizes the content so that it is personally meaningful and relevant to students.</li> <li>The teacher sometimes develops learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration are valued.</li> <li>The teacher sometimes reinforces and rewards effort.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher rarely organizes the content so that it is personally meaningful and relevant to students.</li> <li>The teacher rarely develops learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration are valued.</li> <li>The teacher rarely reinforces and rewards effort.</li> </ul>
<b>Presenting Instructional Content</b>  	<p>Presentation of content always includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visuals that establish the purpose of the lesson, preview the organization of the lesson, and include internal summaries of the lesson;</li> <li>examples, illustrations, analogies, and labels for new concepts and ideas;</li> <li>effective modeling of thinking process by the teacher and/or students guided by the teacher to demonstrate performance expectations;</li> <li>concise communication;</li> <li>logical sequencing and segmenting;</li> <li>all essential information; and</li> <li>no irrelevant, confusing, or non-essential information.</li> </ul>	<p>Presentation of content most of the time includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visuals that establish the purpose of the lesson, preview the organization of the lesson, and include internal summaries of the lesson;</li> <li>examples, illustrations, analogies, and labels for new concepts and ideas;</li> <li>modeling by the teacher to demonstrate performance expectations;</li> <li>concise communication;</li> <li>logical sequencing and segmenting;</li> <li>all essential information; and</li> <li>no irrelevant, confusing, or non-essential information.</li> </ul>	<p>Presentation of content rarely includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visuals that establish the purpose of the lesson, preview the organization of the lesson, and include internal summaries of the lesson;</li> <li>examples, illustrations, analogies, and labels for new concepts and ideas;</li> <li>modeling by the teacher to demonstrate performance expectations;</li> <li>concise communication;</li> <li>logical sequencing and segmenting;</li> <li>all essential information; and</li> <li>relevant, coherent, or essential information.</li> </ul>

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)

**General Educator Rubric: Instruction**

	<b>Significantly Above Expectations (5)</b>	<b>At Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Significantly Below Expectations (1)</b>
<b>Lesson Structure and Pacing</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lesson starts promptly.</li> <li>The lesson's structure is coherent, with a beginning, middle, and end.</li> <li>The lesson includes time for reflection.</li> <li>Pacing is brisk and provides many opportunities for individual students who progress at different learning rates.</li> <li>Routines for distributing materials are seamless.</li> <li>No instructional time is lost during transitions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lesson starts promptly.</li> <li>The lesson's structure is coherent, with a beginning, middle, and end.</li> <li>Pacing is appropriate and sometimes provides opportunities for students who progress at different learning rates.</li> <li>Routines for distributing materials are efficient.</li> <li>Little instructional time is lost during transitions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lesson does not start promptly.</li> <li>The lesson has a structure, but it may be missing closure or introductory elements.</li> <li>Pacing is appropriate for less than half of the students and rarely provides opportunities for students who progress at different learning rates.</li> <li>Routines for distributing materials are inefficient.</li> <li>Considerable time is lost during transitions.</li> </ul>
<b>Activities and Materials</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities and materials include all of the following:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support the lesson objectives,</li> <li>are challenging,</li> <li>sustain students' attention,</li> <li>elicit a variety of thinking,</li> <li>provide time for reflection,</li> <li>are relevant to students' lives,</li> <li>provide opportunities for student-to-student interaction,</li> <li>induce student curiosity and suspense,</li> <li>provide students with choices,</li> <li>incorporate multimedia and technology, and</li> <li>incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts (e.g., teacher-made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> <li>In addition, sometimes activities are game-like, involve simulations, require creating products, and demand self-direction and self-monitoring.</li> <li>The preponderance of activities demand complex thinking and analysis.</li> <li>Texts and tasks are appropriately complex.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities and materials include most of the following:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support the lesson objectives,</li> <li>are challenging,</li> <li>sustain students' attention,</li> <li>elicit a variety of thinking;</li> <li>provide time for reflection,</li> <li>are relevant to students' lives,</li> <li>provide opportunities for student-to-student interaction,</li> <li>induce student curiosity and suspense;</li> <li>provide students with choices,</li> <li>incorporate multimedia and technology, and</li> <li>incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts (e.g., teacher-made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Texts and tasks are appropriately complex.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities and materials include few of the following:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support the lesson objectives,</li> <li>are challenging,</li> <li>sustain students' attention,</li> <li>elicit a variety of thinking,</li> <li>provide time for reflection,</li> <li>are relevant to students' lives,</li> <li>provide opportunities for student to student interaction,</li> <li>induce student curiosity and suspense,</li> <li>provide students with choices,</li> <li>incorporate multimedia and technology, and</li> <li>incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts (e.g., teacher made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)




General Educator Rubric: Instruction

	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)
<p><b>Questioning</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto;"></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher questions are varied and high quality, providing a balanced mix of question types:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ knowledge and comprehension,</li> <li>○ application and analysis, and</li> <li>○ creation and evaluation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questions require students to regularly cite evidence throughout lesson.</li> <li>• Questions are consistently purposeful and coherent.</li> <li>• A high frequency of questions is asked.</li> <li>• Questions are consistently sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.</li> <li>• Questions regularly require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, written and shared responses, or group and individual answers).</li> <li>• Wait time (3-5 seconds) is consistently provided.</li> <li>• The teacher calls on volunteers and non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on ability and sex.</li> <li>• Students generate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning.</li> <li>• Questions regularly assess and advance student understanding.</li> <li>• When text is involved, majority of questions are text-based.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher questions are varied and high quality providing for some, but not all, question types:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ knowledge and comprehension,</li> <li>○ application and analysis, and</li> <li>○ creation and evaluation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questions usually require students to cite evidence.</li> <li>• Questions are usually purposeful and coherent.</li> <li>• A moderate frequency of questions asked.</li> <li>• Questions are sometimes sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.</li> <li>• Questions sometimes require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers).</li> <li>• Wait time is sometimes provided.</li> <li>• The teacher calls on volunteers and non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on ability and sex.</li> <li>• When text is involved, majority of questions are text-based.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher questions are inconsistent in quality and include few question types:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ knowledge and comprehension,</li> <li>○ application and analysis, and</li> <li>○ creation and evaluation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questions are random and lack coherence.</li> <li>• A low frequency of questions is asked.</li> <li>• Questions are rarely sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.</li> <li>• Questions rarely require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers).</li> <li>• Wait time is inconsistently provided.</li> <li>• The teacher mostly calls on volunteers and high-ability students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Academic Feedback</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto;"></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oral and written feedback is consistently academically focused, frequent, high quality and references expectations.</li> <li>• Feedback is frequently given during guided practice and homework review.</li> <li>• The teacher circulates to prompt student thinking, assess each student's progress, and provide individual feedback.</li> <li>• Feedback from students is regularly used to monitor and adjust instruction.</li> <li>• Teacher engages students in giving specific and high-quality feedback to one another.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oral and written feedback is mostly academically focused, frequent, and mostly high quality.</li> <li>• Feedback is sometimes given during guided practice and homework review.</li> <li>• The teacher circulates during instructional activities to support engagement, and monitor student work.</li> <li>• Feedback from students is sometimes used to monitor and adjust instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quality and timeliness of feedback is inconsistent.</li> <li>• Feedback is rarely given during guided practice and homework review.</li> <li>• The teacher circulates during instructional activities but monitors mostly behavior.</li> <li>• Feedback from students is rarely used to monitor or adjust instruction.</li> </ul>

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)





**General Educator Rubric: Instruction**

	<b>Significantly Above Expectations (5)</b>	<b>At Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Significantly Below Expectations (1)</b>
<b>Grouping Students</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole-class, small groups, pairs, individual; heterogeneous or homogenous ability) consistently maximize student understanding and learning efficiency.</li> <li>All students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.</li> <li>All students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.</li> <li>Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) to best accomplish the goals of the lesson.</li> <li>Instructional groups facilitate opportunities for students to set goals, reflect on, and evaluate their learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, individual; heterogeneous or homogenous ability) adequately enhance student understanding and learning efficiency.</li> <li>Most students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.</li> <li>Most students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.</li> <li>Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) most of the time to best accomplish the goals of the lesson.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The instructional grouping arrangements (either whole-class, small groups, pairs, individual; heterogeneous or homogenous ability) inhibit student understanding and learning efficiency.</li> <li>Few students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.</li> <li>Few students participating in groups are held accountable for group work and individual work.</li> <li>Instructional group composition remains unchanged irrespective of the learning and instructional goals of a lesson.</li> </ul>
<b>Teacher Content Knowledge</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher displays extensive content knowledge of all the subjects she or he teaches.</li> <li>Teacher regularly implements a variety of subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.</li> <li>The teacher regularly highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.</li> <li>Limited content is taught in sufficient depth to allow for the development of understanding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher displays accurate content knowledge of all the subjects he or she teaches.</li> <li>Teacher sometimes implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.</li> <li>The teacher sometimes highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher displays under-developed content knowledge in several subject areas.</li> <li>Teacher rarely implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.</li> <li>Teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas in the discipline and therefore presents content in a disconnected manner.</li> </ul>
<b>Teacher Knowledge of Students</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher practices display understanding of each student's anticipated learning difficulties.</li> <li>Teacher practices regularly incorporate student interests and cultural heritage.</li> <li>Teacher regularly provides differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure children have the opportunity to master what is being taught.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher practices display understanding of some student anticipated learning difficulties.</li> <li>Teacher practices sometimes incorporate student interests and cultural heritage.</li> <li>Teacher sometimes provides differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure children have the opportunity to master what is being taught.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher practices demonstrate minimal knowledge of students anticipated learning difficulties.</li> <li>Teacher practices rarely incorporate student interests or cultural heritage.</li> <li>Teacher practices demonstrate little differentiation of instructional methods or content.</li> </ul>




(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)

**General Educator Rubric: Instruction**

	<b>Significantly Above Expectations (5)</b>	<b>At Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Significantly Below Expectations (1)</b>
<p><b>Thinking</b></p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher thoroughly teaches two or more types of thinking:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analytical thinking, where students analyze, compare and contrast, and evaluate and explain information;</li> <li>practical thinking, where students use, apply, and implement what they learn in real-life scenarios;</li> <li>creative thinking, where students create, design, imagine, and suppose; and</li> <li>research-based thinking, where students explore and review a variety of ideas, models, and solutions to problems.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The teacher provides opportunities where students:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>generate a variety of ideas and alternatives,</li> <li>analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints, and</li> <li>monitor their thinking to insure that they understand what they are learning, are attending to critical information, and are aware of the learning strategies that they are using and why.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher thoroughly teaches one or more types of thinking:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analytical thinking, where students analyze, compare and contrast, and evaluate and explain information;</li> <li>practical thinking, where students use, apply, and implement what they learn in real-life scenarios;</li> <li>creative thinking, where students create, design, imagine, and suppose; and</li> <li>research-based thinking, where students explore and review a variety of ideas, models, and solutions to problems.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The teacher provides opportunities where students:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>generate a variety of ideas and alternatives, and</li> <li>analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher implements no learning experiences that thoroughly teach any type of thinking.</li> <li>The teacher provides no opportunities where students:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>generate a variety of ideas and alternatives, or</li> <li>analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Problem-Solving</b></p> 	<p>The teacher implements activities that teach and reinforce three or more of the following problem-solving types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstraction</li> <li>Categorization</li> <li>Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solutions</li> <li>Predicting Outcomes</li> <li>Observing and Experimenting</li> <li>Improving Solutions</li> <li>Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information</li> <li>Generating Ideas</li> <li>Creating and Designing</li> </ul>	<p>The teacher implements activities that teach two of the following problem-solving types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstraction</li> <li>Categorization</li> <li>Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solution</li> <li>Predicting Outcomes</li> <li>Observing and Experimenting</li> <li>Improving Solutions</li> <li>Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information</li> <li>Generating Ideas</li> <li>Creating and Designing</li> </ul>	<p>The teacher implements no activities that teach the following problem-solving types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstraction</li> <li>Categorization</li> <li>Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solution</li> <li>Predicting Outcomes</li> <li>Observing and Experimenting</li> <li>Improving Solutions</li> <li>Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information</li> <li>Generating Ideas</li> <li>Creating and Designing</li> </ul>

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)

## General Educator Rubric: Planning





	Significantly Above Expectations (5)	At Expectations (3)	Significantly Below Expectations (1)
<b>Instructional Plans</b>  	Instructional plans include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>measurable and explicit goals aligned to state content standards;</li> <li>activities, materials, and assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are aligned to state standards,</li> <li>are sequenced from basic to complex,</li> <li>build on prior student knowledge, are relevant to students' lives, and integrate other disciplines, and</li> <li>provide appropriate time for student work, student reflection, and lesson unit and closure;</li> </ul> </li> <li>evidence that plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, and interests of all learners; and</li> <li>evidence that the plan provides regular opportunities to accommodate individual student needs.</li> </ul>	Instructional plans include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>goals aligned to state content standards,</li> <li>activities, materials, and assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are aligned to state standards,</li> <li>are sequenced from basic to complex,</li> <li>build on prior student knowledge, and</li> <li>provide appropriate time for student work, and lesson and unit closure;</li> </ul> </li> <li>evidence that plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, and interests of most learners; and</li> <li>evidence that the plan provides some opportunities to accommodate individual student needs.</li> </ul>	Instructional plans include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>few goals aligned to state content standards,</li> <li>activities, materials, and assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are rarely aligned to state standards,</li> <li>are rarely logically sequenced,</li> <li>rarely build on prior student knowledge, and</li> <li>inconsistently provide time for student work, and lesson and unit closure; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>little evidence that the plan provides some opportunities to accommodate individual student needs.</li> </ul>
<b>Student Work</b>  	Assignments require students to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>organize, interpret, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information rather than reproduce it,</li> <li>draw conclusions, make generalizations, and produce arguments that are supported through extended writing, and</li> <li>connect what they are learning to experiences, observations, feelings, or situations significant in their daily lives both inside and outside of school.</li> </ul>	Assignments require students to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>interpret information rather than reproduce it,</li> <li>draw conclusions and support them through writing, and</li> <li>connect what they are learning to prior learning and some life experiences.</li> </ul>	Assignments require students to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mostly reproduce information,</li> <li>rarely draw conclusions and support them through writing, and</li> <li>rarely connect what they are learning to prior learning or life experiences.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>  	Assessment plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are aligned with state content standards;</li> <li>have clear measurement criteria;</li> <li>measure student performance in more than three ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test);</li> <li>require extended written tasks;</li> <li>are portfolio based with clear illustrations of student progress toward state content standards; and</li> <li>include descriptions of how assessment results will be used to inform future instruction.</li> </ul>	Assessment plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are aligned with state content standards;</li> <li>have measurement criteria;</li> <li>measure student performance in more than two ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test);</li> <li>require written tasks; and</li> <li>include performance checks throughout the school year.</li> </ul>	Assessment plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are rarely aligned with state content standards;</li> <li>have ambiguous measurement criteria;</li> <li>measure student performance in less than two ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test); and</li> <li>include performance checks, although the purpose of these checks is not clear.</li> </ul>

6

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)






**General Educator Rubric: Environment**

	<b>Significantly Above Expectations (5)</b>	<b>At Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Significantly Below Expectations (1)</b>
<b>Expectations</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher sets high and demanding academic expectations for every student.</li> <li>Teacher encourages students to learn from mistakes.</li> <li>Teacher creates learning opportunities where all students can experience success.</li> <li>Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.</li> <li>Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and demands better performance from every student.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher sets high and demanding academic expectations for every student.</li> <li>Teacher encourages students to learn from mistakes.</li> <li>Teacher creates learning opportunities where most students can experience success.</li> <li>Students complete their work according to teacher expectations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher expectations are not sufficiently high for every student.</li> <li>Teacher creates an environment where mistakes and failure are not viewed as learning experiences.</li> <li>Students demonstrate little or no pride in the quality of their work.</li> </ul>
<b>Managing Student Behavior</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students are consistently well behaved and on task.</li> <li>Teacher and students establish clear rules for learning and behavior.</li> <li>The teacher overlooks inconsequential behavior.</li> <li>The teacher deals with students who have caused disruptions rather than the entire class.</li> <li>The teacher attends to disruptions quickly and firmly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students are mostly well behaved and on task, some minor learning disruptions may occur.</li> <li>Teacher establishes rules for learning and behavior.</li> <li>The teacher uses some techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences, to maintain appropriate student behavior.</li> <li>The teacher overlooks some inconsequential behavior, but at other times, stops the lesson to address it.</li> <li>The teacher deals with students who have caused disruptions, yet sometimes he or she addresses the entire class.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students are not well behaved and are often off task.</li> <li>Teacher establishes few rules for learning and behavior.</li> <li>The teacher uses few techniques to maintain appropriate student behavior.</li> <li>The teacher cannot distinguish between inconsequential behavior and inappropriate behavior.</li> <li>Disruptions frequently interrupt instruction.</li> </ul>
<b>Environment</b>  	<p>The classroom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>welcomes all members and guests,</li> <li>is organized and understandable to all students,</li> <li>supplies, equipment, and resources are all easily and readily accessible,</li> <li>displays student work that frequently changes, and</li> <li>is arranged to promote individual and group learning.</li> </ul>	<p>The classroom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>welcomes most members and guests,</li> <li>is organized and understandable to most students,</li> <li>supplies, equipment, and resources are accessible,</li> <li>displays student work, and</li> <li>is arranged to promote individual and group learning.</li> </ul>	<p>The classroom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is somewhat cold and unwelcoming,</li> <li>is not well organized and understandable to students,</li> <li>supplies, equipment, and resources are difficult to access,</li> <li>does not display student work, and</li> <li>is not arranged to promote group learning.</li> </ul>
<b>Respectful Culture</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect for one another.</li> <li>Students exhibit caring and respect for one another.</li> <li>Positive relationships and interdependence characterize the classroom.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher-student interactions are generally friendly, but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, or disregard for students' cultures.</li> <li>Students exhibit respect for the teacher and are generally polite to each other.</li> <li>Teacher is sometimes receptive to the interests and opinions of students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher-student interactions are sometimes authoritarian, negative, or inappropriate.</li> <li>Students exhibit disrespect for the teacher.</li> <li>Student interaction is characterized by conflict, sarcasm, or put-downs.</li> <li>Teacher is not receptive to interests and opinions of students.</li> </ul>

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)


**Professionalism Rubric**

	<b>Significantly Above Expectations (5)</b>	<b>At Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Significantly Below Expectations (1)</b>
<b>Professional Growth and Learning</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses feedback from observations and self-assessment to significantly improve performance in identified areas of need</li> <li>• Consistently prepared and highly engaged in professional learning opportunities</li> <li>• Engages in evaluation process with eagerness by seeking out feedback from both supervisors and colleagues</li> <li>• Consistently self-reflects on evidence of instruction, accurately matching evidence to the rubric in both areas of strength and areas of growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses feedback from observations and self-assessment to implement and reflect on personal improvement strategies</li> <li>• Prepared and engaged in professional learning opportunities</li> <li>• Engages in evaluation process with evidence of focus on improving practice and openness to feedback</li> <li>• Self-reflections on evidence on instruction largely match the expectations of the rubric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistently uses feedback from observations to improve and demonstrates little evidence of growth on targeted indicators</li> <li>• Unprepared or disengaged in professional learning opportunities provided</li> <li>• Engages in evaluation process without evidence of focus on continuous improvement of practice.</li> <li>• Self-reflections do not match the expectations of the rubric or assessment of the evaluator</li> </ul>
<b>Use of Data</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematically and consistently utilizes formative and summative school and individual student achievement data to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Analyze the strengths and weaknesses of all his/her students,</li> <li>◦ Plan, implement, and assess instructional strategies to increase student achievement and decrease achievement gaps between subgroups of students</li> <li>◦ Plan future instructional units based on the analysis of his/her students' work</li> <li>◦ Reflect on use of instructional strategies that led or impeded student learning</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilizes student achievement data to address strengths and weaknesses of students and guide instructional decisions to increase student achievement</li> <li>• Analyzes student work to guide planning of instructional units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rarely utilizes student achievement data to address strengths and weaknesses of students to guide instructional decisions related to student achievement</li> </ul>
<b>School and Community Involvement</b>  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly organizes and leads school activities and events that positively impact school results and culture</li> <li>• Always adheres to school and district personnel policies and serves as a leader and model for others</li> <li>• Regularly works with peers to contribute to a safe and orderly learning environment and actively facilitates improvement in school-wide culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly supports and contributes to school activities and events</li> <li>• Regularly adheres to school and district personnel policies</li> <li>• Regularly works with peers to contribute to a safe and orderly learning environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rarely supports school activities and events.</li> <li>• Inconsistently adheres to school and district personnel policies</li> <li>• Rarely works with peers to contribute to a safe and orderly learning environment</li> </ul>

Updated 4.2016 | 20

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)

**Professionalism Rubric**

	<b>Significantly Above Expectations (5)</b>	<b>At Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Significantly Below Expectations (1)</b>
<b>Leadership</b>  	Actively and consistently contributes to the school community by assisting and/or mentoring others, including successful engagement in three or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborative planning with subject and/or grade level teams</li> <li>• Actively leading in a professional learning community</li> <li>• Coaching/mentoring</li> <li>• Supervising clinical experiences</li> <li>• Leading data-driven professional opportunities</li> </ul>	Contributes to the school community by assisting others, including at least two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborative planning with subject and/or grade level teams,</li> <li>• Actively participating in a professional learning community,</li> <li>• Coaching/mentoring</li> <li>• Supervising clinical experiences</li> </ul>	Inconsistently contributes to the school community by assisting and/or mentoring others

Updated 4.2016 | 21

(Tennessee Department of Education, n.d. b.)

# Appendix B

## Survey

3/5/2018

TEAM Teacher Survey for PK-8th Teachers

### TEAM Teacher Survey for PK-8th Teachers

Dear Participant:

My name is Kelley Harrell and I am a student at East Tennessee State University. I am working on my doctorate in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis. In order to finish my studies, I need to complete a research project. The name of my research study is Teacher Perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).

The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of Pre K through 8th grade Tennessee teachers about the impact of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) evaluations on classroom instructional strategies, teacher planning, professional development and teacher effectiveness. I would like to give a brief online survey to Pre K through 8th grade teachers using Googleforms. It should only take about 5 minutes to complete the survey. You will be asked questions about your experience with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Since this study deals with teacher perceptions, there are no foreseeable risks. This survey will allow you to express yourself about your experiences with TEAM. This study may benefit you or others by adding to the body of knowledge concerning teacher evaluations.

Your confidentiality will be protected as best we can. Since we are using technology no guarantees can be made about the interception of data sent over the Internet by any third parties, just like with emails. We will make every effort to make sure that your name is not linked with your answers. Googleforms has security features that will be used to prohibit the collection of any identifiable information. Although your rights and privacy will be protected, the East Tennessee State University (ETSU) Institutional Review Board (IRB) (for non-medical research), Kelley Harrell and Dr. Virginia Foley can view the study records. Again, no identifiable data will be collected to link you with your survey answers.

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may decide not to take part in this study. You can quit at any time. You can exit the online survey form if you want to stop completely. If you quit or decide not to take part, the benefits or treatment that you would otherwise get will not be changed.

If you have any research-related questions or problems, you may contact me, Kelley Harrell, at 423-767-4100. I am working on this project together with my advisor, Dr. Virginia Foley. You may reach her at 423-439-7615. Also, you may call the chairperson of the IRB at ETSU at 423-439-6054 if you have questions about your rights as a research subject. If you have any questions or concerns about the research and want to talk to someone who is not with the research team or if you cannot reach the research team, you may call an IRB Coordinator at 423-439-6055 or 423-439-6002.

Sincerely,  
Kelley Harrell

\* Required

1. **Clicking the AGREE button below indicates: • I have read the above information • I agree to volunteer • I am at least 18 years old • I am currently a teacher in grades Pre K through 8th \***  
*Mark only one oval.*

I AGREE  
 I DO NOT AGREE *Stop filling out this form.*

2. **How many years have you been teaching including this school year? \***

\_\_\_\_\_

**3. What is your highest level of education? \***

*Mark only one oval.*

- Bachelors Degree
- Graduate Degree in Progress
- Masters Degree
- Post Masters Degree

Please rate your feelings on the following statements as they apply to your experiences. Select the answer that best corresponds to your feelings with 1 being Strongly Disagree and 5 being Strongly Agree.



## 4. Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The instructional strategies used in my classroom have changed since implementing the TEAM framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TEAM has a positive impact on the instructional strategies I use.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have improved my questioning abilities since implementing the TEAM framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have improved the feedback I give to students since implementing the TEAM framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student assessment as an instructional strategy has increased since implementing the TEAM framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The TEAM framework requires increased planning time for weekly lesson plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The TEAM rubrics guide my daily planning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The lesson plans I create are more detailed since implementing the TEAM framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student assessment data as referenced in the TEAM framework guides my planning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I focus more on student work and student outcomes since implementing the TEAM framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The TEAM evaluation framework allows my evaluator(s) to collect an accurate picture of my teaching ability.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The TEAM evaluation framework accurately assesses my teaching ability.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The TEAM evaluation process has led to improvements in my teaching quality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## TEAM Teacher Survey for PK-8th Teachers

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The TEAM evaluation process has led to improvements in student learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Standards and objectives have become more important in my teaching since implementing the TEAM framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The TEAM evaluation framework helps guide my professional development activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The TEAM refinement area provided by my evaluator guides my professional development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I receive specific suggestions for professional learning from my TEAM evaluation post conferences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I consistently reflect on my TEAM evaluations and seek professional learning opportunities to assist in my areas of need.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teachers discuss how to best meet the requirements of the evaluation framework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

VITA

KELLEY RENEE HARRELL

Education: B.S. Interdisciplinary Studies, East Tennessee State University,  
Johnson City, Tennessee 2003

M.A. K-12 Master of Science in Teaching, Tusculum College,  
Greeneville, Tennessee 2004

Ed. S. Administration and Supervision, Lincoln Memorial University,  
Harrogate, Tennessee 2007

Ed. D. Educational Leadership, East Tennessee State University,  
Johnson City, TN 2018

Professional  
Experience: Principal, Ridgeview Elementary School, 2016-present  
Washington County Schools, Tennessee

Principal, Boones Creek Elementary, 2014-2016  
Washington County Schools, Tennessee

Assistant Principal, Boones Creek Middle School, 2009-2014  
Washington County Schools, Tennessee

Assistant Principal, Boones Creek Elementary School, 2009-2013  
Washington County Schools, Tennessee

Middle School Teacher, West View Elementary, 2003-2009  
Washington County Schools, Tennessee