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ABSTRACT

EXAMINING NOVICE TEACHER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE CLINICAL SUPERVISION PROCESS: A PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH

By

Chad L. Daloia

May 2009

Dissertation Supervised by Dr. James E. Henderson

The first clinical supervision experience can significantly impact a novice teacher’s overall success during the early years of their teaching career (Robinson, 1998). It is a very stressful, challenging time, and for many, it is the first time he/she is asked to take on multiple roles aside from direct instruction and professional responsibilities (Sykes, 1996). As districts work to better align policies and induction programs with the changing needs of novice teachers, they must face the fact that they serve powerful roles as teacher educators, mentors, and retainers. It is important for administrators to self-assess how districts are meeting or failing to meet these needs (Grossman & Thompson, 2004). Prescriptive mentoring programs cited by Smith and Ingersoll (2004) have failed to meet the mark. This study will attempt to provide thick description of the clinical supervision process through the lens of novice teachers. Utilizing a social learning intervention, novice teachers took part in semi-structured interviews (pre-observation and
post-observation), professional development (intervention), and reflection writing to assist in their development and preparation for the clinical supervision process. Through rich, thick description of the novice teacher’s experience, I intend to shed light on their perceptions, development, and preparation for their first observation within their new district.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Practical Events Leading to the Problem

My theme is that doing research is a similar exercise to going on a voyage of discovery, and that we undertake scholarly studies to make the familiar strange. In [James Elroy]Flecker’s poem [The Golden Journey to Samarkand], merchants, poets and pilgrims set out for Samarkand, each with their own mission. The pilgrims search for knowledge, the merchants for trade, the poets tell stories. Qualitative research involves the same three goals. Researchers seek enlightenment and understanding, tell stories about them, and finally exchange that knowledge for goods – (Delamont, 2002, p. i)

Choice Theory posits that behavior is central to our existence and is driven by five genetically driven needs (Glasser, 1998). The first need, survival, is a need for clothing, food, shelter, safety, and breathing. The other four needs fall under the classification of fundamental psychological; belonging, power, freedom, and fun. When I reflect upon my first teaching experience I quickly realize that many of Glasser’s basic needs were met quickly. I was made to quickly feel a part of the community. I felt loved by the members of the staff, the administration, and the students. I was granted freedom to run my classroom independent and autonomous from the other teachers around me. I was granted options in my physical, emotional, and intellectual development. I also attempted to make learning fun and had a great time in doing so. I found enjoyment in my work. However, I believe power was a psychological need that developed over time. Power is not the display of dominance over another person, but as the inner sense of achievement, accomplishment, pride, importance, and self-esteem (Glasser, 1998). I lacked accomplishment, achievement in my craft, and had not established self-esteem in my
teaching until nearly my third year in the classroom. My destiny was to be a classroom teacher and a football coach for thirty five years and retire happy. However, shortly into my career a long void of dissatisfaction began to fill my soul. I truly believe this was a motivating factor in beginning my work towards a master’s degree in Education. I believe I was attempting to fill that void through degrees and titles rather than through self-efficacy, worthiness, and empowerment.

As a novice teacher, I entered the classroom with high hopes and expectations. I began the voyage of teaching as thoughts of grandeur filled my lesson plan designs; they were directly aligned with district protocol and fashioned in the Madeline Hunter model (Hunter, 1982). I reached all levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy with my variety of questions eloquently outlined on page two of my lesson plan design. I had anticipated students that may finish early and accounted for them through enrichment activities. I noted expected challenges for the different types of learners in my classroom and made accommodations accordingly. Methods for evaluation were specifically laid out and noted as per the lesson plan form for my district. Nothing would catch me off guard on that first day. I was fortunate enough to be hired in a very affluent district in western Pennsylvania. My background is physics and with the need for science teachers, especially those with specific certifications, I was able to narrow my selection process by all the important variables any twenty-three-year old would have: salary. I attended the two-day “herding” of new district hires. We had luncheons, met administrators, and began the induction process. At the time, we were handed countless forms to sign from health care beneficiaries to W-2 forms for tax purposes. We even sat through a 15-minute explanation of the contractually agreed upon lesson plan design form that all district
teachers had to submit every Monday prior to the start of the school day. Mentoring teachers were assigned and I was fortunate to receive a member of my department. He was an experienced, male teacher, and former Vietnam veteran. I remember him as confident, firm, and well respected. As we sat at lunch together he shared three things with me. Paraphrased, I remember it as such: first, do not smile for the first three months; second, get your materials in on time; and, third, never argue with idiots, they will only drag you down to their level and beat you with experience. His laugh still rings in my memory as he said it all with a deep belly laugh. Translated, I can tell you that the advice was sound: classroom management is necessary and one can always lighten on the reins, but it is difficult to get students back if you loosen them too quickly; you are held accountable as a teacher to have lesson plans and necessary paperwork in on time; and, students have experience on you as a novice teacher: be wary of their intentions.

Finally, the rest of the district teachers reported to work for a district wide assembly. All new hires were given a warm welcome as we were paraded across the front of the auditorium. Our bios were displayed via an LCD projector onto the large screen as we stepped forward to be acknowledged. It seemed as though every step was taken to ensure that I felt part of the community. I was even given a personal tutorial on the use of the copying machine. It was an amazing three days.

On my first day in my own classroom, I arrived early and recall being very excited to start my career. Syllabi were copied and ready for distribution, books were stacked neatly by period to be handed out quickly, and note cards were perfectly placed on the top left corner of every desk to collect personal contact information from the students. One by one they entered what would become the greatest classroom to ever be
created, or so I thought. Fifteen minutes into the start of my well rehearsed speech the fire alarm sounded. Students jumped from their seats, I grabbed my grade book and headed for my exit with students closely following. The moral to this experience is simple; it took all of 15 minutes to realize I knew very little about real-world teaching. As the year progressed I had great days and days I have suppressed into the deepest regions of my brain so as to never recall them again. My most terrifying moment in that initial year stemmed from a pending observation. As part of the clinical supervision process, new teachers were evaluated on a list of items ranging from classroom management to instruction, and from planning to professionalism. Although supervision has come a long way in even recent years, the process was quite subjective. I lived through that experience, but realized I knew very little regarding distinguished teaching. Danielson (1996) had established a framework that outlined four levels of performance by teachers. Distinguished, the highest level of performance, is defined as, “teachers at this level are master teachers and make a contribution to the field, both in and outside their school. Their classrooms operate at a qualitatively different level, consisting of a community of learners, with students highly motivated and engaged, and assuming considerable responsibility for their own learning” (Danielson, 1996). The other three categories, unsatisfactory, basic, and proficient, will be defined for clarification at the end of this chapter. My understanding and exposure had been limited with respect to a social learning experience centered around master teaching. Could I recognize it, define it, demonstrate it? I basically worked within my personality and modeled the few teachers I had exposure to through student teaching. I quickly recognized this as an issue. I
discussed this concern with my mentor, administrators, and even a board member. I received three consistent responses: you’re doing well.

Reflecting on the mentoring experience, having been a mentor later in my career, I received exactly what the protocol called for with respect to the mentor/mentee relationship. There was no formal training provided to the mentors. Once you received the highest rating, you were eligible to become a mentor. And your responsibility was to follow a simple, prescriptive checklist to ensure items were covered and that the mentee was prepared. Certainly, my mentor went above and beyond; however, I still felt as though I was learning on my own, through trial and error.

Currently, I hold a master’s degree in Education in Administration, I hold my Superintendent’s Letter of Eligibility, and have been employed as an assistant principal in another western Pennsylvania district while working towards my doctorate in education. As with all masters in administration programs, I completed the coursework, spent time shadowing in different districts, and completed a checklist of internship items to fulfill requirements for the degree. Helpless again, I found nothing in the way of mentoring or guidance. Certainly my building principal was there to answer questions and provide insight, but nothing formal to facilitate leadership. It was another real life example of trial by fire; discipline, observations, curriculum writing, committees, policy revision, grant writing, all flying by at the speed of light.

I had no reservation walking into this process of doctoral work, that I would focus on helping novice teachers. Hoy and Miskel (2005) write, “Knowledge is both a means and an end; more than the product of previous learning; it also guides new learning” (p. 51). My personal experience has greatly influenced the area of research I have chosen to
examine and existing empirical research has guided me beyond the notion of mentoring relationships to dive deeper into the thought processes of novice teachers.

In addition to personal experience it is important to note significant data regarding the state of the field with respect to teaching. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports about 12% of new teachers nationally fail to make it through the first year of teaching. Fifty-one percent leave the profession within five years and more than 60 percent leave within seven years (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). It is evident that some form of assistance is needed to keep new teachers engaged in the profession.

The natural response in most professions including education is to provide the newcomer with a mentor, thus, easing the transition from college student to teacher in the classroom. Smith and Ingersoll (2004) conducted a study to examine the relationship between the induction programs and teacher retention to see if such programs have a lasting, positive effect on beginning teachers. The authors’ justification for the study was a belief that teacher shortages were not a result of a lack of available candidates leaving college, but due to the “revolving door” of teachers leaving the profession in the early years of their careers, years one through five. The findings of this national study showed that 66% of teachers said they worked with a mentor. Of that 66% that worked with mentors, 70% worked with a mentor in their field and 90% reported their mentor was helpful. Astonishingly, 29% of all teachers either left the school they were in or left the field of education altogether (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). It is apparent that just having a mentor does not guarantee success or retention of novice teachers. New teachers are vulnerable and must be helped to understand and to face their weaknesses even when
they do not wish to (Bullough, 2005). A mentor must be more than a warm body showing new teachers where the collate button is located on a photocopier.

Acknowledging my personal experience as a motivational factor in this intended research, and aided by the statistical data support noted in NCES’s (2004) and Smith and Ingersoll’s (2004) studies, I begin to express that real problems exist with novice teachers. Through a statement of the problem and a purpose statement I will begin to narrow the focus of the intended study, thus, leading to four research questions that will drive my study.

**Historical Context**

It was not until the formation of the common school in the late 1830s that supervision became a formal activity. Superintendents were charged with the responsibility of inspecting schools to hold teachers accountable for the curriculum. As cities grew and populations increased so did the number of schools. This dilemma warranted the supervision of teachers to fall to the principals while superintendents worked to maintain the larger picture associated with its growing number of schools within a district. The early twentieth century saw the movement for supervision shift as the United States employed a more scientific management style as seen in its industrial cities, while the European educators approached learning from a child-centered and experienced-based curriculum (Cogan, 1973; Firth & Pajak, 1998; Garman, 1986).

In the second half of the twentieth century the model of clinical supervision moved more closely to the form we currently use and practice today. Cogan and Anderson are credited with the blending of the objective and scientific classroom observation that had an inquiry based concern centered on student learning (Firth &
Pajak, 1998). Then in 1969 Goldhammer provided a five step process that included: pre-observation conference with supervisor and teacher; classroom observation; supervisor’s analysis of notes from the observation; post-observation conference between supervisor and teacher; and, supervisor’s analysis of the post-observation conference (Harris, 1986). For many current-practicing administrators this five-stage process has been reduced to three stages; pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference.

The current debate for clinical supervision still rages on with such notables as Madeline Hunter, Thomas Sergiovanni, and Charlotte Danielson all contributing vastly to the ever-growing body of knowledge regarding best practices. Some argue that the field should be transformed from supervisor to instructional leader where terms such as mentoring, coaching, and professional development are used (Starratt, 2008). While traditionalists whose careers have been devoted to educational research have “opposed relinquishing the concept of supervision” based on the vast history and legal requirements by states to uphold a professional rigor within the field of education (Starratt, 2008). Regardless of the side of the argument you stand, administrators have an obligation to provide new teachers with the tools necessary to become master practitioners of their craft. That obligation will be pursued through a non-prescriptive approach that investigates novice teacher development with regard to the supervision process through Participatory Action Research.

Statement of the Problem

The 2004 NCES study has empirically stated that there is more that needs to be done for new teachers. Simply providing a mentor is not enough. Wood (2005), in her paper entitled “The Importance of Principals: Site Administrators’ Roles in Novice
Teacher Induction,” states, “The impact of principals’ influence on novice teacher success is largely unexplored” (p. 14). In addition, Chris Street (2004) examined how mentors guide newcomers into a professional community of learners. He stated, “Rather than seeking a prescriptive method or program for mentoring new teachers, what may prove helpful is a deeper exploration of the social and cultural learning experiences of new teachers” (Street, 2004, p. 7). It is my intent to explore this social and cultural learning experience with respect to the principal/newcomer relationship through participatory action research.

“Teaching, alone among professions, makes the same demands on novice teachers as on experienced practitioners” (Danielson & McGreal, 2000, p. 5). In the field of education, a teacher with no prior classroom experience is evaluated on the same series of forms as a tenured teacher with 25 years of service in his/her craft (see Appendix Q). Surgeons and attorneys undergo an extensive program before they are permitted to “fly solo” in the operating room or in the halls of justice. Yet, we provide new teachers with ten to fifteen weeks of student teaching and, upon passing their state exams, set them free to lead a classroom. Approximately four to eight weeks into their first year a formal, clinical observation is conducted with the non-tenured teacher. If that rating is found to be unsatisfactory, that teacher can be removed from the district with no teacher union reaction or retaliation to the rating. The problem, as I have observed in my thirteen years, is that very little is done for new teacher hires to examine their thoughts, questions, or concerns regarding the observation process. In addition, even less is done by districts to provide new teachers with the time to learn, through a social learning theory lens, from tenured teachers rated as distinguished educators by the school administrators. Teachers
are often abandoned by their college institutions and are neglected by their school supervisory personnel, who are overburdened with work (Hall, 1982). There currently exists no empirical evidence that novice teachers can detect, identify, recognize, understand, or apply distinguished teaching practices.

**Purpose**

Exploring this topic through a social learning theory lens, a case study, participatory action research (PAR) design will examine the development of novice teachers while undergoing professional development with respect to the clinical supervision process. Based on existing literature, it is my claim that new teachers do not understand distinguished teaching practices due to a lack of exposure to what administrators rate as distinguished teaching in a clinical observation. This specific purpose of this intended research project is to examine novice teacher development in the clinical supervision process through a social learning opportunity. A thick, rich description of these issues may inform the efforts of administrators as they develop meaningful and insightful induction and mentoring programs for their new hires.

**Justification for the Study**

The first clinical supervision experience can significantly impact a novice teacher’s overall success during the early years of their teaching career (Robinson, 1998). It is a very stressful, challenging time, and for many, it is the first time he/she is asked to take on multiple roles aside from direct instruction and professional responsibilities (Sykes, 1996). As districts work to better align policies and induction programs with the changing needs of novice teachers, they must face the fact that they serve powerful roles as teacher educators, mentors, and retainers. It is important to self-assess how districts are
meeting or failing to meet these needs (Grossman & Thompson, 2004). Prescriptive mentoring programs as previously cited by Smith & Ingersoll (2004) have failed to meet the mark. This study will attempt to provide thick description of the clinical supervision process thorough the lens of novice teachers.

*Research Questions*

This study intends to answer the following four questions, using social learning theory and participatory action research:

1. What themes emerge when novice teachers are led through an exercise designed to identify individual value beliefs as a teacher and shared beliefs as a community of practice regarding distinguished teaching practices?
2. How will increasing novice teacher exposure to and explicit instruction on distinguished teaching affect their perception of the supervision process?
3. How will the intervention process affect novice teacher preparation (if any) for the clinical supervision process?
4. What unintended consequences (e.g., teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-facilitator, teacher-to-administrator) or other themes emerged for novice teachers as a result of this process?

*Objectives*

This PAR research study focused on new K-12 teachers in one southwestern Pennsylvania district. The focus was kept narrow, the data will be transformed in a later chapter, and will only be interpreted beyond the facts if a link is clear. The principal objectives of the present study are as follows:
1. Utilize extant literature on social constructivist learning theory, current trends in novice teacher research, administrator role in novice teacher preparation, and teacher induction practices in the state of Pennsylvania, to design a framework for evaluating distinguished teaching through a novice teacher’s lens.

2. Determine initial understandings of novice teachers regarding the clinical supervision process as a baseline for monitoring any changes in those perceptions.

3. Empower novice teachers to identify the qualities of distinguished teaching through a professional development exercise.

4. Identify and discuss those qualities observed by novice teachers upon the completion of a social learning experience.

5. Familiarize teachers, utilizing the Charlotte Danielson model, with the planning, classroom management, instruction, and professional responsibilities required of distinguished teachers to inform novice teacher perceptions of exemplary teaching.

**Anticipated Limitations of the Study**

It is important to acknowledge that although all principals are licensed by their state, they all did not receive the same education related to the clinical observation processes, nor have all principals been exposed to the most current trends related to instructional strategies. This study requires that a formal observation be completed by a licensed administrator in the state of Pennsylvania after the conclusion of the study. The purpose is to share and discuss how the intervention and professional development
affected novice teacher experiences and development with the supervision process. It would be naïve to believe that all principals evaluate in the exact same manner. However, through strong, locally designed practices where administrators all evaluated according to the *Framework for Teaching* by Danielson and McGreal (2000), one could assume that overall ratings would be scored fairly. Also, the time and effort a principal places on the pre-conference, classroom observation, and post conference, as outlined by Danielson and McGreal (2000), could affect the novice teacher’s perception of the clinical supervision process and the principal’s role in this process.

Next, it must be noted, the research design calls for a PAR case study of kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers that have been recently hired by the district. The selection of a site is extremely important for the study, and it is critical in PAR to have rapport and trust with the participants in order to create depth and breadth of data (Tshannen-Moran, 2001). Although not a primary focus, I am hopeful that designing a study that has generalizability (one that can be replicated) could provide thick, rich description to other practitioners interested in novice teacher research within their own districts.

It is important to note my bias with respect to providing assistance to novice teachers in what I consider to be the most important aspect of the administrator’s job: making good teachers great. I intend to conduct relevant research in a district in the local region. My familiarity with current regional trends and long standing in the community will provide valuable insight and rapport with novice teachers, administrators, and school boards.
It is my goal to use an intervention process and professional development activities in order to provide new teachers with the necessary experiences to eventually become experts regarding distinguished teaching practices. Data will be recorded in a variety of ways including transcribed interviews, observations, open dialogue, member checking, and thick, rich description.

**Definitions and Terms**

Based on the broad variation of terms when discussing clinical supervision, it is necessary to create an operational definition for proper context and meaningful discussion (Jackson & Davis, 2000).

- **Community of practice** (often abbreviated as CoP) - The process of social learning that occurs when people who have a common interest in some subject or problem collaborate over an extended period to share ideas, find solutions, and build innovations.

- **Non-prescriptive** - Inquiry approach to understanding teacher perceptions and experiences versus prescriptive methods where a “checklist” approach may be used. (i.e. Mentor/mentee relationships – mentors use a checklist of items to make sure they are “preparing” their mentee for the classroom.)

- Danielson terms for levels of teacher performance:
  - **Distinguished** - Teachers at this level are master teachers and make a contribution to the field, both in and outside their school. Their classrooms operate at a qualitatively different level, consisting of a community of learners, with students highly motivated and engaged, and assuming considerable responsibility for their own learning.
- **Proficient** - The teacher clearly understands the concepts underlying the component and implements it well. Most experienced, capable teachers will regard themselves and be regarded by others as performing at this level.

- **Basic** - The teacher appears to understand the concepts underlying the component and attempts to implement its elements, but implementation is sporadic, intermittent, or otherwise not entirely successful. Additional reading, discussion, visiting classrooms of other teachers, and experience will enable the teacher to become proficient in this area.

- **Unsatisfactory** - The teacher does not yet appear to understand the concepts underlying the component. Working on the fundamental practices associated with the elements will enable the teacher to grow and develop in this area.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

*Introduction*

As an introduction to the literature review section I would like to share an old educational fable paraphrased to connect with my intended study. There was a school of animals with a vast curriculum consisting of running, climbing, flying, and swimming. In this school all the animals took all the courses. The duck was a great swimmer and passed flying class, but was a poor runner. The district required that he stay after school and drop his swimming class where he excelled to practice running. The eagle was viewed as a problem student. No matter how much the instructor would yell the eagle still wouldn’t climb the tree. See the eagle had found his own way to the top and he did it in record time. However, he couldn’t follow directions and was sent to an alternative school for being defiant. The rabbit was a phenomenal runner, but suffered a nervous breakdown and had to drop out of school on account of so much makeup work in swimming. The rabbit was petrified of the water. The squirrel led the climbing class, but his flying teacher made him start his flying lessons from the ground instead of the top of the tree, and he developed injuries from overexertion at the takeoff and began getting C’s in climbing and D’s in running. Each “student” had strengths and weaknesses. However, they were all forced to follow the curriculum without focusing on their strengths and soaring with them. Similar to each district when new teaching candidates are hired. The analogy is as such, districts select the best ducks, rabbits, eagles, and squirrels and force them through a regimented, prescribed induction program never taking the time to view a
novice teacher’s new environments through their lens. This study will attempt to analyze a non-prescriptive approach to one facet of the induction and mentoring program as the participatory action research investigates their perceptions of the clinical supervision process.

The literature review section is intended to cover four critical elements: present claims that are justified in existing literature and provide reasons and warranted evidence to support those claims, known as relevance; to show existing literature is evaluated with regards to gaps in extant research both substantively and methodically, known as synthesis; show that the claims advanced by the research in both practice and scholarship are supported by the literature review, known as significance; and that all arguments are cogent, developed coherently, and demonstrate intellectual rigor/ethical concern for educational practice and scholarship, known as authorship (IDPEL, 2009). Relevance, synthesis, significance, and authorship were developed as part of a six-month research process that was recently developed at Duquesne University to better align the necessary requirements of a successful literature review. The following will provide five areas of literature which have driven the focus of this study; social constructivist theory, current research trends for novice teachers, teacher preparation programs, the state of teacher induction/mentoring programs, and connecting administrators to the development of novice teachers.

Conceptual Framework

“Knowledge of literature will help you judge whether “the research plans go beyond existing findings and may thereby contribute to your field of study” (Glesne, 2006, p.24). Eisenhart (1991) stated that a theoretical framework is “a structure that
guides research by relying on a formal theory” and that it uses a “coherent explanation of certain phenomena and relationships” (p.205) while a conceptual framework is “a skeletal structure of justification, rather than a skeletal structure of explanation” (p. 209). This differentiation allots that the former is more rigidly tied to existing theory while the latter is suited to be more flexible. It is precisely this flexibility that I intend to explore through a designed intervention to create a thick description of experiences and perceptions novice teachers have regarding the supervision process. Maximizing this framework will not only direct the study first by framing the research questions, but by guiding the literature review, research design, data collection, and analysis.

I will use the literature review section as a means of generating the argument that novice teachers have little understanding and application of distinguished teaching. By probing novice teachers perceptions of the clinical supervision process and by providing a non-prescriptive intervention during professional development sessions this study will attempt to span this gap and improve teacher perceptions and, therefore, novice teacher performance in a clinical supervision.

*Social Constructivist Theory*

“Most qualitative researchers adhere to social constructivism or a constructivist paradigm…This paradigm maintains that human beings construct their perceptions of the world, that no one perception is right or more real than another, and that these realities must be seen as wholes rather than divided into discrete variables that are analyzed separately” (Glesne, 2006, p.7). Hoy and Miskel define constructivist theories of learning as “being interested in how individuals make meaning of events and activities; hence, learning is seen as the construction of knowledge” (2005, p.41). Constructivism has been
widely studied and explored (Piaget, 1969; Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1966; Dewey, 1933). Bruning, Schraw, and Ronning, (as cited in Glesne, 2006) see the underlying belief with social constructivism as the learners contribute to meaning and learning through individual and social activity. Glesne established three general explanations of how knowledge is constructed. Table 1 summarizes the three general explanations.
Table 1

**Constructs of Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Directs Knowledge Formation?</th>
<th>Assumptions about Learning and Knowledge</th>
<th>Example theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External World</td>
<td>Knowledge is acquired by constructing a representation of the outside world. Direct teaching, feedback, and explanation affect learning. Knowledge is accurate to the extent that it reflects the “way things really are” in the outside world.</td>
<td>Information processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Processes</td>
<td>Knowledge is constructed by transforming, organizing, and reorganizing previous knowledge. Knowledge is not a mirror of the external world. Exploration and discovery are more important than teaching.</td>
<td>Piaget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both External and Internal Factors</td>
<td>Knowledge is constructed based on social interaction and experience. Knowledge reflects the outside world as filtered through and influenced by culture, language, beliefs, interactions with others, direct teaching, and modeling. Guided discovery, teaching models, and coaching as well as the individual’s prior knowledge, beliefs, and thinking affect learning.</td>
<td>Vygotsky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vygotsky, as cited by Street (2004), developed an alternative to individualistic theories of learning by pioneering sociocultural theory. This theory of learning “takes
into account that human learning and development are intrinsically social and interactive” (Street, 2004, p. 8). Grounded in the work and view of socio-cultural theory, learning and development take place in socially and culturally based context (Palinesar, 1998; Street, 2004). Vygotsky (1999), as cited in Mahn, focused on three central beliefs:

1. phenomena should be examined as part of a developmental process;
2. change does not occur in a linear, evolutionary process
3. transformations take place through the unification of contradictory processes.

In addition, Vygotsky developed his Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). ZPD differentiates between two levels of development: the actual level of development achieved by independent problem solving, and the potential level of development reached with the guidance or collaboration of a more capable peer (Mahn, 1999). It is my belief that the actual level of development of a novice teacher is greatly affected by not only independent learning, but by the potential level of development as cited by Mahn (1999). By providing a connection with a trained evaluator and direct connections with distinguished teachers, as well as other novice teachers, it is believed that such interaction may have an effect on teacher perceptions of the supervision process. As required by this study’s design, each individual teacher will bring a level of independent knowledge, experience, and development, creating an independent level of performance. The intervention process in this study will connect novice teachers with other knowledgeable professionals (i.e., teachers and administrators), thus providing novice teachers with exposure to a potential level of development through the collective competency of a community of practice. This will allow novice teachers to gain new knowledge and provide an opportunity for them to apply that knowledge in their own classrooms.
Lave and Wenger (1991) Vygotsky followers also view learning as a type of social practice. Their concept of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) is based on increased access to performance (Lave & Wenger, 1991). By this standard, new teachers are modeling the ways of being a teacher and are learning the ways of a community of practitioners (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Wenger (1998) defines a Community of Practice (CoP) as follows:

A group of people who (a) have a sustainable history of mutual engagement; (b) negotiate with one another about what they are doing, how they should behave, their relation with a larger institution, and the meanings and artifacts they use; (c) have developed local routines and artifacts to support their work together; (d) know whom to ask when they need help; and (e) introduce into their community new trainees who want to become proficient at their practice (p. 123).

This CoP will be utilized as novice teachers are grouped together and allowed to share information and experiences. Novice teachers will apply all five levels (a-e) of a community of practice throughout the research study.

The role which constructivist and sociocultural approaches have played in educational research have been critical in making significant developments over the past 10 years (Cobb & Yackel, 1996). Cobb and Yackel (1996) have described the importance of moving from limited to full participation as critical to development, supporting the LPP practice that increased performance is linked to access to distinguished teaching. This concept supports the claim that novice teachers need full immersion in distinguished teaching practices. New teachers enter into new environments that require this type of “participation pattern” (Miller, p. 33).
Street (2004) initiated a project entitled “Effective Mentoring in English Education” (EMEE). The study examined 15 experienced teachers and their student teachers in a qualitative study. The use of qualitative methods was selected as a means to gain rich, thick description of specific places, people, and relationships. Street (2004) believed that a vivid picture would emerge with extensive descriptions from the participants about the significant events of their mentoring experiences. During an 18-week process, EMEE provided opportunities for the mentoring pairs to engage in discussion and reflect on how they were growing from the experience. Throughout the research, Street utilized data triangulation via interviews, observations, and artifacts. In doing so, he was able to notice emerging themes in his research. Mentors and student teachers began to engage in positive, challenging, and meaningful conversations. It is important to note that such engagement did not take place in all pairs, but it was viewed as a common theme in most of the pairings. Such findings allowed Street to conclude that examining this dynamic through a non-prescriptive mentor/mentee relationship highlighted the importance of qualitative investigation of novice teachers and the learning that occurs in their development.

Price, O’Donovan, and Rust (2007) utilized a student-based, peer-reviewed assessment process in which the group developed meaning from a learning activity. Price, Donovan, and Rust believed that assessment has a critical and significant influence on student learning behavior and used a social-constructivist perspective which argues that knowledge is shaped and evolves through increasing participation within different CoP (2007, p. 145):
The social-constructivist process model argues that students should be actively engaged with every stage of the assessment process in order that they truly understand the requirements of the process, and the criteria and standards being applied, and should subsequently produce better work.

Although the authors were disappointed with the findings in this study, my intended research follows a similar mindset. For novice teachers to truly understand the clinical supervision process, they must explore, examine, and experience the process through active involvement and association with distinguished teaching. My intended study attempts to provide such enrichment through designed intervention and professional development exercises.

Another Vygotsky disciple, Rogoff, suggests that learning through social transactions between the novice and expert teacher is critical to allowing the newcomers to see themselves as members of a community (1991). “It is through repeated and varied experience in supported routine and challenging situations [that learners] become skilled practitioners in the specific cognitive activities of their communities” (Rogoff, 1991, p. 351). Another closely related premise to Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory is Bandura’s social learning theory. Bandura’s theory emphasizes the importance of observing and modeling the behaviors, attitudes, and emotional reactions of others (1977):

Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do.

Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action (p. 22).
Both Rogoff and Bandura support claims associated with the learning modality intended in this study. In addition, Street (2004) truly summarized the appropriateness of the social constructivist lens when he stated, “the social constructivist view of learning takes into account that human learning and development are intrinsically social and interactive” (p. 8). Based largely on the social constructivist perspective, novice teachers’ association and exposure to distinguished teaching should be seen as inseparable in their development.

Current Research Trends for Novice Teachers

A recent study entitled “The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher” exposed the fact that many new teachers complete their formal education still under- or unprepared for the classroom (Markow & Martin, 2005). This study showed that one-quarter of teachers report that during the first teaching position, they were not prepared to work with students who had varying abilities; one-quarter report that they were not prepared to engage families in supporting their children’s education; and one in five teachers say that they were not prepared to maintain order and discipline in the classroom (Markow & Martin, 2005). These are all attributes that distinguished teachers possess, and these statistics highlight the driving force behind my research claim that novice teachers do not and cannot recognize, understand, or apply distinguished teaching practices without further exposure and training. Current trends in induction and mentoring allow teachers to feel more adept at handling some situations; however, how can one ensure that novice teachers will become active players in providing the content knowledge and instructional strategies that are required to prepare students for graduation? (Markow & Martin, 2005). A thick description of novice teacher experiences
of the clinical supervision process could possibly shed light on the research questions as stated in chapter 1. A look at recent trends in novice teacher research will continue to guide this section.

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, numerous papers, reports, books, and articles flooded the educational scene in the United States and Britain (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Cochran-Smith and Lytle, upon reviews of existing literature, identified five major trends that characterized the United States movement in teacher research in the late 1990s. The trends were categorized as follows:

1. the prominence of teacher research in teacher education, teacher development, and school reform
2. the development of conceptual frameworks and theories of teacher research
3. the dissemination of teacher research beyond the local level
4. the emergence of critique of teacher research and the teacher research movement
5. the transformative potential of teacher research on some aspects of university culture.

The work of these researchers was building on earlier research from the late 1970s and 1980s. During this time, and grounded by research, teachers were now viewed as knowers and thinkers (Atwell, 1987; Bissex & Bullock, 1987; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Wells, 1994). Goswami and Stillman, as cited by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999), produced “a collection of articles on teacher research as an agency for change” (p. 15). In addition, during this same time frame, studies were conducted that would spark the most recent trend in teacher research. Such noted authors as Beyer (1987), Carr and Kemmis (1986), Kemmis and McTaggart (1988), McNiff (1986), and Stenhouse (1983) are noted
for their studies focusing on the social action and social change constructed from the involvement of teachers (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999).

Anderson and Mithener (1994) state, “The big advances in understanding about student learning have not been matched by equivalent advances in understanding about teaching” (p. 36). Additionally, Armour-Thomas added, “the investigation of teachers’ thought processes is an exciting new area in research on teaching, in that the field promises to yield information that may revolutionize the way we traditionally conceived the teaching-learning process” (p. 35). It is this narrative inquiry that I am attempting to investigate, and I hope it will allow me to see “critical, emancipatory, self-empowering experiences [that] can provide new ways for thinking about pre-service and in-service education for teachers” (Beattie, 1995, p. 65).

Fang (1996) believes that once novice teachers are equipped with learning and teaching theories, they need to find ways that allow them to translate their beliefs into effective instructional practice. Carter (1993) adds that investigating these stories told by teachers through their lens “captures more than mathematical formulae ever can. [it captures] the richness and indeterminacy of our experiences as teaches and the complexity of our understandings of what teaching is and how others can be prepared to engage in this profession” (p. 5). Carter (1993) uses “story,” a telling or recounting of a string of events, to capture the thoughts of novice teachers, believing that such stories can inform the work in educational settings. “I come away from this experience convinced that the analysis of story is of central importance to our field as a framework for reorienting our conventional analytical practices and for attacking many of the basic issues of interpretation, meaning, and power we face” (Carter, 1993, p. 11).
This section of the literature review shows that the direction of research is changing with regard to the field of education. Street (2004) addressed the need for additional research regarding novice teacher experiences. This study intends to expand the body of knowledge from the lens of a novice teacher. Kagan (1992) refers to this type of research as learning-to-teach studies and states:

Preservice and first-year teaching appears to constitute a single developmental stage during which novices accomplish three primary tasks: (a) acquire knowledge of pupils; (b) use that knowledge to modify and reconstruct the personal images of self as teacher; and, (c) develop standard procedural routines that integrate classroom management and instruction. In general, preservice programs fail to address these tasks adequately (p. 128).

Although this study will not focus on the pupils’ acquisition of knowledge, it will attempt to provide novice teachers with professional development activities that target the personal images of self as teacher and provide exemplar demonstrations of procedural routines for application in the classroom setting.

Teacher Preparation Programs

To understand the importance of “The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher,” it is important to understand the requirements placed on teacher preparation programs. It must be noted that I do recognize that all teachers in the state of Pennsylvania did not receive their undergraduate degrees from Pennsylvania, but for the purpose of this study, institutions within Pennsylvania were researched in terms of this state’s preparation requirements. Pennsylvania has 93 colleges and universities that offer teacher education programs approved by the Department of Education. For a successful candidate to
receive a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania teaching certificate, they must have met all requirements of the approved preparation program, obtained qualifying scores on the appropriate Praxis tests, and other requirements established by the State Board of Education (PDE, 2007). The State Board of Education was established by the General Assembly, to be the principal administrative regulatory body for elementary/secondary and higher education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania institutions of higher education follow strict standards and specific guidelines for state approval of professional educator programs. The authority for establishing standards and policies for the approval of institutions to recommend candidates for professional educator certification in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is established in Title 22 of the Pennsylvania School Code, Chapter 49 (PDE, 2007). Major program approval reviews are conducted every five years as mandated by Chapter 49 of the PA school Code.

The Specific Professional Educator Program Approval Guidelines were developed by the Division of Teacher Education over a two-year period, beginning in the fall of 1998 (PDE, 2007). On October 7, 2000, Chapter 354, General Standards for the Preparation of Professional Educators, was published as final rule making in the Pennsylvania Bulletin (PDE, 2007). Institutions must now be evaluated and approved by the department to offer specific programs leading to professional educator certification under Chapter 49 (PDE, 2007). The responsibility for developing and implementing the standards, policies, and procedures mandated by Chapters 49 and 354 is assigned to the Bureau of Teacher Certification and Preparation, Division of Teacher Education (PDE, 2007). Students who meet all above mentioned criteria are granted a teaching certificate and are eligible for hire in the state of Pennsylvania. Successfully chosen candidates are
hired by local school boards and are typically placed in an induction program created and
designed by the hiring district.

Reynolds (1995) summarized findings from the Educational Testing Services
(ETS). It was noted that teaching should be in the service of learning. It was found that
when elementary students entering school are placed with beginning teachers new to the
profession, those students run a risk of not learning. This lack of learning comes not from
the students’ inability to learn, but from the lack of proper preparation and education on
the part of the novice teacher (Reynolds, 1995). Reynolds (1995) states that it is critical
to guide “the redesign of professional development programs…as a progression from
novice to accomplished teacher” that must be “grounded in a well-defined conceptual
framework of teaching” (p. 218). This statement further supports the need for such
research that investigates creating framework for portions of the mentoring process as
will be attempted in this study.

The intent of this section is to develop an argument that teacher preparation
programs rarely account, empirically, for the experience first-year teachers encounter
through a social lens, thus strengthening the claim that new teachers do not recognize, nor
do they apply, distinguished teaching practices because this is simply never studied.
College institutions do not provide any support to novice teachers once they leave their
campus. By looking through the lens of a novice teacher and investigating their needs
rather than a prescriptive list of mentor-provided information, this study hopes to provide
a framework that districts can utilize as part of the induction and mentoring programs
specifically targeting clinical supervision preparation.
**Current State of Teacher Induction/Mentoring Programs**

With the high price stakes and accountability measures of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the demands of statewide assessments, and the rigor now placed on the classroom teacher, there is no wonder that teacher turnover rates in the field of education are at an all time high. Nationally, about 12% of new teachers fail to make it through the first year of teaching. Fifty-one percent leave the profession within five years, and more than 60% leave within seven years (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2004). It is evident that some form of assistance is needed to keep new teachers engaged in the profession. When districts utilize induction programs, they can begin to assist a new teacher who is suffering from a feeling of helplessness and place that teacher in a climate where he or she feels supported. Given the complex challenges facing beginning teachers, mentoring is an effective element in teacher induction programs (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Griffin, Winn, Otis-Wilborn, & Kilgore, 2003; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Mentoring has been defined as a “nurturing process in which a skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter’s professional and/or personal development” (Anderson & Shannon, 1988, p. 29). Many empirical articles have been written examining the need for mentoring new teachers (Bolin, 1988; Daloz, 1999; Jonson, 2002; Maynard, 2000; Portner, 2002). By helping increase early-career teachers’ satisfaction and self-confidence, mentoring can help reduce attrition (Whitaker, 2001).

The extant literature to this point has led me to conclude thus far that, after compiling and synthesizing information on the mentor/mentee relationship, (a) poorly
implemented induction programs severely limit the effectiveness and directly affect the retention rates of new teachers; and (b) very little empirical research has been conducted on the importance of the principal’s role in the mentoring process. The Smith and Ingersoll (2004) study noted in chapter 1 reinforces that additional work is needed to improve induction and mentoring programs to ensure a lasting and positive effect. The findings of this national study showed that 66% of teachers said they worked with a mentor. Of that 66%, 70% worked with a mentor in their field, and 90% reported their mentor was helpful. Astonishingly, 29% of all teachers either left the school they were in or left the field of education all together. Smith and Ingersoll concluded that retention of teachers does not rely on simply having a mentor, and their findings support the claim that novice teachers need more than a prescriptive mentoring experience. My research study intends to directly align the administrator with the mentoring process as the lead facilitator in the PAR, and it intends to provide professional development with respect to distinguished teaching practices.

Managing vulnerability is a large part of learning to teach and being effective as a teacher, and so it is with mentoring. In a study that shed light on the process involved for both mentors and interns to simultaneously manage vulnerability and encouraging development, Bullough (2005) found that it was just as important for the mentor to acknowledge vulnerability and cited three “theoretical lenses” that helped explain his data: 1) self-confirmation (wanting to be correct/right), 2) expertise and self-transcendence (moving past being threatened and moving beyond natural abilities), and 3) positioning (having a sense of the real and the good). When a mentor accepts their role
fully, they are able to support the new professionals who must meet the demands of a new position while managing the stresses of a new environment (Gagen & Bowie, 2005).

Additionally from the literature arose the questions of the district’s role in the novice teacher/principal relationship, and how that relationship may affect the evaluation process (Grossman & Thompson, 2004). As districts work to better align policies and induction programs with the changing needs of novice teachers, they must face the fact that they serve powerful roles as teacher educators, mentors, and retainers. It is important to self-assess how districts are meeting or failing to meet these needs (Grossman & Thompson, 2004). Kersten and Israel (2005) question (a) if principals have the time and/or effort for current trends; (b) if there an increase in learning as a result of the time and effort of the evaluation; and, (c) if principals believe that there is a better way to improve teaching and learning. Findings from this study show that the current systems are inordinately time intensive and preclude many other opportunities for school building leaders to work with faculty to improve classroom instruction. Additionally, it is evident that teachers’ perceptions of the appraiser-appraisee relationship interfere with the effectiveness of the process (Chow, Wong, Yeung, & Mo, 2002).

Putnam and Borko (2000) discuss the importance of examining prospective teachers’ learning throughout the mentoring process. The mentor/mentee relationship is seen as a type of mini discourse community within which the preservice teacher is engulfed by the teaching profession. Discourse communities typically have a broadly agreed-upon set of common public goals and a set way of intercommunication among its members. Supporting the claim that more is needed than simply a traditional mentor/mentee relationship, Putnam and Borko (2000) state, “Although the view of the
cooperating teacher as a mentor or coach to the novice is a common one, little systematic inquiry has been conducted on the nature of this mentoring role” (p. 10). It is here that I intend to explore various approaches through intervention and professional development exercises to improve the relationship between these mini discourse communities, including the role administration plays in the mentoring process, as a means of adding to the current body of knowledge.

It is important to note that the state of Pennsylvania has established specific guidelines for teacher induction and mentoring, but these guidelines are locally designed and controlled (PDE, 2002). “School districts…in Pennsylvania have been required by Title 22, Chapter 49, sections 49.16 and 49.83 of the Pennsylvania Code to have a state-approved teacher induction plan since 1987” (PDE, 2002, p. 1). The plan includes the following: an induction council that is responsible for the development and operation of the induction plan, building induction teams, mentors, inductees, program content, and evaluation/record keeping (PDE, 2002). A mentor checklist is provided that outlines “specific mentor responsibilities” and a list of induction programs that should be covered by each district with its novice teachers (PDE, 2002, p. 4). Pennsylvania only requires one year of induction for novice teachers, with an evaluation of the programs success to be determined annually. A full copy of the induction guidelines can be found in on the PDE website.

*Connecting Administrators to Novice Teacher Development*

Wood (2005) studied the principal’s role in the induction process. Her article entitled “The Importance of Principals: Site Administrators’ Roles in Novice Teacher Induction” makes the claim that the principal’s role in supporting the induction process
and the novice teacher are imperative to his/her success and retention as a new teacher. Despite the evidence that principals play a vital role in novice teachers’ successes, the impact of principals’ influence on novice teacher success is largely unexplored. The majority of articles written on this subject are policy ones, not empirical. As her justification, Wood notes that the data all point to a need for more in-depth research in the role site administrators should assume in the induction process.

Studies of induction programs show that strong principal leadership is an essential element of a quality comprehensive induction program. Principals’ roles are integrally tied to the major goals of teacher induction, teacher retention, and improvement of novice teacher performance. Additionally, research demonstrates that a well designed induction program is one that is developmental in nature, offers differentiated/individualized support of novice teachers by mentors, and is grounded in the school’s culture (Wood, 2005).

Wood’s research demonstrates that principals’ influence on novice teachers is significant, if not profound. Principals often recruit novice teachers and represent the first and only person they know in a school. Novice teachers look foremost to principals for guidance and direction on how they should perform in schools. When they do not receive support and guidance, they often encounter problems in teaching and/or leave the school or profession all together.

Wood cites unclear principal expectations of novice teachers and the lack of quality principal support of novice teachers as reasons why some leave the profession. The author cites the 2004 Ingersoll and Kralik meta-analysis of induction research that chronicled the dearth of research studies on principals and novice teachers, and points to
the need for further research. Finally, worthy of note, are the extensive research citations, which outline and support the three initial findings for the principals’ leadership roles.

Wood’s research was conducted in a large, urban setting in California. The overall approach to this study was a qualitative one. Four case study school selection criteria were utilized. They included impact of novice teachers at school sites, size of school, year round and traditional schools, and schools’ Academic Performance Index Scores. Selection criteria for novice teachers at case study sites included no more than one previous year of teaching experience of any kind, completion of initial three-day induction professional development training, and representative grade levels and subject areas in the sample.

Principals were surveyed using a Likert-scale survey that was administered to all district principals at grade-level, site administrator meetings in Wood’s study. The five site coordinators of the induction programs were asked semi-structured questions about the induction program, their role, their principal’s role, and his/her influence on novice teachers’ practices. Results of the Wood’s study show that principals have five leadership roles in induction: (1) culture builder, (2) instructional leader, (3) coordinator/facilitator of mentors, (4) novice teacher recruiter, and (5) novice teacher advocate/retainer. The induction literature cites the first three major roles of principals in relation to novice teachers; however, this study reveals two additional ones that are alluded to, but not explored in the literature. The findings show that the two additional roles are needed for principals as educational leaders: teacher recruiter and teacher advocate/retainer.

Principals held a pivotal role in the recruitment of novice teachers at their sites. In Wood’s 2005 study, 50% of the participants accepted their positions because they were
actively recruited. Much of the recruitment occurred through job fairs. It is imperative to acknowledge the power recruitment has on a novice teacher. Findings also show that the principal plays a key role in the retention of novice teachers. They had a direct impact on new teachers remaining at the same school, and in the profession. The study also noted that principals acted as advocates by encouraging professional development and by meeting regularly with their mentors (Wood, 2005).

Wood’s study provided insight into the role of the principal in the induction process. Wood stated that 25% of teachers surveyed reported that principals, serving as instructional leaders, had modeled lessons for novice teachers. The author also acknowledges a “dire need” for further research on the roles principals play in the induction process, stating, “What structures and activities can principals institute in schools to enhance and extend the professional development of beginning teachers?” (2005, p. 84). The induction process tends to neglect the most important component of teacher development: learning. Only 25% of principals role-played a lesson for novice teachers. If evaluators have been trained effectively by districts, according to the Danielson and McGreal model, Framework for Teaching (2000), then principals will know what “good teaching” looks like in the form of planning and preparation, classroom management, instructional delivery, and professionalism. By using this method in my study where I role-play different scenarios associated with various levels of Danielson’s model, such characteristics will be carried into the lessons of novice teachers, thus having some impact on their perception of the supervision process. From Wood’s 2005 article, several questions arose that directly helped to shape a portion of the intervention and professional development of my PAR:
How will principals share that knowledge with novice teachers?

Will they provide coaching and shared experiences?

Will novice teachers be allowed to observe what is defined as distinguished teaching prior to their first observation?

How will novice teachers know that what they are doing is being observed by the principal as proficient or distinguished teaching?

If they did know those guidelines, could they self-assess it in taped classroom lessons they performed?

Problem Formation

Clark and Peterson (1986) found that the process of teaching involves two major domains: (1) teachers’ thought processes, and (2) teachers’ actions and their observable effects. The thought processes were categorized by Clark and Peterson into three types: (1) teacher planning, (2) teachers’ interactive thoughts and decisions, and (3) teachers’ theories and beliefs. It is the interactive thoughts and decisions of new teachers that are of great interest to me in the proposed study. Teachers’ thought processes occur in their heads and are unobservable; however, taking the time to understand their experience when entering a new environment and/or gaining an understanding of the preconceptions regarding teaching practices could prove valuable (Fang, 1996). Many novice teachers come to the classroom with 15 or so years of exposure to teachers through instructional experiences, but have very limited time regarding the planning and preparation phases of teaching (Fang, 1996). Additionally, they bring vast experiences regarding the quality of teachers to whom they have been exposed. This eclectic formation of preconceived notions of teaching is intriguing and is of interest in this study.
Research communities are shifting to the role cognition and learning play on the development of teachers as professionals (Putnam & Borko, 2000). “These new ideas about the nature of knowledge, thinking, and learning… are interaction with, and sometimes fueling, current reform movements in education” (Putnam & Borko, 2000, p. 90). In the past, most discussions have focused on the implications such research would have on students. Now, this thought process is being directed towards teachers. “Less attention has been paid to teachers - either to their roles in creating learning experiences consistent with the reform agenda or to how they themselves learn new ways of teaching” (Putnam & Borko, 2000, p. 91).

Few experts in the field of education would argue that the beliefs teachers hold influence their perceptions and judgments, which, in turn, affect their behavior in the classroom, or that understanding the belief structures of teachers and teacher candidates is essential to improving their professional preparation and teaching practices (Ashton, 1990; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Goodman, 1988; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Wilson, 1990). Utilizing a non-prescriptive approach through a PAR process may provide valuable insight into the understanding and application of distinguished teaching practices as they prepare for a clinical observation.

Summary

Learning is a life long process that we as doctoral students still strive to achieve. As new teachers enter the profession, it is ever more critical to acknowledge the importance of the learning that occurs through their eyes, especially in terms of “good teaching” (Danielson, 2000). Do they recognize what it looks like or how it is achieved?
Most importantly, can they prove they recognize and apply distinguished teaching practices?

Chapter 1 attempted to illuminate, from a personal perspective and a research perspective, a deficit in non-prescriptive, qualitative research on novice teachers. No other profession places new hires into positions that hold equal expectations to those with a plethora of experience. The continued call for induction/mentoring reformation has indicated that it alone is not the solution to teacher retention or teacher satisfaction.

Acknowledging this need for further research on novice teacher experiences, chapter 2 explores an alternate method of examining novice teachers through a social learning intervention of the clinical supervision process. The literature review section has attempted to build the case that novice teacher learning is extremely aligned with social constructivist theory. By providing exposure, discussion, learning environments, and direct instruction, it is believed that such experiences will have an impact on their perceptions of distinguished teaching practices. Current trends in research have begun to examine the learning that is necessary for teacher development. I will attempt to probe novice teachers’ preconceived notions of teaching practices and how a PAR process could potentially have an effect on their experience in a clinical observation.

Additionally, the literature review section highlighted the deficiency in teacher preparation programs, the lack of support once teachers leave the college setting, and the disconnect between administrators and novice teachers. Accounting for this problem, my study intends to provide immediate support regarding best teaching practices as the administrator leads a PAR process, attempting to have an effect on novice teachers’ application of such practices in their own classrooms.
We routinely seek high expectations in our school buildings, pushing teachers to reach the pinnacle of distinguished teaching without ever providing professional development on or checking for their ability to recognize and apply distinguished teaching practices. Although numerous studies have been conducted on a variety of teacher beliefs, experiences, and induction perceptions, this study intends to examine novice teachers’ ability to recognize distinguished teaching and apply such practices prior to their first clinical observation. “What [novice teachers] learn in their early years of teaching…will matter to their future career trajectories” (Grossman & Thompson, 2004, p. 152).
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A theoretical framework…guides how we come to know what we know. It includes assumptions about what is of importance to study, what constitutes legitimate knowledge, and what counts as evidence for making knowledge claims (Glesne, 2006, p. 6)

This participatory action research study was designed to determine the effect of a social learning opportunity on novice teacher experiences of the clinical supervision process. The intricacy of the supervision process requires teachers to excel in four critical areas: planning and preparation, classroom management, instruction, and professionalism. Creswell states that an ontological premise refers to the philosophical assumption about the nature of reality, epistemological to the interrelated relationship of researcher to that being studied, and methodological to the researcher’s conceptualization of the research process (1998). As I reviewed this from an ontological perspective, I found myself interested in the effect a non-prescriptive exploration of this process might have and whether or not it may add meaningful insight from the lens of a novice teacher. Epistemologically, it is the interrelated relationship of a community of practice joining together to better understand how an intervention could affect their cognitive approach to monitoring their own teaching that drives my research.

A qualitative study allowed me an opportunity to create a thick description of this interaction, thus, helping a portion of the educational community increase their knowledge and awareness, at a particular site, regarding novice teacher experiences of the
The following includes an overview of Participatory Action Research, site selection and setting, participants, confidentiality, and data collection. In addition, an overview of the professional development procedure is provided. Finally, a look at data analysis and trustworthiness are examined.

**Participatory Action Research**

“Constructivism holds that people’s understanding of any concept depends entirely on their mental construction of that concept – their experience in deriving that concept for themselves” (Danielson, 2000, p.23). Schwandt (as cited in Glesne, 2000, p.6) states that “Constructivists hold that knowledge of the world is not a simple reflection of what there is, but a set of social artifacts of what we make of what is there.” Action Research and/or Participatory Action Research (PAR) find themselves on the constructivist end of the research spectrum. In 1944 Kurt Lewin coined the term “action research” and used it in a 1946 paper titled *Action Research and Minority Problems* (Glesne, 2006). From there the field has begun to explode especially in educational settings. “Action research has experienced popularity again, particularly in education, as a way to improve practice” (Glesne, 2006, p.17).
It is the intent of action research to create knowledge, propose and implement change, and improve practice and performance (Stringer, 1996). Mills (2003) defines PAR and action research as:

Any systematic inquiry conducted by researchers to gather information about the ways that their particular school operates, how they teach, and how well their students learn. The information is gathered while the goals of gaining insight, developing reflective practice, effecting positive changes in the school environment and on educational practices in general, and improving student outcomes [are monitored] (p.4)

While Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) state:

Action research is a form of collective, self-reflective inquiry that participants in social situations undertake to improve: (1) the rationality and justice of their own social or educational practices; (2) the participants’ understanding of these practices and the situations in which they carry out these practices. Groups of participants can be…any group with a shared concern, and the motivation and the will to address their shared concern. The approach is action research only when it is collaborative and achieved through the critically examined action of individual group members (p.5)

Both definitions support the notion of researchers and participants working together as change agents for a community of practice. Glesne (2006) supports this notion that PAR is a collaboration and is inclusive of all major stakeholders with the researcher acting as catalyst in the interactive process of change. PAR attempts to create “an
environment in which participants give and get valid information, make free and informed choices and generate internal commitment to the results of their inquiry” (Argyris & Schon, 2002, p. 613). PAR implies that “participants contribute to the scholarly, as well as practical, outcomes of interventions” (Bartunek, 1993). Outcomes and findings are guided participant contribution to the interventions (Hermans & Bonarius, 1991; Israel, Schurman, & Hugentobler, 1992).

In its most detailed manner PAR is a recognized form of experimental research. With a central focus that accounts for the researcher’s direct actions on a community of practice, it has but one goal. That is to improve the quality and performance of the community or an identified area of concern (Dick, 2002; Reason & Bradbury, 2001; McNiff, 2002). The basic concept of PAR utilizes a cyclical method of planning, action, observing, evaluation, and reflection prior to planning and implementing the next cycle (McNiff, 2002; O’Brien, 2001). The cyclical process establishes and identifies specific problems and addresses said issues through a use of newly created strategies (Quigley, 2000). This method is collaborative, it tests new ideas, and implements some form of action to produce change. It requires direct participation in the process, while continuously monitoring, evaluating and reflecting on the interaction. The overall objective is to improve practice (Hult & Lennung, 1980; Dick, 2002) and better understand how a change in practice can benefit a community of practice (CoP) (McNiff, 2002).

Specifically, I studied a process that will help inform a community of practice about distinguished teaching practices. A review of methodological literature indicated that PAR usually emerges in situations where people want to make changes thoughtfully
after critical reflection. Fitting naturally within the constructivist perspective, PAR involves an understanding of the practice being studied. In completing a PAR study, it was my intent that participants may gain significant epistemological benefits in the setting. Additional understanding was gained through a review of studies completed using this methodology.

As an example of a government led PAR, a 1991 study was completed on the four windward islands of the Caribbean (O’Brien, 2001). The project was initiated to explore how nature tourism could be instituted on each of the islands; St. Lucia, Grenada, Dominica, and St. Vincent. Based on a need to include all stakeholders such as: women’s and youth groups, government ministries, environmental and heritage groups, community organizations, farmers’ cooperatives, and private business, an action research approach was selected (O’Brien, 2001). Advisory councils were formed, and national project coordinators were selected as local project liaisons. Their task was to organize search conferences on each island that provided recommendations for site-development, shared experiences, conducted self-evaluations, and developed plans for maintaining the process (O’Brien, 2001). The outcomes varied. St. Vincent was highly successful, with several local developments instituted. Grenada and St. Lucia showed mixed results, while Dominica was the least successful with the government curtailing the search conference shortly after its conception. The difference in outcomes was attributed to the willingness of government personnel to allow the process to be jointly controlled by all participants. The empowering of stakeholders had huge benefits on the islands where decision-makers were not threatened by the citizens comprising the search conferences (O’Brien, 2001).
Lau and Hayward (1997) utilized a two-year period to explore the structure of internet-based collaborative work groups through action research. Lau and Hayward (1997) participated as facilitators in three action research cycles of problem solving among fifteen staff and 25 health professionals from various regions striving to make a transition to a more community-based health program. The goal of the project was to explore how internet-based communications would influence their evolution into a virtual collaborative workgroup (Lau and Hayward, 1997). Phase one consisted of defining expectations, providing the technology and developing the customized workgroup system. Phase two saw the full deployment of the system. Phase three comprised the final cycle that saw the stabilization of the system and emergence of the virtual groups (Lau & Hayward, 1997). Findings from the research determined that those who used the “system interactively were more likely to establish projects that were collaborative in nature, and that the lack of high quality information on community healthcare online was a drawback” (Lau & Hayward, 1997, p. 13). Additional findings stated that role clarity, relationship building, information sharing, resource support, and experiential learning are important aspects in virtual group development. (Lau & Hayward, 1997).

In examining a review of the PAR literature and several applications of the methodology, PAR fits well with my study. Knowledge is acquired through experience and transfers only to similar situations; and learning is the result of social processes that require negotiating and problem solving with others (Buysse, Sparkman, & Wesley, 2003.) Qualitative researchers generally see reality as socially constructed. In PAR, the researcher interacts with participants in order to understand their social constructions; therefore, action researchers must assess ethical behavior in their role (Owen, 2004).
While conducting PAR, I needed to be aware of several limitations and possible problems associated with this type of research. Owen (2004) sites such issues as conflict of interest, maintaining informed consent, using vulnerable populations, building rapport with participants, avoiding power relationships between participant and researcher, and selecting the appropriate participants as possible dilemmas.

*Site Evaluation*

“Many researchers… [are] doing backyard research. They have relatively easy access; the groundwork for rapport is already established; the research would be useful for their professional or personal life; and, the amount of time needed for various research steps would be reduced” (Glesne, 2006, p.31). Backyard research is defined as research completed within a familiar surrounding (e.g. current place of employment) where clearly established relationships exist (Glesne, 2006). Glesne (2006) notes that doing such research comes with numerous obstacles as identified above including role confusion and constraints on effective data collection. In my study, the participants would have no prior relationship with the selected district because they are new hires. Thus, selecting my own district would not provide any additional benefit with respect to the participants.

Acknowledging that I am a novice with respect to conducting research, I am concerned with identifying the best site; therefore, I have selected a convenient site. Convenience is used in this case not to describe location, but to eliminate many of the variables that create problems in PAR. Relationships and roles are automatically defined with my given rapport with the selected district. Rapport and trust issues can be quickly addressed that I am a long standing individual in the community for over thirty plus years
and my family name within the community for over sixty years. With this in mind, it was my intention to select a site that met the following criteria for typicality: be a public school, provide access to all novice teacher hires willing to participate grades kindergarten through twelfth, provide release time for all novice teachers for intervention and professional development, utilize the Danielson (2000) model and language for teacher supervision, and provide a supportive environment from building level and central administrations. Potential districts researched for the study are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Potential Districts for Research Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Public?</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Release time</th>
<th>Danielson Mod.</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes that the district had been disqualified prior to addressing information

Two districts emerged as possible site locations for the study, meeting all requirements. Both districts were contacted, and an initial meeting was established with the first district to respond. This initial contact meeting went extremely well, and I followed up with a second meeting. I informed building level administrators and union
representatives that I would achieve “transferability through thick description” (Walford, 2001, p. 15), and that I would provide a clear description of the setting and participants to allow others interested in this type of PAR to make “informed decisions about the applicability of the findings to their own or other situations” (Walford, 2001, p. 15). I informed them that it was my belief that the social learning opportunity proposed in my study lends itself to the PAR methodology. I informed the groups at that meeting that I attempted to select this site because its novice teachers, administration, and teacher support/preparation provided opportunities for knowledge that are worth discovering and potentially provided generalizability to other districts.

This county was selected for its geographical region, and schools were alphabetized according to information collected from the respective Intermediate Units (IU) that service the county. Schools were cross referenced with the State Department of Education for accuracy and acted as primary sources of information for the study. Incorporating the information from the IU, utilizing the site matrix, and utilizing individual district information obtained through directory phone calls, I narrowed the field of potential sites for research. A copy of the site evaluation matrix can be found in Table 2.

It is important to note that my current district of employment is located within the county. It was not eliminated from the potential list of sites based on potential participants having never worked within the district. Criteria that limited the site selection field included the following:

- teachers must be non-tenured, with less than two years of total teaching experience
• teachers must be provided time to observe distinguished teachers within the district
• the district must follow the four domains for evaluation as outlined by Danielson as their primary supervision tool for evaluation.

To improve upon the quality and integrity of the study, I would only consider districts that have hired a minimum of five new hires for the upcoming school year, a participant acceptance rate greater than two new hires per district, and full cooperation from district administration (e.g., professional development release time, payment of substitutes if needed, agreement of observation schedules).

Setting

The Victory Area School District (VASD) is located southwest of a mid-major city in the northeastern United States. It resides in a county of nearly 208,000 residents with a local population of approximately 50,000. The area was traditionally a blue-collar, working class community in which most of the residents’ income centered on industry. It has slowly begun the transformation to a white-collar community as it provides easy access to the mid-major city and surrounding areas with numerous access points to two major US interstates, the State Turnpike, and local major roads. The VASD community has undergone a downtown renovation, has increased the number of participants on the redevelopment authority designed to improve declining areas, improved local parks and trails for recreation, and continues to expand multiple business districts. A recent addition of slot-machine casinos and major outlet retail shopping centers has increased revenue within the area and thus directly had an impact on the school district.
VASD currently has an enrollment of approximately 3500 students in the kindergarten through twelfth grade schools. The district is comprised of: four elementary schools (grades K – 5) each with large classrooms and full gymnasiums; one middle school (grades 6 – 8) with large classrooms, swimming pool, and full gymnasium; and one state of the art high school (grades 9 – 12). The districts central office is connected to the high school building. The district is also noted for the following characteristics; student/teacher ratio of 15.5 to 1, 19 administrators, 235.5 teachers hired within the district, seven full time guidance counselors, 4.5 librarians, and 5 nurses.

VASD was selected in part because it met all the initial criteria as outlined in the Site Selection section of this chapter. VASD also was willing to provide distinguished teacher lists per building for novice teachers to observe. Teachers receive the distinguished rating in VASD by performing at the level outlined in the definition section of Chapter I. They must demonstrate exemplary performance in all domains, be accountable both in and out of the classroom, and perform consistently at this level to receive distinction on multiple observations.

In addition, VASD was able to provide; classrooms and/or conference rooms for professional development, classrooms and/or conference rooms from individual interviews, central meeting locations for professional development and discussions, and additional meeting space for administrative interviews and intervention description.

Participants

Given the nature of this PAR study, the selection of a site and the consent of the novice teacher participants were crucial to success. I attempted to obtain the direct involvement of one administrative representative (i.e., principal or assistant principal)
from each of the three levels: elementary, middle school, and high school. By limiting the trained observers to three individuals, the intent was to improve the consistency of their observation reports, as only one administrator would observe each of the novice teachers at each of the levels after the study’s conclusion. I also targeted direct involvement from the teachers’ federation (union) and central office (superintendent or assistant superintendent) throughout the study’s design.

Throughout the interviews and professional development exercises, the teachers participated without any administrator oversight. It was critical to gain both central office support and building level administrative support, based on the design of the study. Establishing a quick level of rapport and trust with central office and building level administration was critical due to the fact that I would be so quickly engaging new hires with no more than two meetings, totaling 40 minutes of face-to-face time with leadership personnel. During a portion of the novice teacher in-service day, the new hires were turned over to me with only a lay summary presentation provided to all administrators involved in the proposed study, to guide their understanding of the process. The administration had to have full confidence in my study with little on which to base that trust. Yet the risk/reward was deemed to be worthwhile as I stressed the support I intended to provide for novice teacher development through the process.

Teachers were invited to participate through the informed consent letters, and neither participation nor non-participation was shared with administration. Throughout the study I continually reflected on and monitored the process, and shared progress with the administration. However, individual feedback and teacher input by the participants was not shared with the administration. Specific attention was given to the influence of
power on teachers to ensure they have the freedom to: (a) participate, (b) not participate, (c) be open and honest about the process and their participation, and/or (d) address any issues that may arise.

**Confidentiality**

The Internal Review Board (IRB) at Duquesne University examined the proposal for this dissertation for expedited approval. Approval was granted in July 2008, and the issue of confidentiality was covered in both the principal and novice teacher consent forms (see Appendices C and D). All participants were over the age of 18, and informed consent was obtained for each participant separately. Expedited review was sought based on the study design that required audio-taping and the retaining of secured records of participants in the study.

The participants received a letter that included the purpose of the study, a direct explanation of my involvement as the researcher, researcher contact information, and a consent form according to the requirements outlined by the IRB of Duquesne University. The form assured participants that pseudonyms would be used and all measures to maintain confidentiality and anonymity in this work, or any other research that may emerge from these findings, would be taken. Each teacher was assigned a fictitious name when it is used in the study. Upon completion of the research, all recordings and transcriptions will be maintained and then destroyed according to IRB guidelines as noted in the consent forms (see Appendix C).

**Data Sources and Collection Techniques**

Primary and secondary sources were used for data collection throughout this study. Analysis of these sources was utilized as a method of ensuring participant and data
triangulation. Glesne (2006) notes that using multiple data-collection methods increases credibility and validity of the data. Novice teacher interviews, building level administrator interviews, central office administrator interviews, direct observations of the professional development, and discussions were used as primary sources in this study. Secondary sources consisted of building artifacts (e.g., teacher handbook, meeting minutes, building/district documentation associated with teacher induction), and observation of teacher environments (e.g., teacher classrooms, planning rooms, offices).

Data triangulation occurred through interviews, participant reflections, observation, and artifact analysis. This is covered in more detail in chapter 4 of this study. Multiple interview sessions were held with each participant to gain a base line for novice teacher perceptions and to later determine the influence of the PAR on their development prior to the clinical observation. Reflection writing and observations of dialogue amongst novice teachers provided additional sources of data. Finally, observations were conducted of novice teacher meetings and staff development sessions as they pertained to the induction process at VASD. This, coupled with analysis of relevant artifacts (e.g., mission statement, teacher handbook), helped establish any relationship to the research questions. School-based websites and publications were utilized to describe the larger setting for the study. The above mentioned collection methods were used to gain understanding of the dilemma new teachers face, contribute different viewpoints on the dilemma, and make use of the time available for data collection (Glesne, 2006).

Procedure

The procedures for this study are presented succinctly in an attempt to provide a firm understanding of the study’s design. As an outline for this section to help guide the
reader, the following areas will be explained in detail: pre-study, initial interviews and artifact collection, intervention (consisting of three phases), concluding interviews, and celebration ceremony.

Pre-study

The initial process began by establishing contact with the gatekeepers, central office administrators at VASD, via telephone and letter (see Appendix A). The letter and phone contact initiated a formal one-on-one meeting in the central office at which time the overview of the study, its purpose, the design, timelines, and potential benefits were discussed. Central office support was sought at this point, and contacts were made to the building level administrators and to teacher union representatives to conduct similar overview meetings. With support of key players in place, timelines were established to initially meet with novice teachers (see Appendix B) that are newly hired or have fewer than two years of teaching experience. The flowchart in Figure 1 was provided to central office administrators to better explain timelines and long-term commitments required by the district.
Early in the novice teacher’s school year, late August 2008, the overview meeting was presented to the intended participants of the study. This communication was essential before the informed consent was obtained. The overview meeting was held in the high school following a luncheon held for new hires and their mentoring teachers. A centrally located area, known as the large group instruction room, was utilized to accommodate novice teachers from different buildings throughout the district for the purpose of the initial contact meeting. The teachers were invited to this initial meeting via letter that was placed into their induction packets received when they arrived for their induction meeting.
(see Appendix M). Building or central office administrators were not permitted to attend this meeting to continue supporting the teacher confidentiality. This meeting with novice teachers covered: my background; the general design of the study; potential benefits and risks to participants; site selection criteria; confidentiality; informed consent procedures; timeline for the study; and the data collection methods that were used. I also noted that this is a PAR design and given the emergent nature of such a study some changes may occur to benefit the group experience (Glesne, 2006). Novice teachers were given the ability to ask questions at the conclusion of the overview meeting for clarification. At that time I provided the group with a copy of the informed consent letter with directions to return those letters to a building specific location for ease. Upon collection of the forms I analyzed, with the assistance of my dissertation chair and methodologist, if there was sufficient participation to move forward with the study.

*Initial Interviews and Document Collection*

It was critical to gain an understanding of novice teachers’ level of comfort with the PDE 426 form (see Appendix Q), Danielson strategies (Danielson, 1996), and perceptions of their first clinical observation. In addition, VASD generated documentation on their induction/mentoring process, teacher handbook, mission statement, and any other relevant materials were collected for analysis.

Semi-structured interviews (see Appendix E) were used with all participants in an attempt to address the issues stated above in this initial interview phase. All efforts were made to place novice teachers at ease by conducting interviews in their classrooms to create a comfortable setting. Interviews were kept organized and lasted no longer than forty minutes.
The artifact collection helped to paint a broader and brighter picture into VASD’s novice teacher commitment. It also helped increase my knowledge of the district in the early phase of the study. Given the nature of PAR, utilizing such methods was of benefit as it provided individual interaction to improve trust and rapport with participants. In addition, this phase of the study allowed me to better prepare participants for their role in the research as well.

*Professional Development*

The first phase in this design provided participants with a chance to improve awareness of distinguished teaching practices through professional development experiences (see Appendix G). The professional development sessions that I led provided; empirical context for distinguished teaching practices based on Danielson (1996; 2000) strategies and methods, allowed novice teachers to take part in a values exercise targeting core characteristics that defined the teacher as self and a group exercise to design the values associated with their perception of a distinguished teacher (Maxwell, 2005), receive and cover exemplar lesson plans that began building on their level of distinguished teaching practices, and provided participants with the chance to conduct peer-observations of a distinguished teacher in their building prior to the next phase including a recorded lesson within their own classroom.

These professional development sessions were important for providing a foundation for truly understanding distinguished teacher practices. These sessions were also a means to develop rapport and trust with the participants and began to separate myself as an expert in the preparation of novice teachers for their first clinical observation. The professional development sessions occurred as one group, lasted
approximately one hundred twenty minutes, and were held during regular business hours. Novice teachers were provided with folders to help maintain organization and collection of study materials. Food and beverages were also provided to maintain a level of comfort. As themes, preconceived notions, and apprehensions were identified, the nature of PAR allowed me to adjust and monitor events and I made the necessary adaptations to the intended direction of the study to continually build on rapport and trust. For example, I had intended to use a confederate to deliver the professional development sessions. Given the complexity of the group dynamics from the initial contact meeting, I felt I had begun to break down barriers immediately and did not want to tear the fragile relationship with novice teachers. By the start of phase one I believed I had developed trust and rapport and, given the social constructivist nature of small group work and the need for such trust in guiding novice employees, I did not want to jeopardize that trust by introducing a stranger into the process (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Ultimately, I made the decision to lead the PAR as participant-researcher maintaining my right to lead the process (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000).

Phase One (Steps 1 – 3)

This phase occurred in the AM portion of a regular school day. Sessions were rotated between AM and PM session to lessen the amount of classroom time missed by a teacher committed to the study. A packet of color-coded papers were organized and placed on the desk for each participant. All of the three phases occurred in a central location using the same classroom to create a level of comfort and one computer lab used for video viewing. As noted in the professional development section of this chapter,
Danielson (1996; 2000) domains, rubrics, terminology, and examples were provided to all participants. Approximately sixty minutes of phase one was devoted to the discussion.

Participants then focused their attention on the PDE 426 (see Appendix Q) and Pre and Post observation interview forms (see Appendix T) that would be utilized by their supervising administrator. I covered the forms with all participants and provided exemplars of teacher submissions and actual observations to improve their understanding of current expectations. Open dialogue and discussion were held to cover the four domains, observer notations and comments, and overall justification for the final rating on those exemplars. Novice teachers were asked to critique examples of Pre and Post-observation forms checking for such things as clarity in lesson design, expectations established by the teacher, adaptations, additional work for accelerated or low level learners, and strategies for higher order thinking skills. Novice teachers shared thoughts and feelings regarding the forms. During this time I would guide questions, keep discussions flowing, monitor and observe discussions, and facilitate the transition of topics from one subject to the next.

The final step in this process followed the John C. Maxwell Values Card Exercise (Maxwell, 2005). With permission from the company Maximum Impact (see Appendix F), the cards are taken from an exercise called “Developing the Leader Within You.” This particular process is designed to find three core values that are of utmost importance to the novice teachers as corner stones to their development as a teacher progressing toward the distinguished level of the Danielson model. The Values Card Exercise provides individuals with thirty-eight cards, similar to playing cards. Each card has one core value placed on it in bold lettering. Below the core value is a brief, one sentence explanation
that helps to clarify the value. Teachers begin by selecting six key values that best
describe them as a young leader. The novice teacher is asked to eliminate two of the six
choices and make notation as to why these were the two easiest to remove. Finally, the
participant will remove one more value from the remaining four cards. Again, the
participants are asked to make notations on the back of this card detailing the reason they
have removed the card. The exercise then generates three core values that best defines the
participant. At the conclusion of the exercise, all values are collected and produced on a
storyboard. This step is taken to create an initial connection to existing staff members that
may share the same values as the participants. It also, builds trust and rapport within
those taking place in the study through examination of shared values. Figure 2 details the
core values of participants.
As noted, this phase of the professional development process was to help teachers identify their core values and, once established, use those core values as a foundation for all four Danielson domains; instruction, management of their classrooms, and continued work on their professional development. In doing so, I always kept these beliefs forefront in the mind of the novice teacher as they work to build their own identity within their new environment of students and colleagues.

Within the core values assignment, I also had participants complete a group activity to establish the core values they collectively believed comprised a distinguished teacher. At first, participants were grouped by grade level (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12). As a building level group they established three core values. Groups selected a spokes person and each group presented the rationale behind their selections. Upon completion of this
first task, they were then asked to agree as a collective whole on three core values. The intent of this component was two fold; to force open dialogue and interaction within the novice group, and to share beliefs early in the process about their individual selected values. Teachers had to select the method by which the three final values would be selected and post their final choices on a bulletin board located within the classroom. This board was left posted throughout the duration of the study as a reminder of the values participants believed defined a distinguished teacher.

At the conclusion of all phases reflection sheets were used to collect participants thoughts and experiences. Novice teachers provided information regarding phase one on the reflection sheet and submitted it to me prior to leaving the classroom for the day (see Appendix H).

*Phase Two (Steps 4 – 5)*

Phase two, a PM session, occurred ten days after the first phase. This provided teachers with the ability to connect with expert teachers from their building and perform the required twenty-minute observation. The participants were provided coverage to perform the observation during the first and second phases so that they would not have to forfeit contractual planning time confirming the districts commitment to the study. Each of the six building principals provided a list of the distinguished teachers, as rated by them or assistant principals, for novice teachers to observe. Teachers were provided with a sheet that divided the period into three equal segments on one side of the sheet and the four Danielson domains of planning, classroom management, instruction, and professional development on the back of the sheet. Novice teachers were asked to
perform a twenty minute observation of a distinguished teacher. During this time they were to complete two tasks. First, on the sheet which divided the periods into thirds (i.e. a forty five minute period would be divided into three sections of fifteen minutes), participants were to record one observed phenomena that uniquely gained their attention and record that phenomena in the corresponding time category. Examples could be a smooth transition of topic, an exemplary method of handling a classroom management issue, an amazing review exercise, an elite lesson plan, extraordinary closing to a lesson, etc. Teachers were only required to record one observed phenomena in a single time category, but were encouraged to record additional information if observed. The second task asked for participants to select a specific domain, one of the four areas on the observation form, and record information from the lesson into that domain. Examples could have been notations on lesson plans from the expert teacher, an instructional delivery method they viewed as unique, record keeping strategies, or discipline issues and the manner in which they were handled. Again, novice teachers were only required to fill in one domain, but were encouraged to add more detail to the form. It was important for the participant to step outside of their comfort zone and allow themselves to be vulnerable while making a connection with the expert teacher. Expert classroom teachers were not notified that they may be contacted by a novice teacher, nor were they compensated in any way for their participation. The teacher union approved and encouraged the collegial observation as a way to improve building communication and cooperation. Other than simply allowing novice teachers to observe their classrooms, nothing more was asked of them for the study. Distinguished teachers were did not take part in the celebration, nor did they have any involvement in post study events.
Distinguished teachers did not need to participate in any interviews as their role in this process was not being studied directly. However, their influence through the eyes of novice teachers was a primary focus. Administration reiterated that the observations would not be used as an evaluative tool and were utilized for the sole purpose of teacher development, collaboration, and growth.

The second phase (see Appendix I) began by having participants place the recorded observation information on two storyboards and write a brief reflection from our last meeting. The reflection was required as a means of activating prior learning and knowledge and to check their level of retention specifically associated with the four domains, rating categories, and rubric information. Storyboards were used as a collection device of thoughts and experiences from the observations. All participants were provided with a copy of recorded notes in an attempt to provide them with a “go to” list for problem solving and a collection of expert ideas for creative classroom techniques. (see Appendix O) For this study, the storyboards were classroom white boards and participants were free to write information on the boards for sharing and discussion. Their observation sheets from the initial twenty-minute observation were also collected and any additional comments not placed on storyboards were recorded into the electronic copy.

Next, novice teachers were asked to perform an observation on the PDE 426 from utilizing an administrative training video. VASD had been selected as a Classroom for the Future (CFF) grant recipient. CFF provided VASD administrators with training videos to improve and enhance their abilities in the field of classroom observations. As a trained CFF observer, I had access to these training videos. Permission was obtained from CFF to use a video in this study (see Appendix F). Teachers viewed the training
video and performed an observation using the same tool that they would be evaluated on in the clinical supervision process. The intent was to place the novice teacher in the mind set of the trained observer as they watch for specifics in the lessons being taught that align with the observation forms they will later be observed on. Upon completion of the training video, open discussion and dialogue occurred. The training videos were then replayed using captions that highlighted what experts noted in their observation. At the conclusion of the video, teachers could compare their observation with an on-screen document completed by expert evaluators. Again, open dialogue and discussion occurred to enhance novice teacher understanding of the clinical supervision process. In addition, participants were asked to complete reflection sheets as they did in phase one (see Appendix J).

It should be noted that at the end of Phase 2 novice teachers were asked to complete two outside objectives prior to our next meeting. Novice teachers video-taped a lesson they were teaching for later self-evaluation (described later in this chapter) and conduct a second peer-observation again using a PDE 426 form.

**Phase Three (Steps 6 – 7)**

As the final phase began (see Appendix K), novice teachers were asked to provide feedback from their second peer-observation experience. They followed a similar format as documented in Phase Two that adds to their growing body of knowledge of distinguished teaching practices. The two storyboards were placed in the room and, again, each teacher was required to add one distinguished teaching behavior or technique to each of the boards based on their experience.
Next, teachers were asked to discuss their observation experiences, first in smaller sub-groups and then with the group at large. This process attempted to force them to recognize the varying levels of teacher as outlined by Danielson (1996). I monitored discussions to keep participants focused, clarify questions, and provide input as needed.

The culminating activity in this study had teachers perform a formal evaluation of their own teaching utilizing the PDE 426 form. Prior to the start of phase three, a video lesson of each participant was recorded. That video was kept in my possession until we reconvened for Phase Three. A minimum of three days had elapsed for each participant prior to viewing. Participants were each provided an individual lap top computer and head set, and were able to watch the video. They were permitted to stop and start the video so that they could record detailed observation notes. Once completed, participants utilized the Danielson (1996) rubrics to assess performance in each of the domains and provide rationale for an overall rating in the observation. This exercise was established to allow teachers to see their development as they applied observed distinguished teaching practices into their lessons from previous peer observations. They were then asked to collect their thoughts and conduct a self-reflection exercise (see Appendix L) regarding their experience of evaluating self as teacher.

Concluding Interviews

As a concluding activity, individual interviews were held with participants to determine the influence of the PAR process on their development with regard to the supervision process (see Appendix N). Additionally, I attempted to better understand the intended and unintended consequences of the study procedures. Participants were given
an opportunity to reflect on the experience and were asked to reevaluate their perceptions of the clinical supervision process.

*Celebration Ceremony*

Upon the completion of the PAR, a celebration breakfast was held for the participants. The intent was to bring the experience to close, share findings, and provide a simple thank you for teacher participation and effort throughout the phases of the study. Later in Chapter IV, this process is discussed and teacher feelings and comments are briefly shared.

*Data analysis*

Coffey and Atkinson (1996) state, “Coding qualitative data enables the researcher to recognize and re-contextualize data, allowing a fresh view of what is there. Because coding inevitably involves the reading and re-reading of data and making selections from the data, it involves interpreting the data set” (p. 46). “Data analysis involves organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned” (Glesne, 2006, p. 147). It is essential for the researcher to categorize, synthesize, search for patterns, and interpret the data you have collected (Coffey & Atkinson, 1995; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) believe that researchers should “account for and disclose their approach to all aspects of the research process” (p. 28) in order to dignify the quality of work conducted. Anfara et al. (2002) address the issue of quality and rigor in qualitative research from a historical perspective. By outlining a process that helps align the research questions, data sources, themes, categories, and findings, Anfara et al. (2002) provide a “methodological rigor and analytic defensibility [to] qualitative
research” (p. 28). The authors define rigor as making the steps from data collection to findings public and transparent. In improving the rigor, Anfara et al. (2002) believe that the quality of research can be improved. When the processes are explained in detail, methods are explained that were used to identify themes, data collection techniques are elaborated upon, and interview protocol is addressed, it only helps to strengthen the claims made in the findings of qualitative research. (Anfara et al., 2002).

I focused on thematic analysis when reviewing data for this study. Each phase of the study was analyzed to guide further decisions in this PAR study. Realizing that even such steps as the analyzing of the professional development exercises provided me with insight into the depth and breadth that the topic was investigated and helped to determine the amount of time the group received information. Additionally, transcriptions were generated from the initial interviews and, when combined with observation notes and artifacts, generated themes when coded.

“Data analysis done simultaneously with data collection enables you to focus and shape the study as it proceeds” (Glesne, 2006, p. 148). In an attempt to make the abundant information manageable, I used memo writing and created analytic files to organize and synthesize information while performing coding (Glesne, 2006). I analyzed transcripts early in the study to become more familiar with the participants, data, and any early emerging themes. I then reflected on my own experiences, notes, and beliefs during the decision making process in data analysis (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness, (i.e. research validity) is a process that should be thought of throughout one’s research (Glesne, 2006) especially in the “midst of data collection” (p.
37). Creswell, as cited in Glesne (2006), describes verification procedures often used in qualitative research to address differences in viewpoints seen by experts in the field of research. Credibility was addressed through: prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field; triangulation of data sources; self evaluation of work/peer reviewing of work; clarification of researcher bias; member checking; and, rich, thick description (Glesne, 2006; Lather, 2001; Creswell, 1998; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). By clearly documenting the steps taken to ensure data collection in the next chapter, I believe trustworthiness was established and the findings will be viewed as credible.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This study was conducted over a three-month period. During this time, I was actively engaged in the site and worked directly with the participants. The study allowed me to: conduct initial interviews that set the context of the study; collect and analyze artifacts relevant to new district hires; conduct professional development sessions; lead a process to familiarize novice teachers with the observation process; and conduct follow-up interviews with participants to assess the influence of those actions on their clinical observation experience.

This chapter will be used to establish a better understanding of the setting and context for this study. Next, the initial interviews will be discussed in order to examine the groups’ overall level of comfort and experience with the supervision process. This step was critical in building rapport and determining the level of need for professional development. I will then discuss the professional development phase and participant reflections to the interventions as they relate to the observation process. Additionally, I will describe the process for and the analysis and coding of the interview transcripts to support the findings. Finally, I will frame the results of the follow-up interviews within the context of the research questions for this study.

Research Questions

The questions used to establish a basis for the research are as follows:
• What themes emerge when novice teachers are led through an exercise designed to identify individual value beliefs as a teacher and shared beliefs as a community of practice regarding distinguished teaching practices?

• How will increasing novice teacher exposure to and explicit instruction on distinguished teaching affect their perception of the supervision process?

• How will the intervention process affect novice teacher preparation (if any) for the clinical supervision process?

• What unintended consequences (e.g., teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-facilitator, teacher-to-administrator) or other themes emerged for novice teachers as a result of this process?

Setting and Context

The Victory Area school district (VASD) is located southwest of a mid-major city in the northeastern United States. It is an eclectic district with working farmland, industry, and a professional community with approximately 50,000 residents. VASD is situated between two major U.S. highways and covers nearly 98 square miles that includes local parks, sports fields, and an expanding business district. Within the district are four townships that comprise VASD. This unique scenario creates a partnership between the school district and the township leaders. Numerous community agencies support the district that maintains an enrollment of approximately 3,500 students in their K–12 schools. VASD provides four elementary schools (grades K–5), one middle school (grades 6–8), and one high school (grades 9–12). Connected to the high school are the central offices housing the district superintendent, assistant superintendent, technology coordinator, and business director.
The district is filled with history and tradition as the main high school campus played a role as a military academy in its early start up. Numerous historical figures graced the campus with their presence in both times of peace and war. The district initially started with nine elementary schools, but in 1993 consolidated those smaller buildings into four newly built and/or renovated buildings. The middle school started as an open-classroom design, but in 1996 also went through a major renovation, creating a more traditional setting. Finally, the high school completed a full renovation in the summer of 2006.

The district demographic breakdown had the following racial/ethnic composition: white (95.25%), Black (2.5%), Hispanic (<1%), Asian (<1%), and multi-ethnic (<1%). In other demographic categories of student population, VASD had a population of economically disadvantaged (13.3 %), special education (11.7%), and English Language Learners (<1%).

Artifact Review

As I gained access to the site, central office administrators provided copies of new teacher hire packets. Examples of such artifacts reviewed included the teacher handbook, student/parent handbook, building level program of studies, yearly event calendar, parent orientation agendas, activities calendars, building maps, W-2 forms, liability and beneficiary forms, and various other letters and forms for communication.

Within VASD, new teacher hires were only provided with a copy of the evaluation form (PDE 426) with regard to the clinical supervision process. Their initial welcome packets that contained the abovementioned items provided no teaching strategy information, nothing in the way of current methodologies, and zero information on
expectations of new hires in the district. Teachers were provided with the name of their mentor for the year and were asked to complete business office items that were necessary for processing paychecks and tax-related information.

Study Structure

Victory Area School District offered a unique situation for this study. Currently the district is in the final year of a buy-out scenario for those teachers that have accumulated 30 or more years of teaching experience. The incentive is designed to help with the rising cost of salary and benefits in the district’s budget. Teachers at the highest end of the pay scale are provided a lump sum incentive so that their position may be filled by lower- or starting-salary teachers, saving the district money in the long run and bringing an influx of new talent. Given this scenario, Victory Area School District had recently hired 16 new teachers with a year, or less, teaching experience. The 16 new teachers were brought in two days prior to the arrival of the entire VASD staff, to receive their orientation and attend a welcome luncheon. Following the luncheon, I was granted the opportunity to hold a closed-door meeting with the new teachers, absent of any district administrators to ensure an open atmosphere for discussion, questions, and answering. During the overview meeting, I provided the new hires with personal background information, an account of my first-year teaching experience, fears and concerns about the current state of new teacher turnover, the current trend in “outsourcing” novice teacher programs through regional outlets, the research study overview, and time commitment and requirements of the participants. Each participant was provided an agenda for the meeting (Appendix V) entitled “New Hire/Novice Teacher Contact Meeting.” The agenda provided additional information such as an abstract of the
study, the four research questions pertaining to the study, and the purpose and significance of the study.

Following the overview meeting, I received the informed consent of 14 of the 16 new hires. All 14 were willing to take part in the full study, including initial and post study interviews and the group process. The structure, certification area, and level of those participating in the study are reflected in Table 3.

Table 3 Participation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades K – 5</th>
<th>Grades 6 – 8</th>
<th>Grades 9 – 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading/English</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Librarian[^{dnp}]</td>
<td>Librarian[^{dnp}]</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{dnp}\] – did not participate in study

Given the particular nature of the study design, the high percentage of participation – 14 of 16 (87.5%) – was critical. In the following table, a breakdown of additional characteristics further establishes the site context. In Tables 4, 5, and 6, general demographic information about the study participants is provided. The information is displayed by building level.
Table 4
Demographic Information for Participants K - 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades K – 5</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Exp.</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Course/Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading/English</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>K – 5</td>
<td>Phys. Ed/Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>K – 5</td>
<td>Support Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Demographic Information for Participants 6 - 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades 6 – 8</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Exp.</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Course/Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>Learning Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>American Literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Demographic Information for Participants 9 - 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades 9 – 12</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Exp.</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Course/Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>Letters A - G*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>Letters N - Z*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Psych / Amer. History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Amer. History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Adv. Placement Chem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Guidance members work with all grade levels, but with a defined portion of the alphabet.

*Initial Interviews*

Within this Participatory Action Research were a series of initial interviews designed to gain insight and understanding of the participants in the study. It was critical for me to learn the initial perceptions of the participants related to the research questions being studied, and their overall experience in their undergraduate and graduate programs. As a result, this socially constructed research was designed with a series of initial interview questions set to depict background as well as help frame their overall perceptions, experiences, fears, and concerns of the clinical supervision process. Following is a list of the initial interview questions utilized in this PAR.

1. How do you define/explain the supervision process?
2. Have you formally been observed during your undergraduate/graduate work or during your teaching experience? If yes, how many formal observations did you take part in over that time?

3. Have you experienced a formal pre-conference interview? If yes, please describe.

4. Have you experienced a formal post-conference interview? If yes, please describe.

5. What is the major function of the clinical supervision process?

6. Are you able to define the four domains found on the formal PDE 426 form?

7. Do you have experience working with the four domains found on the formal PDE 426 form or teacher preparation program PDE 430 form?

8. What exposure do you have to the Charlotte Danielson rubric for the four domains?

9. Can you define the four categories of rating that a teacher can receive using the Danielson model?

10. During your district in-service/induction, have you received any professional development regarding preparation for your first clinical supervision? If yes, please describe.

11. During your district in-service/induction, have you received any professional development regarding the Danielson model and the domains associated with the PDE 426 form? If yes, please describe.

12. What exposure were you provided to distinguished teachers and teaching practices?

13. What literature or exemplar documentation have you been provided to improve on your understanding of distinguished teaching?
14. How would you classify your overall level of comfort with your pending first observation?

As information from participant responses was reviewed, similar emerging themes allowed me to adjust and revise the professional development being provided for the study. All results from the initial interview and the analysis of documents helped to illustrate the perceptions of novice teachers as they moved toward their first clinical observation.

Results from Initial Interviews

Heading into the study, the initial interviews provided background information on classroom experiences and formal observation exposure. Of the 14 participants, only three had previously worked in other districts in a formal capacity as a hired teaching employee. None of the participants had previously worked in VASD, and the remaining newly hired teachers had only student teaching experience. Based on the initial interview results, there had been no professional development provided by VASD to improve novice teacher understanding of the PDE 426 form, examine the district’s expectations of the new hires with regard to their performance on this form, or provide novice teachers with the empirical resources to self-reflect on the items required during observation to be successful in the classroom. It was evident that I was building trust and rapport with the novice teachers. The interview questions continued to allow me to gain a better understanding of Danielson domains, depth of knowledge of rating categories, novice teachers’ level of comfort with the formal observation form, teacher responsibility in their own developmental growth and knowledge in the field, and the consistency of perspectives on the overall clinical supervision process (see Appendix C). The results
from the initial interviews have been placed into a narrative format and organized by theme.

*Purpose of the Clinical Supervision Process*

The lead question in the initial interview asked teachers to define or explain their understanding of the clinical supervision process. Definitions varied in a few different ways from a sixth grade science teacher that stated, “a process to make us better teachers in the classroom…helping the district to make sure they got the right guy” (Roo), to “a formal process that shows us where we are weak (as classroom teachers) and helps us get better” (Ed). However, the overall consensus definition was best summarized by one high school social studies teacher as “a collaborative effort between administration and new teachers to improve on their overall performance so that teachers can enhance student achievement” (Cledda). This was viewed as a benefit for both district and novice teacher, another participant stated, “I do not want to be a good teacher, I want to be a great teacher. I have memories of my best teachers and the teachers that molded me… that made me want to be a teacher. I want to be in the stories of my students when they talk to their kids about their high school experience or talk about their favorite teacher…I want to make a difference. I think this process is about working with me to reach my goal” (Briana). The primary function of the clinical supervision process was to improve teacher performance, thus impacting student achievement. Each teacher in some way commented that the supervision process centered on meeting teacher needs and directly and/or indirectly improving the quality of teaching for student success. It was interesting to note that less information was provided on the developmental needs of teachers in terms of
improving classroom management, instruction, planning and preparation, and professional responsibilities as referenced by Danielson (1996).

As noted in Tables 4 - 6, three teachers had some form of initial induction outside of VASD as they began their teaching careers. Each stated that they received no professional development on the Danielson model, domains associated with the clinical supervision process, or the expectations for the classroom observation. One of the middle school special education teachers with one year of experience stated, “[O]ther than a one day ‘induction’ that had us filling out beneficiary cards and W-2 forms, I received very little support from either district. At least [VASD] gave me a t-shirt with school colors. I do have a mentor …sure he will help with a lot of the transition, but if I were asked to rate both schools on how they are supporting us with regards to preparation for a pretty traumatic experience (first clinical observation), I would say the other participants are in for a shock.” One emerging theme from the three teachers with experience in the supervision process was that little emphasis was placed on the observation by the districts which they had recently left. “I never had a pre-conference. I was given a note in my mailbox that said my principal would be in my classroom the next day. I was told to have copies of my lesson plans ready and that was it. My post-conference lasted less than five minutes and I was told to continue working on my questioning techniques” (Jesse).

Exposure and Experiences

Despite many of the teachers just leaving their institutions of higher learning, there was a general uncertainty regarding the actual observation process, forms, expectations, and professional development strategies to improve the quality of their teaching. Nine of the 14 interviewed were unable to define the four domains found on the
PDE 426 form. Three were able to provide only two domain categories, while only two members were able to list all four domains. One high school guidance counselor commented, “I didn’t even know what you meant by domains when you asked me. And Charlotte Danielson was not a name I was familiar with …although some of the terms sounded familiar” (Joey).

Each of the 14 teachers had a unique experience. One female social studies teacher who was able to define the four domains commented on her experience in undergraduate classes: “I have been observed formally by my university over 25 times. I used the PDE form 430 and had to design unit plans according to the Danielson model. I am aware of the rubric categories, but received more generalized comments with respect to the feedback I was given… overall, I am very comfortable with this process” (Cledda). Her experience was clearly very different from most of the teachers that participated in the study. As most teachers entered the work force, their perspectives of the classroom and observation experience were formed by a very narrow window. Exposure is usually granted to one or two cooperative teachers or mentors. As noted by a high school chemistry teacher, “I was observed by my professor once and after the first week my mentoring teacher was not even around. I was never observed by my mentoring teacher. He simply told me ‘You’re doing a good job…just keep a tight rein on them.’ So I did just that, but never received category ratings or talked about my level of ‘proficiency’ in the domains” (Todd).

Only four participants were able to provide substantial feedback regarding the 1996 Danielson model and philosophy. An underlying theme emerged, that most had some recollection of the terminology, but very few could place those terms into the
correct context or define the significance with which they should be associated.

“Danielson and the domains sound familiar…I know it had something to do with the way we are moving in education. I want to say that I had this early in my classes. It was a philosophy? No, not sure to be honest” (Anson). Another teacher commented, “I feel like I’m taking a test on my undergraduate experience right now…and I am failing. Have I even answered a question yet? I hope this is what we will talk about” (Jenna).

While conducting the initial interviews, it became apparent that there was a level of discomfort with the pending observation and the participants’ understanding of the overall process. Only one participant clearly defined her pre- and post-observation process. This participant had used formal forms for the meeting with professors and mentoring teachers. She was well versed in the Danielson model and had used the four rating categories of distinguished, proficient, basic, and unsatisfactory throughout her undergraduate training. The remaining participants struggled greatly with defining the four ratings and could not distinguish between the four ratings to differentiate the terms. “I’ve never used or been scored using those (Danielson) terms. I was given a subjective score, provided no rubric for those numbers, and was told words such as ‘good job, improve here, strong student control, etc…’ I was never scored using a defined rubric” (Lennie).

It was interesting to note that many of the participants wanted to know immediately how their level of understanding, or lack there of, compared with the other participants. It was very apparent that 10 of the 14 participants were very uncomfortable during the interview. When asked a question from the standard list regarding this discomfort, nine reported not feeling prepared in some capacity for the upcoming
experience of being observed formally. One participant commented on her uneasiness during any type of interview and on feeling unprepared for the questions: “It is as if I don’t know the test. We talk all the time as undergrads about making sure we have covered the items on our tests or with respect to the PSSA tests that our students will take… it is unfair to test them on material they don’t know. I feel like one of my students about to take this test” (Dea).

Expectations

The final theme was generated by the participants and was not the direct result of questions that were asked during the initial interviews. No questions were specifically asked about common language or clear expectations; however, multiple teachers talked about the district’s process of supervision lacking just those things. More than one teacher described the experience of undergraduate work and the VASD induction as “a horse and pony show. I still can’t answer what you are looking for as an administrator from me as a teacher. I didn’t use this terminology and haven’t been provided with any information from the district about it either. It is October and I’m being observed soon. This is the first I am hearing about a rubric or domains” (Brian).

When informally asking participants at the conclusion of the interviews if they felt there was a need for a common language to be explained, each stated profoundly, “Yes.” “To have a level playing field where we all know the expectations, share a common language, and have clearly defined terminology would place the full responsibility on the teacher. Right now, I don’t know which way is up” (Wes). Only three participants mentioned that they had bee provided with clearly defined examples of distinguished teaching videos to observe and from which to learn. Only five novice
teachers rated their mentoring teacher as outstanding or remarkable. Zero of the five used the term “distinguished” when describing their experience. It was evident from a review of the VASD induction packet that no exemplar documentation, lesson plan examples, or current teaching literature was provided to the newly hired teachers. Additionally, it was noted that more than one novice teacher stated, “I have received no feedback on my lesson plan designs to this point. I’m not even sure I’m doing what they want me to be doing. I was confident before you asked me all these questions” (Jim).

Overall, I received a very resounding review that the participants for this study wanted a clearly defined common language, a set of clear expectations for their first clinical supervision experience, examples of distinguished lesson plan designs, literature to support Danielson (1996) rubrics and domain categories, and exposure to distinguished teaching practices. When asked if they would enjoy watching distinguished teachers within her building without losing preparation time, one participant commented, “…that would be a dream come true. To not have to give up critical planning time and clutter my hectic day even more, while I get to watch great teachers teaching the students in my building… it would be like the Visa commercials. Priceless!” (Briana). Similar feelings were echoed in the comments of other teachers.

The Three Phases

Phase One (Steps 1 – 3)

Participatory Action Research lends itself to researcher flexibility. Given the information collected and general themes that emerged, it was concluded that professional development would be provided. I utilized current research to organize packets of information for all novice teachers. Formal training on the Danielson model
(1996), a common language centered around corresponding terminology, and current empirical research was provided. As noted in the methodology section of this research, novice teachers were provided with packets of information centered around the four domains, the rubrics associated with those domains, lesson plan exemplars, a copy of the PDE 426 form, and additional information. I provided explicit information and practice as I focused the group on using a specific language and creating clear expectations for their pending observation. Teachers were asked to write their thoughts and reflections throughout the process. Since the overall purpose of this study was to examine novice teacher development through the clinical supervision process, it is appropriate to report teacher reactions to each stage of the participatory action research study.

I have grouped teacher comments by building level to provide continuity in the reporting style of this research study. The following comments summarize teacher reactions to the initial professional development activities in which current research was provided through the final professional development process designed to have novice teachers perform self-evaluations on their teaching style (see Appendix U). Chapter 3 detailed the steps chronologically for this research. I will follow that same order while reporting novice teacher comments and statements, to fully illustrate their reactions to the activities. As it is common in PAR, I continued to prompt, encourage, expand, and extend novice teacher discussions and thinking by asking questions throughout this process.
Professional Development (Step 1)

Grades K – 5

Not knowing what to expect, the information shared allowed me to have a better feeling for what would be expected. The Danielson model provides clearly defined domains and a common language. (Briana)

The clinical supervision process is more complex than my first gut feeling. The data provided has eased some concerns. (Jim)

The MetLife information provided and the one study that talked about the revolving door of teacher education were alarming. To hear that most teachers were unprepared and uncomfortable…and worse, that many were leaving the field altogether…that was disheartening. (Jenna)

The information provided was a good refresher for me. I used the domains and seeing them with a rubric allows me to reach for the districts expectations. (Jesse)

Grades 6-8

I use rubrics all the time in my classes. It is nice knowing what is expected and what I need to do to reach my goals. (Roo)
I didn’t realize that the domains were so complex and that the rubrics associated with them were so detailed. I’ve been through an in-service before, plus the one this year. This is the first I am seeing this model in action. (Ed)

This just made me feel way behind. I had to ask someone what in the world you meant by domains. I had never seen this before. (Lennie)

The presentation was well organized, it had a clear agenda, and I learned a few things about the clinical supervision process. (Wes)

*Grades 9 – 12*

This process started to have me look through [the administrator’s] eyes. You mentioned a different lens. That made sense to me after the presentation. (Joey)

I felt safe in an environment with other young teachers. Hearing your experiences regarding your first years helped me to realize I would be alright. This information was new and different from how I had been observed, but I know what is expected. (Dea)

After hearing the discussions and group questions, I realized I am much further ahead. It made me appreciate all the headaches my professors caused me in my undergraduate work. This was a complete review lesson for me. (Cledda)
Danielson has simplified a confusing topic for me. (Brian)

Considering I had no idea what you asked me about in our initial interview, I feel much better about the subject. The [Danielson] model was presented well and I understand the rating categories. (Anson)

I haven’t had to write reflections in some time. Although a little elementary, I felt the information was worthwhile. Especially since this is how I will be judged. (Todd)

*Values Card Exercise – Individual Experience (Step 2)*

The Values Card exercises (individual and group) were the final step of the first day presentation. The novice teachers each received four pages of paper with eight to ten core values listed and defined on them. They followed the process as outlined in chapter 3 of this study. It was very important to me that the new hires identified who they were as a person. Throughout the day, I preached the importance of working within who you are and not trying to just mirror or clone yourself as a different version of a distinguished teacher. That “self” had to be key in developing their own personality for the students. Teachers were asked to keep the information in the handouts in mind as they began to define who they were and who they wanted to be as a teacher. Each teacher would end up with three core values. Those values were then shared with the group and with their respective buildings (see Appendix P).
In addition, for the first time, the novice teachers would work as a group to create a fictitious distinguished person. The concept was designed to force the group to work with each other. Separated by building level, they followed the same process to narrow their group down to six, and eventually three, core values. The teams then dissolved into one large group of 14 and had to provide three single core beliefs for their person of distinction. This process is outlined in chapter 3. Groups were asked to have designated spokespersons, but others were allowed to provide input as they felt was needed. Below are the reactions to the Values Card exercises.

*Grades K – 5 (Individual)*

Finding my values out of a list of nearly forty cards was challenging, but I feel the three I selected define me. (Briana)

I didn’t understand the exercise at first. It seemed difficult because many were alike. However, hearing how easy it is to lose who you are in this process and the need to keep who you are became crystal clear. (Jim)

I rushed through the exercise…felt that I selected cards that didn’t define me. Then I read them after a few minutes and felt ok with my selections. I hope this is how my colleagues perceive me someday. (Jenna)

This was very difficult because so many of the cards depict someone I want to be or be seen as in my personal and professional life. The three I selected are truly me. (Jesse)
For the first time in a long while I reflected on who I am. We talk a lot about reflecting in my undergraduate classes, but it was simply a buzz word… talked about it, but never did it. (Roo).

This would have been a great exercise for an interview. (Ed)

I felt like so many of the cards were similar. I didn’t like this exercise because I feel like I am more than just three simple words. (Lennie)

Great exercise for self reflection. I do not want to be another Mr. Smith or Mrs. “Math Teacher.” I want to learn from them, but not be them. (Wes)

It was interesting to move from six cards to four cards and finally select my three. I had a more difficult time explaining why I eliminated three of the cards then I did selecting the three to define me. (Joey)

This made me stop and think about who I am and never losing sight of “me.” (Dea)
I really liked this. I am my three cards. I like me…haha. (Cledda)

It was hard and I hated this exercise simply because I wanted to work as a group. Making us pick six and then once we had troubled over six to then eliminate three again…just evil. (Brian)

It was interesting to read all of the core values. Many were similar or used other core values to define them. I picked the three best that defined me. (Anson)

This made me rethink the person I believe I am. I liked this exercise and I would love to see who I align with from the colleagues in my building. (Todd)

Values Card Exercise – Group Experience (Step 3)

Grades K – 5 (Group)

This process was not as difficult as I had expected. We quickly agreed on two values and simply voted on the third. (Jim)

I found that one group member dominated how this would be done. Before I knew it we had three values and I wasn’t sure how. I didn’t like this process. (Jenna)
It was interesting to see what people had as their values. I quickly learned who was willing to fight for their beliefs and opinions. Three members participated and one seemed to just agree with our suggestions. When we all came together, one member suggested that we count up the cards and the three that are most present become our person of distinction. We voted and agreed. (Jesse)

*Grades 6 – 8 (Group)*

We struggled to agree on our second and third core values. We had open discussion, argued a little, then came to a consensus after prompted by the instructor (Chad Daloia) to work through questions and explain why some were so set on the selection of certain values. In the large group, we just decided to let the most selected values win. That process was easier than the small group. (Roo)

I am not sure I understood the reason for selecting this fictitious person. It was only clear after talking with Mr. Daloia. I like the idea of establishing who we are and who we think a distinguished person “looks like” and what values we rightly or wrongly believe they possess. (Ed)

*Grades 9 – 12 (Group)*
This process had a deeper meaning. I believe it was a way to teach us that we are going to have to learn to play nice with others. The normal arguments and discussions took place and we eventually created this person. My small group was more difficult than the large group. We simply voted and had our man…or woman. (Brian)

Difficult at first. Not sure I understood the intent of this objective. Finding self was understood. Did not understand why we needed to find a group consensus for the clinical observation process. (Anson)

Phase Two (Steps 4 - 5)

As we entered the second phase of the research study, novice teachers were asked to complete a 20-minute peer observation and conduct an observation from a video lesson published through an extension of Penn State University as discussed in chapter 3 (see Appendix U). All participants took part in each step and procedure. Teachers were first asked to comprise a written reflection of past knowledge specific to the first meeting. From this initial discussion, I led participants through the story board activity and video observation exercise. The next section will describe the individual teacher thoughts for steps three and four in the process.

Story Boards (Step 4)

The peer observation lesson was limited to 20 minutes as not to overwhelm the novice teachers. Their task was to find something unique and amazing they observed in a distinguished teaching lesson and place that observation in the correct domain. In addition, they were to find something that occurred in the lesson that was unique and
define it by a time period (first, second, or last third of a period). Examples were given such as: denote a transfer of topic, the manner with which a discipline issue was handled, how the room was reorganized during a lesson, cooperative learning exercises, or specific levels and types of questioning (see Appendix R). Teachers then placed their information onto the respective story boards in front of the room. One board was designated as a domain board, and the other was designated as a period break-down board sectioned into three parts. A side note worthy of mentioning: novice teachers were responsible for handling the set up of the observation with distinguished teachers from their respective buildings. Distinguished teachers were not prompted, nor were they made aware they had been recommended by their building principals for observation. This was done intentionally to force novice teachers into building their own level of trust and rapport with members of the VASD teaching community.

*Grades K – 5*

I had completed observations before, but never domain specific. At first I struggled to find things to fit the four domains, but I realized eventually that they were there. I just need to be confident as I wrote them into place. (Briana)

The distinguished teacher I observed made twenty minutes fly by… I forgot to write until the time had elapsed. (Jim)

The planning and preparation domain was of particular interest. My distinguished teacher had meticulous plans. It was clear why she was in the elite category. (Jenna)
There were very smooth activity or topic changes every seven minutes. At the conclusion of lesson I asked the reason for the rapid changes and was informed that many TV shows now run commercials approximately that often and this was a way to keep their interest at a high level. (Jesse)

*Grades 6 – 8*

It was evident from the onset of the class that I was observing a distinguished teacher. I couldn’t write fast enough on my sheets to keep pace with the information I wanted to record. (Roo)

Students were in groups, each with a clearly defined role, and all were required to provide something physical (notes, records, etc…). (Ed)

I loved the start up activity. It began at the bell, had students list three topics from the previous lesson, and five random papers were selected for discussion to start the lesson. (Lennie)

I had physically observed teachers in my undergraduate program, but never recorded information in a formal capacity. I liked this exercise. I am starting to see how administrators have to see and hear everything. (Wes)
During the lesson, I am writing feverishly and I break my train of thought as everyone in the classroom is laughing. I never heard the joke or story that lead to the laughter. You (Chad Daloia) preached in the first session how easy it is to overlook something that may be critical to the observation while documenting. It was a great lesson to have it occur to me. (Joey)

I observed two great techniques for non-verbal behavior correction. That teacher has some look. She has to practice that in the mirror. Also, the subtle proximity to two male students discussing gym class in her room was amazing. Not a word said. (Dea)

Very distinct style. Ultimate respect of students. True trust and caring displayed. Teacher asked specifics about their lives to show he cared. (Cledda)

Was so excited about being provided time and not giving up my prep period. Teacher was energetic, charismatic, and showed great rapport with students. Used humor in lesson to keep students motivated. (Brian)

I loved the twenty minutes I spent in (teacher’s) classroom. She never took her foot off the pedal and continued to challenge her students. They rose to the challenge. (Anson)
Using the domains as “must finds” gave me a direction for the observation. I still could not rate the teacher as one of the four ratings though. I am not comfortable enough to do so. (Todd)

*Video Observation (Step 5)*

Penn State University (PSU) has been engaged in a program entitled *Classrooms for the Future*. As part of this program, districts are trained in observation techniques using a series of video teaching lessons. PSU granted me permission to use their instructional video. Participants were asked to conduct a 30-minute observation using the PDE 426 form. At the conclusion of the video lesson, PSU provided feedback from the lesson with an example observation form completed by an expert. Novice teachers were able to compare their observation findings. Each domain was discussed, and the lesson was reviewed in a group setting. Participants thoughts on the process are listed below.

*Grades K – 5*

This process was very nerve racking. I didn’t want to make a mistake. I felt like it was a test. But the discussion afterwards was very enlightening. (Briana)

I realized I am not a very good observer. I thought I saw things that according to the expert I did not see. The explanation and discussion gave me a different perspective from the observer’s lens. (Jim)
This was hard. I was afraid to write because I thought I might miss something.

(Jenna)

I liked this exercise mainly because I liked the challenge. Watching an average teacher in that lesson and critiquing the lesson using the form we will be observed on was interesting. (Jesse)

Grades 6 – 8

Tough…very tough. Using the 426 form and checking off those items, making notes, making suggestions…all very difficult. (Roo)

As the observation continued I found myself more at ease with the PDE 426 form. I have done observations before, but not on the actual form I will be observed. It was an interesting exercise. (Ed)

The lesson was very boring and it made it tough to follow. I wish we would have observed a better lesson. (Lennie)

I liked this exercise and especially the discussion afterwards. It helped me see how things could be viewed differently from a trained eye. (Wes)
Grades 9 – 12

The lesson plans provided at the start of the lesson seemed over the top. And the lesson observed was average at best. I had a lot of suggestions to make this teacher better…and got some of them right when compared to the expert. (Joey)

Good exercise..long, but worth the trouble once we had the discussions. (Dea)

I have done a similar exercise through (her university). I’ve used the PDE 430 form for observing peers in my classes. This was a bit boring having done it before. But got the point across. (Cledda).

Liked the exercise and it got its point across. (Brian)

Struggled with watching the video and writing down notes. I missed quite a few things pointed out by the expert example (of the observation). (Anson)

The process was good. I understood many of the things I missed during the observation. I needed to be more critical. (Todd)

Phase Three (Steps 6 – 7)

The final phase was designed to focus on the clinical observation process. Novice teachers were provided with full exposure to the PDE 426 form in this phase. They were
asked to share information on the story boards from a formal observation conducted prior
to entering phase three, and they performed a formal evaluation of their own classroom
performance via a video lesson recorded prior to them entering this final day. The
participant’s thoughts are detailed below.

*Formal Distinguished Teacher Evaluation (Step 6)*

In the final phase of the study, novice teachers were asked to perform their third
observation using the PDE 426 form prior to this final meeting date. The first observation
was performed on a condensed version of the PDE 426 form prior to the start of phase
two, while the second observation occurred during phase two as participants used the
PDE 426 form during the video lesson. For this observation, the participants were asked
to again make contact with a different distinguished teacher in their building and
establish an observation date and time. This time they were asked to perform a full period
or lesson observation. Novice teachers were provided coverage again so that they did not
need to forfeit their preparation periods. Most lessons lasted approximately 30 to 45
minutes. All teachers used the PDE 426 form for the evaluation and shared thoughts and
experiences via the story boards.

*Grades K – 5*

I learned a lot about structuring a successful lesson by observing a master teacher.
Her control of the classroom and instructional delivery were amazing. (Briana)

It was tough to record information during the lesson because I felt like a student
in the class. I wanted to participate and even gave an answer to one question.
Great interaction and questioning with students. (Jim)
My experience was great from start to finish. Strong introduction, a thorough review of previous material, great classroom management control, and a fantastic closing to a lesson. Clear to see why teacher is rated distinguished. (Jenna)

I had just taught the same lesson a day ago. It was great to see how someone else in my discipline approached the same subject material. Especially someone rated so highly by my building principle. (Jesse)

Grades 6 – 8

I looked for all the items on the (PDE 426) form. He hit them all. Planning, classroom management, instruction, and professionalism. He had them all. Easy to rate as a distinguished teacher. (Roo)

I was very critical of the lesson. I attempted to find fault first…was unsuccessful in my attempt. The rating was easy…distinguished. Loved the interaction with the students from start to finish. (Ed)

As this exercise started, I knew from the onset that I am no where near her league. It is great to have exposure to such sound teaching. I really learned a lot from this experience. (Lennie)
With my background it was interesting to watch such a concrete subject as math taught in an abstract fashion. Children were challenged, engaged, and motivated by the teacher. They wanted to do well for him. (Wes)

*Grades 9 – 12*

The teacher I observed had over twenty five years of teaching experience, but had the enthusiasm of a first or second year teacher. Great (instructional) delivery throughout the lesson. Not a single discipline issued. (Joey)

I was not a fan initially of having to observe someone for forty plus minutes, but fully understand now the reasoning behind the task. I’ve struggled early in my class keeping student attention for the full period. I picked up a few techniques to help with this issue. (Dea)

I have used this process on other teachers including my mentor during my student teaching experience. It is always good to see experts practice their craft. I certainly picked up a few ideas to try with my students. (Cledda)

Strong interaction and always kept students engaged in something. Had various activities for those students that finished early and modeled all expectations. (Brian)
A full lesson was a little too much for me. I struggled to take notes and listen to the teacher. I am afraid that I might have missed a few things during the lesson, but it is clear that I have a long way to go before I reach his status. (Anson)

I found that I have a lot in common with the teacher I observed…the lesson was clear and it was easy to follow the domains on the form. I looked at everything from lesson plans to grade book. The lesson was perfect. (Todd)

**Self-Reflection Observation (Step 7)**

The culminating activity required participants to conduct their own PDE 426 observation on their teaching style. A lesson of their selection was recorded and placed onto a DVD. All lessons were recorded between the second and third phase of the professional development. All video taped lessons had to be completed a minimum of three days prior to our last session. This allowed all DVDs to be created and placed some time between the lesson performance and the actual observation. The thoughts of participants are documented below.

**Grades K – 5**

Of all the activities we were asked to complete, this was my favorite. Given school time to complete an observation on my performance and reflect on my early development was great. I was very critical on myself and learned quite a bit from this experience. (Briana)

I know the domains. I know the rubric. I know the expectations of the district. These are all things I did not know prior to these sessions. (Jim)
Although this could have been done in less than three sessions, I appreciated the experience. If I don’t know this form now, I never will. (Jenna)

My introduction was strong and I had very good classroom management skills. I noticed that my lesson faded in the middle and became strong again in the end. I use the word “um” to much to start discussions and I constantly rub my hands together which could both be distracting to my students. I would like to do this process again in the second semester to see how far I have come. (Jesse)

*Grades 6 – 8*

I have never formally observed myself using the “test.” Using the same form that I will be evaluated on seems so simple, yet, I’ve never done this before. I am sure that I have areas to improve, but hope that I learned some things from my self evaluation that will keep me from duplicating the mistakes in my first observation. (Roo)

I liked this the best. Working on improving me after seeing some of the techniques I picked up during the peer observations…that was of great benefit. I will hopefully make even more strides before my observation. (Ed)

I wish we would have done a full experience, pre and post interviews as well. But all in all I see the point in this exercise. I made some mistakes and had some really good moments as well. (Lennie)
My review was not as strong as I would have liked and I didn’t question half of the students in the class. I answered more questions than my kids answered. It was not a very good lesson. I think I was nervous because I wore the microphone and the camera was in the room. (Wes)

*Grades 9 – 12*

I hated my voice on camera and I need to work on my stage presence. However, all the components of an effective lesson were present. I covered all of the domains and I believe I had a proficient performance. This was my favorite activity. (Joey)

During my lesson, I noticed that I said “ok” a lot and was actually distracting myself during the observation. I need to project my voice more and only called on a few students during the period. I did however, have strong openings and closings in my lesson. It was a good experience. (Dea)

As mentioned throughout this process, I have always felt ahead of the group because I have experienced all of this in some shape or form. I have observed myself from video before. This time was slightly different in that it was solely my classroom. No other teacher had any control of the dynamic within my four walls. It was still beneficial. I was able to realize I hate how I talk. (Cledda)
I can already see a difference in my teaching style. I have incorporated some of the observed distinguished behaviors into my style of teaching. Still have a long way to go, but seeing improvement. (Brian)

I haven’t laughed so much at myself in a long while. I have a lot of idiosyncrasies that need addressed. I know my material, but need to improve questioning to see if my students know the material. Liked my closing… picked up from observations. (Anson)

…favorite of all the activities. Mainly because I worked on improving me. I used the strategies we discussed and can certainly recite the four domains to anyone. Overall, a great experience. (Todd)

Celebration

When phase 3 came to a close, participants were invited to a brief breakfast celebration held at the high school in VASD. The novice teachers were invited to share in a thank you for their participation, sharing of their experience, and collaboration. Two items were produced in the process of this study. Novice teachers received a copy of the story boards (see Appendix O) they had created. This step in the process was intended to provide a quick reference guide for finding solutions to similar problems they may be experiencing in their classrooms, and as a reference list for new ideas/strategies. Also, they received a copy of the core values poster that would be shared with their respective buildings. Again, this concept was used to help novice teachers identify who they are and
provide a means of connecting with teachers in their buildings and within the district.

Teachers were asked to review the sheets prior to their final interviews. We made quick reference to the handouts and informally discussed their overall experience and new level of comfort with the observation process.

Post Interviews

As the concluding activity in this PAR, participants were asked to take part in a post interview so that I might gain insight on their perspective of the overall process. It also gave me a chance to assess their development as they moved towards their first clinical observation in Victory Area School District. The post interview questions were designed to provide answers targeting the initial research questions posed in this study. In the upcoming Data Analysis section of this paper, I will address the rationale and rigorous method used to record, code, and differentiate the data. The questions utilized in the study for post observation are as follows.

1. What do you think was the overall influence of the steps and processes on your perceptions of the clinical supervision process?

2. As you identified core values that defined who you are as a person and teacher, how did that experience affect your approach for preparation in the clinical supervision process?

3. In creating storyboards for the domains and time, how does that product influence your development in preparation for the clinical supervision process?

4. Did the overall process help you to more clearly identify and articulate the PDE 426 form used in the clinical supervision process? Are you able to more clearly
articulate the domains, rubrics, and teacher expectations as they relate to this form?

5. In the study I introduced Danielson’s framework for teacher development. Do you believe this framework was appropriate for your grade level/job description? How did explicit instruction help in your development as a novice teacher?

6. In reflecting on your initial perceptions of the clinical supervision process, how did the exposure to distinguished teachers affect your preparation for the pending clinical observation?

7. How did using the PDE 426 form in your peer observations and your personal observation influence your development in the clinical supervision process?

8. Do you think this exposure helped in your development as a novice teacher?

9. Did the overall process or use of the Danielson framework create any additional pressure (stressors) for you as you prepare for the pending clinical supervision process? What unintended consequences (e.g. teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-facilitator, teacher-to-administrator) or other themes emerged for you as a result of this process?

10. Do you have any other comments or thoughts on your overall experience?

Data Analysis

Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) stated, “We operate from the basic premise that how researchers account for and disclose their approach to all aspects of the research process are key to evaluating their work substantively and methodologically” (p. 28). These researchers have suggested a process in response to the dilemma facing qualitative researchers’ methods of data analysis. This process provided suggestions for “assessing
and publicly disclosing the methodological rigor and analytical defensibility of qualitative research” (p. 28). “Too frequently, qualitative research is evaluated against positivist criteria of validity and reliability and found to be lacking…Positivists allege that the product of qualitative inquiry is fiction…researchers have no way to verify their truth statements” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 8). As a means to inform readers, I have applied many of the suggestions of Anfara, Brown, and Mangione in my data analysis.

Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) outline a process designed to create a connection between research questions, themes, data sources, categories, and findings. They believe that this process is about taking the steps necessary for making all aspects from beginning research to discussion of findings clear, public, and transparent. In using such a method, I attempted to improve the quality of my research by explaining the process and the methods taken to identify themes, explain the data collection process, and address trustworthiness. “These observations have led us to conclude that in all the discussions of validity in qualitative research there is one major element that is not sufficiently address—the public disclosure of processes” (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 29).

In this section, I will disclose how I applied these strategies to my data collection process. I used four forms of data collection: observation, artifact analysis, pre and post interviews, and written comments/reflections. The primary function for using such methods was to ensure that questioning techniques covered the initial research questions. In Table 7, I reviewed the initial research questions as they related to the process taken during the activities described in Chapters 3 and 4, any written responses given for those steps along with the post interview questions outlined in Table 7. Additionally, as an
active participant and facilitator, many of my personal observations could be applied to support teacher comments.

Table 7

Research Questions in Relation to Interview and Process Steps/Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question(s)</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What themes emerge when novice teachers are led through an exercise designed to identify individual value beliefs as a teacher and shared beliefs as a community of practice regarding distinguished teaching practices?</td>
<td>P1, P2, P3 T1, T2, T4, T6, T7, T9, T10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How will increasing novice teacher exposure to and explicit instruction on distinguished teaching affect their perception of the supervision process?</td>
<td>P1 T4, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How will the intervention process affect novice teacher preparation (if any) for the clinical supervision process?</td>
<td>P1, P2, P3 T2, T3, T6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What unintended consequences (e.g., teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-facilitator, teacher-to-administrator) or other themes emerged for novice teachers as a result of this process?</td>
<td>P1, P2, P3 T1, T9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
P1 = Phase One Steps 1 – 3 (Appendices U and H)
P2 = Phase Two Steps 4 – 5 (Appendices U and J)
P3 = Phase Three Steps 6 – 7(Appendices U and L)
T = Teacher Post Interview Questions (Table 4.6)

Four research questions were reviewed for this study. As a means to ensure that data collection strategies were appropriate, I matched post interview questions, field notes from the three phases, and written teacher comments that provided relevant data for analysis. “Keeping in mind that research questions provide the scaffolding for the investigation and the cornerstone for the analysis of the data, researchers should form
The interview questions used in this study were a primary form of data collection and were critical in understanding novice teacher perceptions and development throughout the study. This method of linking questions, notes, observations, and written reflections allowed the research questions to be cross-referenced within this strategy.

The next suggestion provided by the work of Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) outlines a process for analyzing data through code mapping. “The purpose of this process is to present the reader with the stories identified throughout the analytical process, the salient themes, recurring language, and patterns of belief linking people and settings together” (p. 31). This task has been referred to as “practices and politics of interpretation” (Denzin, as cited in Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 31) and the telling of the “tales of the field” (Van Maanen, as cited in Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 31). For this process, interview transcripts and reflection notes were analyzed individually to determine the surface concepts and codes. In reviewing the codes, similar patterns and connecting comments began to emerge. The larger patterns were then summarized under relating research questions and are provided in Table 8. This process of using raw data produced surface codes and eventually lead to the preliminary findings. Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) refer to the method as “constant comparative analysis” and state that it occurs “as the data are compared and categories and their properties emerge or are integrated together” (p. 32). “This process of identifying and ‘tagging’ data for later retrieval and more intensive analysis is called code mapping” (Seidel, Kjoiseth, & Seymour, as cited in Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 32).
Table 8

Code Mapping - Three Iterations of Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ #1 – Emergent Themes</th>
<th>RQ #2 – Exposure and Instructional Influence on Teacher Perception</th>
<th>RQ #3 - Process Influence on Teacher Perception</th>
<th>RQ #4 – Unintended Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A. Purpose of Clinical Supervision Process</td>
<td>2A. Students lack exposure to distinguished teachers</td>
<td>3A. Most novice teachers express little familiarity with PDE 426</td>
<td>4A. Teachers provided time to meet and discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B. Exposure to Distinguished Teaching Practices</td>
<td>2B. Little explicit instruction provided to beginning teachers</td>
<td>3B. Domains/rubrics must become common</td>
<td>4B. Administration play more active role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C. Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>3C. Novice teachers account for own development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(THIRD ITERATION: APPLICATION TO DATA SET)
Examining Novice Teacher Development Through Clinical Supervision Process

(SECOND ITERATION: PATTERN VARIABLES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1A. Purpose of Clinical Supervision Process</th>
<th>2A. Students lack exposure to distinguished teachers</th>
<th>3A. Most novice teachers express little familiarity with PDE 426</th>
<th>4A. Teachers provided time to meet and discuss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B. Exposure to Distinguished Teaching Practices</td>
<td>2B. Little explicit instruction provided to beginning teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C. Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(FIRST ITERATION: INITIAL CODES/SURFACE CONTENT ANALYSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1A. Individual beliefs about Clinical Supervision Process</th>
<th>2A. Overall lack of exposure to distinguished teachers</th>
<th>3A. Many novice teachers have never used PDE 426</th>
<th>4A. Novice teachers do not share concerns with other novice teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A. Shared Beliefs about Clinical</td>
<td>2A. Little to no time to observe</td>
<td>3A. Lack confidence in performance for</td>
<td>4A. Open dialogue not provided for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a final method to ensure full disclosure of processes taken for data analysis, triangulation was utilized. “The use of multiple sources of data collection as a form of triangulation prevent[s] reliance exclusively on a single data collection method and thus neutralize[s] any bias inherent in a particular data source” (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 33). Table 4.9 shows the major findings of this study listed with the three primary data collection methods. “Each source of data provides corroborative evidence to verify information obtained by other methods” (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 33). As Fielding and Fielding noted, “Triangulation puts the researcher in a frame of mind to regard his or her own material critically, to test it, to identify its weaknesses, to identify where to test further doing something different” (as cited in Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 33).
Leading up to the matrix of findings (Table 4.9), comments and notations from the participants will be described as they related to the four research questions. Taken from the post interview transcripts and the written reflections/observations of each participant, concepts that emerged will be noted as support.

Research Question 1: Emerging Themes Regarding Distinguished Teaching Practices

Examining novice teacher development through the clinical supervision process was the primary goal of this study. As transcripts from the post observations, reflections notes from participants, and observation field notes were reviewed, the following concepts emerged: novice teachers found it important to establish their own identity (core values); perceptions of clinical supervision process were consistent among participants; novice teachers believed providing clear expectations for teacher performance in clinical supervision process was important to their success; and, novice teachers’ placed high value/responsibility on their own development. The following statements from individual transcripts are provided to articulate these findings:

I did not want to become just another Mr./Mrs. Smith in my classroom. It was important to me that I had my own identity. The card game (values exercise) allowed me to keep focused on who I am and who I want the students to see.

(Wes)

At first, I didn’t see the importance of identifying my core values. But as I watched the distinguished teachers in my building it was evident that they all had
a great confidence in who they were in the classroom. I want that. And I feel the three values I picked will come through to my kids. (Jesse)

Using cards to identify what was important to me actually helped me to buy in to this process. This was about helping me become a better teacher and be prepared for my first observation. (Brian)

My first impressions of the clinical supervision process were slightly off. After hearing what the district expects of us, how we need to know and apply that knowledge to the domains… made me understand the process more clearly. (Wes)

When this process initially began, I felt like I knew very little. You asked me questions that I couldn’t answer…at least I felt that way. [My] perception of this process has drastically changed… a solid experience. (Roo)

The material was provided sequentially, we were never given more than we could handle, and we were challenged to see things from the administrators perspective. The expectations are now clear as to what I have to do to become a successful teacher. (Todd)

I received my induction packet and didn’t receive any support… maybe I didn’t even know what I should be getting in the way of support. This process made the expectations of me as the teacher clear and concise. (Briana)
We talk all the time about making sure our students have seen, read, and understand the material they will see on the PSSA. I feel like I know the test now. It is clear what I am expected to do. (Jim)

Having completed numerous observations through [my university] much of this seemed repetitive and I would have liked to have spent less time on it… but I realize I am ultimately responsible for my own growth… and development. (Cledda)

Seeing the distinguished teachers in my building…it was crystal clear that they are constantly reading and learning about the most current trends. To be like them…reach that level… it is on me. (Jenna)

This process was about making me more prepared and I am the one responsible for putting it to use. (Lennie)

*Research Question 2: Exposure and Explicit Instruction*

The second question in the research study targeted how novice teacher exposure to distinguished teachers and teaching practices, along with the receiving of explicit instruction on these methods, would impact their overall perception of the supervision process. The general findings include the following: lack of exposure to distinguished teaching practice was surprising for novice teachers prior to professional development process; providing explicit instruction on distinguished teaching practices stimulated
reflection on own teaching; professional development process and explicit instruction reinforced the value of novice teacher exposure to distinguished teaching; and, process exposed lack of district support in preparation for clinical supervision process. The following comments are provided as support for findings.

I was never given time to leave my mentoring teacher and see what other teachers were doing. I was surprised that the district provided us the time to do so. (Jenna)

Prior to this … I had been able to observe teachers. But I never knew how they were rated by the principals. As I did this (process) I know I got to see the best … those rated as ‘distinguished’ by the very principal that would be observing me. (Joey)

We covered the domains and rubrics in the first part (Phase One). I had never used those terms until that day. To know that I was about to be judged by that criteria … I was glad we covered it prior to my observation. (Dea)

I had not thought about how my pre-conference would play out. Having the (instructional) part first gave me a strong understanding of the concepts…it allowed me to really think about how I would handle that initial contact. (Anson)

I loved getting into the classrooms of distinguished teachers. I applied countless ideas that I had stolen from them in my very next lessons. They were very exciting and seemed genuinely interested in helping me. (Joey)
Until this process, I would not have been able to tell you if I was prepared for the first observation. From a district standpoint, our (induction) was pretty simple. We didn’t receive any information other than a copy of the observation form.

(Jesse)

Research Question 3: Influence of Process on Preparation

This research question attempted to determine the influence of a series of phases on novice teacher development and their overall preparation regarding the clinical supervision process. The general findings include the following: repeated use of supervision tool allowed novice teachers to view experience through an administrative lens; shared experiences from observations had impact on teacher development and preparation (storyboards); awareness of domains/rubrics/expectations had impact on teacher development and preparation; and, self-observation as culminating activity had greatest impact on teacher development and preparation. Comments to support findings include the following.

I found myself missing some things trying to write all that I observed…next thing I knew the class was laughing or answering a question. I never heard the joke or the question. It was a great lesson as to how something could be missed in an observation…or by a student that would be taking notes in my class. (Lennie)

Using the (PDE) 426 form over and over was repetitive, but it was a drill and skill that I clearly needed. I had not used the terminology on the form… now
more aware of the form. I can see what administrators are looking for and know how I plan to attack each domain. (Roo)

The storyboards were my least favorite exercise, but between the time we finished them and this interview, I actually pulled a technique for closing a class off of that form. It was an easy reference sheet to use. (Brian)

Hearing (novice) teachers share their stories from great (distinguished) teachers was exciting. I have and will continue to reference the sheets throughout the year. (Jim)

If I don’t know this form by now there might be no helping me. Using it (PDE 426) to observe distinguished teachers and my own performance was a great benefit. I know what my principal is looking for in my observation. (Briana)

I learned more in my first session (Phase One) than I did in all my undergraduate work. The domains were presented clearly and I have clear examples that detailed how the rubrics can be used… I even organize my lesson plans differently. (Roo)

The Danielson model provides a common language. Phase one provided countless handouts and examples of the domains, how the lesson plan design should look, examples of the rubrics in use…I used the examples as I designed lessons. (Jenna)
I couldn’t believe what I sounded like on my taped video lesson. I couldn’t stand my own voice. I watched my non-verbal cues and critically evaluated my performance like I was the principal in the room… my favorite exercise. (Cledda)

The self-observation really had an impact on my teaching style. I tried some of the tactics I picked up in the (distinguished) teacher observations, I implemented different strategies we discussed as a group, as was able to see everything in my own classroom. (Todd)

**Research Question 4: Unintended Consequences**

Participatory Action Research lends itself to open dialogue and continuous monitoring. Given this fact, the final research question was designed to assess any unintended consequences. The findings show novice teachers’ perceive: there to be great benefits from collaborating across grade levels; and, better communication/collaboration is needed from administrators to improve novice teacher development throughout early teaching years. Examples of those statements include the following.

I sat in this room with other beginning teachers and wondered if I really knew anything. It was great to hear and share similar concerns with others walking in my shoes. I can honestly say I learned something from each member. (Jesse)

Having each of the three (building) levels represented I found it easy to relate and share thoughts and ideas. I didn’t expect to take things from the elementary teachers, but hearing their concerns were similar to mine … allowed me to make a connection …share…and discuss how to handle our new careers. (Brian)
I didn’t think the open discussions ran very smoothly at first. No one wanted to sound as if they didn’t know anything. But as we became more comfortable we opened up and actually talked about education… I felt safe with the other (novice) teachers. (Wes)

I sat in the beginning year meetings (induction/teacher in-service) and we never once talked about expectations for any teachers, let alone me as a beginning teacher. I felt like I would have walked blind into the first observation… no one communicated anything to me about it (observation). (Dea)

We had meetings with (central office), with my principal… no one talked about the things we discussed here. This would have been nice to have immediately at the start of the year… not wait until October. (Jim)

As noted earlier, Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) described a findings matrix used to show how data was triangulated. In doing so, it “ensures that the study will be accurate because the information is not drawn from a single source, individual, or process of data collection” (Creswell, as cited in Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002, p. 33). I have attempted to apply this matrix to my research study in Table 4.9.
Table 9 Matrix of Findings and Sources for Data Triangulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Findings</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1: Process Themes</strong></td>
<td>* Novice teachers found it important to establish their own identity (core values).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Perceptions of clinical supervision process were consistent among participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Provide clear expectations for teacher performance in clinical supervision process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* High value placed on novice teacher responsibility for own development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 2: Exposure and Explicit Instruction</strong></td>
<td>* Lack of exposure to distinguished teaching practice was surprising for novice teachers prior to professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Providing explicit instruction on distinguished teaching practices stimulated reflection on own teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Professional development process and explicit instruction reinforced the value of novice teacher exposure to distinguished teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Process exposed lack of district support in preparation for clinical supervision process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3: Influence of Process of Preparation</strong></td>
<td>* Repeated use of supervision tool allowed novice teachers to view experience through an administrative lens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Shared experiences from observations had impact on teacher development and preparation (storyboards).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Awareness of domains/rubrics/expectations had impact on teacher development and preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Self-observation as culminating activity had greatest impact on teacher development and preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 4: Unintended Consequences</strong></td>
<td>* Positive benefit from collaborating across grade levels as novice teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Better communication and collaboration is needed from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I = post interview  R = teacher responses/reflections  O = observations
Conclusion

I chose to provide information at the beginning of this chapter to better help the reader fully understand the participants in this study. Document and artifact analysis as well as initial interviews from the novice teachers were utilized to establish existing beliefs, concerns, and exposure to the clinical supervision process.

Due to the social-constructivist nature of Participatory Action Research, I was able to adjust and monitor the amount of information I presented to the group regarding domains, rubrics, pre/post conferencing, and the use of the PDE 426 form. This process, in which my role allowed me to remain an active facilitator, permitted me the ability to make such decisions. In doing so, I was able to add additional dialogue and empirical literature in later phases of the development to support their learning with respect to the clinical supervision process.

As this chapter comes to conclusion, post interview questions were used to generate additional data (Table 6). This led to the final component which allowed me to determine the appropriate coverage of the research questions using Table 7. As the Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) article explained, I then conducted constant comparative analysis to identify initial codes. As I reviewed these surface codes, I looked for patterns that could assist in framing thoughts and participant comments from written reflections. Once patterns emerged, they were used to determine preliminary findings (Table 8). In chapter 5, findings will be discussed within the context of the literature in the field.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The first clinical supervision for any teacher is a stressful, nerve-wracking moment in their career (Robinson, 1998; Sykes, 1996). By examining and studying the interactions, comments, and perceptions of novice teachers, I was able to gain valuable information regarding the development of participants with respect to the clinical supervision process. Novice teacher dialogue, along with explicit literature, and the professional development activities (Phases One – Three) proved valuable in their perceptions and development as teachers. As recently as 2005, noted in chapter 2 of this study, new teachers were reported to be under or unprepared to take over their classrooms (Markow & Martin, 2005). Investigating teachers’ thought process is considered to be newly charted grounds in the field of qualitative research (Anderson & Mithener, 1994). I wanted to engage novice teachers during their most vulnerable periods, in those critical first three to four months, and help them develop a level of comfort and confidence as they prepared for their clinical observation.

In this final chapter, I will analyze the findings organized under the broad themes of professional development, core values, exposure and experience, and novice teacher development. Throughout the analysis, I will include concepts and make connections from social constructivist learning and novice teacher development discussed in the literature review section. Additionally, I will provide a section that depicts limitations within this study and reemphasize my stance as the researcher. Finally, implications for future research and practice will then be explored.
Professional Development

In connecting with chapter 2 of this study, Reynolds (1995) noted in ETS studies that a contrast existed when elementary students were placed with novice teachers. The 1995 studies showed that elementary students run a risk that lack of learning occurs not due to the student’s inability to learn, but from the lack of proper preparation and education of novice teachers (Reynolds, 1995). It is critical that professional development programs be redesigned and done so within the teaching framework. As Whitaker (2001) noted, it is essential to improve novice teacher’s satisfaction and self-confidence levels.

In this study, my initial interviews with the participants showed a clear lack of confidence and knowledge of the four domains found on the PDE 426 form. Although a few teachers were able to provide some information as noted in chapter 4, most novice teachers struggled to list any of the domains by proper title. The interviews also showed that the participants lacked an understanding of the rubrics used within this system of evaluation.

Considering I had no idea what you asked me about in our initial interview, I feel much better about the subject. The (Danielson) model was presented well and I understand the rating categories. (Anson)

I use rubrics all the time in my classes. It is nice knowing what is expected and what I need to do to reach my goals. (Roo)

As interviews continued, all participants disclosed that Victory Area School District (VASD) provided no training with respect to the clinical supervision process. Of
the three teachers entering the district with experience from outside VASD, none reported any form of formalized assistance or training for the clinical supervision process by their respective districts. Numerous quotes were shared in the previous chapter to support this finding.

I didn’t realize that the domains were so complex and that the rubrics associated with them were so detailed. I’ve been through an in-service before, plus the one this year. This is the first I am seeing this model in action. (Ed)

This just made me feel way behind. I had to ask someone what in the world you meant by domains. I had never seen this before. (Lennie)

Based on these findings, I increased the amount of professional development I provided to include a PowerPoint presentation of the Danielson (1996) model and more literature from Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice and Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching. Additionally, I provided information from the literature review in an attempt to increase novice teachers’ awareness of the challenges facing them, including the NCES study (2004), and to improve their understanding of the expectations of VASD with regard to the clinical supervision process. The professional development reinforced the value of having a model to work within and provided a common language for communication.

All of the professional development sessions were conducted in a group setting, and each participant was exposed to the Danielson (1996) model, the open dialogue and
discussion, and shared experiences of each teacher. Exemplars were given to all novice teachers regarding pre and post-observation forms. In addition, examples of lesson plan designs were provided to reduce novice teacher stress levels regarding the expectations of VASD (see Appendix S). The participants expressed that having the information proved valuable for their development.

Not knowing what to expect, the information shared allowed me to have a better feeling for what would be expected. The Danielson model provides clearly defined domains and a common language. (Briana)

As in any Participatory Action Research (PAR) design, building trust and rapport was critical throughout this study. But it was equally important to show that the administration of VASD was supportive of the participants’ development. In this study, administrators from VASD were not permitted to take part in or enter any of the phases associated with this study. Open dialogue revealed that many of the teachers felt alone, even though VASD provides each teacher with a mentor. I explained that VASD valued their development so greatly that they allowed a doctoral candidate to work with their newly hired teachers. Participants acknowledged a level of trust developing with their district as well. To further support the claim that VASD valued their development, it was noted that all teachers were provided with substitutes that allowed for release time during the normal school day. Teachers never had to forfeit any time beyond the normal school day, were never asked to miss preparation periods (planning periods), use their lunch period, and were even provided time to visit distinguished teachers within their buildings. These gestures by VASD continued to build on a relationship with new hires that they were willing to support their development through this process. Throughout the
professional development sessions, teachers expressed their appreciation for the material covered and the time spent to ensure a solid foundation in the model used by VASD for all teachers.

Core Values

Kagan (1992) conducted research that created a single stage of development for novice teachers. Within this stage, Kagan (1992) noted three primary tasks that novice teachers accomplish. One of those tasks specifically targets “use (of) knowledge to modify and reconstruct the personal images of self as teacher” (Kagan, 1992, p. 128). This activity within professional development was targeted to specifically create an image of self within the classroom of novice teachers. Participants in the study reported never considering the importance of identifying “self” for the benefit of their development as teachers. Markow and Martin (2005) disclosed valuable data from “The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher” when they documented that 25% of novice teachers were not prepared to work with students with varying abilities, that many lacked the tools to communicate with families to support student development, and that 20% were never prepared to maintain classroom order. Many teachers would claim that it is nearly impossible to maintain some level of identity in this early stage of teacher development. Participants were required to develop their core values from the onset of this study. As outlined in chapter 3, novice teachers used the Maxwell (2005) exercise to select their three core values. Participants noted such comments as follows:

I didn’t understand the exercise at first. It seemed difficult because many were alike. However, hearing how easy it is to lose who you are in this process and the need to keep who you are became crystal clear. (Jim)
For the first time in a long while I reflected on who I am. We talk a lot about reflecting in my undergraduate classes, but it was simply a buzz word… talked about it, but never did it. (Roo).

As Fang (1996) believed, novice teachers, once equipped with the necessary tools, will need to find ways to translate their beliefs into effective practice, thus connecting with chapter 2 and reinforcing the notion that teachers must establish such beliefs (values) early in their careers to find a level of satisfaction with who they are in their respective classrooms.

Throughout this process, I observed teachers struggling with defining themselves. I required teachers to record reasons why they discarded the Values Cards, as outlined in Chapter IV. The exercise, explained in the methodology section of this study, required that teachers reduce the nearly 40 cards to six, then to four, and finally establishing three core values. Comments on the back of discarded values helped show the struggle novice teachers experienced in defining their core values.

I could not part with four values. I am who I am, and will do anything to protect my family. I only part with this card (honesty) because you are forcing me to do so. (Lennie)

This one was tough (to let go), because I love teamwork and feel I am definitely a team player. But I feel I will find a way to do things myself if necessary. (Jim)

Participants reported an understanding of the process once completed. I found the exercise to be valuable in establishing identities for novice teachers. This process focused
on learning, in alignment with social constructivist learning, from distinguished teachers. However, I routinely stressed that we did not want to produce clones of those they observed. Open dialogue continued, and novice teachers expressed their feelings about the process:

Great exercise for self reflection. I do not want to be another Mr. Smith or Mrs. “Math Teacher.” I want to learn from them, but not be them. (Wes)

I repeatedly spoke about the need for novice teachers to connect with peers and colleagues and the importance of making that connection with their values in mind. This required novice teachers to become vulnerable. Managing vulnerability is a large part of learning to teach and being effective as a teacher (Bullough, 2005).

During the informal celebration to bring this study to a close, one of the most discussed items was the values boards (see Appendix ? – value board). Novice teachers continually commented on the number of staff members that spoke with them either asking questions about the process or sharing similar thoughts. The activity had a dual purpose which simply created connections within the respective buildings. As Maxwell (2005) noted, “Showing people that you care about them is always a good thing. But if you don’t also make an effort to get to know them as individuals, you run the risk of being like the Peanuts character, Charlie Brown, who said ‘I love mankind. It’s the people I can’t stand.”

Exposure to Distinguished Teaching

Although many of the findings were critical to the success of this study, nothing seemed to be more enjoyed by the participants than the final two findings sections of this dissertation. In the initial interviews, no one reported having any exposure to documented
distinguished teachers. The interviews uncovered that novice teachers were never provided time to observe distinguished teaching practices by their cooperating student-teaching districts and had little interaction with professional development provided by those districts. In linking with the literature review, Hoy and Miskel (2005) commented “learning is the construction of knowledge” (p. 41) and by providing social learning connections to distinguished teachers, I provided participants with a vehicle to construct knowledge first hand. Lave and Wenger (1991) referred to the importance of providing, in this case, novice teachers with increased access to performance. This study provided such access in the form of peer observations with noted distinguished teachers within their respective buildings. Rogoff (1991) suggested that it is critical for newcomers to see themselves as members of a community, and that connection can be established through social transactions between novice and distinguished teachers. Again, this study followed social constructivist learning principles by providing multiple experiences for novice teacher development. Participants reported that they learned a tremendous amount from the observations of colleagues rated as distinguished.

It was evident from the onset of the class that I was observing a distinguished teacher. I couldn’t write fast enough on my sheets to keep pace with the information I wanted to record. (Roo)

Social constructivist learning models also explain that “learning takes into account that human learning and development are intrinsically social and interactive” (Vygotsky as cited in Street, 2004, p. 8). As a means of using an interactive approach, I required teachers to share thoughts and experiences on story boards (see Appendix O). Teachers found the activity beneficial as a quick reference tool for ideas and problem
solutions. This process required participants to share their observations, communicate using the language, and discuss some of the strategies they had observed, thus forcing novice teachers to engage first hand in the evaluation process. Novice teachers shared in post interview responses their thoughts regarding the process.

I had physically observed teachers in my undergraduate program, but never recorded information in a formal capacity. I liked this exercise. I am starting to see how administrators have to see and hear everything. (Wes)

Additionally, novice teachers were required to perform multiple observations using the PDE 426 form. As noted in the literature review section, Price (2007) described the social constructivist process requires that participants actively engage in the assessment process so that they may truly understand the process. Requiring novice teachers to use the PDE 426 enabled them to explore, examine, and experience the process through active involvement. Participants reported that the exposure to distinguished teachers was extremely valuable.

Tough…very tough. Using the 426 form and checking off those items, making notes, making suggestions…all very difficult. (Roo)

As the observation continued I found myself more at ease with the PDE 426 form. I have done observations before, but not on the actual form I will be observed. It was an interesting exercise. (Ed)

I liked this exercise and especially the discussion afterwards. It helped me see how things could be viewed differently from a trained eye. (Wes)
Noted in chapter 3, participants worked to become proficient and extremely comfortable with the clinical supervision process. Providing full exposure to the PDE 426 form, the exposure to multiple distinguished teachers, and an immersion in the supervision process from the lens of the administrator proved valuable. Participants reported this process was critical to their development prior to their pending observation. Novice teachers stated they changed how they prepared for the observation, changed their lesson design, improved instructional delivery methods, and increased understanding of expectations for their observation.

My experience was great from start to finish. Strong introduction, a thorough review of previous material, great classroom management control, and a fantastic closing to a lesson. Clear to see why teacher is rated distinguished. (Jenna)

I had just taught the same lesson a day ago. It was great to see how someone else in my discipline approached the same subject material. Especially someone rated so highly by my building principle. (Jesse)

As Bandura explained, “human behavior is learned observationally though modeling: from observing others… and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action” (1977, p. 22).

Novice Teacher Development

Studies of strong induction programs show that sound principal leadership is essential for a comprehensive program (Wood, 2005). When conducting initial interviews and the professional development sessions, it was evident that novice teachers participating in the study were uncertain of the role administration could/would play in
their development. I focused on the clinical supervision process because I am passionate about the subject. It allowed me to engage personally in the investment and development of new teachers for Victory Area School District. Novice teachers in this study valued the experience and felt the time spent in preparation for a personally challenging event such as the first clinical supervision for VASD provided support that many felt was lacking in their first months on the job. This study allowed me to be viewed as an expert in the field of clinical supervision preparation in the eyes of the participants.

As the final, culminating activity, novice teachers were provided an opportunity to observe themselves in action via the video taped lesson. Prior to this point of the research study, they had observed multiple distinguished teachers and were now able to critique their own style. Participants used the PDE 426 form during the self-evaluation to again improve their exposure to the clinical supervision process.

My introduction was strong and I had very good classroom management skills. I noticed that my lesson faded in the middle and became strong again in the end. I use the word “um” to much to start discussions and I constantly rub my hands together which could both be distracting to my students. I would like to do this process again in the second semester to see how far I have come. (Jesse)

I have never formally observed myself using the “test.” Using the same form that I will be evaluated on seems so simple, yet, I’ve never done this before. I am sure that I have areas to improve, but hope that I learned some things from my self evaluation that will keep me from duplicating the mistakes in my first observation. (Roo)
Novice teachers reported this single activity was extremely beneficial to their development heading into their pending observation with building level administration. Eisenhart (1991) referred to the theoretical framework as a “skeletal structure of explanation” (p. 209). Novice teachers provided that explanation through their repeated displays of compliments and satisfaction with the process.

Of all the activities we were asked to complete, this was my favorite. Given school time to complete an observation on my performance and reflect on my early development was great. I was very critical on myself and learned quite a bit from this experience. (Briana)

I liked this the best. Working on improving me after seeing some of the techniques I picked up during the peer observations…that was of great benefit. I will hopefully make even more strides before my observation. (Ed)

…favorite of all the activities. Mainly because I worked on improving me. I used the strategies we discussed and can certainly recite the four domains to anyone. Overall, a great experience. (Todd)

Post interviews revealed highly improved levels of comfort with the domains, increased use of a common language, and a better understanding of expectations associated with the clinical supervision process. Simply creating a connection and investing in the development of the novice teachers within Victory Area School District proved extremely valuable to novice teachers as they prepared for their first observation in VASD.
Limitations

As a qualitative researcher, educator, and administrator, I must acknowledge that I am a strong proponent of the clinical supervision process. I believe in its intent and the standards that it applies to teacher accountability. In chapter 1, I openly discuss my passion for the subject of novice teacher development. Primarily formed by my own poor experience, this passion drove me to study the effects a professional development process may have on the preparation, perceptions, and overall development of novice teachers. Working closely with novice teachers, I have had the pleasure of personally seeing the satisfaction that many have experienced when one takes interest in their development both personally and professionally. Upon reviewing the social constructivist learning literature and examining a review of literature related to teacher development and improvement, my beliefs were reinforced. I attempt in this section to be forthright about my stance as an educational professional with 13 years of experience in the field. In doing so, I believe that it will increase the trustworthiness and credibility of my analysis of the findings and provide the support needed in my discussion of the results.

Strategies for prolonged engagement, member checking, triangulation, thick description, purposive sampling, and reflexivity are essential when selecting a methodological design for any study (Glesne, 2006; Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002). In my research, certainly prolonged engagement surfaced as a study limitation. Although initial contact meetings began in late August 2008, the crux of the professional development spanned a six-week period. Data collection was performed on site, but I did not have daily access to all teachers to see their interactions and daily use of the material we were installing through the professional development sessions. By using triangulation,
many of the depictions were obtained through interviews, artifact collection, written reflections, and observation notes from professional development sessions. Additionally, the purpose of the study was to examine novice teacher development through the clinical supervision process. It may have proved beneficial to collect long-term impact and/or post observation data from administrators conducting the formal observations as well as teacher perceptions of the impact on their overall rating in those observations. Both are items explored in a later section of this chapter.

In an ideal world, it would have been beneficial to have 100% participation of all eligible (novice teacher) candidates. Fourteen of 16 eligible teachers took part in the study and, given the social constructivist nature of this study, may have been viewed differently based on a change in the dynamic the two additional individuals may have provided. It was later brought to my attention that one non-participating novice teacher had an ailing father and couldn’t commit to the study with unknown time frames looming, and the second teacher was six and a half months pregnant at the time of our initial meeting and feared that the timing would not work and she would have to remove herself from the study. Teachers, according to IRB procedures, did not need to provide any rationale for not partaking in the study.

Finally, Victory Area School District had determined that novice teachers would receive ACT 48 credit for their professional development. I did not take part in the negotiation of this aspect for the study and was unaware until the studies completion that it was occurring. However, this could have possibly been a motivating factor that I did not account for in the study. When asked after the celebration dinner what prompted the incentive, VASD assistant superintendent commented that it never crossed her mind that
novice teachers would not receive the credits and that it is typical in districts to offer ACT 48 for most all forms of professional development. Novice teachers were not required to submit documentation for approval as it may constitute identifying themselves in the study, thus, breaking confidentiality as described in IRB protocol (see Appendix C). In all, the professionalism, flexibility, and commitment to this study from VASD were more than I could have ever asked for in a district. I am so thankful for their support.

**Implications for Future Research**

School districts nationwide face the hiring process nearly every year due to a variety of reasons such as retirement, expanding student populations, teachers leaving the profession, or a combination of all three. These phenomena allow for novice teachers to join an eclectic work force that immediately assesses their ability on the same evaluation form as teachers with 30 years of experience and service (Danielson, 1996). Based on this fact, I implemented a strategy that would better acquaint novice teachers with the clinical supervision process. While appropriate for the setting I chose, there are future implications for research that resulted from this study. The major implications for future research described in the following section include longitudinal impact on novice teacher performance on the evaluation form, longitudinal impact on administrator perceptions of this process on novice teacher performance in the clinical supervision, role of the administrator in the development of novice teachers, and further analysis of factors that impact novice teacher development once hired by a district.

As I reflected upon my work, the first implication for future research of my study would be to assess the longitudinal impact of the process. This would allow me to
determine the influence the professional development process (phases one - three) had on teacher performance in the clinical supervision. By conducting interviews after the actual observations and post conferences had occurred with building level principals, I would be able to determine the novice teacher’s overall experience in the process. The attitudes, behaviors, and changes made by participants in their preparation style could be monitored and assessed.

The second area for future research ties directly to the administrator or building level principal. I would like to extend the study to determine if building level principals found the time and money spent (substitute teacher coverage) were beneficial from their perspective. Also, it would also allow me to look at documented PDE 426 forms to assess participant performance through the lens of an administrator skilled in evaluation of new hires. Both research areas would provide valuable data to determine if the process novice teachers experienced in my study had lasting impact throughout their first year within a specific district.

Wood (2005) stated that little research has been conducted in the role of the administrator in novice teacher development. This process places the administrator facilitating the study in the role of coach, not adversary. Future research could be conducted within this realm, helping to define one role of the administrator in the development of novice teachers. Wood stressed that administrators are imperative to novice teacher success and retention. Placing perceived novice teacher notions regarding administrators as against, not for, new teachers at bay.

Finally, future research could extend into the areas that also impact novice teacher development. A similar process could be used conjointly with novice teacher mentors
participating in the observations of colleagues. Novice teachers could compare their PDE 426 evaluations against mentor evaluations conducted simultaneously. Open dialogue and discussion could occur between mentor and novice teacher to discuss similarities and differences on their respective evaluation forms, thus impacting novice teacher’s perceptions and possibly their development leading up to their own evaluation.

**Implications for Practice**

Newly hired personal face a myriad of challenges when entering a district. Novice teachers are searching for an identity, attempting to make new connections, and are struggling to simply stay on top of the plethora of paperwork (Street, 2004). In reviewing the information provided by novice teachers, it became evident that each community of new comers is uniquely different. Thus, having a framework to connect with new hires seems extremely proactive in aiding their development. As a means for continuous improvement, the activities in this study show great potential for improving the performance of novice teachers in the clinical supervision process.

As novice teachers focus on the importance of the clinical supervision process, the task activities within the study, and the overall investment into their development as a teacher, they will better understand the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead. The review of literature indicates that individuals learn by observing experts around them. By providing such access, continued professional development, and exposure to current trends in research, districts will demonstrate their commitment to each participant’s growth as a teacher and serve as an investment into their futures. The relative simplicity of this process to examine novice teacher development in the clinical supervision process has proved valuable. Victory Area School District must now determine if they will
continue to utilize this design for preparing future novice teachers to fit within their overall mission as a district.
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Appendix A

Superintendent Contact Letter
June 24, 2008

Dear Superintendent and Building Level Principals,

I am currently the Assistant Principal at Trinity High School in the Trinity Area School District and a doctoral candidate in the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders (IDPEL) at Duquesne University. I am interested in scheduling a brief 30 minute overview meeting with you to discuss my research. As an experienced educator in a school district with high expectations for success, I firmly believe that my research topic will provide potential benefits to your newly hired novice teachers. I have already utilized a similar process in my own building.

The purpose of my study is to determine the influence of a Participatory Action Research intervention on novice teacher perceptions of the clinical supervision process. In taking novice teachers through professional development and an intervention process, it is believed that a heightened awareness of distinguished teaching practices will influence their performance and may serve to enhance understanding and effectiveness. The first clinical supervision experience can significantly impact a novice teacher’s overall success during the early years of their teaching career. It is a very stressful, challenging time, and for many, it is the first time he/she is asked to take on multiple roles aside from direct instruction and professional responsibilities. As districts work to better align policies and induction programs with the changing needs of novice teachers, they must face the fact that they serve powerful roles as teacher educators, mentors and retainers. It is important to self-assess how districts are meeting or failing to meet these needs. This study will attempt to provide thick description of the clinical supervision process through a social learning intervention.

Despite the widespread use of induction and mentoring, most of the empirical research is focused on prescriptive (checklist) items created to support novice teachers. Little empirical attention is given to novice teacher needs based on information collected through their lens. After gaining access to the site and the informed consent of participants, I will follow these general steps: (a) baseline interviews with a small number of teachers; (b) artifact collection; (c) professional development sessions; (d) an intervention process; and (e) follow-up interviews. The dialogue and reflection inherent in this type of qualitative research may prove to be as valuable as the product – a site specific framework for distinguished teaching practices.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Given that all participants are 18 years of age or older, informed consent will be obtained for each participant. Students are not a part of this research design. As a component of the IRB procedural safeguards, the confidentiality of participants will be addressed. Participants will have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. If you have additional questions, please contact me at (724) 255 - 2146 or at daloiac@trinityprid.org. You may also contact my dissertation chair and the IDPEL Program Director, Dr. James E. Henderson, at (412) 396-4880 or via email at henderson@duq.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to the possibility of a brief meeting.

Respectfully,

Chad L. Daloia
School of Education
Duquesne University
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Teacher Contact Letter
June 24, 2008

Dear Team Teacher,

I am currently the Assistant Principal at Trinity High School in the Trinity Area School District and a doctoral candidate in the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders (IDPEL) at Duquesne University. On _____________, I met with building level principals and the superintendent to provide an overview of my planned research. As an experienced educator in a school district with high expectations for success, I firmly believe that my research topic will provide potential benefits for novice teachers. I have already utilized a similar process in my own building. If you agree to attend, I am scheduled to meet with you in the library at ______ a.m./p.m. on _____________, August ___, 2008.

The purpose of my study is to determine the influence of a Participatory Action Research intervention on novice teacher perceptions of the clinical supervision process. In taking novice teachers through professional development and an intervention process, it is believed that a heightened awareness of distinguished teaching practices will influence their performance and may serve to enhance understanding and effectiveness. The first clinical supervision experience can significantly impact a novice teachers overall success during the early years of their teaching career. It is a very stressful, challenging time, and for many, it is the first time he/she is asked to take on multiple roles aside from direct instruction and professional responsibilities. As districts work to better align policies and induction programs with the changing needs of novice teachers, they must face the fact that they serve powerful roles as teacher educators, mentors and retainers. It is important to self-assess how districts are meeting or failing to meet these needs. This study will attempt to provide thick description of the clinical supervision process thorough a social learning intervention.

Despite the widespread use of induction and mentoring, most of the empirical research is focused on prescriptive (checklist) items created to support novice teachers. Little empirical attention is given to novice teacher needs based on information collected through their lens. After gaining access to the site and the informed consent of participants, I will follow these general steps: (a) baseline interviews with a small number of teachers; (b) artifact collection; (c) professional development sessions; (d) an intervention process; and (e) follow-up interviews. The dialogue and reflection inherent in this type of qualitative research may prove to be as valuable as the product – a site specific framework for distinguished teaching practices.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Given that all participants are 18 years of age or older, informed consent will be obtained for each participant. Students are not a part of this research design. As a component of the IRB procedural safeguards, the confidentiality of participants will be addressed. Participants will have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. If you have additional questions, please contact me at (724) 255 - 2146 or at daloiac@trinityprid.org. You may also contact my dissertation chair and the IDPEL Program Director, Dr. James E. Henderson, at (412) 396-4880 or via email at henderson@duq.edu.

Respectfully,

Chad L. Daloia
School of Education
Duquesne University
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Informed Consent Letter for Teacher
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY (Teacher Form)

TITLE: Examining novice teacher development through the clinical supervision process: A participatory action research

INVESTIGATOR: Chad L. Daloia
35 Mulberry Hill Road
Washington, PA 15301
(724) 255 - 2146

ADVISOR: Dr. James E. Henderson
IDPEL Program Director
Department of Foundations and Leadership
(412) 396-4880

SOURCE OF SUPPORT: This study is being performed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders at Duquesne University.

PURPOSE: As a teacher, you are being asked to participate in a research project that seeks to investigate the influence of a Participatory Action Research intervention on novice teacher perceptions of the clinical supervision process. This study should illuminate practical issues in enhancing novice teacher performance and include professional development sessions and an intervention process to develop shared beliefs for teacher behaviors and techniques regarding distinguished teaching practices. With consent, all novice teachers within the district will participate in the professional development process. In addition, participants will also participate in the semi-structured interviews. The interviews will be audio-taped and transcribed. These are the only requests that will be made of you. The overall timeline for engagement within the district will be approximately six-eight weeks, with the intervention and professional development occurring over a three-four week period within the overall timeline.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no risks greater than those encountered in everyday life. Possible benefits of the study include professional development related to distinguished teaching practices and the creation of a site-specific framework for improved novice teacher
performance in a clinical supervision process. Building administrators will not be involved in the sessions. Your participation/non-participation will not be shared with school district administrators.

COMPENSATION:

The project will require no monetary cost to you. Compensation may include staff development and/or Act 48 credit hours for appropriate portions of the study. If confidentiality of participants cannot be maintained, credit will not be provided.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

Your involvement in this study will remain confidential. For teachers participating in the individual interviews, the audio-recordings will be transcribed. Pseudonyms will be used for the teacher and any references to students or other school personnel. After identifiers are removed, portions of the transcript may be used for direct quotation or discussion in the final dissertation report. Pseudonyms will also be used when describing teacher participation in the professional development sessions and intervention process. All written materials, consent forms, and audiotapes will be stored in a locked file in the researcher’s home and retained for five years after study completion. At that time, all materials will be destroyed. Your response(s) will only appear in statistical data summaries.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:

You are under no obligation to participate in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

A summary of the results of this research will be supplied to you, at no cost, upon request. You will also receive a transcription of your interview session as a part of the data analysis process for review.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT:

I have read the above statements and understand what is being requested of me. I also understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, for any reason. On these terms, I certify that I am willing to participate in this research project. I understand that should I have any further questions about my participation in this study, I may call Chad L. Daloia (see above for contact information), Dr. James Henderson (see above for contact information) and/or Dr. Paul Richer. Chair of the Duquesne University Institutional Review Board (412-396-6320).

Participant’s Signature (General Participation) Date

Researcher’s Signature Date
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Informed Consent Letter for Principals
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY (Administrator Form)

TITLE: Examining novice teacher development through the clinical supervision process. A participatory action research

INVESTIGATOR: Chad L. Daloia
35 Mulberry Hill Road
Washington, PA 15301
(724) 235 - 2146

ADVISOR: Dr. James E. Henderson
IDPEL Program Director
Department of Foundations and Leadership
(412) 396-4880

SOURCE OF SUPPORT: This study is being performed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders at Duquesne University.

PURPOSE: As building level administrators, you are being asked to participate in a research project that seeks to investigate the influence of a Participatory Action Research intervention on novice teacher perceptions of the clinical supervision process. This study should illuminate practical issues in enhancing novice teacher performance and include professional development sessions and an intervention process to develop shared beliefs for teacher behaviors and techniques regarding distinguished teaching practices. With consent, all novice teachers within the district will participate in the professional development process. In addition, participants will also participate in the semi-structured interviews. The interviews will be audio-taped and transcribed. As principal, you are invited to participate in an individual interview that will allow for a better understanding of district requirements in the observation process and the administrators experience and exposure levels to distinguished teaching practices. You will also be involved in reviewing the materials and group progress. The interviews will be audio-taped and transcribed. You will not be directly participating with the teachers. You will not receive information about teachers' participation or non-participation. These are the only requests that will be made of you.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no risks greater than those encountered in everyday life. Possible benefits of the study include professional development related to distinguished teaching practices and the creation of a site-specific framework for improved novice teacher performance in a clinical supervision process. Building administrators will not be involved in the professional development/intervention sessions. Participation/non-participation will not be shared with school district administrators.
COMPENSATION: The project will require no monetary cost to you. Compensation may include staff development and/or Act 48 credit hours for appropriate portions of the study. If confidentiality of participants cannot be maintained, credit will not be provided.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Based on the hierarchy of administrative job titles, your position is inherently identifiable. Therefore, your identity may be linked back to you by your position. For those participating in the individual interviews, the audio-recordings will be transcribed. Pseudonyms will be used for the administrator, teacher and any references to students or other school personnel. After identifiers are removed, portions of the transcript may be used for direct quotation or discussion in the final dissertation report. Pseudonyms will also be used when describing teacher participation in the professional development sessions and intervention process. All written materials, consent forms, and audiotapes will be stored in a locked file in the researcher's home and retained for five years after study completion. At that time, all materials will be destroyed. Your response(s) will only appear in statistical data summaries.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW: You are under no obligation to participate in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS: A summary of the results of this research will be supplied to you, at no cost, upon request. You will also receive a transcription of your interview session as a part of the data analysis process for review.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT: I have read the above statements and understand what is being requested of me. I also understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, for any reason. On these terms, I certify that I am willing to participate in this research project. I understand that should I have any further questions about my participation in this study, I may call Chad L. Daloxa (see above for contact information), Dr. James Henderson (see above for contact information) and/or Dr. Paul Richer, Chair of the Duquesne University Institutional Review Board (412-396-6326).

Participant's Signature (General Participation) __________________________ Date ___________

Researcher's Signature __________________________ Date ___________
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Semi-Structured Interview Questions for Teachers
Sample Teacher Interview Questions

Interviewee (Alias): __________________________ Date: __________________

Interview Location: __________________________ Start: _______ End: ______

Opening Comments:
Thank you for participating in this interview. As a fellow educator, I understand the demands on your time. This interview will last approximately 45 minutes and the questions will relate to your perceptions and experiences with various aspects of distinguished teaching practices. Please feel comfortable to stop me at any time or clarify an idea. It is my goal to create a positive, relaxed setting for our time together.

A. Demographic/Background
Can you provide some of your background experiences (e.g. certification, experiences, grade level, subject level, years in education, etc.)

B. Distinguished Teaching
How do you define distinguished teaching practices? On what do you base that definition? Do you think the other novice teachers would define distinguished teaching practices using the same words?

With regard to distinguished teaching practices, please talk about your understanding of the rating categories (i.e., distinguished, proficient, basic, and unsatisfactory) used in the Danielson model. What is your level of comfort with this model?

What are some of the things that you do (did) and/or talk about as a novice teacher to improve teaching practices (e.g. readings, professional development, faculty discussion, discussions with colleagues in the profession, etc.)?

What values (e.g. friendship, integrity, etc.) do you believe distinguished teachers possess? What role do these values play in there achievement of distinguished teacher?

C. Exposure to Distinguished Teaching Practices
During your student teaching or early years in the profession, what exposure have you had to distinguished teaching practices through observation? Has time been provided to you in your schedule to experience master teachers? Did your college/university provide such experiences?

During your student teaching or early years in the profession, what exposure have you had to distinguished teaching practices through professional development or undergraduate classroom experiences? Have exemplars been provided to you? Did your college/university provide such experiences?

D. Miscellaneous
Are there any other thoughts about distinguished teaching practices that you wanted to share?
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Permission to use Video and Values Cards Activity
VIDEO USAGE:

TO: Chad Daloia
FROM: Robert McNergney
RE: Use CaseNEX videos for research

Per your request, we are pleased to let you use the CaseNEX videos for your research. See login and password below:

daloiac/champ

Please let us know if you need anything else.
Best,
Robert McNergney & Francine Oliver

Francine Oliver <franonice@gmail.com

VALUES CARD ACTIVITY

Chad,

Thank you for your email and interest in utilizing the values cars in your research. Based on the nature of your work, and the fact that is to be used for research only, we are able to grant you conditional approval to use the resources for the project.

Good luck to you during this season and please let me know if I can be of any assistance to you in the future!

Kind Regards,
Rachael Rudolph
Director of Global Development
Mi - www.maximumimpact.com
GIANT Impact - www.giantimpact.com
3760 Peachtree Crest, Ste A
Duluth, GA 30097
678-225-3154 office
678-225-3106 fax
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Phase One Professional Development Agenda
PHASE ONE AGENDA

I. Constructivist Math Lesson

II. Intro
   a. Constructivist theory
   b. Purpose of the research
      i. Create an environment for open discussion
      ii. Teacher responsibility for own development – continued or fresh start
   c. Data - National Center for ed research and Metlife teacher survey

III. Video – It isn’t always as it seems

IV. Presentation on Danielson
   a. Framework
   b. Rationale
   c. Rating categories

V. Presentation of observation forms

VI. Individual values exercise

VII. Team values exercise

VIII. Reflection

IX. Homework = )
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Phase One Reflection Sheet
Professional Development #1 Reflection

Phase One

Directions: As we meet throughout today, I will ask you to take a few moments to reflect on each step of the process. As part of my research design, I will collect your sheets at the end of the session.

Step One:

Constructivist Theory: Please describe your thoughts and feelings regarding the information presented. What impact does this information have on your thinking?

Danielson Model: Please list thoughts on the information presented:

   Framework:

   Rationale:

   Rating Categories:

   Values Card Exercise – Please record your thoughts about the experience as you select core values for this activity.

Step Two:

Individual:

Step Three:

Group:
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Phase Two Professional Development Agenda
PHASE TWO AGENDA

Welcome:

I. Our last session accomplished three primary goals:
   a. Examined constructivist learning theory
   b. Explored the Danielson Framework
   c. Completed the values exercise

II. Discussion regarding our prior learning

III. Importance of Values

TODAY’S OBJECTIVES:

IV. Evaluate key observed characteristics of distinguished teachers (peer observations) using story boards for discussion

V. TPR/CFF exercise – observe classroom teacher on PDE 426 form

VI. Discuss new information (packets)

VII. Reflection

VIII. Homework: 426 observation // video lesson
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Phase Two Reflection Sheet
Professional Development #2 Reflection

Phase Two

Directions: As we meet throughout today, I will ask you to take a few moments to reflect on each step of the process. As part of my research design, I will collect your sheets at the end of the session.

Step Four:

Story Boards (Peer Observation) –

(a) Please detail your observation experience. Include any thoughts or feelings about the PDE 426 domains, the use of a modified form for the observation, and the general experience of observing a distinguished teacher.

(b) Please discuss the experience of having to make initial contact with the distinguished teacher, establishing the meeting, and any additional comments or thoughts regarding the experience.

Step Five:

Video observation – Please describe the experience of using the PDE 426 form to conduct a formal observation. Provide any thoughts regarding the professional video feedback as it compared to your observation findings.
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Phase Three Professional Development Agenda
PHASE THREE AGENDA

Welcome:

I. Our last session accomplished three primary goals:
   
b. Observed distinguished teaching practices and story boards
   
c. Video observation experience // “you” as evaluator

II. Recalling domains and rating categories

III. Importance of Values

TODAY’S OBJECTIVES:

IV. Evaluate key observed characteristics of distinguished teachers (peer observations) using story boards for discussion

V. Self-evaluation (video lesson) – Perform on PDE 426 form

VI. Reflection
Appendix L

Phase Three Reflection Sheet
Professional Development #3 Reflection

Phase Three

Directions: As we meet throughout today, I will ask you to take a few moments to reflect on each step of the process. As part of my research design, I will collect your sheets at the end of the session.

Step Six:

Story Boards (Peer Observation) –

(a) Please detail your observation experience. Include any thoughts or feelings about the PDE 426 domains, the use of the PDE 426 form for the observation, and the general experience of observing a second distinguished teacher.

(b) Please discuss the experience of having to make initial contact with another distinguished teacher, establishing the meeting, and any additional comments or thoughts regarding the experience.

Step Seven:

Self-evaluation (video lesson) – Please describe the experience of using the PDE 426 form to conduct a formal observation. Provide any thoughts regarding the professional video feedback as it compared to your observation findings.
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Timeline Flowchart
Examining Novice Teacher Development through the Clinical Supervision Process: A Participatory Action Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Study</th>
<th>Process Intervention</th>
<th>Post Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Gatekeeper Contact</td>
<td>Lay Summary with Teachers</td>
<td>Document Collection and Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Summary with Administration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District IRB Process?</td>
<td>Teacher Informed Consent</td>
<td>Professional Development by Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Informed Consent</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Office Informed Consent</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 30 minutes with Central
- 30 minutes with Teachers at an overview meeting
- 45-60 minutes per Interview
- Three 2 hour sessions
- 30-45 minutes per Interview
- 30 minutes All Team Celebration
Appendix N

Post Observation Interview Questions for Teachers
Post Interview Questions for Teachers

1. What do you think was the overall influence of the steps and processes on your perceptions of the clinical supervision process?
2. As you identified core values that defined who you are as a person and teacher, how did that experience affect your approach for preparation in the clinical supervision process?
3. In creating storyboards for the domains and time, how does that product influence your development in preparation for the clinical supervision process?
4. Did the overall process help you to more clearly identify and articulate the PDE 426 form used in the clinical supervision process? Are you able to more clearly articulate the domains, rubrics, and teacher expectations as they relate to this form?
5. In the study I introduced Danielson’s framework for teacher development. Do you believe this framework was appropriate for your grade level/job description? How did explicit instruction help in your development as a novice teacher?
6. In reflecting on your initial perceptions of the clinical supervision process, how did the exposure to distinguished teachers affect your preparation for the pending clinical observation?
7. How did using the PDE 426 form in your peer observations and your personal observation influence your development in the clinical supervision process?
8. Do you think this exposure helped in your development as a novice teacher?
9. Did the overall process or use of the Danielson framework create any additional pressure (stressors) for you as you prepare for the pending clinical supervision process? What unintended consequences (e.g. teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-facilitator, teacher-to-administrator) or other themes emerged for you as a result of this process?
10. Do you have any other comments or thoughts on your overall experience?
Appendix O

Domain and Time Story Boards
# Distinguished Teaching Strategies

**By Domain**

**Victory Area School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Classroom Management</th>
<th>Instructional Delivery</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems designed to raise a specific student question</td>
<td>Called on student to list current world conflicts to keep all students focused and prepared to answer</td>
<td>&quot;Serious&quot; loud voice</td>
<td>Modeled all expected behaviors — students completely respected her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relentless notes on plans — what worked/what did not</td>
<td>Students reviewed objective portion of test and analyzed validity and reliability; students lead essay questions out loud</td>
<td>Made jokes that connected with serious topics</td>
<td>Detailed plans, meticulous grade book, complete professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a section of &quot;must ask&quot; questions — very detailed to raise level of student thinking</td>
<td>Teacher had students stand-up and move around so that they could wake-up</td>
<td>All students involved, no down time between activities</td>
<td>From greeting at door until final bell — true professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans similar to examples discussed — multiple activities for high end learners</td>
<td>Defines clear boundaries with students without seeming cold or distant</td>
<td>Calm voice/kind yet firm regardless of situation</td>
<td>Treated students with respect — called on them by name, addressed issues, and clearly displayed he cared for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used color coding on plans for different learners — ex red for high end enrichment activities</td>
<td>Think time (not wait time) asked question, waited then called on student (kept all involved)</td>
<td>Great rapport with students. Kept the environment light and fun</td>
<td>Used position as leader rather than dictator of his classroom. Great interactions — caring environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used monthly map for long term planning and detailed lesson plans for day to day interaction</td>
<td>Smooth transitions from topic to topic and continuously revisited the last topic as reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST THIRD OF PERIOD</td>
<td>SECOND THIRD OF PERIOD</td>
<td>LAST THIRD OF PERIOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review had additional part (NEW) students had questions, these questions answered</td>
<td>• Always told students that they could do it even when they doubted themselves</td>
<td>• Previews next chapter and topic by handing out an outline – makes student ask questions on topics they didn’t understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in new material</td>
<td>• Non-verbal cues – used lab equipment to reinforce information during review</td>
<td>• Teacher broke down spelling words into syllables and sounded them out slowly for the students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expectations/goals were clearly defined</td>
<td>• Used projector to include math website into the lesson</td>
<td>• She uses verbal cues, non-verbal and physical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewed vocabulary terms</td>
<td>• Split period using “refocus” activity – smart boards and student answering devices used to review prior learning</td>
<td>• She does an excellent job of providing for a counseling experience with a beginning middle and end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had a game set up that students could do independently</td>
<td>• Had two topic transitions during this block of time - used students to discuss and recap topics prior to moving forward</td>
<td>• Full conclusion techniques that broke the period into phases – “someone tell me what we did in the first phase of class...how did that relate to phase two discussions?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review test and concept of validity and reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Exit strategy used that had student’s correct teacher provided information ex. It was Tom that did...students no, Huck Finn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students got up and moved around to wake up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Began overview of next unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used smart board and 4Sight questions to engage students at bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used smart boards and response “clickers” as a quick start up activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher had a system in place for note taking. Students placed objectives on top of notes written from board - very effective routines in place for success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Core Values Chart
VALUES 2008 - 2009

OUR NEW STAFF

ROO
- FAIRNESS
- LOYALTY
- STRUCTURE

JOE
- COMPETENCE
- CREATIVITY
- TRUST

WOOKIE
- FAITH
- FAMILY
- INTEGRITY

DEA
- FAMILY
- PASSION
- TRUST

LEN
- KNOWLEDGE
- PERFECTION
- STRUCTURE

ANSON
- COMMITMENT
- COURAGE
- FAMILY

JENNA
- COMMITMENT
- FAITH
- FAMILY

BRIAN
- COMMITMENT
- COURAGE
- FAMILY

JIM
- FAMILY
- INTEGRITY
- HONESTY

ED
- FAMILY
- INTEGRITY
- HONESTY

WES
- FAMILY
- INTEGRITY
- HONESTY

BRIANA
- COMPETENCE
- CREATIVITY
- TRUST

CLEDDA
- FAMILY
- FUN
- INTEGRITY

JESSE
- FAITH
- FAMILY
- HONESTY
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PDE 426 Form
SEMI-ANNUAL EMPLOYEE EVALUATION FORM FOR INSTRUCTIONAL I TEACHERS

Employee's Last Name | First | Middle | Positions(s) of Employee
--- | --- | --- | ---
District/IV | School | Evaluator | Interview/Conference Date

School Year: 2006 - 2007 Evaluation (Check 1) | One | Two

This form is to serve as a permanent record of an administrator's evaluation of a teacher's performance during a specific time period based on specific criteria.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Directions: Examine all sources of evidence provided by the teacher and bear in mind the aspects of teaching for each of the four categories used in this form. Refer to the rubric language, checking the appropriate aspects of teaching, and indicating the sources of evidence used to determine the evaluation of the results in each category. Finally, assign an overall evaluation of performance, sign the form and gain the signature of the employee.

Category 1: Planning and Preparation — Through their knowledge of content and pedagogy skills in planning and preparation, teachers make plans and set goals based on the content to be learned, their knowledge of students and their instructional context. Category 2 reviews: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Knowledge of Pennsylvania Academic Standards, Knowledge of Students, Selecting Instructional Goals, Designing Coherent Instruction, Assessing Student Learning, Knowledge of Resources, Materials and Technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTORY</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</td>
<td>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Adequate knowledge of content and pedagogy</td>
<td>▶ Limited or partial knowledge of content and pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Adequate knowledge of Pennsylvania's Academic Standards</td>
<td>▶ Limited or partial knowledge of Pennsylvania Academic Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Adequate knowledge of students and how to use this knowledge to direct and guide instruction</td>
<td>▶ Irrelevant or partial knowledge of students and how to use this knowledge to direct and guide instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Appropriate instructional goals that reflect standards and reasonable expectations for students</td>
<td>▶ Unreal or trivial instructional goals and absence of expectations for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Reasonable awareness of resources, materials, or technology available through the school or district or professional organizations</td>
<td>▶ Little or no awareness of resources, materials, and technology available through the school or district or professional organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Appropriate instructional design in which plans for various elements are partially aligned with the instructional goals and have a recognizable sequence with some adaptations for individual student needs</td>
<td>▶ Inappropriate or uncoherent instructional design in which plans for elements are not aligned with the instructional goals, and have few or inappropriate adaptations for individual student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Appropriate reflection on teaching and learning to enhance instruction</td>
<td>▶ Little or no reflection on teaching and learning to enhance instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Appropriate assessments of student learning most aligned to the instructional goals and partially adapted as needed for student needs</td>
<td>▶ Inappropriate assessments of student learning not aligned to the instructional goals not adapted as needed for student needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Evidence (Check all that apply and include dates, types/titles and number)

- [ ] Lessons/Unit Plans See Attachment 426 A | [ ] Teacher Evaluation/Interviews See Attachment 426 A
- [ ] Resources/Materials/Technology See Attachment 426 A | [ ] Classroom Observations See Attachment 426 A
- [ ] Assessment Materials See Attachment 426 A | [ ] Teacher Resource Documents See Attachment 426 A
- [ ] Information About Students See Attachment 426 A | [ ] Other See Attachment 426 A
Category II: Classroom Environment -- Teachers establish and maintain a purposeful and equitable environment for learning, in which students feel safe, valued, and respected by instituting routines and by setting clear expectations for student behavior. Category II reviews: Teacher Interaction with Students, Establishment of a Learning Environment; Student Interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</td>
<td>Teacher's performance demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Clear and moderate expectations for student achievement with reasonable value placed on the quality of student work</td>
<td>o Low or nonsensical expectations for student achievement with little or no value placed on the quality of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Moderate attention to equitable learning opportunities for students</td>
<td>o Little or no attention to equitable learning opportunities for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Appropriate interactions between teacher and students and among students</td>
<td>o Inappropriate or disrespectful interactions between teacher and students and among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Effective classroom routines and procedures resulting in little or no loss of instructional time</td>
<td>o Inefficient classroom routines and procedures resulting in loss of instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Clear standards of conduct and effective management of student behavior</td>
<td>o Absent or unclear standards of conduct or ineffective management of student behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Safe and adequate organization of physical space, to the extent it is under the control of the teacher, that provides accessibility to learning and to the use of resources, materials and technology</td>
<td>o Unsafe or inadequate organization of physical space, to the extent it is under the control of the teacher, to provide accessibility to learning and to the use of resources, materials, and technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Evidence (Check all that apply and include dates, types/titles, and number)

- Classroom Observations [See Attachment 426 A]  
- Informal Observations/Visits [See Attachment 426 A]  
- Teacher Conferences/Interviews [See Attachment 426 A]  
- Visual Technology [See Attachment 426 A]  
- Resources/Materials/Technology/Space [See Attachment 426 A]  
- Other [See Attachment 426 A]
| Justification for Evaluation |   |
Category III: Instructional Delivery – Teachers, through their knowledge of content and their pedagogy and skill in delivering instruction, engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies. Category III reviews: Communications, Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning, Providing Feedback, Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s performance demonstrates:</td>
<td>Teacher’s performance demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate communication of procedures and clear explanations of content</td>
<td>- Unclear or inappropriate communication of procedures and poor explanations of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate use of questioning and discussion strategies that encourage many students to participate</td>
<td>- Ineffective use of questioning and discussion strategies and little student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reasonable engagement of students in learning and adequate pacing of instruction</td>
<td>- Little or no engagement of students in learning and poor pacing of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate feedback to students on their learning</td>
<td>- Inaccurate or inappropriate feedback to students on their learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate use of informal and formal assessments to meet learning goals and to monitor student learning</td>
<td>- Little or inappropriate use of formal and informal assessments to meet learning goals and to monitor student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reasonable flexibility and responsiveness in meeting the learning needs of students</td>
<td>- Inflexibility in meeting the learning needs of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Evidence (Check all that apply and include dates, type/size, or number)

- Classroom Observations | See Attachment 426 A | Student Assignment Sheets | See Attachment 426 A |
- Informal Observations/Visits | See Attachment 426 A | Student Work | See Attachment 426 A |
- Assessments Materials | See Attachment 426 A | Instructional Resources/Materials/Technology | See Attachment 426 A |
- Teacher Conferences/Interviews | See Attachment 426 A | Other | See Attachment 426 A |

Justification for Evaluation
Category IV: Professionalism – Professionalism is demonstrated through qualities that characterize a professional person in aspects that occur in and beyond the classroom/building. Category IV reviews: Maintaining Clear and Accurate Records, Communication with Families and Students, Contributing to School and District, Developing Professionalism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s performance demonstrates:</td>
<td>Teacher’s performance demonstrates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adherence to school and district procedures and regulations related to attendance, punctuality and the like</td>
<td>- Failure to adhere to district procedures and regulations related to attendance, punctuality, and the like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge of the Professional Code of Conduct</td>
<td>- Lack of knowledge of the Professional Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compliance with school or district requirements for maintaining accurate records, communicating with families</td>
<td>- Lack of compliance with school or district requirements for maintaining accurate records, communicating with families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compliance with participating in school and or district events and school or district professional growth and development opportunities</td>
<td>- Lack of compliance in participating in school and or district events and school or district professional growth and development opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Evidence (Check all that apply and include dates, type/title, and number):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>See Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/Interviews</td>
<td>426 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations/Visual Technology</td>
<td>See Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts/Interaction with Family</td>
<td>426 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Records/Grade Book</td>
<td>See Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptive Use of Teaching/Learning Reflections</td>
<td>426 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>See Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for Evaluation
I certify that the before named employee for the period beginning (month/day/year) and ending (month/day/year) has been evaluated with an overall level of proficiency that is: ☐ Satisfactory; ☐ Unsatisfactory

________________________________________
Signature of Principal/Assistant Principal (Evaluator) Date

________________________________________
Signature of Superintendent or I. U. Executive Director Date

Overall Justification for Evaluation

________________________

Recommendations (optional)

________________________

Professional Development Areas:

________________________

Name of Employee Signature of Employee Date
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Initial Observation Form for Peer Observation
COLLEGIATE OBSERVATION

Class/Subject

LENGTH OF PERIOD

DIRECTIONS: You are to find at least five distinguished teaching practice observed during a portion of the period that gained your attention. Examples could be (but are not limited to): unique introduction/closing, unique review/exit strategy, non-verbal cues to refocus student learning, student praise techniques, transition techniques, etc. Please provide specific details.

FIRST THIRD:

MIDDLE THIRD:

FINAL THIRD:
COLLEGIAL OBSERVATION

Class/Subject ___________________________ Number of students ________ Date of observation ________

DIRECTIONS: You are to find at least one distinguished teaching practice observed and place it under the appropriate domain. Please provide specific details. (You do NOT need to find a distinguished teaching practice for EACH domain.)

FOUR DOMAINS:

PLANNING AND PREPARATION:

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT:

INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY:

PROFESSIONALISM:
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Example Lesson Plans
# Weathering and Erosion Lesson Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Earth Science</th>
<th>Key Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit: Weathering, Erosion, &amp; Deposition</td>
<td>What are the different types of weathering?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson(s): Introducing Weathering and Erosion</td>
<td>What is the difference between erosion and weathering?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates: 4/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class: 3rd period, Cardozo Growth Program, 22 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length: 50 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Objectives:**

* Students will **know** ... that mechanical weathering and chemical weathering are the two types of weathering.
* that the natural agents of erosion are streams, glaciers, wave action, wind, and mass movement
* Students will **understand** ... that weathering involves breakdown and erosion involves transport.
* that weathering and erosion are examples of change over time as a gradual geological process in which different events take different amounts of time.
* Students will **be able to do** ...
  * Work in groups to identify which type of weathering a photograph depicts.
  * Work in groups to identify which agent of erosion a photo depicts.
  * Define the two types of weathering, and provide an example of each.

**Evidence of Achievement:** Application work w/ photos, exit slip, homework (due tomorrow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources/Materials:</th>
<th>Keywords:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalkboard</td>
<td>abrasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk</td>
<td>mass wasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear plastic container w/ red blocks inside</td>
<td>mass movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two beakers w/ water</td>
<td>mechanical weathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar cubes, sugar sachets</td>
<td>chemical weathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos for groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework handouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do Now: (3-4 minutes)
- Wind erosion experiment data analysis questions in pairs

Introduction: (3-4 minutes)
- Review answer to Do Now question. Note that their ability to answer the questions suggests they already know something about erosion, and are therefore primed for success in this lesson and unit.
- Note lesson objectives, relevant standards

Information Lecture-Discussion: (25 minutes)
Students take Cornell notes
Overview:
- Erosion vs. Weathering – weathering is the breakdown of rocks, erosion is the transport of rocks
- Weathering is the breakdown of rocks into smaller pieces by mechanical or chemical methods
Example #1 – Chalk example
- Rate of Weathering – determined by rock type and climate

Two different types of weathering:
- Mechanical Weathering – rocks broken apart by physical force – chemical makeup unchanged
  Examples of mechanical weathering – heat, cold, plants, animals (including humans), abrasion
Example #2 – Ice wedging – Red blocky example
Example #3 – Sugar cubes, sugar sachets
- Chemical Weathering – chemical makes of rock changes
  Examples of chemical weathering – oxidation, plant acids (lichens), acid rain (sulfuric acid),
  carbonic acid (dissolves limestone)
Example #4 – Cleopatra’s Obelisk (acid rain)
Example #5 – Carbonic Acid in soda

Erosion - as weathering occurs, erosion is the process of carrying away the smaller rock particles.
- Gravity is at work in many types of erosion
- Agents of erosion include:
  1. streams
  2. glaciers
  3. waves
  4. animals (note humans as examples of animals)
  5. wind
  6. mass movement

Students leave out Cornell notes to be checked by teacher as he circulates during the next task.
Teacher records completion of notes on classwork checklist.

Application: (10 minutes)
Students choose whether work individually or in teacher assigned groups (heterogeneous by achievement[gender/race]) of three or four students. Students look at 6 photos of weathering, determine whether photo shows chemical or mechanical weathering. Once they have successfully done so, they will be given 6 more photos of erosion, and will have to label which agent of erosion is pictured.
Additional erosion photos are available for those who finish early.

Closure: (7-9 minutes)
- Address any misunderstandings that were evident during application work
- Revisit lesson objectives
- Answer student questions
- Assign homework
- Exit slip – What are the two types of weathering? Give an example of each.
  What is the difference between weathering and erosion?
### Additional Support:
- Recommend to students who struggle with application work to look at additional weathering and erosion photos from earthscienceworld.org: [Link](http://www.earthscienceworld.org/images/searchresults.html?Category=ECategory&Continent=ECountry&ImageID=ImageID)
- Recommend to students who struggle with application work to take self-quiz on weathering at: [Link](http://glencoe.mcgrawhill.com/sites/0076617529/student_view2/chapter2/section1/self-check_quiz_eng.html)
- Tell students who remain confused after self-quiz to come tomorrow at lunch for extra help.

### Extension Activities:
- Early finishers of the application activity can use the computer in the back of the room to play the Weathering and Erosion Game: [Link](http://www.glencoe.com/sites/geo/science/Science600/co/530.php?Ref=530&Chapter=16)
- Reading excerpt from *Out of the Dust* by Karen Hesse: [Link](http://www.env.duke.edu/geo41/sea2.htm) (Cleopatra’s Obelisk photo)

### Homework:
- Students will identify photos on handout as examples of different types of weathering, or as examples of different agents of erosion. Collected the next day and graded for accuracy.
- Students have checked out digital cameras from school, and will have one week to find and take pictures of examples of weathering and erosion in their community. Photos are due via e-mail attachment.
- Extra Credit: What is concentric weathering? Spherical weathering?

### Notes:
- Michael was absent yesterday — get make-up work, ask why.
- Be sure they understand glaciers — some kids lack prior knowledge.
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Pre and Post Observation Forms
Interview Protocol for a Pre-observation (Planning) Conference

Questions for discussion:

1. To which part of your curriculum does this lesson relate?

2. How does this learning "fit" in the sequence of learning for this class?

3. Briefly describe the students in this class, including those with special needs.

4. What are your learning outcomes for this lesson? What do you want the students to understand?

5. How will you engage the students in the learning? What will you do? What will the students do? Will the students work in groups, individually, or as a large group? Provide any worksheets or other materials the students will be using.

6. How will you differentiate instruction for different individuals or groups of students in the class?

7. How and when will you know whether the students have learned what you intend?

8. Is there anything that you would like me to specifically observe during the lesson?
**Interview Protocol for a Post-observation (Reflection) Conference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. In general, how successful was the lesson? Did the students learn what you intended for them to learn? How do you know?

2. If you were able to bring samples of student work, what do those samples reveal about those students’ levels of engagement and understanding?

3. Comment on your classroom procedures, student conduct, and your use of physical space. To what extent did these contribute to student learning?

4. Did you depart from your plan? If so, how, and why?

5. Comment on different aspects of your instructional delivery (e.g., activities, grouping of students, materials, and resources). To what extent were they effective?

6. If you had a chance to teach this lesson again to the same group of students, what would you do differently?
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Outline of Process
OUTLINE OF PROCESS

PHASE ONE (STEPS 1–3)
INTERVENTION (AM or PM 120 minutes)

- Provide copy of Danielson’s Framework for Teaching – and handout of “language” used
- Provide empirical research (e.g. METLIFE study) and literature on distinguished teaching practices to increase novice teacher awareness
- Provide copy of PDE 426 form
- Slide show – reasons for using Danielson framework
- Values cards exercise
  - Individual – to identify self as teacher following John C. Maxwell process
  - Group - to either: (a) identify 3 values of distinguished teaching for each domain (on story boards) (b) identify 5 total values of distinguished teacher (on story boards)

** TEACHERS MUST VIDEO TAPE A LESSON FOR SELF-EVALUATION AND REFLECTION IN STAGE THREE**

**TEACHERS MUST COMPLETE SECOND PEER-OBSERVATION ON 426 FORM**

PRODUCE – NEW TEACHER HIRES – VALUES BOARD/PERCEIVED VALUES OF DISTINGUISHED TEACHER (BY DOMAIN)

PHASE TWO (STEPS 4–5)
- PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (AM or PM 120 minutes)

Two story boards – teachers place observed distinguished teaching techniques or behaviors on one of two story boards
- board one – the four domains
- board two – teaching period divided into three sections (first, second and last third) based on minutes
  - Discuss peer-observations
  - CFF video lessons on 426 forms – discuss and analyze teaching videos through the eyes of an administrator

PHASE THREE (STEPS 6–7)
- PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (AM or PM 120 minutes)

- (2) Story boards – teachers add observed distinguished teaching techniques or behaviors on one of two story boards
  - board one – the four domains
  - board two – teaching period divided into three sections (first, second and last third) based on minutes
- Discuss peer-observations
- Perform self-evaluation of teaching lesson that has been video taped
- Discuss self-evaluation

PRODUCE – DISTINGUISHED TEACHING BOARDS (1 BY DOMAIN – 1 BY TIME)
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Teacher Contact Meeting
NEW HIRE / NOVICE TEACHER CONTACT MEETING

AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTION

2. BACKGROUND

3. FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE

4. FEARS & CONCERNS

5. STUDY OVERVIEW

ABSTRACT

The first clinical supervision experience can significantly impact a novice teacher’s overall success during the early years of their teaching career (Robinson, 1998). It is a very stressful, challenging time, and for many, it is the first time he/she is asked to take on multiple roles aside from direct instruction and professional responsibilities (Sykes, 1996). As districts work to better align policies and induction programs with the changing needs of novice teachers, they must face the fact that they serve powerful roles as teacher educators, mentors, and retainers. It is important for administrators to self-assess how districts are meeting or failing to meet these needs (Grossman & Thompson, 2004). Prescriptive mentoring programs cited by Smith & Ingersoll (2004) have failed to meet the mark. This study will attempt to provide thick description of the clinical supervision process through the lens of novice teachers.

1. Statement of the research question(s)
What themes emerge when novice teachers are led through an exercise designed to identify individual value beliefs as a teacher and shared beliefs as a community of practice regarding distinguished teaching practices?

How will increasing novice teacher exposure to and explicit instruction on distinguished teaching affect their perception of the supervision process?

How will the intervention process affect novice teacher preparation (if any) for the clinical supervision process?

What unintended consequences (e.g. teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-facilitator, teacher-to-administrator) or other themes emerged for novice teachers as a result of this process?

2. **Purpose and significance of the study**

Exploring this topic through a social learning theory lens, a case study, participatory action research (PAR) design will examine experiences novice teachers have with respect to the clinical supervision process. Based on existing literature, it is my claim that new teachers do not understand distinguished teaching practices due to a lack of exposure to what administrators rate as distinguished teaching in a clinical observation. This specific purpose of this intended research project is to determine the effects of a social learning opportunity and a professional development experience on new teacher perceptions of the clinical supervision process. A thick, rich description of these issues may inform the efforts of administrators as they develop meaningful and insightful induction/mentoring programs for their new hires.