TEACHER PERCEPTIONS REGARDING
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
TENNESSEE EDUCATOR ACCELERATION MODEL (TEAM)
 IN AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Education Department

Carson-Newman University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the

Requirements of the Degree

Doctor of Education

By

Nikki Giovanni Hughes

May 2017

CARSON-NEWMAN
UNIVERSITY

Dissertation Approval

Student Name/ CNU ID:

Dissertation Title:

This dissertation has been approved and accepted by the faculty of the Education Department, Carson-Newman University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree, Doctor of Education.

Dissertation Committee:

Signatures: (Print and Sign)

Dissertation Chair   Earnest Walker   *Earnest Walker*

Methodologist Member   Brenda Dean / *Brenda Dean*

Content Member   Kori Floyd   *Kori Floyd*

Approved by the Dissertation Committee   Date: _____

Abstract

This quantitative study analyzed the implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). The study was established to investigate the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework in an urban school district. Specifically, the researcher's goal was to determine the teachers' perceptions in regard to the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework and its impact on teacher practices. Educators who were members of the local professional educators' organization located in an urban Tennessee school district were randomly selected and used in this study. An instrument in the form of a survey was developed which included 30 inquiries. This instrument included 6 questions regarding demographics, 12 questions related to TEAM evaluation implementation with 1 open-ended question, and 11 questions on self-efficacy which were duplicated from a survey instrument that was utilized in a different study conducted by Dana (2014). A Likert-type Scale that included the possibility of seven levels that range from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree was utilized in the survey. Demographic data was analyzed using an ANOVA. Results indicate a statistical significant difference in the implementation of TEAM framework based on selected demographics which included the use of the rubric, teacher differentiation, student achievement, and improving their craft. In addition, an open-ended question that provided an opportunity on how to improve the TEAM model was analyzed using the data text analysis diagnostic tool on Survey Monkey that resulted in emerged themes. Findings from this study indicate that the perceptions of educators are significantly impacted. School districts that are encouraged to provide opportunities for modifications that will positively support educator's professional growth in regards to the TEAM framework.

Keywords: *Tennessee Educator Accelerator Model (TEAM), implementation, urban*

Dedication

This work is dedicated to the memory of my exceptional grandmother. A woman that exemplified wisdom, strength, and unconditional love and laughter. To the world she was known as Margaret (Maggie) Ransom or MaDear. But my special name for her was Beautiful. She still remains as the wisest woman I've known. To the memory of my father, Frank R. Hughes, my first hero. He always inspired me to go get it! No matter what it was he made me believe that I could conquer the world. I am truly grateful and proud to be his daughter. To my mother, Bernice Gooch, there aren't any words that can describe how many ways you have impacted my life. Your life lessons have molded me into the woman that I am today.

To my brilliant children, MönCherié Hughes-Clay and Niekko Matlock, you have always been the source of why I keep going, going, going. The two of you are equipped with beautiful minds that continuously amaze me. The world is better place because of you are a part of it.

To my life partner and best friend, Raymond Clay, whose love and support for me has never wavered. For 29 years, we have certainly seen the good, the bad, and the ugly. A multitude of strife and setbacks have come our way. Yet, God has showered us with favor and blessed us with stamina to weather any storm. Thank you for listening when I needed an ear, your shoulder when I needed to cry, and your endless positive encouragement when challenges arose. Thank you for loving me.

To my aunts, Gloria, Rosalyn, Carolyn, Doris, and Dorothy. Thank you for always being a pillar in my life. To my cousins Yashika and Tiffani thank you for your support. To my God children: Christian, Keshon, Patricia, Kobe, and Crighton, continue to keep God first in all that you do and know that God momma is always just a call away.

My sincere thanks to all of you for being an inspiration in my life.

Acknowledgements

With a tremendous list of people to acknowledge, where do I even start? This journey began so long ago. I'd like to first thank my God sister LaQuilla Nabors, without you and your motivation I probably would not have begun this process. Thank you for your incredible love, help, and support during this process and now our hard work has finally come to fruition.

I would like to acknowledge my dissertation committee, Dr. Earnest Walker, Dr. Brenda Dean, and Dr. Kori Floyd. Thank you for your undying patience and support. You were always there for me to lean upon. Please know that your guidance and expertise was embraced with gratefulness.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Kenneth Kungu and Dr. Samad Dimbie-Mumuni for your statistician expertise, support and laughter. Your kind of friendship is priceless.

I would like to acknowledge my BFF since 5th grade, Terra Nicole "Nickey" Horton for simply being irreplaceable. Whatever, whenever, however, you are there. Thank you. To my sister friend Chenier Northern, you have been a rock, a cheerleader, a sister, and a friend like no other. Life for me hasn't been the same since God sent you. Thank you for being a branch and not a leaf.

Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge the administrators that have changed my life and given me room to evolve as an educator, Mrs. Clementine Chamberlain, Mrs. Renita Perkins, Mr. Ricki Gibbs II and Dr. Natalyn Gibbs. How does one person experience excellence this many times? I have acquired phenomenal knowledge in leadership because of you. Thank you for showing me what greatness looks like.

With humbleness, I thank God for the opportunity to experience this journey we call life.

Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

The core of sound educational practices consists of effective teaching and learning. Most bodies of research indicate educator quality as the extremely vital school level factor that disturbs student achievement. Students that were being instructed by teachers identified as highly effective showed as much as one grade level growth as opposed to students being taught by the slightest operative teachers (Hanusek, 1992). As school districts seek opportunities to provide exemplary achievement for its students, it is also their priority to cultivate as well as support the educators. Research suggests that evaluation systems for teachers designed to support professional growth would also enhance the academic lives of students.

Background of the Study

Initially, the purpose of evaluations focused on the personality of the educator. The primary reason of teacher evaluations is to identify, nurture, and develop effective instruction (Danielson, 2001). In the past educators were examined on characteristics that were personal. For example, if they had obtained "a community standing with good morals standing." (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003 p.3). Today, the effectiveness of teachers along with teacher evaluation, has been the focus of increased communication around the world. (Goe & Stickler, 2008). The argument to express what constitutes teacher effectiveness is ongoing among the education world (Exstrom, 2010). Teacher effectiveness characteristics and the methods used to measure that effectiveness has altered over the years (Campbell, Kyriadkides, Muijs, & Robinson, 2003). Some teachers provide more effectively for student achievement than others; however, the characteristics surrounding the effectiveness of teachers have continued to vary among educational professionals (Harris & Sass, 2009). An increasing accord of the way that most states and districts nationwide evaluate teachers has failed to improve student understanding or instructional practice (Sartain et al., 2010). Rich

(2009) stated that a correlation of the achievement of students and the evaluation of teachers must exist when the expectation of increased achievement of students is the outcome you're seeking.

Statement of the Problem

There is a minimal amount of research that correlates teacher practices and teacher performance as it relates to the teacher evaluation process. The researcher seeks to contribute to the present body of research regarding teacher evaluation, specifically, the impact of self-efficacy as it relates to the Tennessee Educator Accelerator Model (TEAM) evaluation framework. The focus of the research is on the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework of educators in an urban school district. The research will further address the model of the TEAM evaluation framework from the perspective of educators.

The new model requires teachers to approach each lesson with the multiple indicators which are outlined to determine the effectiveness of the educator that is being observed. There is also a rubric that is used to determine how well the educator performed during the evaluation. The previous evaluation model did not outline specific criteria directed towards practices of the teacher in the classroom.

Through this study the researcher seeks to investigate the perceptions of educators on the implementation of the TEAM evaluation model and determine its impact on teacher practices.

Theoretical Foundation

The Theoretical Framework for this study derives from our nation's educational department's announcement of a grant known as Race to the Top worth $4 billion that states could receive by participating competitively. Eligibility requirements for the grant meant that regulatory, legal or statutory barriers were non-existent in linking data on scholar accomplishment or academic growth to educators for their performance. The Tennessee Educator Accelerator Model (TEAM)

evaluation was initiated due to an application criteria requiring states to exhibit ways in which they are improving the effectiveness of their administrators and educators.

There are three purposes of teacher evaluations according to Natriello (1990): (1) placing an influence on the performance of individuals within particular roles; (2) directing decisions about the advancement of individuals into and out of positions (3) legitimizing the organizational control system itself, and coaxing employees and constituents of the organization that personnel decisions are fair and effective. Goldrick (2002) reported that evaluating teaching behaviors alone does not constitute a purposeful evaluation system. Rather, evaluation should measure the outcomes of the teaching.

A vital reason to evaluate teachers is to determine teacher achievement, impact and professional activity. Teacher evaluations bear a heavier responsibility when compared to other occupations (Scriven, 1994). Peterson (2000) noted that other professions have a strong market-based evaluation mechanism that teachers do not and students are assigned to teachers regardless of past performance. Teachers must be carefully evaluated by other means. Furthermore, the evaluation of teaching occurs for a larger audience than the students, an audience that includes parents, elected representatives, society, and the profession itself. These stakeholders demand that quality instruction is being delivered every day of the school year. Quality teacher evaluation has the purpose of showing all indicating to all stakeholders how well and in what ways teachers are performing.

Purpose of the Study

The study's purpose was to investigate and analyze correlation between the TEAM Evaluation Model and teacher efficacy in a Tennessee school district. The study analyzed teacher

perceptions regarding the TEAM model of evaluation in relation to its implementation in the state of Tennessee and its impact on teacher practices.

Significance of the Study

Continually improving teacher performance practices should be the primary operation of a school. Schools should exemplify a community of learning for both students and teachers (Joyce & Showers, 2002). There are recent studies that analyze evaluation models for teachers and their impact on instructional practices. Goe, Little, and Bell (2008) produced documentation on the effectiveness of educators. Their outcomes validate a struggle of measuring the effectiveness of a teacher. Darling-Hammond (2002) stated that the consensus generally shows that good teaching is vital, the continuous debate surrounding measuring effectiveness of an educator is based upon what an educator is and is yet to be determined. The study contributed to the body of literature which focuses on teacher evaluation and the effect on teacher efficacy. Study results provided data for school district leaders regarding the TEAM evaluation process in the state of Tennessee.

Research Questions

This study analyzed the perceptions of educators as it relates to the implementation of the TEAM framework. Two research questions were the focus of the investigation.

Research Question 1: What are the perceptions of teachers based upon the implementation of the TEAM framework?

H_{01}: There is no significant difference in instructional strategies in the evaluation model in this Middle Tennessee district.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on teacher differentiation.

H_{03}: There is no significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on student achievement

H_{04}: There is no significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on implementation of the model to improve the educator's craft.

Research Question 2: What are the instructional implications of using the TEAM evaluation framework?

H_{05}: There is no statistical significant difference between teacher instructional strategies and the TEAM evaluation model in this Urban Tennessee school district

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' beliefs regarding the implementation of teacher evaluations. Specifically, the study examined the effect of the implementation of TEAM evaluation framework on teaching practices and teacher efficacy. Two research questions were presented to address the topic.

Researchers Wise, et al (1984), Peterson (2004), Darling-Hammond, et al, (2012) agree that providing feedback to teachers is one of the most important roles carried out by principals. Therefore, it was important to investigate how effective the TEAM Teacher Evaluation process is in providing teachers with meaningful feedback that will enhance instructional strategies and improve student achievement.

Research Participants and Setting for the Study

Purposeful sampling was used in this study. Randomly selected educators in the state of Tennessee who taught in a public school in an urban Tennessee district were used in this study.

Tennessee teachers who were members of the local professional educators' organization will be the sample population.

A letter was mailed to the president of the organization to ask permission of the members to participate in this study. Once approved, a recruitment letter was sent to the members. Creswell's (2005) three questions for a research study were taken in consideration in the design for the study, however, only two of them were used:

(1) What strategies of inquiry will inform the procedures?

(2) What methods of data collection and analysis will be used?

These questions were addressed in the design of the study. In order to address these research questions, a non-experimental quantitative approach was selected for this research study. A survey was the instrumentation used for data collection.

Proposed Data Analysis

The qualitative research of this study utilized Survey Monkey (1999) in the collection of data from the Teacher Survey. Questions was inputted manually in the designated order and delivered via an email link to the members of the local professional educators association by a member of the organization. The researcher monitored the number of respondents after the first week of delivery of the Teacher Survey. A reminder was distributed to the participating members after one week passed with a link to Survey Monkey survey. After this time, the researcher determined that additional communication was unnecessary to get an accurate representation from the data sample.

Limitations

The school district was vast. A limitation in this study was the sample size since the participation was voluntary and limited to educators that were members of the local professional educators' organization. The soundness of the study was restricted to the dependability of questions on the instrument. Another limitation was that the researcher was an educator that taught in the urban Tennessee school district and was a member of the local professional educator's organization.

Definition of Terms

Teacher evaluation. The process of vetting teachers to maintain teaching standards. (Collins
English Dictionary online, n.d.).

Evaluation Process. A process whereby an educator is observed by a person in a leadership
position, usually an administrator, which follows specific guidelines as an element to
provide support and assist in improving teaching and learning. (National Institute for
Excellence in Teaching [NIET], 2011a).

First to the Top Grant (FTTT). A grant totaling $501 million that was awarded to the state of
Tennessee in 2010. The initiative of the grant was to fund the Tennessee First to the Top
grant. (Tennessee First to the Top website, n.d.).

Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). An evaluation process that is administered to
educators in the state of Tennessee that involves observations which are performed
frequently, encompassing dialogue and feedback with constructivism and support to
enhance their craft, reflection of data from their scholars, while providing purposeful
professional advancement strategies. (Tennessee First to the Top website, n.d.).

Tennessee Value Added Assessment (TVAAS). Data achievement that is statistically analyzed

whose results show academic growth individually and collectively for students over time. (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.).

Teacher Efficacy. The confidence of a teacher's ability to promote the learning of students (Hoy, 2000).

Organization of the Document

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter provides information regarding the background for the study, the purpose and significance of the study as well as the theoretical framework. During the first chapter the research questions are clearly stated. The limitations are provided. A list of definitions to assist the reader is also included. Chapter Two contains a review of literature related to the teacher evaluation process. Chapter Two addresses the history of teacher evaluations, the policies that surround education, and the process of the current teacher evaluation model (TEAM) being implemented in Tennessee. It further discusses teacher perceptions of evaluations, student achievement and teacher efficacy. Chapter Three provides an overview of the methodology involved in this study. Data analysis procedures, the time period of the study, and the type of data analyzed is outlined in chapter Three. The fourth chapter reviews the results of the study including any relation noted between the perceptions of educators and its impact on teacher practices. Chapter Five outlines the findings and conclusions drawn from the study and provides recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER 2: Review of literature

This chapter reviews the relevant literature as it pertains to teacher evaluation as well as the implementation of the new evaluation model for teachers in Tennessee. The literature is organized into ten areas of content: (1) the history of teacher evaluations; (2) The Tennessee First to the Top Act; (3) No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB); (4) instructional leaders' role in the evaluation process; (5) a former teacher evaluation process in the state of Tennessee; (6) the current teacher evaluation model (TEAM) being implemented in Tennessee; (7) teacher perceptions of evaluations; (8) The System for Student Achievement and Advancement (TAP), (9) student achievement and, (10) teacher efficacy.

The evaluation of educators has been an appendage in education for an extensive amount of time. Evaluators have continuously altered among quality assurance and professional learning. (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Milanowski & Heneman, 2001). The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act, commonly known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002) by President Obama and Bush have added increasing pressure on educational leaders to carry out evaluation practices aligned with value added modeling (VAM) (Harris, 2009; Martineau, 2006). Sheppard (2013) reports that most systems of teacher evaluations include both formative evaluations as well as summative evaluations. The formative evaluation of teachers is intended to assist and support teachers in professional growth. Formative evaluations are designed to help teachers become better at their craft and is focused on the needs of the teachers rather than those of the school. Summative evaluations are used to determine if a teacher has met predetermined requirements

History of Teacher Evaluations

Callahan (1962) reports that teacher evaluating polices can be traced back to Joseph Taylor who in 1913 developed scales of ratings for educators that would measure a teacher's efficiency. America was coaxed to examine its educators and seek enhanced individuals in our classes. This influence was brought forth during the era of the Cold War and Russia. America believed that in order to contend students in America needed to be instructed by the best educators, particularly in the sciences. (Pease, Wise, & Darling-Hammond, 1983).

According to Clark (1983), the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act (ESEA) was enacted by the federal government in 1965. Lyndon B. Johnson initiated this act that was $11 billion a year which authorizes assistance to educational institutions, children and communities for over half a century. Reauthorization subsequently focuses on an identified area of accountability that would increase incentives in educational reform. From the 80's to the 90's, the next phase of ESEA, identical funding did not increase. Several programs were consolidated or block-granted by President Ronald Reagan and in 1983 A Nation at Risk was released. As a result of this release, education was nationally in the political spot light, showcasing the economic status of our nation's schools. This inhibited educators as workers executing a scripted program that was dictated by the political realm, not more so as an independent capable professional.

Towe (2012) stated:

A Nation at Risk called for a movement away from the "one-size-fits-all" approach to teaching, and towards the emergence of effective teachers who would lead the schools to new levels of excellence. This would occur through using the established methods of evaluation, as based on the description of public education by Alexanderov. These evaluations were not designed to identify effective teachers, but those who met the minimum requirements to be a teacher. The requirements included punctuality, providing a safe learning environment, and upholding school rules and district policy (Alexanderov, 1989).

According to Rogers and Weems (2010), teachers today are entering the classrooms with better preparation to educate the scholars in our schools. Nonetheless, the public consistently continues to bombard publicly with their beliefs as to why our system of education ineffectively progresses. The authors also revealed that the heart of most of the disparagement involves the manner by which a teacher is evaluated. The nation's municipal institutions are educational establishments that are sponsored by way of taxpayers. Quality assurance is an expectation that is accepted. The evaluation of teachers has not produced the outcomes that were desired from the process that was designated to assure that our students would be receiving an instructional quality of teaching in classrooms also reported by Rogers and Weems (2010).

Tennessee First to the Top Act (FTTT)

A $500 million grant was awarded to the state of Tennessee as a provision for the Tennessee First to the Top Act (FTTT) to be implemented. The act was signed in January 2010 by Governor Bredesen (Tennessee Department of Education, 2011a). This award has positively impacted the progress in Tennessee which include the new evaluation system for its educators (United States Department of Education, 2012).

Responsibility of designing and sharing the measures and guiding principles for educators was given to the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Council, which was established by the First to the Top legislation. (FAQ Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model, n.d.). The Tennessee State Board of Education Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201 (Tennessee State Board of Education, 2012) included basic standards, responsibility, the purpose, and protocol for the evaluation framework. The main purpose of the policy of yearly evaluations for educators is to locate and provide instructional support which yields the outcomes of students at high levels.

These evaluations would provide information on selecting educators, their placements, as well as job enhancements and professional growth plans. The evaluations will also dictate an educator's tenure, dismissal, and even compensation. Performance evaluations of teachers are differentiated and have been divided. The five groups range between significantly above expectations, and significantly below expectations. Half of the benchmarks for evaluations were encompassed of scholar achievement which includes thirty-five percent of scholar achievement growth utilizing TVAAS as well as fifteen percent which derives from the teacher's selected measure. The qualitative appraisal instrument is applied to the fifty percent that still remains (FAQ Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model, n.d.). Tenure for educators became possible if teaching had occurred for at least 5 years in the same local education agency and the educator had accomplished a score of at least a 4 consecutively for 2 calendar years (Tennessee Code Annotated, 2012c). Teachers that were unable to attain at least a score of 4 could return to the profession with tenure eligibility. Teachers that were tenured prior to July 2011 were not affected (Tennessee First to the Top website, n.d.).

<div align="center">

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

</div>

Bryant (2013), concludes that Requirements for educators in the 2001 act, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) required that all educators obtain a status of highly qualified in the 2005-2006 school year. Attaining highly qualified status possibly assured that teachers were qualified, however, a question of effectiveness existed and research revealed this solo requirement did not determine that a teacher would be successful at improving instructional learning for students (Rothman, 2008). The provisions of NCLB have not compelled strong enhancements in the area that is deemed most important, which is where promoting and supporting student learning is occurring continuously from the teacher's instruction.

Before the 'highly qualified' stipulation, 27% of new teachers entered the profession without full certification (Eubanks & Weaver, 1999). NCLB required that teachers earn certification and pass Praxis tests in their content areas prior to entering the teaching force, or, for those already teaching without certification, within a period set by local governments. Thus the influence of accreditation and certification standards was extended to more of the teaching force. Both Race to the Top and Section II of the Blueprint for the reauthorization of NCLB thus discuss "great teachers and leaders," and require teachers to be effective rather than qualified.

Instructional Leadership and Teacher Evaluations

Rowe (2000) suggests that principals establish a positive rapport with their faculty to foster the process of professional practice during evaluations. This relationship significantly impacts the decision of professional growth by the educator. As remarked by researchers (Olivia, Mathers, and Laine, 2009; Peterson, 2004), principals are the primary individuals who conduct teacher evaluations. Davis, Ellet, & Annunziata (2002) reported that "An evaluation system can be state of the art in every respect and still not result in change because change requires, in a broad conceptualization, leadership" (p. 292). Researchers emphasized the principal as the instructional leader who spearheaded change, encouraged teachers working together, set increased goals for educators and scholars, as well as supported this alternative with all that are involved without academic institution (Ash & Persall, 2001; Blase & Blase, 2004; DuFour, 2002; King, 2002; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Next to instructional practices, the governance in a school was a vital element connected to the achievement of students (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Leadership affected scholar outcomes in various areas, which includes creating an environment that lends a demand of high expectations with learning (Wallace Foundation, 2012). School leadership directly

correlates with enhancements in scholar success which would not occur without the presence of an effective leader (Wilson, 2009).

According to research, there is a correlation among the effectiveness and improvement of a school when the principal leads as an instructional leader (Pease, S. R. (1983), Darling-Hammond, L., & Wise, A. E., & 1983; Fullan, 1991; Joyce & Showers, 1995). A balanced leadership framework was developed by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2003) based on research that spans over three decades along with over 100 years combined from the research team's professional understanding on leadership in a school setting. There were 21 leadership responsibilities identified that are highly connected with the achievement of students. The group organized the leadership responsibilities into four knowledge taxonomies. They are identified as Declarative, Experiential, Conceptual, and Procedural knowledge (p.13).

Research provided by Ovando and Ramirez (2007) yielded successful results from the actions of principals with comprehensive evaluation systems established. The results showed how those principals' instructional leadership behaviors were geared toward the educators' capacity of instruction ensuring that each student experienced success. Instructional leaders not only established the building's climate and tone, but there is also an influence that impacts the overall culture in the operation of everything else in the school (Chappuis, S., Chappuis, J., & Stiggins, R. 2009).

DuFour and Marzano (2009) stated that if the primary reason for schools was to ensure every student achieves at a pivotal level, then instructional leaders were unnecessary. Rather, they need leaders whose focus is directed towards evidence of learning. When administrators made the transition to learning leaders, they transformed the talk from "What was taught?" or "How was it taught?" to deeper questioning such as, "What was learned?" and "How

can we use evidence of learning to strengthen our professional practice?" Building the capacity of collaborative teams rather than just evaluating individual teachers seemed more inclusive with the ideas that a school was dedicated to learning rather than to teaching primarily.

The Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth

Another framework or approach to evaluating teachers widely used is the method of observations where school administrators drop into classrooms, observe teachers, and then complete a formal rating scale. Typically, these evaluations are conducted by an administrator visiting a classroom at some point during the school year usually for a thirty-minute period of time and then completing an observation instrument. Early in 2000s, Tennessee realized that an expansion of both opportunities of professional growth and programs that support teachers were necessary. The evaluation was developed in 2004 to expand the area of professional growth known as The Framework for Evaluation of Professional Growth. The span of this evaluation process ended in July 2001 (Tennessee Department of Education, 2009).

The framework consisted of 44 criteria within six domains whereby the teacher's performance was research based descriptive. Performance results from the evaluation was provided in a summative report. Under the six domains and professional growth teachers were identified as advanced, proficient, developing, or unsatisfactory. (Tennessee Department of Education, 2009). Twice every 10 years, the process evaluated professionally licensed teachers, though in theory, the evaluation process supported individualized professional growth. This evaluation process was too infrequent and became another checklist as an effort to meet a state mandate rather than its initial agenda which was to provide support for individualized professional growth.

Following the implementation of this framework, an opportunity existed where states could seek to obtain monies by way of Race *to the Top* funds. Barton (2010) reported that new requirements of this evaluation framework includes achievement data. This data compares test score improvement status, change measures, and growth measures (Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, Shepard, 2010). Models of value added growth doesn't compensate fully for student differences (Burris & Welner, 2011).

Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)

Tennessee First to the Top Act of 2010 created a new educator evaluation system. Some components of the new evaluation system (the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model or TEAM) are still under development, but TEAM has been implemented as part of Tennessee's agreement for receipt of federal grant funds (OREA, 2012).

The implementation of the TEAM in July of 2011 marked the state of Tennessee as the first state to embark upon a statewide evaluation system that was both student outcome based and comprehensive. Adopted with bipartisan support by the General Assembly, it was a vital component to the state's First to the Top Act during 2010's federal competition of Race to the Top. This legislation milestone set forth the limits of an evaluation system that was new for educators and administrators with the commitment of the implementation during the school year of 2011-2012.

The goal of TEAM was to ensure that the best possible instruction is provided daily to students from the collaboration of teachers and principals (Tennessee First to the Top Teacher Model, n.d., p. 1). Development of TEAM was derived from a combination of elements that included constructive feedback, frequent observation, data of students, and purposeful professional growth. TEAM linked compensation, professional growth, job advancement, guaranteed job

retention, and decisions of renewal decisions with the needs of educators as determined through the evaluation process. Professionally licensed educators were subject to an evaluation at least twice during the school year (Tennessee State Board of Education website, 2011).

After the post discussion, a teacher had an opportunity to discuss in detail the results of the evaluation in either the area strengthening or achievement, enhancement, or progress with identified opportunities for professional growth. Three performance components are included in the framework. Fifty percent of qualitative observation data; thirty-five percent of quantitative student growth score; fifteen percent of quantitative student achievement data (Tennessee First to the Top website, n.d.). The legislation consisted of these components, by which the charge for the responsibility of the state's Department of Education was to assist with implementing TEAM to the best of their ability (Huffman, 2011). By providing several observations followed by meaningful discussions and opportunities of targeted professional growth, TEAM provided a continuous cycle of feedback that was reflective that absorbed the instructional quality, performance of students and teacher growth (FAQ Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model, n.d.). TEAM provided an outline for principals and teachers to collaborate to guarantee that students benefited from continuous high quality daily. The four domains for the qualitative data of the TEAM model are: environment, planning, instruction, and professionalism. Rubrics guided evaluators in making decisions on the instructional practices in a classroom. The rubrics were designed to present a rigorous vision of excellent instruction not an expectation of perfection (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012b). Administrators and/or Evaluators provided teachers with the evaluation criteria prior to the initial evaluation, provided teachers with post-conference feedback, and provided teachers with sustenance in the besieged areas of weaknesses (Goe et al., 2008; Jerald & Van Hook, 2011). The scaling of the rubrics was created to open the door for honest

discussions about areas for growth (Tennessee Department of Education, 2012b). Research supported using a variety of methods to assess teachers (Daley & Kim, 2010; Jerald & Van Hook, 2011; Marzano, 2012). The numerical and descriptive components were utilized to configure an overall effectiveness of the teacher and the score's total was then converted to a rating for overall effectiveness. There were 41 indicators utilized in scoring an observation for those teachers with a professional license, while a teacher with an apprentice license was based on 60 indicators. To make sure TEAM was executed with impartiality, the state's department of education mandated that evaluators exemplify understanding by passing a certification test which is given yearly, provide support to ensure consistency of scores, and committed to analyzing the outcomes of the process ensuring that proper training as given. Feedback on the process was provided from focus groups, surveys, as well as the previous evaluation that had been performed (Tennessee First to the Top website, n.d.). The state contracted with an evaluation management system known as My Learning Plan to create the data system for TEAM which allowed teachers to see their observation outcomes and give insight to the progress of the evaluations to the educational department (Tennessee First to the Top website, n.d.).

As stated on the state Department of Education's website (TDOE), each year, the administrator as well as any other administrative licensed personnel that will serve as an evaluator for the upcoming school year has to participate in mandatory training and receive a passing certification from the State of Tennessee. Each year the department increased the rigor for the certification test. The evaluators are given a total of three attempts to receive the credential. This certification is only good for one school year and must be renewed each year in order for that person to perform a formal evaluation.

Administrators also receive an evaluation utilizing the TEAM model. The administrator evaluation system was also initiated in the 2011-2012 school year and has continued to evolve. During the first year, the system aligned to the old Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) without a rubric with specific indicators and descriptors. In response to feedback, specific indicators and descriptors were added for the 2012-2013 school year. During the following year there was a revision of the TILS to reflect greater alignment with the changing nature of the principal role. The revised and streamlined TILS were accepted in April 2013 (TEAM-TN website, n.d.).

To continue improvement to the TEAM evaluation framework, the department opened dialogue with educators by conducting a statewide feedback tour where they collected informative feedback from teachers, school level leaders and district leaders in each CORE region. An extensive amount of time was spent in discussion with educators. After collecting this feedback the information was categorized into three themes. These themes included:

•A desire to maintain the stability of the current observation rubric

•Time required to perform the observation process with fidelity

•Implementation challenges associated with the 15 percent achievement measure

As a result of these themes, the department decided to implement the following changes upcoming in the 2014-2015 school year.

•15 Percent Achievement Process: During the 2014 legislative session, legislation passed that allows the person being evaluated to decide which measure to be selected as evidence of achievement. In the past, the evaluator made the final selection of measure pertaining to the fifteen percent. Moving forward, the person being evaluated will be able to make the final selection.

•Additional Evaluation Coaches: In 2013-14, evaluators who initially had difficulty with accuracy improved after working with a state coach. This resulted in the state providing additional coaches during the 2014-2015 school year. These coaches focused on supporting schools in an effort to strengthen and sustain the implementation of TEAM with high quality.

•Continued Expansion for Grades and Subjects (Non-Tested): Teachers that fall under this criteria remained a priority throughout the 2014-15 school year. Improving performance of teachers in all subject areas while providing recognition and support is the overall goal. Expansion of coverage exists through portfolios, assessments and other measures that are school-wide.

There are four components that outline the TEAM Evaluation Framework. These components are: Environment, Instruction, and Planning and Professionalism. Teachers are then scored according to these component guidelines on domains which can vary. An evaluator gives a score that ranges from 5 to 1. It should be noted that 5 is the highest possible score. A requirement for teachers is to also complete a self-reflection evaluation on the same domains. This reflection is discussed during the post conference and submitted as part of the evaluation framework. Table 2.1 outlines the specifics of the four components and each domain.

Table 2.1: TEAM Evaluation Framework Components

Component: Environment	Component: Instruction
1. Expectations 2. Managing Student Behavior 3. Environment 4. Respectful Culture	1. Problem Solving 2. Thinking 3. Presenting Instructional Content 4. Activities and Materials 5. Lesson Structure and Pacing 6. Teacher Content Knowledge 7. Grouping Students 8. Academic Feedback 9. Questioning 10. Teacher Knowledge of Students 11. Motivating Students 12. Standards and Objectives
Component: Planning	Component: Professionalism
1. Assessment 2. Instructional Plans 3. Student Work	1. Community Involvement 2. School Responsibilities 3. Growing and Developing Professionally 4. Reflecting and Teaching

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

In this evaluation model a teacher's overall effectiveness rating has been defined by the combined observation rating, growth score, and the achievement measure rating. Descriptors for effectiveness of teachers are:

(Level 5) Significantly Above Expectations – Educators that achieve this level will exemplify exceptional skills of instruction and content knowledge, as identified implementation of instruction is driven by data in order to attain learning goals.

(Level 4) Above Expectations – Educators that achieve at this level as identified in the rubric consistently show evidence of teaching and learning with a strong understanding of their craft. Instruction is appropriately taught and its impact on achievement is strong.

(Level 3) At Expectations – Educators that achieve at this level shows evidence of an ability to convey an understanding of a vast amount of their instruction and content knowledge base as identified in the rubric. The achievement goal of students that is expected is reached.

(Level 2) Below Expectations – Educators that achieve at this level will exemplify skills of instruction, responsibility, and knowledge in small amounts and implementation proves to be inconsistent. Student achievement goals are not achieved at its expectancy.

(Level 1) Significantly Below Expectations – Educators that perform at this level will exemplify skills on instruction, responsibility, and knowledge according to the rubrics design. Implementation is difficult. Impact on student achievement is nearly non-existent. (Tennessee First to the Top Teacher Model, n.d., p.3).

The System for Student Achievement and Advancement (TAP)

A comprehensive system to address the challenges that were being faced by public education was developed in the 1990s by the 1990s Milken and the Milken Family Foundation. According to the standards for teaching the System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP) the administrators of Tennessee were give a model framework and the resources to administer the TEAM evaluation process. The process of observation of TAP has been implemented for a decade. The TAP rubric was selected as the model for Tennessee's new evaluation process. The rubric was selected based upon the resources and research on behalf of TAP. For example, Danielson's assessment framework. Evidence of Danielson's work is located in the evaluation rubric for TAP (National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, 2011a).

The TEAM evaluation framework also mirrors Danielson's components. TAP's development can measure accurately the effectiveness of a teacher as well as offer support for teachers that enhances their performance. The system has shown outstanding results and is currently being governed by the NIET public charity (National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, 2011a).

Teacher Perceptions of Evaluations

In Xu and Sinclair's (2002) study, teachers and principals were surveyed regarding current evaluation methods. Regarding perceptions of the reasons for teacher evaluations, teachers believed that the reasons for the evaluations were accountability, teacher growth, and improving curriculum and instruction. The most effective aspects of teacher evaluations were goal setting, pre and post-conferences, and peer coaching. Consequently, the least effective component of teacher evaluations were time restraint, feedback only from one administrator, and the infrequent length of the classroom observations.

Rindler (1994) found that teachers believed there are several factors that have an impact on their professional growth: the rationale provided by the evaluator on the usefulness of suggestions and persuasiveness; reliability and the evaluator's trust is acquired. The feedback obtained from the evaluator should be authentic. Teachers also showed concern about the amount of time that was spent during the actual evaluation; whether or not the evaluation was focused on standards that showed clarity along with instructor support.

In a study conducted in Nicosia Cypres, Kyriakides, Demetriou, and Charlambous (2006) used a five-point Likert scale questionnaire to survey to over 300 teachers with 237 teachers completing and returning the survey. An invitation was given to teachers to determine the validity of each of the 42 identified criteria of teacher evaluation, specifically the extent the criteria was

used in formative and/or summative evaluations. The criteria selected, which were based on the main research of teacher effectiveness models (TER), related to goals and tasks, resource utilization, working processes, absence of problems, continuous learning and accountability.

Teachers rated those criteria related to working processes as most important in the evaluation process. These items included: differentiation, classroom organization, cooperative learning, providing feedback, discovery learning, teacher reflection, etc. Kyriakides et al. found that when teachers are given input into the development of the criteria for teacher evaluations, they are more accepting of the evaluation process and its importance. In addition, the researchers found that while the Cypriot teachers did not feel favorably toward current evaluation methods they were not eager for changes to be made.

In his study on teacher evaluation, Doherty (2009) surveyed 170 teachers in a suburban school district in Massachusetts using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) as well as interviews from several small focus groups. The teachers surveyed left the impression that the current system of evaluation could be enhanced by producing a teacher evaluation system that was differentiated, including the rubrics which they felt should accompany the different teaching positions, decreasing the process of paperwork and performing more informal evaluations and visits, and utilizing various data sources when interviewed in small focus groups (p.4). Teachers did feel that the current system of evaluation had an impact on their growth professionally, and that these evaluations positively impacted school improvement (Sheppard, 2013).

Sheppard (2013) also reported that Breedlove (2011) analyzed the data collected from the 2008 and 2010 North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey (TWC) in order to determine if teachers' perceptions regarding the process of evaluation that had been revised in North Carolina. Some revisions incorporated establishing clarity of standards. Two additions to the

evaluation process was a self-assessment and an artifacts collection. Responses to the survey totaled 10,400 in 2008, and increased in 2010 to 105,600. After analyzing the responses, Breedlove concluded while the majority of educators expressed positively about the revision to the evaluation process, many still felt that improvements were needed (p.145).

Why Student Achievement Matters

According to Daley and Kim (2010) teachers were a vital school factor related to student achievement. Baker et al (2010) reports that policy makers suggest that schools would have increased accountability if student growth scores on standardized tests were used in the teacher evaluation process. Former studies revealed that the correlation among the scores of a teacher evaluation and achievement from their scholars was minimal (Gallagher, 2004). The data achievements of students are highly sought as a parameter of evaluative data (Ovando & Ramirez, 2007). Fuhrman (2010) reports that states were encouraged to include the data scores of their students for the RTTT grant funding competition. Contest guidelines were provided in section (D) (2) (ii) provides evidence of minimal relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student achievement (State of Tennessee application, United States Department of Education, 2009, p.81). Many states obliged this encouragement and included achievements of their scholars as a way to identify the effectiveness of educators in their designs when they applied for the RTTT.

There are many different types of assessment data regarding to student achievement. Using student achievement information for a teacher's evaluation is identified as a chief issue in the restructuring of an educator's assessment (Ramirez & Ovando, 2007). Standardized data are the central basis from which the success of a scholar is resultant. This particular information will give insight on the achievement level and abilities of student growth. Data scores for students will be used in conjunction with the teacher's evaluation during that same year. Determination of the

teacher's effectiveness varied and was dependent upon the statistical measure that was selected, according to the achievement scores (NEA, 2010). NEA (2010) also asserted that a score on an assessment for an individual could not precisely indicate what a student learned in relation to an evaluation for an educator. Therefore, educators promote for additional resources of work of scholars being utilized for achievement progression measurement.

Problems usually surface while attempting to apply student achievement to specific teachers. This is especially true in instances where the performance of a teacher is applied to a class that is not required to administer formal tests (Stumbo & McWalters, 2011). Thus, increasing the administering of this form testing in order to obtain an outcome of value-added measure is not desired (Fuhrman, 2010).Not in R Limitations that exist in current testing brings about difficulty when using data that is value-added for educators that teach non-tested subjects. An estimation of less than twenty-five percent of educators are in classrooms where applying tests scores are applicable (Donaldson, 2009; Kane et al., 2010). As a measure to resolve this problem, states have decided that teacher of untested subjects will have school-wide data as source of information. Doing so can lead to unlikeable comments due to the possibility of teachers not being involved directly with the reflection of the data. This is particularly concerning in both middle and high school levels because students have multiple teachers each day (Stumbo & McWalters, 2011).

Labaree (2011) adds that weaknesses of reliability and validity exist among many testing experts as a measure of teacher effectiveness. Educators criticize the value-added model of measurement. Labaree (2011) further states that this particular form of data was created to identify teacher influence on scholar achievement during one school year while external factors are controlled. Proponents are existent, in spite of negative comments that support the idea that the

sole measurement of the evaluation of teachers is objective only when utilizing the test data of students (Markley, 2004).

Fuhrman (2010) asserts that there are external elements which are uncontrolled by educators that could affect student achievement, thus affecting data results as well. Though research suggests that a positive correlation among the effectiveness of educators and the achievement of their students has been established. There are two studies that support this correlation. Both studies revealed a strong positive linkage that was statistically clear in correlating the educator's scores from an evaluation and their value-added gains (Odden, 2004).

Despite areas of concern previously mentioned, Gallagher (2004) contends that defining the effectiveness of a teacher is now an imperative issue for our nation to address and improve instruction. Merely evaluating a teacher does not influence the achievement of students. Rather, the reflection from the evaluator and professional progression does influence the achievement of students as a result of the educator's professional practice. (DuFour & Marzano, 2009).

Teacher Efficacy

With the work of Rotter (1966) as a theoretical base, the researchers at the Rand Corporation studying the effectiveness of reading instruction first conceived of teacher efficacy as the extent to which teachers believed that they could control the reinforcement of their actions. Studies underwritten in 1976-77 by the Rand foundation of evidence that shows a positive correlation with student achievement and a sense of self-efficacy (Denham and Michael, 1981). Bandura's extensive work (1997) has contributed to the understanding of self-efficacy and its impact on work performance. In a study that examined the relationship regarding the self-efficacy of the principal and his/her actions individually and collectively, the following information was noted. A person's belief about their ability to motivate and teacher effectively those students who

are experiencing difficulty defines the self-efficacy concept developed by Bandura. Bandura defines the concept of efficacy that is collective as the idea that the group effort from teachers impacts students positively Guskey, (1994), Lewandowski (2005), Yılmaz & Çokluk Bökeoğlu (2008). According to this definition, collective efficacy at a high level opens the door for educators to persevere through obstacles as they educate scholars (Demir, 2008; Goddard, 2002; Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002). According to Allinder (1994), teacher's self-efficacy beliefs may influence a student's achievement in several ways: teachers with high self-efficacy beliefs are more likely than teachers with a low sense of self-efficacy to implement didactic innovations in the classroom, to use classroom management approaches and adequate teaching methods and encourage students' autonomy, and to take responsibility for students with special learning needs. According to research, the characteristics of efficacious teachers are:

- better organized

- willing to try new ideas to meet students' needs

- less critical of students whenever they make mistakes

- more positive about teaching

- have a reluctance to refer students to special education services

- more likely to implement positive classroom management strategies

(Henson, 2001; Pinkston-Miles, 2003; Scharlach, 2008).

Ashton and Webb (1986) recognized that highly efficacious teachers tend to be more organized, display greater skills of instruction, questioning, explaining, and providing feedback to students having difficulties, and maintaining students on task. Low efficacy teachers, display a more custodial than humanistic approach to classroom management, spend significantly more time in group work as opposed to whole group instruction, feel angered and threatened by challenging behavior, and experience difficulty in maintaining students on task. Teachers with high self-efficacy are much more likely to provide opportunities for student communication by using a variety of models to meet the needs of all learner as reported by Smylie (1989).

New teachers may not acquire the experience in dealing effectively with struggling or difficult students. They may not have high expectations or the degree of stamina required to develop them. As a result, the teacher's actions and expectations may prohibit the students from rising above their expectations. The student may achieve no more than what was expected by the teacher. This negative aspect is what Cagle (1998) described as the "self fulfilling prophecy."

In a report, Klassen (2015) states that anyone who has spent time in any workplace for an extended period knows that motivation and emotions fluctuate over time. Working in schools is no exception, and teacher efficacy can change as demands increase and energy wanes. According to Huberman, the typical reaction of novice teachers to early classroom experiences combines feelings of survival. However, teachers in later career phases experience the classroom differently from new teachers, and mid-career teaching differs from end-of-career teaching, with different motivations and levels of engagement.

Summary

This chapter provided a review of literature, including the history of teacher evaluations, The Tennessee First to the Top Act, No Child Left Behind Act, the instructional leaders' role in

the evaluation process, a former teacher evaluation process in the state of Tennessee, the current teacher evaluation model (TEAM), teacher perceptions of evaluations, the System for Student Achievement and Advancement and student achievement.

CHAPTER 3: Methodology

Teacher evaluations have been examined by researchers in various aspects. This study investigated the impact of teacher evaluations on elementary educator perceptions in the state of Tennessee. The study's purpose was to investigate teachers' beliefs regarding impact of teacher evaluation. Particularly, this study examined the effect of the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework on instructional practices. Two research questions were presented to address the topic.

These research questions centered on feedback provided by teachers to improve teaching practices. Several researchers (Wise, et al, 1986; Peterson, 2004; Darling-Hammond, et al, 2012) agree that providing feedback to teachers is one of the most important roles carried out by principals. It was therefore important to investigate how effective the TEAM teacher evaluations process was in providing teachers with meaningful feedback that would enhance instructional strategies taking into account a teacher work load.

Participants and Setting

Purposeful sampling was used in this study. Educators who were members of the local professional educators' organization located in an urban Tennessee school district were randomly selected and used in this study. Tennessee teachers were the sample population. A sample size of 152 members were used in this study.

A letter was sent to the President of the organization securing permission of the members to participate in this study. Once approval was secured from the president a recruitment email was sent to the members. A copy of the recruitment email is included in the Appendix section.

Procedures

An instrument in the form of a survey was developed which included 30 inquiries. This instrument included 6 questions regarding demographics, 12 questions related to TEAM evaluation implementation with 1 open-ended question, and 11 questions on self-efficacy which were duplicated from a survey instrument that was utilized in a different study conducted by Dana (2014). Since this section of the survey has been previously utilized, it should be noted that this section was subjected to piloting. A pilot study was conducted on the survey being used as well in order to assess the comprehensibility and accuracy of the survey. The pilot study involved six educators who had previously been evaluated with the TEAM evaluation framework at their respective schools. Also, a panel of experts with terminal degrees reviewed the survey and provided suggestions. All participants were invited to respond to the questions in the survey. They were provided with the research questions and were invited to provide comments on the transparency of the question and their relevance to the research questions. A duplicate survey will be located in Appendix section.

A Likert-type Scale that included the possibility of seven levels that range from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree was utilized in the survey. The evaluation rubric for TEAM used in this district applied to every educator. Selection of educators this organization was possible because of their required usage of the rubric of this specific evaluation model. Any identifiable information acquired in connection with this study will remain confidential, only to be disclosed with the permission of the individuals involved or as required by law. At no time, including publishing of the results or discussion in conferences was identifiable information be shared. This instrument was used to measure the perceptions of educators since the implementation of the TEAM Evaluation Framework by the educators that participated.

Data Collection

This non-experimental, quantitative study analyzed data retrieved from a survey instrument administered to members of the local professional educators' organization. This study utilized Survey Monkey (1999) in the collection of data from the Teacher Survey. Questions were inputted manually in the designated order and delivered via an email link to the members of the local professional educators' organization. The researcher monitored the number of respondents after the first week of delivery of the Teacher Survey. A reminder to follow up was distributed to the participating members after the first week passed with the link to the Survey Monkey survey. A second reminder email was delivered after two weeks passed from the initial email request.

Documentation in letter form was sent via email to the president of the organization that outlined the study specifically with information that explained in detail the process of conducting the survey. Upon accepted approval from the president of the organization and from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Carson-Newman University, the survey was administered. A link to the Survey Monkey online tool was distributed via email to all members evaluated under the TEAM rubric. Using the Survey Monkey link, educators were allowed to respond to all of the questions on the survey online. The request for the member's participation was voluntary and they were informed that anonymity of responses shall remain in all reporting. An additional request was distributed to members to encourage completion of the survey. After the administering of the survey, no follow-up occurred.

Analysis of Data

This researcher used a non-experimental quantitative methodology with a survey instrument to collect data. All data from this research was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0. The data sources that were analyzed consisted completely

of a survey design administered to the educators that were members of the local professional educators' organization. Each research question in this study had a corresponding null hypothesis.

Chapter Summary

In summary, a non-experimental approach was selected for this study. This study investigated the implementation of the TEAM evaluation model framework in an urban Tennessee organization. Specifically, the researcher sought to determine the teacher's perception regarding the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework and its impact on instructional practices.

CHAPTER 4: Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of educators regarding the implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model evaluation framework in a Tennessee school district. After attaining approval from the university Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Appendix A) an online survey (Appendix B) was distributed to members of a local professional educator organization. At the time of distribution for the survey, there were 1,800 members in the organization. Due to the anonymity of the survey, the actual number of members that received the link is unknown.

In this chapter, data were presented and analyzed to answer two research questions and their corresponding null hypotheses. Analyzation of data were derived from a questionnaire which reflected 30 questions from which 18 were measured on a 7-point Likert type scale, 11 were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, as well as one question was open ended. Data were collected from an online survey format utilizing Survey Monkey tool. The survey was distributed only once and received a total of 152 responses, representing a response rate of 8.4%. Using survey data with a response rate of less than 50% have become common for educational researchers (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003). Literature published by Porter & Whitcomb (2003) further reported that this practice was consistent with other studies conducted in the social sciences that received return rates of less than 50% as well. Hamilton (2009) defined response rate as the percentage of survey invitations that result in a response. Response rates can vary greatly among surveys and were affected by multiple variables throughout the entire process.

Descriptive Statistics

In reviewing the demographic results from Table 4.1, there were three areas which stood out significantly: academic qualification, age, and grade subject taught. With regard to academic qualification, the data indicated that the largest number of respondents 92, had earned a master's

degree, representing 60.5%. The least number of respondents reflected those who had earned a

bachelor's +30, representing six or 3.9%.

Table 4.1 shows the level of education of the respondents

Education Level of Participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bachelors	21	13.8	13.9	13.9
	Bachelors+30	6	3.9	4.0	17.9
	Masters	92	60.5	60.9	78.8
	Education Specialist	21	13.8	13.9	92.7
	Doctorate	11	7.2	7.3	100.0
	Total	151	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	0.7		
Total		152	100.0		

According to Table 4.2, in the category for age, those respondents that were 46 years and

older, provided the most responses representing 52.6%, while the age group that represented the

least number of respondents, three, were those with ages ranging from 21-25 years of age only

represented 2% of the respondent population.

Table 4.2 reflects the age of respondents.

Age of Respondents

_____

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	21- 25	3	2.0	2.0	2.0
	26-32	20	13.2	13.2	15.1
Valid	33-45	49	32.2	32.2	47.4
	46+	80	52.6	52.6	100.0
	Total	152	100.0	100.0	

According to Table 4.3, with respect to grade level taught, the data indicated that non-classroom educators, (e.g. principal, assistant principal, coaches, and librarian) comprised 37 of the respondents or 24.3% of respondents, which was the highest number of respondents for this category. Closely in range were educators who taught grades 3 through 5, with 35 respondents or 23% of the total. The least number of respondents were those from grades 9-12, which represented 15.1% of the respondent total of the sample.

Table 4.3 shows the grade level taught by the respondents.

Grade Level Taught

_____

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Pre-K-2	31	20.4	20.4	20.4
	3-5	35	23.0	23.0	43.4
	6-8	26	17.1	17.1	60.5
Valid	9-12	23	15.1	15.1	75.7
	Non-Classroom Teacher	37	24.3	24.3	100.0
	Total	152	100.0	100.0	

_____

Research Question 1 and Hypotheses

Research Question 1: What are the perceptions of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework and are there statistical differences in TEAM implementation based on selected demographics?

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on the use of the rubric.

H_1: There is a significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on the use of the rubric.

Results: The Pearson correlation coefficient was .551 as it related to perception, which revealed a statistically significant difference, therefore the null-hypothesis must be rejected.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on teacher differentiation.

H_2: There is a significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on teacher differentiation.

Results: The Pearson correlation coefficient was .542 as it related to perception, which revealed a statistically significant difference, therefore the null-hypothesis must be rejected.

H_{03}: There is no significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on student achievement.

H_3: There is a significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on student achievement.

Results: The Pearson correlation coefficient was .538 as it related to perception, which revealed a statistically significant difference, therefore the null-hypothesis must be rejected.

H_{04}: There is no significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on implementation of the model to improve the educator's craft.

H_4: There is a significant relationship in the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on implementation of the model to improve the educator's craft.

Research Question 1 Analyses

Results: The Pearson correlation coefficient was .445 as it related to perception, which revealed a statistically significant difference, therefore the null-hypothesis must be rejected.

An ANOVA was conducted on Prek-12 educators who were members of the educational organization in an Urban Tennessee school district. The first selected demographic analyzed the use of the TEAM Evaluation Rubric as it relates to reaching all learners within the classroom setting. The demographic analysis included educators with experience ranging in: 0-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-15 years; and 16+ years. The total population was 151 ($N = 151$), with 21 educators representing 0-5 years teaching experience; 25 educators representing 6-10 years of teaching experience; 26 educators representing 11-15 years teaching experience; and 79 educators representing 16+ years of teaching experience. The TEAM evaluation rubric is based on a scale of 1-5, with one representing significantly below expectations, three representing at expectations, and five representing significantly above expectations. The mean score for teachers with 0-5 years of experience was 4.19 *($m = 4.19$)*. The mean score for teachers with 6-10 years of experience was 3.80 ($m = 3.80$). The mean score for teachers with 11-15 years of experience was 3.00 ($m = 3.00$). The mean score for teachers with 16+ years of experience was 3.42 *($m=3.42$)*. The next selected demographic analyzed the use of the TEAM Evaluation Rubric as it relates to the effectiveness of differentiation and question during instruction. The demographic analysis

included educators with experience ranging in 0-5years; 6-10 years; 11-15 years; 16+ years. The population was 150 ($N = 150$), with 21 educators representing 0-5 years of experience; 25 educators representing 6-10 years of experience; 26 educators representing 11-15 years of teaching experience; and 78 educators with 16+ years of teaching experience. The mean score for educators with 0-5 years of teaching experience was 4.38 ($m = 4.38$). The mean score for educators with 6-10 years of teaching experience was 3.64 *($m = 3.64$)*. The mean score for educators with 11-15 years of experience was 3.31($m = 3.31$). The mean score for educators with 16+ years of teaching experience was 3.69 ($m = 3.69$). Another selected demographic analyzed the use of the TEAM Evaluation Framework model as it relates to an increase in student achievement. One of the core purposes of TEAM is to increase student achievement. The data analysis included educators with experience ranging in: 0-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-15 years; and 16+ years. The total population was 151 ($N = 151$), with 21 educators representing 0-5 years of experience; 25 educators with 6-10 years of experience; 26 educators with 11-15 years of experience and 79 educators with 16+ years of experience. The mean score for educators with 0-5 years of experience was 3.66 ($m = 3.66$). The mean score for educators with 6-10 years of experience was 3.44 ($m = 3.44$). The mean score for educators with 11-15 years of experience was 2.58 ($m = 2.58$). The mean score for educators with 16+ years of experience was 2.99 ($m = 2.99$). The final selected demographic analyzed the TEAM Evaluation Framework model as it relates to improving the educator's craft as a result of the implementation model. The demographic model included educators with experience ranging in: 0-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-15 years; and 16+ years. The total population was 151 ($N = 151$), with 21 educators with 0-5 years of teaching experience and a mean of 4.00 ($m = 4.00$); 25 educators with 6-10 years of experience and a mean score of 3.84 ($m = 3.84$); 26

educators with 11-15 years of experience and a mean score of 3.00 ($m = 3.00$), and 79 educators

with 16+ years of experience with a mean score of 3.05 ($m = 3.05$).

Table 4.4 shows the means scores regarding perceptions of educators.

Means Scores of Perceptions of Educators

		N	Mean
Using the TEAM evaluation rubric, it allows me to reach all learners in my classroom.	a. 0-5	21	4.1905
	b. 6-10	25	3.8000
	c. 11-15	2:6	3.0000
	d. 16 +	79	3.4177
	Total	151	3.5166
The differentiation and questioning used during my instruction is effective due to the TEAM evaluation rubric.	a. 0-5	21	4.3810
	b .6-10	25	3.6400
	c.11-15	26	3.3077
	d.16 +	78	3.6923
	Total	150	3.7133
Student achievement has increased due to the TEAM evaluation framework.	a. 0-5	21	3.6667
	b. 6-10	25	3.4400
	c.11-15	26	2.5769
	d.16 +	79	2.8987
	Total	151	3.0397
The TEAM evaluation framework model has made me a better teacher.	a. 0-5	21	4.0000
	b. 6-10	25	3.8400
	c. 11-15	26	3.0000
	d. 16 +	79	3.0506
	Total	151	3.3046

Research Question 2 and Hypothesis

Research Question 2: What are the instructional implications of using the TEAM evaluation framework?

H_{05}: There is no statistical significant difference between teacher instructional strategies and the TEAM evaluation model in this Urban Tennessee school district.

H_5: There is a statistical significant difference between teacher instructional strategies and the TEAM evaluation model in this Urban Tennessee school district.

Research Question 2 Analyses

Result: The Pearson correlation coefficient was .326 as it related to self-efficacy and TEAM implementation which revealed a statistical significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis must be rejected.

An ANOVA was conducted on Prek-12 educators who were members of the educational organization in an Urban Tennessee school district. The mean score for self-efficacy was 4.09 ($m = 4.09$). The mean score for the implementation of TEAM was 4.69 ($m = 4.69$). The mean scores are reflected in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 shows the mean scores of self-efficacy and TEAM implementation scores.

Means scores of self-efficacy and TEAM implementation

	Mean	N
Self-efficacy	4.0901	149
TEAM implementation	4.6868	152

Based on the results of the survey, the following themes emerged from the collected data:

- TEAM evaluation process lacks objectivity

- TEAM evaluation should be used as a coaching tool rather than punitively

- TEAM evaluation is not practical for all content areas

- TEAM evaluation process does not accurately depict teacher classroom success

- TEAM evaluation should be eliminated and replaced

These themes were identified using the data text analysis diagnostic tool on Survey Monkey on question 19 of the survey which was the only open ended question which provided the respondents with an opportunity to share how they would improve the TEAM evaluation system.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 4 presented and analyzed data obtained from Prek-12 educators who were members of an educational organization in an Urban Tennessee school district. There were two research questions and five corresponding null hypotheses and non-directional hypotheses. All data were collected through an online survey distributed to an unknown number of members resulting in 152 responses. Results for Research Question 1 indicated the respondents had a statistical significant difference in perception of the implementation of TEAM framework based on selected demographics which included the use of the rubric, teacher differentiation, student achievement, and improving their craft. Research Question 2 indicated the respondents had a statistical significant difference between teacher instructional strategies and the TEAM evaluation model. The results of the survey also emerged themes from an open-ended question on the survey that provided an opportunity for respondents to state how they would improve the TEAM model system.

CHAPTER 5: Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter presents conclusions which have been drawn from the study, described implications, and provided recommendations for future research in retrospect to the evaluation framework of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model. The purpose of this study was to investigate and analyze the potential correlation between the TEAM evaluation model and teacher efficacy. The study analyzed teacher perceptions in relation to its implementation in an urban Tennessee school district. The study was conducted through an online survey which was distributed to a local professional educators' organization in an urban Tennessee district.

Summary

The statistical analysis in this study was based on two research questions presented in Chapters 1and 3. Each question had a corresponding null hypothesis which was presented in Chapter 3. Each research question was analyzed using an ANOVA. The total number of educators from Prek-12 was 152. The level of significance used in each test was .05. The results of the study demonstrated a statistically significant difference in each question. As a result, the null hypotheses were rejected. Responses to an open-ended question presented an outline of themes in which respondents gave their input on how to improve the TEAM framework system.

Conclusion

The following conclusions were drawn based on the findings related to the data in this study:

1. There was a statistically-significant difference related to perception of the educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on the TEAM rubric. This conclusion was drawn based on a Pearson correlation coefficient of .551, which indicated a statistically-significant relationship.

2. There was a statistically-significant difference related to the perception of the educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on teacher differentiation. This conclusion was drawn based on a Pearson correlation coefficient of .542, which indicated a statistically-significant relationship.

3. There was a statistically-significant difference related to the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on student achievement. This conclusion was drawn based on a Pearson correlation coefficient of .538, which indicated a statistically-significant relationship.

4. There was a statistically-significant difference related to the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on implementation of the model to improve the educator's craft. This conclusion was drawn based on a Pearson correlation coefficient of .445, which indicated a statistically-significant relationship.

5. There was a statistically-significant difference related to self-efficacy and TEAM implementation. This conclusion was drawn based on a Pearson correlation coefficient of .326, which indicated a statistically-significant relationship.

Recommendation for Practice

The findings and conclusions of this research have established a foundation for the following recommendations for assisting school systems, all PreK-12 teachers who are evaluated under the TEAM evaluation framework, and possibly the State Department of Education with the planning and improvement of the TEAM evaluation framework:

1. This study found a statistically-significant difference related to the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on the TEAM rubric. This statistically-significant relationship has been indicated by the Pearson correlation

coefficient of .551. Based on this statistically-significant relationship, it is recommended that an adjustment is made to the TEAM rubric in order to provide a better alignment to educators.

2. This study found a statistically-significant difference related to the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on teacher differentiation. This statistically-significant relationship has been indicated by the Pearson correlation coefficient of .542. Based on this statistically-significant relationship, it is recommended that teachers are provided with professional development centered on teacher differentiation to ensure that all teachers are knowledgeable about this strategy and implementation during practice.

3. This study found a statistically-significant difference related to the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on student achievement. This statistically-significant relationship has been indicated by a Pearson correlation coefficient of .538. Based on this statistically-significant relationship, it is recommended that student achievement is excluded from the framework.

4. This study found a statistically-significant difference related to the perception of educators on the implementation of the TEAM framework based on the implementation of the model to improve the educator's craft. This statistically-significant relationship has been indicated by the Pearson correlation coefficient of .445 Based on this statistically-significant relationship, it is recommended that a replacement model is implemented that will provide positive support for educators as well as lend guidance on improving the educator's craft.

5. This study found a statistically-significant difference related to self-efficacy and TEAM implementation. This statistically-significant relationship has been indicated by a Pearson correlation coefficient of .326. Based on this statistically significant relationship, it is recommended that a self-efficacy rubric is considered and included as part of the scoring rather than just a reflection tool after an observation.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study indicate that educators' perceptions of the TEAM evaluation framework were significantly different as it related to the implementation of the TEAM rubric, teacher differentiation, student achievement, enhancing the educator's craft, and the educator's self-efficacy. The following recommendations for future research which may add to the body of research on teacher evaluation and more specifically the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework in Tennessee.

1. This study should be replicated to include smaller school districts from regions in Tennessee in order to allow for a broader collection of data to evaluate if the findings are similar for a smaller sample.

2. A study to evaluate the perceptions of educators with 0-5 years of experience as compared to tenured teachers in school districts should be conducted. This research could provide insight on ways to improve the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework rubric based on years of experience.

3. A study to evaluate the perceptions of educators that teach in Title1 schools as compared to affluent schools should be conducted. This research could provide insight on the misalignment of the implementation expectations in various school environments.

4. A study to evaluate the impact on student achievement should be conducted after the fifth year of implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework. With *TNReady* being fairly new in replacing the Tennessee Comprehensive Achievement Program (TCAP), five years to acquire student data to be analyzed to evaluate student achievement would be appropriate to identify any possible effects of student achievement that may exist.

5. A study to evaluate school administrators' feedback after the TEAM evaluation should be conducted. This research could provide insight on the perceptions of the educator's self-efficacy after the evaluation as compared to the self-reflection rubric that is required after the evaluated lesson.

Conclusion of the Study

This study addressed teachers' perceptions of the TEAM evaluation framework's process in Middle Tennessee. In order to conduct this study, a survey was distributed to educators in an urban Tennessee school district. Data was collected and analyzed through SPSS and Survey Monkey. The data revealed the following emerging themes:

- TEAM evaluation process lacks objectivity
- TEAM evaluation should be used as a coaching tool rather than punitively
- TEAM evaluation is not practical for all content areas
- TEAM evaluation process does not accurately depict teacher classroom success
- TEAM evaluation should be eliminated and replaced

Based on the emerging themes from this study, it was determined that the educators' perceptions regarding the TEAM framework indicated a lack of confidence in accuracy and objectivity, as well as the practicality of the TEAM framework implementation process. As a result, it is believed that continuous revisions are necessary to enhance the TEAM framework

implementation process or the attrition rate for educators in the state of Tennessee is projected to

increase in the future.

References

A1exandrov, D. (1989). *Teacher evaluation in an era of school reform.* (ERIC Document
   Reproduction Services ED318081).

Ash, R., & Persall, M. (2001). *The principal as chief learning officer: The new work of
   formative leadership*. Toronto, Canada: Refresher.

Ashton, P. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education.
   Journal of Teacher Education, 35(5), 28-32.

Baker, E.L., Barton, P.E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H.F., Linn, R.
   L.,Shepard, L.A. (2010, August 29). *Problems with the use of student test
   scores to evaluate teachers*. Retrieved September 21, 2015, from
   http://www.epi.org/publication/bp278/

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: W. H.
   Freedman & Co.

Barton, S. N. B. (2010). *Principals' perceptions of teacher evaluation practices in an
   urban school district.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of the
   Pacific: Stockton, California.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful
   principals promote teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Burris, C.C., & Welner, K.G. (2011a, July 27). *Letter to Secretary of Education Arne
   Duncan concerning evaluation of teachers and principals*. Retrieved September 21,
   2015, from http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/letter-to-Arne-Duncan

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency.* Chicago: The University of
   Chicago Press.

Chappuis, S., Chappuis, J., & Stiggins, R. (2009). Supporting teacher learning teams. *Educational Leadership, 66*(5), 56-60.

Clark, D. (1993). Teacher evaluation: A review of the literature with implications for educators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED359174).

Cooper-Twamley, S. (2009). *Action research and its impact on teacher efficacy: A mixed methods study.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis http://udini.proquest.com/view/action-research-and-its-impact-onpqid: 1852669571/

Dana, Laura Beckham, "Relationships Among Job Satisfaction, Professional Efficacy, Student and School Performance, and Teacher Absenteeism" (2014). *Dissertations.* Paper 17.

Daley, G., & Kim, L. (2010, August). *A teacher evaluation system that works*. Retrieved February 22, 2013, from http://www.tapsystem.org/publications/rb_eval.pdf

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T.L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 53*(3), 285-328.

Davis, D.R., Ellett, C.D., & Annunziata, J. (2002, December). Teacher evaluation, leadership and learning organizations. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *16*, 287-301. Retrieved September 22, 2015, from https://login.ezproxy.etsu.edu:3443/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview /201571224?accountid=10771

Denham, C.H. & Michael, J.J. (1981). Teacher sense of efficacy: A definition of the construct

and model for further research. Educational Research Quarterly, 6(1), 39-61.

DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(8), 12-15.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (1965).

FAQ Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). (n.d.). http://www.teamtn.

org/faq

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008, June). *Approaches to evaluating teacher*

effectiveness: A research synthesis. Retrieved February 22, 2013, from

http://www.tqsource.org/publications/EvaluatingTeachEffectiveness.pdf

Goldrick, L. (2002). *Improving teacher evaluation to improve teaching quality.* Issue

Brief. Education Policy Studies Division, National Governors Association Center

for Best Practices.

Harris, D. N. (2009). Would accountability on teacher value added be smart policy? An

examination of the statistical properties and policy alternatives, *Education*

Finance and Policy, 4(4), 319-350

Henson, R. K. (2001, January). Teacher self efficacy: Substantive implications and measurement

dilemmas. Presented at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Exchange, Texas

A & M University.

Henson, R., Kogan, L., & Vacha-Haase, T. (2001). A reliability generalization study of

the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological*

Measurement, 61(3), 404-420.

Hoy, A. (2000) *Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching.* Paper

presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research
Association, New Orleans, LA.

Huffman, K. (2011, July 27). *Testimony of Kevin Huffman Tennessee Commissioner of Education before the House committee on education and labor* [Transcript]. Retrieved February 22, 2013, from Tennessee Department of Education website: http://www.tn.gov/education/doc/Huffman_Testimony_072711.pdf

Jerald, C.D., & Van Hook, K. (2011, January). *More than measurement: The TAP system's lessons learned for designing better teacher evaluation systems*. Retrieved February 22, 2013, from http://www.tapsystem.org/publications/eval_lessons.pdf

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals o/school renewal* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

King, D. (2002). The changing shape of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(8), 61-63.

Klassen, R. (2015, April 8). Teacher efficacy: four lessons learned from a decade of research. Retrieved from www.teacherresearch.ca/blog/article/2015/04/08/261

Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. Merrill: Pearson Education Inc.

Mathers, C., Olivia, M., & Laine, S. (2008). Improving Instruction through effective teacher: evaluation: Options for states and districts. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ). Washington, DC.

Martineau, J. A. (2006). Distorting value added: The use of longitudinal, vertically scaled student achievement data for growth-based, value-added accountability, *Journal*

of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 31(1), 35-62.

Marzano, R. (2012). Reducing error in teacher observation scores. *Educational*

Leadership, 70(3), 82-83. Retrieved September 22, 2015, from

http://www.ascd.org/publications/educationalleadership/

nov12/vol70/num03/Reducing-Error-in-Teacher-Observation-

Scores.aspx

Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From*

research to results. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and

Learning.

Milanowski, A., & Heneman, H.G. III. (2001). Assessment of teacher reactions to a

standards-based teacher evaluation system: A pilot study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation*

in Education, 15, 193-212.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The*

Imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Ovando, M. N., & Ramirez, A. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a

teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success.

Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20, 85-110.

Overbaugh, R., & Lu, R. (2007, February). *Factors that influence technology*

implementation in K-12 classrooms. Paper presented at the annual conference of

the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater Beach, FL.

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *National Association on*

Secondary School Principals, 88(639), 60-79.

Pinkston-Miles, S. J. (2003, October). An analysis of improving teacher efficacy to enhance student learning by developing an evaluation instrument for special education teachers. A paper submitted to the Graduate School at Rowan University

Rogers, C. B. H., & Weems, D. M. (2010). Are US teachers making the grade?; A proposed framework for teacher evaluation and professional growth. *Management in Education,* 24(1), 19-24. doi:10.1177/0892020609354959

Rowe, B. W. (2000). The influence of teacher efficacy and readiness for self-directed learning on the implementation of a growth-oriented teacher performance appraisal process. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (Report No. SP039393). New Orleans, LA: AERA (EDRS Document Reproduction Services No. ED4444942).

Scharlach, T. D. (2008). These kids just aren't motivated to read: The influence of pre-service teachers' beliefs on their expectations, instruction, and evaluation of struggling readers. *Literacy Research and Instruction,* 47, 158-173.

Shaughnessy, M. (2004). An interview with Anita Woolfolk: The Educational Psychology of Teacher Efficacy, *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(2), 153-175.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2009). *Framework for evaluation & professional growth: Comprehensive assessment*. Retrieved February 22, 2013, from http://state.tn.us/education/frameval/doc/comprehensive_assessment.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education. (2012b). *Tennessee educator acceleration model training participant new observer manual.* Retrieved September 22, 2015, from http://team-tn.org/assets/misc/TEAM_New_Participant_Handbook_12_13.pdf

Tennessee First to the Top. (n.d.). http://team-tn.org/

Tennessee First to the Top Teacher Model. (n.d.). http://team-tn.org/teacher-model

Tennessee State Board of Education. (2012). *5.201 Teacher and principal evaluation policy*. Retrieved September 22, 2015, from http://www.tn.gov/sbe/Policies/5.201_Teacher_and_Principal_Evaluation_Policy_ Revised_9-28-2012.pdf

Towe, Princess B., "An Investigation of the Role of a Teacher Evaluation System and Its Influence on Teacher Practice and Professional Growth in Four Urban High Schools" (2012). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs).* Paper 1792.

Tucker, C., Porter, T., Reinke, W., Herman, K., Ivery, P., Mack, C., & Jackson, E. (2005). Promoting teacher efficacy for working with culturally diverse students. *Preventing School Failure, 50*(1), 29-34.

Walters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL).

Appendix 1

Perceptions of Tennessee Teachers Regarding Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model Evaluation System

Thank you for participating in this study. This survey is designed to help the researcher gather your perception about the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework to improve teaching practices. Please answer all questions based upon your experience. All responses are strictly confidential.

Section 1: Demographics

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-15
   d. 16 and up
2. Is your current school a Title 1 or Non-Title 1?
   a. Title 1
   b. Non-Title 1

3. What is your level of education?(Please circle your choice)
   a. Bachelors
   b. Bachelors+30
   c. Masters
   d. Ed.S
   e. Doctorate

4. What is your age?
   a. 21- 25
   b. 26-32
   c. 33-45
   d. 46+

5. What grade level do you teach?
   a. K-2
   b. 3-5
   c. 6-8
   d. 9-12
   e. Non-Classroom Teacher

6. My gender is
    a. Female
    b. Male

Section 2: TEAM Evaluation Implementation

Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in regards to your experience with the implementation of the TEAM evaluation framework, **(1 Strongly disagree, 2 Somewhat disagree, 3 Disagree, 4 Undecided, 5 Agree, 6 Somewhat agree, or 7 Strongly agree).**

7. I was provided training on the process of the TEAM evaluation framework by my evaluator.
    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    3-Disagree

    4-Undecided

    5-Agree

    6-Somewhat agree

    7-Strongly agree

8. My evaluator provides full attention during an observation
    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    3-Disagree

    4-Undecided

    5-Agree

    6-Somewhat agree

    7-Strongly agree

9. My evaluator uses the rubric to structure feedback during our conference after an evaluation.
    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    3-Disagree

4-Undecided

5-Agree

6-Somewhat agree

7-Strongly agree

10. My evaluator provides me with specific feedback that I can apply to my teaching that will improve student achievement.
1-Strongly disagree

2-Somewhat disagree

3-Disagree

4-Undecided

5-Agree

6-Somewhat agree

7-Strongly agree

11. My evaluator offers professional development opportunities based on my needs.
1-Strongly disagree

2-Somewhat disagree

3-Disagree

4-Undecided

5-Agree

6-Somewhat agree

7-Strongly agree

12. My evaluator communicates expectations for implementing knowledge and skills gained from professional learning activities.
1-Strongly disagree

2-Somewhat disagree

3-Disagree

4-Undecided

5-Agree

6-Somewhat agree

7-Strongly agree

13. My evaluator supports my development by utilizing a variety of methods.
    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    3-Disagree

    4-Undecided

    5-Agree

    6-Somewhat agree

    7-Strongly agree

14. I feel that my evaluator provides teacher-leader opportunities.
    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    3-Disagree

    4-Undecided

    5-Agree

    6-Somewhat agree

    7-Strongly agree

15. Using the TEAM evaluation rubric, it allows me to reach all learners in my classroom.
    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    -Disagree

    4-Undecided

    5-Agree

    6-Somewhat agree

    7-Strongly agree

16. The differentiation and questioning used during my instruction is effective due to the
    TEAM evaluation rubric.

1-Strongly disagree

2-Somewhat disagree

3-Disagree

4-Undecided

5-Agree

6-Somewhat agree

7-Strongly agree

17. Student achievement has increased due to the TEAM evaluation framework.
    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    3-Disagree

    4-Undecided

    5-Agree

    6-Somewhat agree

    7-Strongly agree

18. The TEAM evaluation framework model has made me a better teacher.

    1-Strongly disagree

    2-Somewhat disagree

    3-Disagree

    4-Undecided

    5-Agree

    6-Somewhat agree

    7-Strongly agree

Open Ended Question

19.   If anything, what would you do to improve the TEAM evaluation system?

Section 3: Self-Efficacy

Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below **(1 Nothing, 2 Very Little, 3 Some Influence, 4 Quite a Bit, 5 A Great Deal).**

	Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a bit	A Great Deal
	1	2	3	4	5
20 How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?					
21. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?					
22 How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?					
23. How much can you do to help your students' value learning?					
24. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?					
25. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?					
26. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?					
27. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?					
28. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?					
29. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?					
30. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?					

Appendix 2

CARSON-NEWMAN UNIVERSITY

From: Greg Casalenuovo
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 9:01 PM
To: Earnest Walker
Subject: RE: Nikki G. Hughes Ed.D. Dissertation Proposal for IRB Review

This request has been approved - please notify the student - thanks,

In His service,

Gregory A. Casalenuovo, PhD, RN
Associate Professor, Nursing
Carson-Newman University
C-N Box 71883
Jefferson City, TN 37760

Office: Pedersen #1
Phones: (865) 471-3236, office; (865) 471-4574, fax

Appendix 3

October 19, 2015

Dear Fellow Educator,

As a doctoral candidate in Administrative Leadership at Carson Newman University and longtime member of MNEA, I am requesting to conduct research through an online survey with fellow members of MNEA in our district who have been evaluated with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) for teacher evaluation. The purpose of this quantitative study is to analyze the perceptions of teachers in Tennessee about the implementation of TEAM and the impact of TEAM on teachers' instructional practice. Detailed information related to the research is listed at the bottom of this email. With your permission, the members of MNEA will receive an email link to an online survey that will consist of 3 demographic questions, 4 statements that ask the respondents to indicate their degree of agreement on a 4-point Likert scale, and three open ended response questions. The survey is currently being piloted to ensure that the questionnaire is transparent, appropriate, and applicable. Participation is strictly voluntary and all results are completely anonymous. The survey should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete and the responses of no more than 25 randomly selected members are necessary. Please be assured that the final copy of the survey will be presented to you prior to distribution of the survey link. (link will be provided through Survey Monkey).

I ask that you or your designee reply to this email by Monday, November 2, with the following information:

- President's permission for MNEA members to voluntarily participate in the research.
- The preferred method of survey distribution to members:

  1. You request that I, the researcher, email all information on the voluntary survey to members, or
  2. You or your designee will forward the link directly to your members.

Respectfully,

Nikki G. Hughes
Administrative Leadership Doctoral Candidate
Carson Newman University

Appendix 4

Nikki Hughes
412 Ocala Ct., N.
Nashville TN 37211

November 30, 2015

Dear Ms. Hughes:

The purpose of this letter is to confirm that the Metropolitan
Nashville Education Association is willing to assist you in
the distribution of your survey instrument to our members
in Nashville. Please let me know if there is anything else
you need from me.

Sincerely,

Erick E. Huth, Ed. D.

Appendix 5

Consent Form

Consent Form for Participation in the Research Study Entitled
Teacher Perceptions Regarding the Implementation of the Teacher Evaluation Acceleration
Model

Funding Source: None

IRB Approved 3/2/16

Principal investigator
Nikki G. Hughes*, Ed.S.*
412 Ocala Court North
Nashville, TN 37211
(615) 615-513-8839

For questions/concerns about your research rights, contact:
Institutional Review Board or IRB
Carson-Newman University
irb@cn.edu

Site Information
Metropolitan Nashville Education Association
531 Fairground Court
Nashville, TN, 37211
www.mnea.com

What is the study about?
The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of educational professionals regarding the implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). Ms. Hughes hopes to analyze the implementation process of the TEAM framework.

Why are you asking me?
You are being invited to take part in this study because of your commitment to increase students' achievement by implementing instructional strategies in accordance to the TEAM framework. In addition, your opinions are significant regarding the implementation of the TEAM framework and instructional practices that were utilized. The information obtained will provide data for school district leaders and policy makers. Once final approval of the dissertation is received from Carson-Newman University, the results of this research study will be shared with Metropolitan Nashville Education Association.

What will I be doing if I agree to be in the study?
If you agree to participate in this research study, your participation will involve: reading and electronically signing this consent form and participating in an online questionnaire. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Is there any audio or video recording?
This research project will not include audio or video recording.

What are the dangers to me?
There may be a minimal risk for loss of confidentiality. To minimize loss of confidentiality, the questionnaire will be secure on the researcher's personal password protected computer and flash drive. The information will be stored for three years. If you have questions about the research please contact Ms. Hughes at (615) 513-8839. You may also contact the IRB at the email address indicated above with questions about your research rights.

Are there any benefits to me for taking part in this research study?
There are none.

Will I get paid for being in the study? Will it cost me anything?
There are no costs to you or compensation for participation in this research study.

How will you keep my information private?
To protect your identity, the questionnaire will not ask you for any information that could be linked to you. To ensure confidentiality, data gathered from the instrument s will be safeguarded with a password on Ms. Hughes's personal computer. Upon completion of her doctoral degree, data from this research study will be properly disposed of after 3 years. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. The IRB, regulatory agencies, or Dr. Earnest Walker may review the questionnaire data.

What if I do not want to participate or I want to leave the study?
You have the right to leave this study at any time or refuse to participate. If you do decide to leave or you decide not to participate, you will not experience any penalty or loss of services you have a right to receive. If you choose to withdraw, any information collected about you **before** the date you leave the study will be kept in the research records for 36 months from the conclusion of the study and may be used as a part of the research.

Other Considerations:
If significant new information relating to the study becomes available, which may relate to your willingness to continue to participate, this information will be provided to you by the investigators.

Voluntary Consent by Participant:
By signing below, you indicate that
- this study has been explained to you

- you have read this document or it has been read to you
- your questions about this research study have been answered
- you have been told that you may ask the researchers any study related questions in the future or contact them in the event of a research-related injury
- you have been told that you may ask Institutional Review Board (IRB) personnel questions about your study rights
- you are entitled to a copy of this form after you have read and signed it
- you voluntarily agree to participate in the study entitled *Teacher Perceptions Regarding the Implementation of Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model*

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Participant's Name: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 6

Participation Letter

Title of Study: Teacher Perceptions Regarding the Implementation of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model

Principal investigator
Nikki G. Hughes, Ed.S
412 Ocala Ct. North
Nashville, TN 37211
615-513-8839

Site Information   Institutional Review Board
                                                                                    Carson-Newman University
531 Fairground Court   irb@cn.edu
Nashville, TN, 37211
615.726.1499

Description of Study: Nikki G. Hughes is a doctoral student at Carson-Newman University engaged in research for the purpose of satisfying a requirement for a Doctor of Education degree. The purpose of this study is to investigate and analyze correlation between the TEAM evaluation model and teacher efficacy in a Tennessee school district. The intent of this study is analyze teacher perceptions regarding the TEAM model of evaluation in relation to its implementation in the state of Tennessee.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to participate in an online survey that will serve as the foundation for my doctoral dissertation. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The interviews take approximately 15 minutes. During this study, your individual identity will remain anonymous. While your participation in this study is completely voluntary, I hope that you will choose to participate.

Risks/Benefits to the Participant: There may be minimal risk involved in participating in this study. There are no direct benefits to for agreeing to be in this study. Please understand that although you may not benefit directly from participation in this study, you have the opportunity to enhance knowledge necessary to effectively implement the evaluation model in schools and districts. If you have any concerns about the risks/benefits of participating in this study, you can contact the investigators and/or the university's human research oversight board (the Institutional Review Board or IRB) at the email address listed above.

Cost and Payments to the Participant: There is no cost for participation in this study. Participation is completely voluntary and no payment will be provided.

Confidentiality: Information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. All data will be secured in a locked filing cabinet. Your name will not be used

in the reporting of information in publications or conference presentations.

Participant's Right to Withdraw from the Study: You have the right to refuse to participate in this study and the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

I have read this letter and I fully understand the contents of this document and voluntarily consent to participate by responding to questionnaire. All of my questions concerning this research have been answered. If I have any questions in the future about this study they will be answered by the investigator listed above.

Sincerely,

Nikki G. Hughes, Ed.S