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This quantitative dissertation explored the association between teacher self-efficacy and teacher perceptions of the Illinois teacher performance evaluation process. It also examined how the teacher evaluation system’s procedures, the evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and the context of the evaluation process related to teacher self-efficacy in the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. Teachers from two different Illinois suburban public elementary school districts were surveyed. One school district employed the Charlotte Danielson Framework and the other a more traditional evaluation model.

The study results showed teachers who reported using a high-quality teacher evaluation process also reported greater levels of self-efficacy. An association was not found among teacher perceptions of the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, the context of the evaluation and self-efficacy in student engagement. An association was found between perceptions of the evaluation procedures and a teacher’s reported self-efficacy in instructional strategies. A similar association was not found between the quality of evaluative feedback and teacher perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies. Also, no associations were found among teacher perceptions of the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received,
the context of the evaluation and self-efficacy in classroom management. The first exploratory research question found the type of performance evaluation tool used in the district does not impact teacher perceptions of self-efficacy. The second exploratory research question found significant differences in teacher perceptions of various aspects of performance evaluations depending upon whether a teacher is evaluated using the Danielson Framework or not. Specifically, teachers evaluated with the Danielson Framework have better perceptions of their own personal attributes, evaluation procedures, the quality of feedback received, and the context of the evaluation.

This study showed teachers in school districts that implemented the Danielson model perceived the evaluation procedures, the quality of feedback received, and the context of the evaluation more positively than teachers in school districts that were not utilizing the Danielson model. Teachers who reported using a high-quality teacher evaluation process also reported greater levels of self-efficacy. This is significant because it suggests the quality of the teacher evaluation process quality might be linked to teacher self-efficacy.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Rationale for the Study

In an era of greater accountability, public school teachers are facing increased expectations to produce improved student learning in their classrooms. Part of this accountability movement focuses on teacher performance evaluation. As a result of the federal government’s competitive Race to the Top (RTTT) grants, many states amended their systems for evaluating teacher classroom performance (RTTT, n.d.). In 2009, the U.S. Department of Education required states seeking competitive RTTT grants to link student academic achievement data to teacher performance evaluation ratings. In Illinois, the focus of this study, the state legislature passed the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 (hereinafter, PERA). PERA designated September 1, 2012, as the date when all Illinois public school teachers would begin receiving summative performance evaluation ratings of either Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory. Additionally, PERA established 2016 as the year when student growth measures would become one of the metrics used in the teacher performance evaluation process. PERA also directed Illinois public school districts to either develop their own teacher performance evaluation model or to adopt all or part of the state-designated “model,” based upon Danielson’s Framework for Professional Practice (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]; 2015b).
PERA directed school districts to use an instructional framework based upon the research of effective classroom instructional practices. This mandated framework was intended to address the following components of the teaching process: planning, instructional delivery, and classroom management. Each school district’s teacher performance evaluation system was also to be aligned with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]; 2015b). While PERA did not require school districts to adopt the Danielson system, any alternative teacher performance evaluation system was expected to emphasize and utilize “research-based practices that promote[d] student learning and explain[ed] what teachers should know and do … [and incorporate] evidence, such as lesson plans and student work, to support various ratings, and [consider] cultural and developmental issues that can affect teaching” (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]; 2015a, para. 2).

It was anticipated PERA’s mandated changes would impact Illinois public teachers in many ways, both positive and negative. As such, it is incumbent upon Illinois public school leaders to understand how various components of the amended teacher performance evaluation process may impact teachers. One potential impact is how teachers view their efficacy in the classroom. The current study examined teacher self-efficacy and its association to components of the evolving Illinois public school teacher performance evaluation system.

Teacher self-efficacy is a teacher’s belief that he or she can affect student learning and behavior (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Self-efficacy beliefs in general affect thoughts and emotions that allow people to achieve goals, persist in challenging situations, and take control over events impacting their lives (Bandura, 1986, 1993, 1996, 1997). In the context of public schools, research has shown teacher self-efficacy influences both teacher and student outcomes (Ross,
1992; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Tschanne-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Ware & Kitsantas, 2007). In addition, teacher self-efficacy has been shown to be related to teacher goals and aspirations (Muijs & Reynolds, 2002) and also to teacher attitudes toward innovation and change (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Bishop, 1992; Guskey, 1988).

Research suggests teachers with high self-efficacy engage in positive teaching behaviors such as employing effective instructional techniques, conducting ongoing formative assessment of student learning, and providing students with timely feedback (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Conversely, it has been found teachers with low self-efficacy experience lower levels of job satisfaction, higher levels of work-related stress, and more difficulties in their teaching (Betoret, 2006).

Notwithstanding considerable research on teacher self-efficacy, there have been few studies specifically examining the association between components of the teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy. Thus, the current study’s goal was to examine what, if any, association exists between teacher levels of self-efficacy and teacher perceptions of the performance evaluation process.

**Problem Statement**

Little research exists examining the association between teacher perceptions of the performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy. This limits school leader access to information showing how components of the teacher performance evaluation process impact how teachers feel about their ability to make a difference in the classroom. As a result of PERA’s formulation, examination of the association between components of the evolving Illinois teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy is timely. As a result of PERA, many
Illinois public school districts have adopted new models for teacher classroom performance evaluation. Often teacher performance evaluation models, including Illinois’s default model, require school officials to develop and implement standards-based systems for evaluating teacher classroom performance (Sartain, Stoelinga, & Krone, 2010). Arguably, this has created greater emphasis on teacher accountability. Since teacher self-efficacy has been found to be linked to effective teaching and learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998), and effective teaching is the ultimate goal of the teacher performance evaluation process, obtaining information on teacher self-perceptions of efficacy would be beneficial.

In the environment of increased accountability for student learning, it is important to examine the effect perceptions of teacher performance evaluation components have upon teacher self-efficacy. For example, are the amended performance evaluation systems creating more confident teachers? It is important to closely examine the association between teacher perceptions of the performance evaluation system components and teacher self-efficacy because, to date, this association has not been adequately addressed by the research. Understanding this association may be useful to school leaders as they consider how to enhance and support not only effective implementation of the teacher classroom performance evaluation process but also effective classroom teaching practices.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the association between teacher perceptions of components of the evolving Illinois teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy in Illinois public elementary and middle schools. The study examined teacher
perceptions of several components of the performance evaluation process. The specific components examined by this study include teacher perceptions of their evaluator, the performance evaluation procedures, the feedback teachers received regarding their classroom performance, and the context of the evaluation. The context of the evaluation is the amount of time allocated to the evaluation process and the policies governing the evaluation process. In addition to teacher self-reports on the components of the performance evaluation process, teacher self-efficacy in the areas of classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies was also examined. The associations among these variables were examined in order to understand how they influence one another.

**Significance of the Study**

As previously noted, to date, few studies have examined the association between the components of the teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy. It is important for school leaders to understand how various components of the performance evaluation process may impact teacher self-efficacy. This study examined aspects of the teacher performance evaluation process and their association to teacher self-efficacy perceptions. The information gained from this study may be useful to school leaders as they consider how to further refine the performance evaluation process to better support effective classroom teaching practices.

In this study, teacher perceptions of performance evaluation model components were examined using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) developed by Stiggins and Duke (1988). Teacher self-efficacy is defined using the construct first developed by Bandura (1997) and extended through later research (Ashton et al., 1983; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk & Hoy,
Teacher self-efficacy is measured using the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES), an instrument initially developed by Gibson and Dembo and later modified by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001).

Theoretical Framework

Self-efficacy is grounded in Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theoretical framework, which is based on the idea that people have the capacity to influence their own behavior. According to this theory, self-efficacy beliefs refer to an individual’s conviction she or he can successfully perform a behavior necessary to create a desired outcome. Bandura (1997) defined perceived self-efficacy as the “belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3). Self-efficacy refers to the level of competence a person believes he or she will exhibit in a future situation. Self-efficacy beliefs affect thoughts and emotions that allow people to put forth effort to achieve goals, persist in challenging situations, recover from failure, or take control over events impacting their lives (Bandura, 1986, 1993, 1996, 1997).

Bandura (1986, 1997) identified four major sources of self-efficacy beliefs; enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and physiological reactions. Mastery experiences, a person’s prior experiences with tasks, are the most powerful source of efficacy information (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003; Pajares, 1997). Self-efficacy beliefs are strengthened when a person perceives his or her task performance has been successful. This in turn contributes to the belief that future performance will also be successful (Goddard, 2001). Success strengthens self-efficacy while repeated failure damages it. A strong sense of self-
efficacy based on previous successes can help a person endure temporary failures (Bong & Skaalvik).

Vicarious experiences are observations of peer performance on specific tasks. This modeling serves as another effective source of efficacy information (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). These experiences also have greater influence on self-efficacy information when people are uncertain about their own abilities or when they have little prior experience with the task being performed (Schunk, 1987). In addition, vicarious experiences have greater influence on self-efficacy formation when the observer identifies similarities between the model and themselves. When the identified model performs well on a task, the observer’s efficacy beliefs are likely to improve. On the other hand, when the model does not perform well, the observer’s efficacy expectations may diminish (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004).

Social persuasion, or persuasive communication and evaluative feedback from others, can also influence a person’s self-efficacy beliefs. This source of self-efficacy is more effective when the person providing the feedback is viewed as being knowledgeable, trustworthy, and credible (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). Examples of social persuasion include performance feedback from a supervisor or general discussions among teachers about their ability to influence students (Goddard et al., 2004). It is believed social persuasion alone has limited ability to create lasting increases in self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982). However, it may contribute to successful performances by convincing a person to begin a task, implement new strategies, or try hard enough to succeed (Bandura, 1982). Physiological reactions, such as fatigue, perspiring, pain, or mood changes, may also send signals that affect an individual’s efficacy expectations (Bong & Skaalvik; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007).
Bandura’s (1986, 1997) social cognitive theory suggests behavior, personal factors, and the environmental conditions interact to influence each other through the process of reciprocal determinism. Therefore, it is important to examine reciprocal relationships between the environment, school context, and teacher efficacy beliefs. In the context of schools, teacher self-efficacy refers to a teacher’s beliefs about his or her ability to influence students, particularly in the areas of student learning and engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

The idea that teachers’ perceptions of their own capabilities are important gained meaning as a result of the RAND study of teacher characteristics and student learning (Armor et al., 1976). The RAND researchers conceived teacher self-efficacy as the extent to which teachers believed they could control the reinforcement of their actions. Teachers who think the environment overpowers a teacher’s ability to impact learning believe reinforcement of their teaching is beyond their control. Teachers who express confidence in teaching difficult students believe reinforcement of their teaching is within their control. In the RAND study researchers found student motivation and performance significantly reinforced a teacher’s classroom teaching behaviors. The study also found teachers with high levels of self-efficacy believed they could influence student achievement and motivation (Armor et al.).

In recent decades, researchers have studied the effects of teacher self-efficacy on teacher behavior and student achievement and motivation. This research suggests teacher self-efficacy has a powerful impact on both teaching and student learning (Armor et al., 1976; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Ware & Kitsantas, 2007).
Since research has indicated teacher self-efficacy can influence student academic achievement, it is important to examine how the teacher performance evaluation process may affect teacher self-efficacy. This study examined the association between teacher perceptions of the Illinois teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy. Specifically, this study examined the association between the evaluation procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, context of the evaluation, and teacher self-efficacy in the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

Research Questions

This quantitative study addressed the following research questions:

- Research Question One: What is the association between teachers’ perceived quality of the performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy?

- Research Question Two: How do a teacher performance evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and the context of the evaluation process relate to teacher self-efficacy in student engagement?

- Research Question Three: How do procedures of the performance evaluation system, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and context of evaluation relate to teacher self-efficacy in instructional strategies?

- Research Question Four: How do procedures of the performance evaluation system, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and the context of the evaluation relate to teacher self-efficacy in classroom management?
• Exploratory Research Question One: Are there differences in teacher self-efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management based on the type of evaluation tool used?

• Exploratory Research Question Two: Are there differences in attributes of the teacher, perceptions of the evaluator, teacher perceptions of the evaluation system, feedback received, and context of the evaluation system based on the type of evaluation tool used?

Assumptions

Notwithstanding the measures utilized by the study to assure participant confidentiality and anonymity, it was assumed participating teachers provided honest answers to all survey questions.

Delimitations

The study was delimited to Illinois public elementary and middle school teachers. Teacher participants from the Illinois public school where the researcher is employed were not included in this study.

Definitions

The following terms have been defined in order to provide clarification for this study:

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): AYP is an acronym for the No Child Left Behind Act’s phrase, “adequate yearly progress.” AYP represents a state’s annual student academic performance targets in reading and math that school districts and schools must attain in order to
be considered on track for 100% proficiency by school year 2013-14 (ISBE; n.d.).

**Classroom management**: The wide variety of classroom skills and techniques teachers use to keep students organized, orderly, focused, attentive, on task, and academically productive. When classroom-management strategies are executed effectively, teachers minimize student behaviors that impede student learning while maximizing the behaviors that facilitate or enhance student learning (Glossary of Education Reform, 2014).

**Elementary or middle school**: For the purposes of this study, an elementary or middle school is an Illinois public school providing instruction to students enrolled in kindergarten through the eighth grade.

**Illinois Teacher Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 (PERA)**: Legislation enacted by the Illinois General Assembly requiring school districts to develop and implement standards-based systems of teacher evaluation. PERA also requires school districts to include a measure of student academic growth as a “significant factor” in teacher evaluations in addition to measures of teacher practice.

**Instructional strategies**: Instructional strategies are techniques teachers use to help students become independent, strategic learners. These techniques become learning strategies when students independently select the appropriate strategies and use them effectively to accomplish tasks or to meet instructional goals. Instructional strategies can motivate students and help them focus attention, organize information for understanding and remembering, and monitor and assess learning (Health and Life, 2002).

**No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001**: Title of the reauthorized and amended Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). NCLB is a landmark federal educational reform designed to increase student achievement and close student achievement gaps. NCLB represents
a federal effort to improve elementary and secondary education in the United States.

**Student engagement:** In education, student engagement refers to the degree of attention, curiosity, interest, optimism, and passion students show when they are learning or being taught. Student engagement extends to the level of motivation students have to learn and progress in their education. Generally speaking, the concept of student engagement is predicated on the belief that learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired, and learning tends to suffer when students are bored, dispassionate, disaffected, or otherwise “disengaged.” Stronger student engagement or improved student engagement are common instructional objectives expressed by educators. (Glossary of Education Reform, 2016).

**Teacher:** For the purposes of this study, a teacher is defined as a certified Illinois public school classroom teacher in the kindergarten, first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh or eighth grade.

**Teacher self-efficacy:** Teacher beliefs about his or her ability to influence students, particularly in the areas of student learning and engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides an overview of Illinois teacher performance evaluation systems and discusses how the components of these systems may be related to teacher self-efficacy. First, recent changes to the statutorily mandated Illinois teacher performance evaluation process are outlined. Second, Danielson’s Framework for Teaching is described. Third, the association between teacher efficacy and components of classroom teaching (e.g., student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) is examined. These classroom teaching components are generally recognized to be elements of effective classroom instruction (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2011). Fourth, the purpose of teacher performance evaluation is discussed to show a connection between the purpose and function of the performance evaluation process. Finally, perceived problems with the Illinois teacher classroom performance evaluation systems in place prior to PERA are delineated and research on key components of teacher classroom performance evaluation process, e.g., the role of feedback, evaluator characteristics, and the evaluation procedures, is discussed.
Recent Statutorily Mandated Changes to the Illinois Teacher Performance Evaluation System

Many state teacher performance evaluation systems were amended in response to congressional concern that the pre-PERA teacher performance evaluation systems generally did not result in sufficient accountability for student learning. Among these concerns was the lack of meaningful feedback to teachers. As a result, policymakers are demanding that states and local school districts redesign their teacher performance evaluation systems. Many of these redesigns incorporate a student academic growth metric into the teacher performance evaluation process (Sartain et al., 2010). In 2009, the U.S. Department of Education required states opting to compete for federal Race to the Top funds to incorporate student academic growth data into the teacher performance evaluation process. As a result, many state legislatures amended their statutorily mandated teacher performance evaluation systems. For example, the Illinois legislature passed the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 (PERA). PERA amended Article 24A of the Illinois School Code to mandate that Illinois public school districts create and implement a teacher-performance-based evaluation system that both assessed teacher professional skills and included student academic growth measures. PERA allowed Illinois public school districts to either design an evaluation system that met minimum state standards or to adopt the state’s default teacher evaluation model. Illinois’s default evaluation system was adapted from Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Professional Practice (The Danielson Group, 2013). Illinois selected the framework as the default option with the knowledge that Danielson had expressly stated her framework was not intended to be used as a teacher evaluation tool (Danielson, 2007). Danielson described her framework as a definition of good teaching. While not the framework’s primary purpose, Danielson acknowledged her model could be used in the teacher performance evaluation process (Danielson Group, General Questions, 2013). However,
if the framework was incorporated into the teacher performance evaluation process, it was to be used as a performance-based tool, emphasizing research-based practices that buttressed student learning and utilizing evidence in formulating individual teacher performance evaluation ratings (Performance Evaluation Advisory Council [PEAC], n.d.).

Danielson’s Framework for Teaching

Danielson’s Framework for Teaching is a set of instructional components aligned with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and grounded in research as well as a constructivist view of the teaching and learning process (Danielson, 2007). The framework is based upon both empirical research and recommendations from experts in the areas of curriculum, instruction and assessment (Danielson). The constructivist approach to learning is rooted in cognitive psychology theory, including the work of Dewey, Vygotsky, and Piaget (Danielson). Constructivism is a theory of teaching and learning that asserts people actively establish their own understandings of information (Martin & Loomis, 2013). People construct their own knowledge and representations of knowledge based on their own experiences (Martin & Loomis). The Danielson Framework was based on the belief that education’s primary goal is for students to understand important concepts and develop important cognitive skills. The framework assumes the teacher’s responsibility is to facilitate student understanding of these concepts and student acquisition of these cognitive skills (Danielson). The framework acknowledges highly effective teachers encourage students to actively rather than passively participate in the learning process (Danielson Group, 2013).

The framework divides the teaching process into four areas or domains: Planning and
Preparation, the Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. Each domain is comprised of five to six components, i.e., a total of 22 components within the overall framework. These individual components describe important aspects of the teaching process. Each component is further divided into essential elements, resulting in a total of 76 essential elements within the framework. A teacher’s level of performance is determined in each of the four domains and also for each of the essential elements within the Framework (Danielson, 2007). These levels of performance may then be used in the teacher evaluation process, for coaching or for professional growth.

While the Danielson Framework is both comprehensive in nature and research based, it does not endorse a particular teaching methodology. Instead, the framework assumes individual teachers are able to make choices and decisions about instructional methodology based upon desired instructional outcomes (Danielson, 2007). The framework is premised on an overall belief that students should acquire a deep understanding of complex content, analyze information, and make connections between the components of their learning. In order for this level of deep learning to occur, teachers must have an in-depth understanding of both curricular content and the skills students must be able to use in analyzing and interpreting information. Teachers must be able to apply these understandings in planning and executing their classroom teaching in order for students to achieve high levels of learning. The framework is based on assumptions about what is important for students to learn and the nature of the teaching and learning process (Danielson).

The framework is intended to provide individual teachers opportunities for self-assessment and reflection and assist students enrolled in teacher preparation programs. School districts may also utilize framework concepts during the process of recruiting and
interviewing teacher candidates (Danielson, 2007). Additionally, the framework can serve as a foundation for professional conversations among teachers who seek to enhance their teaching skills (Danielson Group, 2013). As a result, the framework’s potential uses include teacher coaching, professional development, and the teacher performance evaluation process (Danielson Group).

Key Components of Effective Teaching

Teacher performance evaluation systems, including the Danielson Framework, focus on “effective teaching.” Evaluators utilize the recognized components of effective teaching in assessing teacher effectiveness within the context of the classroom performance evaluation process. Effective teaching can also be described with standards for teacher competency such as those outlined by InTASC. InTASC is a group of national and state educational agencies and organizations collectively “dedicated to the reform of the preparation, licensing, and on-going professional development of teachers” (CCSSO, 2013). InTASC believes an effective teacher must be able both to teach curricular content and to respond to student needs. InTASC provides guidance to state education agencies responsible for teacher licensure, including information on the areas that collectively comprise teacher competency. Figure 1 provides information on InTASC’s ten key areas and how these key areas interface with the Danielson Framework for Teaching. It is generally recognized that effective teachers set high expectations for students and provide developmentally appropriate, challenging learning experiences designed to help students achieve academic success. Effective teachers also collaborate with students to develop shared values and expectations for respectful interactions and a shared responsibility for producing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InTASC Standard</th>
<th>Framework for Teaching Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **#1. Learner Development**  
The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. | Domain 1: Planning and Preparation  
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students  
1e: Setting Instructional Outcomes |
| **#2. Learning Differences**  
The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. | Domain 1: Planning and Preparation  
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students |
| **#3. Learning Environment**  
The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation. | Domain 2: Classroom Environment  
2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport  
Domain 3: Instruction  
3c: Engaging Students in Learning |
| **#4. Content Knowledge**  
The teacher understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. | Domain 1: Planning and Preparation  
1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy  
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction  
Domain 3: Instruction  
3c: Engaging Students in Learning |
| **#5. Application of Content**  
The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use different perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. | Domain 3: Instruction  
3a: Communicating with Students  
3c: Engaging Students in Learning  
3f: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness |
| **#6. Assessment**  
The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learners progress, and to guide the teacher’s and learners decision making. | Domain 1: Planning and Preparation  
1f: Designing Student Assessments  
Domain 3: Instruction  
3d: Using Assessment in Instruction |
| **#7. Planning for Instruction**  
The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. | Domain 1: Planning and Preparation  
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students  
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction |
| **#8. Instructional Strategies**  
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. | Domain 3: Instruction  
3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques  
3c: Engaging Students in Learning |
| **#9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice**  
The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adopts practice to meet the needs of each learner. | Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities  
4a: Reflecting on Teaching  
4e: Growing and Developing Professionally  
4f: Showing Professionalism |
| **#10. Leadership and Collaboration**  
The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance their profession. | Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities  
4c: Communicating with Families  
4d: Participating in a Professional Community  
4f: Showing Professionalism |

Figure 1: InTASC standards compared to Danielson’s Framework.
quality work. By effectively organizing, allocating, and coordinating time and space, teachers engage students in learning (CCSSO).

Instruction is one of the four overall areas, or domains, included in the Danielson Framework. Instruction is an “on-stage” domain that evaluators observe when conducting an observation of classroom instruction, as opposed to an “off-stage” domain that may not be discernible during an observation of classroom teaching. InTASC standard eight, Instructional Strategies, also focuses on this area of teaching. The standard explains how teachers employ a variety of instructional strategies to assist learners in developing a deep understanding of curricular content and in acquiring skills needed to apply this knowledge in meaningful ways. Effective instructional practice involves teachers understanding and integrating assessment, planning, and instructional strategies.

InTASC standard three, Learning Environment, explains how effective teachers create a learning environment that fosters student learning, motivation, and engagement. This is similar to the other “on-stage,” observable domain (the Classroom Environment) in the Danielson Framework. InTASC standards three and eight may be distilled into the following areas: classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement. These areas are important areas of focus for teachers and evaluators during the teacher performance evaluation process. Research related to these three recognized components of effective teaching are reviewed below.

**Classroom Management**

Classroom management is a recognized component of effective teaching (Brophy & Good, 1986). Research indicates students achieve more when teachers use effective classroom
management strategies designed to maximize student learning time. Student engagement is dependent upon a teacher’s ability to create a well-organized learning environment characterized by smooth transitions with minimal time being allocated to addressing student misconduct (Brophy, 1986).

Positive classroom environments with minimal disruptive student behaviors require teacher planning and consistency (Parsonson, 2012). Positive teacher-student relationships can also reduce disruptive student behavior and increase student on-task behavior and achievement (Sutherland, Lewis-Palmer, Stichter, & Morgan, 2008). Specific teacher behaviors that contribute to effective classroom learning environments include consistent and fair application of classroom rules and expectations, predictable and established classroom routines, use of cues to signal students of upcoming transitions, use of frequent praise, monitoring the difficulty of learning tasks, and providing students with opportunities to respond and participate in classroom activities (Kern & Clemens, 2007). It is also important for teachers to anticipate and limit problematic student classroom behaviors (Parsonson). Classroom management is often a concern for beginning teachers (Veenman, 1984). Veenman found classroom discipline was one of the most frequent and serious problems experienced by first-year teachers. Veenman also suggested characteristics of the work environment and deficiencies in teacher training were factors contributing to beginning teachers experiencing problems with classroom discipline.

Teachers with high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to effectively use classroom management techniques designed to develop positive classroom environments with minimal disruptive student behaviors. Research shows teacher self-efficacy has been linked with effective classroom management (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Gordon, 2001; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Efficacious teachers tend to persist with struggling students and
use criticism less when students provide incorrect answers (Gibson & Dembo). Efficacious teachers are also more likely to successfully manage the classroom learning environment (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Almog and Shechtman (2007) examined specific teacher beliefs, including self-efficacy, in relation to teacher responses to student behavior problems. The researchers found significant positive correlations between individual teacher self-ratings of efficacy beliefs and teacher responses to student classroom behavior problems. Study participants included 33 Israeli elementary school teachers, with at least two years of classroom teaching experience, who taught first through third grade levels. The researchers used multiple measures to examine both observed and self-reported teacher behaviors. For example, a survey was used to collect information about teacher responses to hypothetical situations, and classroom observations were conducted to document how teachers responded to student classroom behavior problems. Findings indicated significant positive correlations between individual teacher ratings of self-efficacy beliefs and responses to student classroom behaviors such as social rejection, shyness, low achievement, and passive-aggressive behavior. Efficacious teachers were found to respond more positively to student behavior problems (Almog & Shechtman).

Further evidence of the link between self-efficacy and classroom management was found by Gordon’s (2001) work. In a study comparing high- and low-efficacy elementary teachers on factors related to classroom management and discipline of at-risk students, Gordon (2001) examined whether high teacher self-efficacy was related to specific teacher attributes, emotions, beliefs, or intervention strategies associated with the successful management of at-risk student behaviors. The study sample consisted of 21 full-time urban public school elementary teachers in a large western city. All teachers had general education classroom assignments. Participating
teachers tended to be mature, experienced, and well educated. A questionnaire, classroom observations, and audiotaped teacher interviews were utilized to collect data. Results suggested teacher efficacy was an indicator of teacher effectiveness in classroom management. Gordon (2001) found teachers with high self-efficacy were more likely to expect student behaviors to improve; less likely to feel angry, embarrassed, or guilty about student misbehavior; and were more likely to feel confident about managing student misbehavior. Teachers with high self-efficacy were also less likely to utilize negative consequences and severe punishments. In contrast, teachers with low self-efficacy were more likely to perceive difficult students as having chronic behavior problems; less likely to expect behaviors to improve; more likely to feel embarrassed, angry and guilty about student misbehavior; and less likely to feel confident about managing student misbehavior (Gordon, 2001).

The association between self-efficacy and classroom management beliefs was also investigated by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990). Woolfolk and Hoy examined the association between pre-service teachers’ sense of self-efficacy and their beliefs about classroom management. Specifically, the researchers examined three aspects of classroom management: pupil control ideology, motivation orientation, and bureaucratic orientation. Motivational orientation, an outgrowth of cognitive evaluation theory, is a conceptualization of adult control of children. According to the theory, events can have both controlling and informational aspects. A controlling aspect can produce a particular behavioral outcome in the person, whereas the informational aspect communicates important information. Intrinsic motivation is encouraged when teachers provide important information to students rather than trying to control them. The pupil control ideology can be conceptualized along a continuum, from custodial to humanistic (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). The custodial perspective is often observed more frequently in
traditional school settings with more rigid and highly controlled environments, whereas the humanistic perspective is frequently observed in school settings where students learn through cooperative learning and experiences (Willower et al.). Bureaucratic orientation refers to the person’s commitment to the attitudes, values, and behaviors characteristically encouraged by bureaucracies using authority as the main source of discipline. A bureaucratic orientation emphasizes rule conformity, traditionalism, and loyalty to the organization (Willower et al.).

In order to investigate the association between these three aspects of classroom management and self-efficacy, Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) distributed questionnaires to 182 pre-service teachers at an east-coast state university. The Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) was used to measure general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. Pupil control ideology was measured using the Pupil Control Ideology form (Willower et al., 1967), a 20-item questionnaire scored using a Likert scale. Motivation orientation was measured using the Problems in School Inventory (Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman, & Ryan, 1981). Bureaucratic orientation was measured using the Work Environment Preference Schedule (WEPS) developed by Gordon (1967), a 24-item instrument with 5-point Likert response categories ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Woolfolk and Hoy found teachers with low self-efficacy were oriented toward classroom control and tended to employ harsh and punitive management strategies. In contrast, the researchers found teachers with high self-efficacy encouraged student autonomy and responsibility. The researchers had expected to find the dimensions of teaching and personal teacher self-efficacy to be negatively related to custodial pupil control ideology, controlling motivational orientation, and bureaucratic orientation. As expected, Woolfolk and Hoy found self-efficacy was positively correlated with a pupil control ideology. Also as
predicted, self-efficacy was negatively correlated with a bureaucratic orientation. Teachers with higher self-efficacies tended to have less bureaucratic perspectives.

Classroom management is a recognized component of effective teaching (Brophy & Good, 1986). When teachers effectively manage classroom learning environments, student engagement is increased (Brophy, 1986). In addition, research shows teacher self-efficacy is linked with effective classroom management (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Gordon, 2001; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Efficacious teachers tend to respond more positively to student behavior problems, are more likely to feel confident about managing student behavior, and tend to use less punitive management strategies (Gordon, 2001).

**Instructional Strategies**

Instructional strategies are also a recognized component of effective teaching (Hattie, 2013). Instructional strategies are outlined in InTASC standard eight. In addition, Instructional Strategies is one of the four Danielson Framework domain areas considered when evaluating teacher classroom teaching performance. To improve schools, as measured by improved student academic performance, strategies must directly impact what happens in classrooms (Black & Wiliam, 1998). No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) and the accompanying demand for increased accountability require schools to implement strategies based on scientifically based research (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The 2009 Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiative also heightened the importance of using effective instructional strategies. One of CCSS’s stated goals was to develop college- and career-ready students. CCSS’s internationally benchmarked K–12 academic standards for mathematics and English language arts and literacy established what students were expected to learn by the time they graduated from high school (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2014). Teachers in states that have
adopted CCSS must implement effective instructional strategies designed to support student attainment of end-of-year CCSS standards. Effective instruction is one of the most critical factors in increasing student academic achievement (Schmoker, 2006). Research shows an individual teacher can have a significant impact on student achievement (Brophy & Good, 1986; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). Brophy (1986) found academic learning was influenced by the amount of time students spent engaged in appropriate academic activities. He also found students learned more when their teachers connected new information to previously acquired student learning, monitored student performance, and provided students with specific feedback (Brophy).

Research has found a relationship between effective instructional strategies and how teachers feel about themselves as instructors (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Teacher self-efficacy has been linked to effective teaching and learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Research shows students with efficacious teachers outperform students with less efficacious teachers on achievement tests (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1998; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992). Teachers with high self-efficacy tend to experiment more with instructional methods and search for improved classroom pedagogies (Allinder, 1995; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988).

Based on the research showing effective instructors typically have a strong sense of self-efficacy, Guskey (1988) conducted a study to examine the relationship between selected teacher perceptions known to be shared by highly effective teachers and teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional practices. Study participants included 120 veteran elementary and secondary teachers in one inner city school district, one suburban school district, and one rural school district. The teachers participated in a staff development program focused on mastery learning of instructional strategies. The teachers completed a questionnaire after the
staff development program to collect information on teacher self-efficacy and attitudes toward the implementation of mastery learning of instructional strategies. Results indicated more self-efficacious teachers rated mastery learning as more important, more congruent with their teaching practices, and less difficult to implement than their less self-efficacious colleagues. Data analysis indicated a statistically significant relationship between teacher perceptions of instructional effectiveness and teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional methods. Teachers who were highly self-efficacious and highly effective in the classroom were found to be more receptive to new instructional methods. Teachers who were less effective appeared to be less receptive to instructional innovation. Guskey explained this could be because more effective teachers were already incorporating effective instructional strategies into their classrooms, whereas less effective teachers probably were not.

In another study examining teacher self-efficacy and its relationship to instructional practices, Allinder (1995) compared the self-efficacy of teachers who provided indirect services to students with disabilities in general education classrooms using consultation, collaboration, or team teaching strategies with the self-efficacy of teachers who provided direct services. Allinder’s study, conducted in schools in four Midwest states, had two purposes: to examine the relationship between instructionally relevant behaviors and attitudes and teacher self-efficacy and to examine whether this relationship was similar for special education teachers who provided indirect services compared to teachers who provided direct services. Seventy-three teachers who provided direct service and 40 teachers who provided indirect service participated in the study by filling out questionnaires. The questionnaires included items from Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale and Fuchs et al.’s (1992) Teacher Characteristics Scale. Two scores were computed for teacher self-efficacy: personal efficacy, or teacher feelings that they could affect
change in students, and teaching efficacy, the belief students benefit from school. Three scores were computed from the teacher characteristics survey: instructional experimentation, assuredness, and business-like approach. Correlations and multiple regressions between the two dimensions of self-efficacy and teacher characteristics were computed. Results showed associations between the different facets of self-efficacy and the teacher characteristics. For example, teaching self-efficacy was related to assuredness, or confidence and enthusiasm about teaching. Allinder’s study showed the existence of relationships between type of self-efficacy and different teacher characteristics, thereby adding to research indicating that teacher self-efficacy is an important concept. The study also found teachers who provided direct services were instructionally less innovative and less experimental than teachers who provided indirect services or worked cooperatively with or as consultants to general education teachers. No differences in the levels of either personal or teaching self-efficacy were found between teachers who provided indirect and direct services.

In another study, Stein and Wang (1988) examined the relationship between teacher success in implementing innovative programs, teacher perceptions of self-efficacy, and teacher-perceived value of innovative programs. The study was conducted in 14 kindergarten through fourth-grade classrooms in three public elementary schools. All schools were in the first year of implementing an innovative adaptive mainstreaming program called the Adaptive Learning Environments Model. The program’s goal was to provide learning experiences to meet the diverse social and academic needs of both regular and special-needs students, all of whom received instruction in a regular education classroom. Participants included 14 female teachers with varying levels of experience. The study data included measures of the degree of program implementation, teacher perceptions and attitudes, and teacher goals and self-assessments.
Measures included behavioral observations, self-report questionnaires and interviews. The study indicated successful program implementation was related to teacher perceptions of self-efficacy and a high teacher-perceived value of the innovative program. A positive relationship between teacher success in program implementation and teacher perceptions of self-efficacy for implementing the program was found.

Instructional strategies are a recognized component of effective teaching (Hattie, 2013). A relationship exists between the use of effective instructional strategies and how teachers feel about themselves as instructors (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Teacher self-efficacy is linked to effective teaching and learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Teachers who are highly self-efficacious and highly effective in the classroom have been found to be more receptive to new instructional methods (Allinder, 1995; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). Teachers with high self-efficacy also seem to have higher confidence and enthusiasm about teaching and are able to successfully implement new programs (Allinder, 1995).

**Student Engagement**

Student engagement is an important component of both student learning and the Danielson Framework. Newmann, Wehlage, and Lamborn (1992) defined student engagement as the student's psychological investment in and effort directed toward learning, understanding, or mastering knowledge, skills, or crafts. Disengaged students tend to disrupt classes, skip classes, or fail to complete assignments, whereas psychologically engaged students are more invested in learning. Engaged students not only earn good grades, they also internalize academic material. Finn (1993) found a strong association between student engagement and academic achievement.
He found with higher engagement levels, students tended to have higher achievement scores in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies. For teachers, the challenge is how to effectively engage students in their learning.

Research on student engagement has historically focused on keeping students in school by increasing student achievement, positive behaviors, and sense of belonging and has targeted middle- and high-school age students for whom disengagement is often an issue (Willms, Friesen, & Milton, 2009). Recently, the goal of student engagement has expanded to include improved student ability to learn and to become lifelong learners (Gilbert, 2007). Student engagement has become a strategic learning process. Therefore, it is important for teachers to implement strategies designed to support student engagement in learning (Taylor & Parsons, 2011).

The literature on strategies for improving student engagement shows an emerging pattern of practice. Windham (2005) recommended, in order to engage students in learning, teaching should include interaction, exploration, relevancy, and multimedia instruction. These themes are seen throughout the literature on student engagement (Barnes, Marateo, & Ferris, 2007; Claxton, 2007; Hay, 2000; Willms, 2003). Interaction is an important strategy because today’s students are intensely social learners who seek to interact with people both within and beyond the school environment (Willms et al., 2009). In order to engage learners, teaching practices should be exploratory, allowing students to participate in problem-based learning (Hay; Willms et al., 2009).

Relevancy is also a factor in successfully engaging learners. Students tend to be more engaged when learning applies to real-life situations rather than being theoretical and text based. Examining authentic problems and issues engages students and gives learning a sense of purpose
In the classroom, teacher support, positive teacher-student relationships, and authentic and challenging tasks have also been found to be related to student engagement (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004). Teacher self-efficacy has been found to be associated with student engagement. Van Uden, Ritzen and Pieters (2013) surveyed 195 prevocational and vocational teachers in the Netherlands to examine whether the motivation for becoming a teacher, ratings of teacher competencies, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher ratings of their own interpersonal teaching behavior were related to teacher perceptions of student engagement. The rated teacher competencies included subject-matter knowledge, or knowledge of the content and academic goals; pedagogical knowledge, or knowledge about teaching and student development; and didactic knowledge, or knowledge about how to present lessons. Interpersonal teaching behavior refers to a teacher’s behavior during interactions with students. The researchers expected to see higher levels of teacher self-efficacy positively correlated with higher levels of perceived student engagement. Results indicated a positive correlation between interpersonal teacher behavior and perceived student engagement in vocational education. In addition, the study found teacher self-efficacy was important in predicting student engagement. Teachers who rated themselves higher in interpersonal teacher behavior, didactic and pedagogical competence, and self-efficacy perceived their students to be more engaged.

In another study, Putman (2012) examined self-efficacy beliefs of pre-service, novice, and experienced teachers. In addition, the extent to which teachers judged their teaching efficacy in different areas, such as student engagement, was also examined. Four hundred eighty-four study participants were drawn from a convenience sample comprised of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in education programs at a mid-sized Midwest public university. The
long form of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) was used to assess participant efficacy levels. Results showed both less experienced and pre-service teachers scored significantly lower in teaching self-efficacy than experienced teachers. Examination of domain-specific subscales for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management showed the pre-service teachers and novice teachers were significantly lower than the experienced teachers but did not have significantly different beliefs. This suggests the longer a teacher remains in the profession, the greater chance he or she will demonstrate positive self-efficacy. On the student engagement subscale, experienced teachers showed significantly greater self-efficacy than the less experienced teacher groups. Based on these results, Putman recommended that universities create opportunities for pre-service teachers to examine their self-efficacy beliefs and confidence in their abilities during field experiences and coursework.

Teacher self-efficacy has been found to be related to student motivation and achievement. Three decades ago, RAND researchers examined whether teachers believed they could control the impact of their reinforcement actions on student learning (Armor et al., 1976). The RAND study examined the improvement of reading achievement among students in Los Angeles schools. Researchers also included two efficacy items on their teacher questionnaire. The two efficacy items were: “When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment,” and “If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult and unmotivated students” (Armor et al.). The researchers summed the scores on those two items and used the results to measure teacher self-efficacy. This study found high teacher self-efficacy was correlated with larger student gains in reading. Student motivation and performance were found to significantly
reinforce teaching behaviors. Therefore, teachers with high levels of self-efficacy thought they could control or significantly influence student achievement and motivation (Armor et al.).

In another study examining the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and student engagement, Guo, Justice, Sawyer, and Tompkins (2011) collected data on 48 pre-school teachers employed in 38 pre-school centers. Bandura’s Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale, a 20-item self-report measure, was administered to participants. Additional data were obtained from classroom observations. The researchers sought to determine if teaching experience, perceptions of sense of community, and student engagement predicted preschool teacher self-efficacy and if the relationship between student engagement and teacher self-efficacy was dependent on teacher characteristics. One of the study’s major findings was preschool teacher self-efficacy was predicted by the interaction between the teacher’s sense of collaboration and student engagement. Guo and colleagues also found student engagement positively related to teacher self-efficacy, but only for teachers with perceived high levels of collaboration. This outcome supported Bandura’s (1997) theory that the level of student engagement is a powerful factor in building teacher efficacy. The researchers presumed students who were actively engaged could cause teachers to believe their teaching performance was effective, thereby boosting teacher self-efficacy. This finding suggested teacher self-efficacy may be a result of the interaction between teacher professional collaboration and student engagement. Therefore, collaboration may be an effective strategy for engaging students. As a result, when students are more engaged, teachers are more self-efficacious.

There are many components contributing to effective teaching. If classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement are the bedrock components of effective teaching, it would be beneficial to obtain information on teacher self-perceptions of efficacy in
these areas. For example, are components of the teacher performance evaluation process related to these recognized components of effective teaching? Arguably, the overarching purpose of teacher evaluation should be to increase teacher self-efficacy and ultimately teacher effectiveness. As discussed below, this may not always be the purpose of teacher performance evaluation.

**Purpose of Teacher Evaluation**

Federal and state interests have combined with the research examining teacher effectiveness to prompt legislative support for reforming teacher performance evaluation systems. Several researchers have focused attention on the need for multiple measures of teacher effectiveness such as better differentiation among teachers and clearer connections to student outcomes (Gordon, Kane, & Staiger, 2006; Heneman, Milanowski, Kimball, & Odden, 2006; Toch & Rothman 2008). The 2009 RTTT federal grant application guidelines required states to adopt systems for evaluating teacher effectiveness. RTTT required these evaluation systems to use multiple rating categories as opposed to the traditional binary rating of satisfactory and unsatisfactory. RTTT also required these systems to incorporate student academic growth data into the evaluation process. As a result, many of the state grant applications, including Illinois’s application, included amended or entirely new versions of teacher performance evaluation systems.

Teacher performance evaluation should produce both improved teacher quality and student achievement. Toch (2008) observed, "Among the many strategies for improving public schools teaching-performance pay, alternative certification, licensing exams, and professional practice, school reformers have long neglected a potentially powerful one: teacher evaluations"
(p. 32). Toch further stated, "Through their focus on the quality of teaching, teacher evaluations are at the very center of the educational enterprise and can be catalysts for teacher and school improvement" (p. 32).

Teacher performance evaluation systems generally have two main purposes: providing teachers with feedback to improve their classroom teaching practices and identifying underperforming teachers for remediation or possible dismissal (Donaldson, 2012). As part of the first purpose of teacher performance evaluation, providing teachers with feedback, formative assessment data can be gathered and used for professional development, continuous improvement, and teacher reflection. Teachers typically utilize student formative assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction while it is occurring in the classroom (Ainsworth & Viegut, 2006). School administrators use formative evaluation data to monitor teacher professional growth and provide teachers with periodic feedback (Kowalski, Lasley, & Mahoney, 2008). Formative assessment data also encourage teachers to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching performance. Effective formative assessment practices allow information about teaching to be collected in a non-judgmental way and provide an opportunity for peer review and feedback (McColskey & Egelson, 1997). The teacher performance evaluation process also yields summative information, which helps school administrators hold teachers accountable and identify teachers who are not performing effectively (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983; Millman, 1981; Stiggins & Duke, 1988).

Although the purpose of teacher performance evaluation seems straightforward, it can be difficult to conduct quality teacher performance evaluations. Problems can arise throughout the process.
Recent research highlights concerns related to the teacher performance evaluation process and suggests little evidence exists to indicate that the pre-PERA evaluation practices were effective (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2009; Taylor & Tyler, 2011; Toch & Rothman, 2008; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009). For example, many teacher performance evaluation models did not effectively assess the quality of classroom instruction. When this occurs, the performance evaluation process does not lead to either the remediation or dismissal of underperforming teachers (Donaldson, 2009; Jacob & Lefgren, 2008; Weisberg et al., 2009).

Binary teacher performance rating systems, i.e., evaluation systems rating teacher classroom performance as either “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory,” have been criticized as not being sufficiently rigorous because the performance of most teachers is rated as “Satisfactory” (Weisberg et al., 2009). Moreover, in many performance evaluation systems, excellent teachers have not been identified. Fifty-nine percent of teachers and 63% percent of school administrators have reported their school districts are not doing enough to identify, recognize, compensate and retain highly effective teachers (Weisberg et al., 2009). Because many pre-PERA teacher performance systems have not been shown to effectively identify variations in instructional effectiveness, underperforming teachers did not always receive the necessary professional development in areas where support was needed (Weisberg et al., 2009). As a result, poor classroom teaching performance was not effectively addressed. Some researchers point out large urban school systems such as Chicago, San Francisco, Denver, and Atlanta seldom dismiss underperforming teachers, i.e., often less than one percent of underperforming teachers are dismissed in any given year (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Eisner, 1992; The New Teacher Project, 2012; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1984).
Other factors also hinder the success of teacher performance evaluation systems. These hindrances include poor evaluation instruments and overly restrictive collective bargaining agreements that make it difficult for school leaders to effectively evaluate teachers (Halverson & Clifford, 2006). Additionally, internal constraints, such as lack of administrator assessment skills, lack of quality teacher professional development, and school cultures that discourage critical feedback and negative evaluation ratings hinder the effectiveness of teacher performance evaluation systems (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009). As a result, the teacher performance evaluation process often does not yield positive or negative consequences for teachers. This result leads school leaders to be less inclined to conscientiously evaluate teachers and makes teachers less motivated to take the evaluation process seriously (Weisberg et al., 2009).

While the teacher performance evaluation process is fraught with problems and shortcomings, research nonetheless indicates there are components of performance evaluation systems that have the potential to yield instructional improvement and teacher growth (Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996). Some of these components are reviewed below.

**Key Components of Effective Performance Evaluation Systems**

As indicated above, research has highlighted concerns related to the teacher performance evaluation process (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2009; Taylor & Tyler, 2011; Toch & Rothman, 2008; Weisberg et al., 2009). Therefore, it is important for school leaders to understand the specific components of teacher performance evaluations that are most effective and incorporate these processes into their local evaluation systems. These areas include the importance of feedback linked to professional development, evaluator characteristics, evaluation procedures, and the context within which the evaluation process occurs.
Feedback Linked to Professional Development

Research has found the evaluation process often does not provide teachers meaningful feedback on their performance (Weisberg et al., 2009). However, research shows providing meaningful feedback to teachers yields professional growth (Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996). Meaningful performance evaluations designed to improve classroom instruction and increase student achievement should include opportunities for the teacher to receive frequent feedback.

Several factors should be considered when delivering feedback to teachers. For example, information should be communicated privately to the teacher in a sensitive, caring manner (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Regular feedback from a credible source identifying specific aspects of teaching performance that is accompanied by suggestions for improvement has been found to be effective in allowing teachers to monitor their improvement (Stiggins & Duke). Hennessey (1997) examined the perceptions of beginning teachers who were evaluated using an innovative performance evaluation process. This qualitative study was conducted in a large midwestern urban school district. The evaluation system used was the Collaborative Assessment Procedure (CAP). Under CAP, beginning teachers were assigned a teacher consultant during their first year of teaching. The consulting teacher provided the new teacher with feedback for improvement. The consultation process included both classroom observations and conferences with the beginning teacher. The consulting teacher documented and shared suggestions with the beginning teacher after each observation, prepared at least one interim report, and prepared a summative report on the beginning teacher’s performance. The process also integrated evaluation procedures with on-going professional development by offering simultaneous, specifically targeted graduate courses for the beginning teachers. The study showed the conversations
between the beginning teachers and their assigned consulting teacher positively impacted the novice teacher’s sense of teaching efficacy (Hennessy, 1997).

Wagner and Hill (1996) also studied 52 tenured elementary and middle school teachers in Johnson City, Tennessee, to identify the activities, processes, and structures used to link the teacher evaluation process with professional growth and motivation. Two different teacher programs (one traditional competency-based model and one more formative model, the Professional Teacher Evaluation Model [PTEM]), were examined. The traditional competency-based model evaluated all teachers using the same checklist and procedures. The purpose of the highly structured traditional model was to determine the extent to which teachers met a specific level of competency. Conversely, the PTEM encouraged reflective practice and professional growth by allowing for self-direction, self-correction, and self-evaluation.

A case study approach was used to determine the impact of the teacher evaluation systems and identify reasons for each system’s strengths and weaknesses. One group of teachers was evaluated using the PTEM. The PTEM group participated in professional dialogue and goal setting with administrators as a part of the evaluation process. The other group was evaluated using the Tennessee State Model for Local Evaluation, a more traditional standards-based checklist evaluation approach. Teachers who participated in the study were selected using both random and purposeful sampling techniques. Researchers used both quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze the data. The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) instrument was used to measure teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the evaluation systems. The results showed differences between the teachers who were evaluated using the PTEM and those who were evaluated using the more traditional approach. Wagner and Hill (1996) found informal observations, goal setting, and frequent professional dialogue among teachers and evaluators
yielded greater teacher growth.

Weisberg et al. (2009) examined teacher performance evaluation systems in 12 school districts across four states. During previous evaluations, 26% of the teachers had received feedback identifying areas of teaching performance in need of improvement. In addition, 47% of teachers reported they had not participated in informal conversations with their evaluators about improving their classroom instruction (Weisberg et al., 2009). As a result, many teachers reported their current performance evaluation systems were not effective and did them a disservice. Only 42% of teachers surveyed reported their current performance evaluation system accurately assessed their performance, and only 43% indicated the system helped improve their teaching performance (Weisberg et al., 2009).

A large South Carolina school district was the setting for a study examining teacher perceptions of pre- and post-classroom observation conferences that included written feedback (Anast-May, Penick, Schroyer, & Howell, 2011). The study sought to gain insight into teacher interpretations of classroom observations, conferencing and performance feedback. The school district used ADEPT and SAFE-T systems to evaluate teacher performance as well as classroom walk-throughs (CWT). These systems focused on student learning and achievement by using data to identify areas of strength and weakness in classroom instruction. The study was conducted as an action research project using qualitative data to examine teacher experiences with classroom observations and face-to-face conferencing feedback. Thirty-seven teachers representing three district elementary schools volunteered to participate in the study.

Results showed teachers believed the face-to-face pre- and/or post-conferences contributed positively to their professional growth. The teachers also indicated the post-observation feedback they received assisted them in reflecting on their teaching practice. When
asked how frequently observations and feedback conferences should be used, teacher responses varied. However, all teachers indicated they preferred to receive specific feedback after each observation. The study concluded teacher performance evaluation processes should involve conferencing and feedback to support teachers in constructing their own understandings and assist them in creating professional goals. Systematic feedback was important for teachers in improving their performance, motivation and personal satisfaction (Anast-May et al., 2011).

Research shows meaningful and frequent feedback yields professional growth (Anast-May et al., 2011; Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996) and positively impacts a beginning teacher’s sense of teaching efficacy (Hennessy, 1997). In addition, evaluator characteristics can also enhance the quality of the teacher performance evaluation process.

**Evaluator Characteristics**

Stiggins and Duke (1988) conducted three studies over a three-year period to identify problems with teacher performance evaluation systems and find potential solutions to the problems. The goal of the first study, an ethnographic case study, was to identify barriers to teacher growth. The second study, also a case study, was designed to highlight keys to success for teachers who experienced significant professional growth as a result of the evaluation process. The third study used TEP to analyze the performance evaluation experiences of over 400 teachers. Stiggins and Duke found it was important for teachers to perceive their evaluators as credible and identified several evaluator attributes affecting the quality of the teacher performance evaluation process.
The first identified attribute was evaluator credibility. The study found effective evaluators established themselves as credible sources through interpersonal communication that informed the teacher of the evaluator’s knowledge about the technical aspects of teaching, subject matter knowledge, experience in the classroom, and familiarity with the teacher’s class and situation (Stiggins and Duke, 1988). The study found overall evaluator credibility improved when multiple evaluators participated in the performance evaluation process.

Toch and Rothman (2008) suggested one way to counter the subjective nature of many conventional evaluation systems was to provide teachers with multiple evaluations conducted by multiple evaluators. However, often this option is not feasible for school districts. Lower’s (1987) study of 63 Ohio school districts showed when multiple evaluators were utilized in the evaluation process, teachers and principals had more confidence in the process and believed the evaluative information was more helpful in improving teacher performance. Boyd (1989) observed increasing the number of evaluators improved the quality of the teacher evaluation process. Using multiple evaluators, including those with instructional background and content knowledge similar to the teacher being evaluated, is a growing practice (Goldstein & Noguera, 2006). Although research indicates the use of multiple evaluators improves the evaluation process, many school districts do not have the financial resources needed to utilize such a model.

The evaluator’s ability to inspire trust is also important, particularly when the evaluator suggests changes in teacher behavior. Evaluators who inspire trust are better able to effectively deliver important feedback to teachers (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Cogan (1973) observed the supervisory relationship is fundamentally based on trust, and without trust the supervisor will not be able to effectively assist a teacher in improving instructional practice. Goldstein (2005) studied a California urban school district’s implementation of a peer assistance and review
(PAR) program. PAR evaluators, or coaches, provided professional support when evaluating teachers. In this model, the coaches were charged with providing professional support to both new teachers and to struggling veteran teachers. The coaches also played a part in the teacher’s summative performance evaluation. The study showed most teachers were comfortable taking instructional risks and speaking openly and honestly with their coaches. Most teachers in the study indicated they had a trusting relationship with their coaches. This is thought to be due to the structure of the program, specifically the assistance coaches provided to teachers. Goldstein found trust was a strong predictor of quality of assistance teachers reported receiving. The more trust teachers felt toward their evaluators, the better teachers were able to understand what was expected of them (Goldstein). McGreal (1982) stated the ultimate test of a performance evaluation system was whether a relationship of mutual trust exists between the supervisor and the teacher.

Another key to success was found to be the amount of flexibility the evaluator and teacher had in working on particular skills, knowledge, and techniques that best fit the teacher’s needs. McGreal (1983) also observed a positive, supportive relationship between a knowledgeable supervisor and a committed teacher was the best way to produce improved instruction. In addition, if an evaluator had a good track record and had established a reputation for being helpful, teachers were more likely to value the supervisor’s feedback (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Jiang, Sporte & Luppescu (2015) found Chicago Public Schools teachers had positive perceptions of the overall teacher performance evaluation process, particularly when they valued the leadership of their principal and rated principal-teacher trust as being high.

Modeling is also an effective strategy for the evaluator to employ during the teacher performance evaluation process (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). The impact of modeling is strongest
when the evaluator models desired instructional practices within the teacher’s own classroom.

It is important for teachers to view evaluators as instructional experts. This reflects Bandura’s (1986) theory of social persuasion. Teacher self-efficacy beliefs are enhanced when the teacher views the evaluator as being knowledgeable, trustworthy, and credible (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). Danielson and McGreal (2000) found many teachers believed their evaluators lacked the necessary expertise to effectively conduct classroom observations. A study released by REL Midwest in 2007 collected teacher evaluation policies from a representative sample of school districts in seven midwestern states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin (Brandt, Mathers, Oliva, Brown-Sims, & Hess, 2007). This study found only 8% of midwestern school districts cited evaluator training as a component of their teacher performance evaluation system (Brandt et al., 2007). A study by Jacob and Lefgren (2008) examined principal ratings of teacher performance in comparison to student achievement scores. They found principals were generally able to effectively identify the best and worst teachers. However, it was more difficult for them to evaluate average teachers. The teacher belief that evaluators lack expertise in conducting observations as well as the absence of evaluator training in many school districts reinforces the need for more comprehensive training for evaluators.

Highly skilled evaluators are an important component of the teacher performance evaluation process because it has been posited that evaluator observational skill influences the teacher performance rating/student achievement relationship (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009). More skilled evaluators are more likely to give ratings that accurately reflect how teachers perform on dimensions defined in the evaluation system. Therefore, if there is a relationship between teacher behaviors and student learning, accurate ratings will show a stronger relationship with student achievement than inaccurate ratings (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009). An
important factor in evaluation accuracy is the evaluator’s knowledge or familiarity with the curricular content (Bernadin & Cardy, 1982; DeNisi, Cafferty, & Meglino, 1984). Although some research suggests observer familiarity with curricular content is related to a more accurate teacher performance rating (Smither, Barry & Reilly, 1989), the research is somewhat mixed as to whether evaluators with experience teaching or who have a knowledge base about the content of the job rate it more accurately. This is important because evaluators may not have either the teaching experience or knowledge related to all of the curricular content taught in the classrooms of the teachers they observe, especially at the secondary level (Nelson & Sassi, 2005). Providing evaluator training related to conducting observations and understanding the teacher evaluation system is important to help develop highly skilled evaluators and to ensure accuracy in evaluations.

Role of Evaluation Procedures

The procedural profile of a teacher performance evaluation system includes three basic elements: the manner in which performance standards or criteria are addressed, the information and data sources used to evaluate teacher performance, and the procedures used to gather information on teacher performance (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Each of these elements impacts the quality of a teacher performance evaluation process. Performance criteria define the dimensions of the teacher’s performance being evaluated. Performance standards represent levels of performance required in regards to the criteria. Stiggins and Duke found criteria and standards must focus clearly on observable aspects of the teaching and learning process and be communicated clearly to the teacher. The performance data gathered during a teacher observation can vary depending on the data source and how the data is collected.
It is important to use multiple sources of performance data, such as observations of teaching, records, and student achievement data, in order to help teachers grow through the performance evaluation process. Using one source alone may not be sufficient in order to gain a complete picture of how a teacher plans for instruction, delivers instruction, and what the impact of instruction is. The use of multiple sources of performance evaluation information is suggested in order for the process to result in teacher growth. Effective performance evaluations should begin with an objective record of what was observed during informal or formal observations. Classroom records, such as lesson plans, can also be a valuable source of data for determining future areas for professional development (Stiggins & Duke, 1988).

McGreal (1982) asserted evaluation procedures, processes, and instrumentation must complement the purpose of the evaluation system in order for the system to be effective. For example, if improving instruction is the purpose of a school district’s evaluation system, this purpose should be aligned with the evaluation procedures. Effective performance evaluation systems must be fully integrated with other district systems such as teacher assignment, compensation, professional development, and retention and dismissal to reinforce the importance of evaluation outcomes (Weisberg et al., 2009). When properly implemented, effective teacher performance evaluation systems provide teachers opportunities to reflect on their practice, receive constructive feedback, and participate in professional growth activities (PEAC, n.d.).

Most successful teacher performance evaluation systems establish a clear understanding of the system’s purposes. These purposes are reflected in the system’s procedures and processes (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; McGreal, 1983). Wise et al. (1984) also recommended if a school district changes the teacher performance evaluation system’s purpose, the teacher performance evaluation process should also be changed.
The components of successful performance evaluation models discussed in this section are critical to the success of a teacher performance evaluation process and should be examined by school officials when either creating or amending their local school district’s teacher performance evaluation process. Recent research on this topic is lacking; therefore, this study is needed to add to the existing body of research.

In summary, three components of effective teaching practice were reviewed in this chapter. These components included classroom management, the use of effective instructional strategies, and the ability to engage students in the learning process. The literature review also reviewed the purpose of teacher performance evaluation and problems with pre-PERA systems. In addition, components of effective teacher performance evaluation systems were reviewed. To date, researchers have not examined the association between teacher self-efficacy and components of effective teacher performance evaluation systems. Therefore, the current study is timely. The study was designed to help school leaders learn more about how to effectively support classroom teachers in their school districts. The research questions guiding this study are presented below.

Research Questions and Predictions

**Research Question One**

What is the association between the teacher's perceived quality of the performance evaluation process and the teacher's self-efficacy? It is predicted an association exists between a teacher’s perceived quality of the performance evaluation process and a teacher’s self-efficacy. Teachers who report the quality of the performance evaluation process as being high will be teachers who are more self-efficacious.
The previously discussed study of a large South Carolina school district (Anast-May et al., 2011) examined teacher perceptions of the feedback received during post-observation conferences. This study found systematic feedback was a critical element in assisting teachers in improving their classroom performance, motivation, and personal satisfaction. Results showed teachers believed the face-to-face pre- and/or post-conferences were both positive and beneficial to their professional growth. Participants also agreed the feedback they received assisted them in reflecting on all aspects of their teaching (Anast-May et al.). According to PEAC (n.d.), when properly implemented, effective teacher performance evaluation systems afford classroom teachers expanded opportunities to reflect on their practice, receive constructive feedback, and participate in professional growth opportunities. Feeney (2007) also noted constructive and meaningful feedback is needed to promote reflection and assist teachers in setting and achieving goals. In order for teachers to be provided quality feedback, Feeney recommended a structure needed to be in place to promote reflective inquiry and conversations about professional learning. When a structure to promote reflective inquiry is in place, such as conferencing, teachers are more likely to internalize feedback and make changes in their teaching practice (Feeney).

Teachers in one of the school districts surveyed in this current study were evaluated using the Danielson Framework, which allowed evaluators to provide feedback to teachers related to instructional practices. Bong and Skaalvik (2003) found social persuasion, or persuasive communication and evaluative feedback from others, can influence a person’s self-efficacy beliefs. This source of self-efficacy is most effective when the person communicating the information is viewed as being knowledgeable, trustworthy, and credible (Bong & Skaalvik). Social persuasion may involve performance feedback from a supervisor (Goddard et al., 2004).
Therefore the evaluator’s ability to inspire trust is important as the evaluator suggests changes in the teacher’s behavior. Effective evaluators inspire trust and more successfully deliver important feedback to teachers (Cogan, 1973; Stiggins & Duke, 1988). An effective teacher performance evaluation system includes the development of a trusting relationship between evaluator and teacher.

Teacher performance evaluation procedures can also impact the quality of the evaluation process. Both performance criteria and performance standards must focus on the important aspects of the teaching and learning process, be observable, and be communicated to the teacher. In addition, effective evaluations should begin with an objective record of what the evaluator will observe in the classroom setting (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). The Danielson Framework, used by one of the school districts participating in the current study, expressly outlines the performance criteria and standards used in the school district’s teacher performance evaluation system. McGreal (1982) stated evaluation procedures, processes, and instrumentation must complement the purpose of the evaluation system in order for the system to be effective.

**Research Question Two**

How do the teacher performance evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and the context of the evaluation process relate to teacher self-efficacy as it relates to student engagement? It is predicted an association exists between the teacher performance evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, the context of the evaluation, and a teacher’s self-efficacy as it relates to student engagement. Teachers who report high levels of satisfaction with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation are likely to report higher self-
efficacy in their ability to engage students than teachers with low self-efficacy.

In recent years, the goal of student engagement has become to enhance students’ abilities to become lifelong learners in a knowledge-based society (Gilbert, 2007). Therefore, teachers must utilize classroom strategies that support student engagement in learning both in and beyond the classroom (Taylor & Parsons, 2011). Van Uden et al. (2013) assumed teacher beliefs drive teachers to act in certain ways and this behavior influences student engagement. A 2013 study analyzed how teachers’ perceptions of student engagement related to beliefs about being a teacher. The researchers expected to find higher levels of self-efficacy connected to higher levels of perceived student engagement. Results of the Van Uden et al. (2013) study found teacher self-efficacy was important in predicting student engagement. Teachers who rated themselves high in areas of interpersonal teacher behavior, didactic and pedagogical competence, and self-efficacy perceived their students as being more engaged.

Research Question Three

How do procedures of the performance evaluation system, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and context of evaluation relate to teacher self-efficacy in instructional strategies? It is predicted an association exists between the teacher performance evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, context of the evaluation, and a teacher’s self-efficacy in instructional strategies. Teachers who report high levels of satisfaction with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation are likely to report higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies than teachers with low self-efficacy.
McGreal (1982) noted effective performance evaluation systems should be built around the concept of improving instruction. Weisberg et al. (2009) suggested the main purpose of a comprehensive teacher performance evaluation system should be optimizing teacher effectiveness and growth. Schmoker (2006) asserted effective instruction is one of the most critical factors in increasing student achievement. Research has shown an individual teacher can have a significant effect on student achievement (Brophy & Good, 1986; Wright et al., 1997). Teacher self-efficacy has been linked with effective teaching and learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Students of efficacious teachers have been found to outperform students with less efficacious teachers on standardized achievement tests (Anderson et al., 1998; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992). Teachers with high self-efficacy tend to experiment with methods of instruction, search for improved teaching strategies, and experiment with instructional materials (Allinder, 1995; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). Based on the research showing effective teachers generally have a stronger sense of self-efficacy, Guskey examined the relationship between selected teacher beliefs known to be shared by highly effective teachers and teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional practices. Guskey found more efficacious teachers rated mastery learning as being more important, more congruent with their teaching practices, and less difficult to implement than did their less efficacious colleagues.

Data analysis showed a statistically significant relationship existed between teacher perceptions of instructional effectiveness and teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional methods. Assuming teachers who are highly self-efficacious are also highly effective in the classroom, these teachers appear to be more receptive to implementing new
instructional methods. Teachers assumed to be less effective appear to be less receptive to instructional innovation.

**Research Question Four**

How do the performance evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and the context of the evaluation relate to teacher self-efficacy in classroom management? It is predicted an association exists between the teacher performance evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, the context of the evaluation, and a teacher’s self-efficacy in classroom management. Teachers who report high satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation are likely to report higher self-efficacy in classroom management than teachers with low self-efficacy.

Classroom management is an important element in effective teaching. Research indicates students achieve more when teachers use effective classroom management strategies designed to maximize student learning time (Brophy, 1986). In a study comparing elementary teachers with high and low self-efficacy on factors related to classroom management and discipline of at-risk students, Gordon (2001) found teachers with high self-efficacy were less likely to judge difficult students as having chronic behavior problems; more likely to expect student behaviors to improve; less likely to feel angry, embarrassed, or guilty about student misbehavior; more likely to be accepting of difficult students; and more likely to feel confident about managing student misbehavior. Gordon’s (2001) study supports the belief that teacher self-efficacy is an important indicator of teacher effectiveness in classroom management. In addition, efficacious teachers have been found to persist with struggling students and criticize less when students provide
incorrect answers (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Efficacious teachers are more likely to be motivated to successfully manage the classroom and learning environment (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). In a study by Almog and Shechtman (2007) examining teachers’ responses to student classroom behavior problems and teacher self-efficacy, results showed significant positive correlations between individual teacher self-ratings of efficacy beliefs and teacher responses to student behavior problems in the classroom with regard to incidents of social rejection, shyness, low achievement, and passive-aggressive behavior. Correlations between teacher self-efficacy and a helpful response style were also positive in regards to hypothetical situations that teachers responded to in interview situations.

**Exploratory Research Question One**

Are there differences in teacher self-efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management based on the type of evaluation tool used?

**Exploratory Research Question Two**

Are there differences in attributes of the teacher, perceptions of the evaluator, teacher perceptions of the evaluation system, feedback received, and context of the evaluation system based on the type of evaluation tool used?

These exploratory research questions were investigated since the participant sample allowed for a meaningful comparison of the type of evaluation tools used in the participating school districts.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the association between teacher self-efficacy and components of teacher performance evaluation systems. This chapter outlines the methodology employed in this study. First, the research design will be discussed. Then, the population and sample are defined. Next, the instruments are explained, the procedures are delineated, and finally, statistical analyses are presented.

Research Design

The study adheres to a quantitative correlational design. All data collected was self-reported by teachers on a Likert-type scale. Associations between key quantitative variables were examined via statistical analyses. A correlational design is preferable to a causal-comparative design because, although directionality was investigated in this study, there is no true way to determine if the IV causes the DV or if the reverse is true, as is the case with most behavioral science research.

Population and Sample

All elementary and middle school teachers in the state of Illinois serve as the population for the study. However, because it is not feasible to obtain permission to conduct research in all elementary and middle schools in the state, the study sample consists of 118 elementary and middle schools in the state of Illinois where the researcher obtained
permission to conduct survey research. Teachers in South and West Elementary Schools in Glencoe District 35 were surveyed. South School services students in kindergarten through second grade and West School services students in grades three and four. According the 2014-2015 School Report Card, Glencoe District 35 had a student population consisting of 2% English language learners, 1% low-income students, and 90% White students. In addition to having high achievement on state tests that year, Glencoe District 35 had a high student attendance rate and a low student mobility rate. At the time they were surveyed, Glencoe District 35 had been implementing the Danielson Framework for three years.

Teachers in eight elementary and three middle schools in Crystal Lake Community Consolidated School District 47 were also surveyed. Crystal Lake District was also a high-achieving district according to 2014-2015 test results, although students scored lower than District 35 overall on state tests. In 2014-2015, the district was comprised of 8% English language learners and 31% low-income students. Crystal Lake District 47 also had a high attendance rate and low student mobility rate according to the 2014-2015 School Report Card. The District 47 teachers had not been using the Danielson Framework for teacher performance evaluation when they were surveyed, nor had they received any professional development on the Danielson Framework. Research was conducted with certified teachers responsible for assigning grades to small or large groups of students. This includes general education teachers, special education teachers, fine arts teachers (such as P.E., art, and music), and reading specialists. Professional educators who were not functioning as teachers were excluded from the study. Exclusionary groups include but were not limited to school psychologists; school social workers; speech-language pathologists; school nurses; classroom assistants, even if they held a professional teaching license; and any other person who was not functioning in the capacity as a
teacher. In addition to delimiting participants to teachers who assign grades to students, teachers who were in their first year of teaching in their current district were also excluded from the study. This delimitation was necessary as the study aimed to examine perceptions of the most recently conducted teacher performance evaluation in the current district. By definition, this means that all people who were in their very first year of teaching were also excluded from the study since they had never participated in a teacher performance evaluation cycle by virtue of being in the first year of their career.

Instrumentation

In this study, two existing measures were used: the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP; Stiggins & Duke, 1988) and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). In addition, data on several demographic variables were collected. Each measure is described in greater detail below.

Teacher Evaluation Profile

TEP was used to collect data about teacher perceptions of various components of the teacher performance evaluation system used in their school district. TEP was developed by Stiggins and Duke (1988) to collect and analyze data about teacher perceptions of several key components of performance evaluations in educational settings. Stiggins and Duke conducted three studies of teacher evaluation systems in four school districts prior to developing TEP. One of the studies uncovered barriers to teacher professional development within the evaluation systems, and another focused on teachers who had experienced professional growth as a result of a high-quality evaluation experience. The goal was to determine if the instances of growth-
producing evaluation had any characteristics in common. If so, the favorable evaluation conditions could be replicated.

In their third pilot study, Stiggins and Duke (1988) gave teachers a questionnaire designed to determine if the identified elements of successful evaluation were related to the differential growth experiences of the general teacher population. The questionnaire used in the third study was later revised and became what is now TEP (Stiggins & Nickel, 1989). Five common elements were found and were identified as keys to growth-producing teacher evaluation. These five elements became the five subscales of TEP: Attributes of the Teacher, Perceptions of the Evaluator, Procedures of the Evaluation System, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context.

The technical analysis of the tool was based on the responses of an independent sample of over 4,500 teachers from Connecticut, Montana, Ohio, Oregon, and Washington. The first phase of the analysis focused on questionnaire item and subscale intercorrelations. Instrument and subscale internal consistency reliability estimates and subscale intercorrelations were computed. Also, the individual scales were factor analyzed to examine the factor structure of the instrument. The second phase of the analysis addressed the relationship between the individual items and the teacher ratings of the quality and impact of their evaluation experiences. Bivariate correlations were computed between items and criterion ratings, and items were regressed on the criterion ratings to describe the predictive efficiency of TEP. In the third phase of the analysis, the sensitivity of TEP to differences in teacher evaluation environments across school districts was examined. Individual regression equations were calculated for 26 of the 27 school districts and were compared in terms of the magnitude of the multiple correlation and the items that provided the best explanation of variance in criterion ratings. Also, the range of school district mean responses to TEP items were graphed to examine the variability in district profiles.
After analyzing the data, Stiggins and Duke (1988) concluded TEP had an overall internal consistency reliability of .93. Furthermore, factor analytic techniques confirmed the five-factor structure. The final version, which was utilized in this study, is a 55-item questionnaire separated into five subscales: Attributes of the Teacher, Perceptions of the Evaluator, Procedures of the Evaluation System, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context. The questions are self-reported using a five-item Likert scale response, asking teachers to answer the questions based on the extent to which they either agreed or disagreed with a statement. Please refer to Table 1 for subscales, items for each subscale, and alpha coefficients reported for each subscale.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Subscale and Items</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Sense of Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy in Student Engagement Items</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale-Long Form</td>
<td>1,2,4,6,9,12,14,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alpha = .94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items 7,10,11,17,18,20,23,24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items 3,5,8,13,15,16,19,21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation Profile</td>
<td>Attributes of the Teacher Items 1-9</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alpha = .94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of the Evaluator Items 10-20</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures of the Evaluation System Items</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback Received Items 34-42</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Context Items 43-47</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) was also used to collect data about teacher self-efficacy. This tool was developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) to examine teacher self-efficacy in three areas: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. The scale was created through a sequence of item development, item selection, and factor analysis-revision cycles utilizing item creation and critique by both students and teachers (Heneman et al., 2006). There are two forms of TSES: a long form and a short form. The long form has 24 items, and the short form has 12 items; all items on both scales are rated with a 9-point Likert-type response.

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy tested their instrument in three studies using pre-service and in-service teachers in order to assess the tool’s reliability and validity. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy concluded TSES was reasonably valid and reliable based on construct validity analyses and results. They also concluded the forms were better than the previously developed measures of teacher self-efficacy. The researchers found the long form had a reliability of .94, and the short form had a reliability of .90. The validity of the tool was correlated to the original RAND study as well as Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) Teacher Self-Efficacy tool. The researchers also concluded the three dimensions of efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management signify the richness of teachers’ work and the requirements of quality teaching for content validity (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The long form of TSES, consisting of 24 items, was used in this study because it demonstrates higher reliability coefficients on both the overall scale as well as for each of the three subscales. For a specific breakdown of TSES subscales, items, and corresponding alpha coefficients, see Table 1.
Demographics Variables

The demographics variables that were collected in this study were current teaching assignment grade level, educational status, and gender. Information about the type of evaluation tool used (Danielson vs. non-Danielson) was also collected. Last, a question about the participants’ most recent performance evaluation summative rating was asked.

Procedure

After gaining approval from the Institutional Review Board, the researcher contacted the administrators in several elementary school districts in Illinois via e-mail to discuss the details of the study and gain permission to conduct the study. Please see Appendix A for the initial contact letter. When permission was granted, the researcher requested participation from certified teachers in the elementary and middle schools by sending individual teachers a link to an online survey that described the study. Please see Appendix B for the e-mail sent to teachers. If teachers agreed to participate, they could click on the Google Forms link provided, which took them to a description of the overview of the study as well as a question indicating their consent to participate. All data collected were anonymous. If teachers consented, they were taken to the first study question. If, after reading the study description, they did not wish to participate, they could have clicked, “No I do not wish to participate,” and they would have exited the survey. In addition, due to the delimitations, the second question asked if the participant was indeed a classroom teacher and provided a definition for this. If the participant selected “No,” she/he was exited from the survey. The third and final delimiting question asked if this was the teacher’s first year in his/her current district. Participants who selected “Yes” were exited from the survey. Once the participants made it past the first three questions, which were all required, they were
taken to several demographics questions, then on to the surveys. No other questions were required, and participants were able to skip any question they did not feel comfortable answering. For the specific layout and order of questions presented to participants via Google Forms, please refer to Appendix C.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

To examine the association among the primary study variables, descriptive statistics were conducted. Please see Table 2 for sample size, means, and standard deviations for primary study variables. Please see Table 3 for correlations among primary study variables. In addition to descriptive statistics, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated for all TSES and TEP subscales and compared to the alpha coefficients reported by the test developers to ensure the measures demonstrated adequate reliability with the current sample. Please see Table 4.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Primary Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Evaluation Quality</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Attributes of the Teacher Subscale</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.31</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Perceptions of Evaluator Subscale</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.52</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System Subscale</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Feedback Received Subscale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Evaluation Context Subscale</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSES Student Engagement Subscale</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSES Instructional Strategies Subscale</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSES Classroom Management Subscale</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSES Total Score</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Correlations Among Primary Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Evaluation Quality</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>.579**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>.710**</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TEP Attributes Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.199*</td>
<td>.289*</td>
<td>.220*</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TEP Perceptions of Evaluator Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.608**</td>
<td>.668**</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.841**</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TEP Feedback Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.751**</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TEP Evaluation Context Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TSES Student Engagement Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>.863*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TSES Instructional Strategies Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.583**</td>
<td>.862*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TSES Classroom Management Subscale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.826**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TSES Total Score</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01
Primary Analyses

**Research Question One**

What is the association between the teacher's perceived quality of the performance evaluation process and teacher's self-efficacy? It was predicted teachers who reported a higher quality performance evaluation process would also report greater levels of self-efficacy. Supported.

To examine Research Question One, a regression analysis was conducted. The independent variable for this analysis was the TEP teacher rating of the overall quality of the evaluation process, whereas the dependent variable was the TSES Total Self-Efficacy score. Results of the simple linear regression suggest a significant proportion of the total variation in
overall teacher self-efficacy was predicted by teacher ratings of the overall quality of the evaluation process, \( F (1,117) = 3.89, p = .05. \) The \( R^2 = .03 \) indicating approximately 3% of the variance in self-efficacy scores can be attributed to perceptions of the quality of the performance evaluation process.

**Research Question Two**

How do a teacher performance evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and the context of the evaluation process relate to teacher self-efficacy in student engagement? It was predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in student engagement. Not Supported.

In order to examine this research question, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted. The independent variables entered into the analysis were the TEP subscales of Procedures of the Evaluation System, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context. The dependent variable was the TSES Student Engagement subscale. Results of the regression analysis are not significant: \( F (3,104) = 2.54, p = .06. \) Please see Table 5 for specific regression results.

**Research Question Three**

How do procedures of the performance evaluation system, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and context of evaluation relate to teacher self-efficacy in instructional strategies? It was predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies. Partially Supported.
Table 5
Regression Results for Research Questions Two, Three, and Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSES Student Engagement Subscale Score</td>
<td>TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEP Feedback Received</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEP Evaluation Context</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSES Instructional Strategies Subscale Score</td>
<td>TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.412*</td>
<td>.087*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEP Feedback Received</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.484**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEP Evaluation Context</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSES Classroom Management Subscale Score</td>
<td>TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEP Feedback Received</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEP Evaluation Context</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

In order to examine this research question, the same procedure conducted above for Research Question Two was utilized. The independent variables used in the analysis were the TEP subscales Procedures of the Evaluation System, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context. The dependent variable was the TSES Instructional Strategies subscale. Results of the simultaneous multiple regression analysis are significant: $F(3,101) = 2.58, p < .05$. Together, the three TEP subscales in the analysis account for almost 10% of the variability in the TSES Instructional Strategies subscale score ($R^2 = .087, p < .05$). The TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System subscale emerges as a unique predictor, $b = .469, p < .05$. These results indicate as teacher perceptions of the evaluation procedures increase, so does teacher reported self-efficacy in instructional strategies. Conversely, as quality of feedback increases, teacher perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies decrease, as indicated by the
negative beta weight. Please see Table 5 for specific regression results.

**Research Question Four**

How do procedures of the performance evaluation system, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, and the context of the evaluation relate to teacher self-efficacy in classroom management? It was predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in classroom management. Not Supported.

In order to examine this research question, the same procedure conducted for Research Questions Two and Three was utilized. The independent variables entered into the analysis were the TEP subscales of Procedures of the Evaluation System, Feedback Received, and Evaluation Context. The dependent variable was the TSES Classroom Management subscale. Results of the regression analysis are not significant: \( F(3,104) = .74, p = .53 \). Please see Table 4 for regression results.

**Exploratory Analyses**

**Exploratory Research Question One**

Are there differences in teacher self-efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management based on the type of evaluation tool used?

The number of participants evaluated with the Danielson model was lower in number (i.e., \( n=31 \)) than the number of participants who were not evaluated using the Danielson model (i.e., \( n=87 \)). After accounting for missing data, there were 29 usable cases of participants evaluated with the Danielson model. Due to unequal sample sizes, a random sample of 29
participants who were not evaluated using the Danielson model was selected as the comparison group for the first exploratory analyses. The first exploratory analysis examined mean differences in TSES Total Self Efficacy and the three TSES subscales of Instructional Strategies, Student Engagement, and Classroom Management for Danielson vs. Non-Danielson participants. This comparison was conducted using a one-way MANOVA. The IV was Danielson vs. Non-Danielson Performance Evaluation, and the DVs were the TSES total score and subscale scores. Results of the overall MANOVA are not significant: Wilks’ lambda = .872, \( F (1, 56) = 2.21, p = .12 \). These results indicate the type of performance evaluation tool used in the district does not impact teacher perceptions of self-efficacy. Please see Table 6 for the means and standard deviations for each group in the analysis.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSES Student Engagement Subscale</th>
<th>Danielson Framework Used in Last Performance Evaluation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Danielson</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSES Instructional Strategies Subscale</th>
<th>Danielson Framework Used in Last Performance Evaluation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Danielson</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSES Classroom Management Subscale</th>
<th>Danielson Framework Used in Last Performance Evaluation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Danielson</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSES Total Score</th>
<th>Danielson Framework Used in Last Performance Evaluation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Danielson</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploratory Research Question Two

Are there differences in attributes of the teacher, perceptions of the evaluator, teacher perceptions of the evaluation system, feedback received, and context of the evaluation system based on the type of evaluation tool used?

After accounting for missing data, there were 25 usable cases of participants who were evaluated with the Danielson model. Due to unequal sample sizes, a random sample of 25 participants not evaluated using the Danielson model was chosen as the comparison group for the exploratory analyses. Means and standard deviations for this analysis are located in Table 7.
The second exploratory analysis examined mean differences in the TEP subscales for Danielson vs. Non-Danielson participants. This comparison was conducted using a one-way MANOVA. The IV was Danielson vs. Non-Danielson Performance Evaluation, and the DVs were the TEP subscale scores. Results of the overall MANOVA are significant: Wilks’ Lambda = .713, $F (1, 48) = 3.55, p < .01$.

Results of the follow-up ANOVAs for the TEP subscales are as follows. The TEP Attributes of the Teacher subscale, $F (1, 48) = 4.03, p = .05$, was significant. An examination of means indicated the Danielson group was higher ($M=38.96, sd=2.75$) than the non-Danielson group ($M=37.20, sd=3.42$). The TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System subscale, $F (1, 48) = 14.99, p < .001$, was significant. An examination of means indicated the Danielson group was
higher (M=38.76, sd=10.2) than the non-Danielson group (M=29.76, sd=5.55). The TEP Feedback Received subscale, $F(1, 48) = 10.79, p < .01$, was significant. An examination of means indicated the Danielson group was higher (M=33.92, sd=8.53) than the non-Danielson group (M=27.12, sd=5.86). The TEP Evaluation Context subscale, $F(1, 48) = 5.04, p < .05$, was significant. An examination of means indicated the Danielson group was higher (M=19.04, sd=5.4) than the non-Danielson group (M=16.24, sd=3.06). The TEP Perceptions of the Evaluator subscale, $F(1, 48) = 1.59, p = .21$, was not significant. Please see Table 8 for specific follow-up ANOVA results.

Results of this analysis indicate significant differences in teacher perceptions of various aspects of performance evaluations depending upon whether a teacher is evaluated using the Danielson Framework or not. Specifically, teachers evaluated with the Danielson Framework have better perceptions of their own personal attributes, evaluation procedures, the quality of feedback received, and the context of the evaluation. The only non-significant difference, perceptions of the evaluator, showed no differences in how teachers perceive the skill of their evaluator.
Table 8

Follow-up ANOVA Results for Exploratory Research Question Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEP Attributes of the Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Perceptions of Evaluator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Feedback Received</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP Evaluation Context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This quantitative, correlational study examined the association between teacher perceptions of components of the teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy in a small sample of teachers from select Illinois elementary and middle schools. Teacher perceptions of the performance evaluation process were measured using the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP; Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Teacher self-efficacy was measured using the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). In order to examine the association among the primary study variables, descriptive statistics were conducted. In addition to descriptive statistics, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated for all TSES and TEP subscales and compared to the alpha coefficients reported from the test developers in order to ensure the measures demonstrated adequate reliability with the current sample. The study examined teacher perceptions of several components of performance evaluation process. In addition to teacher self-reports on components of the performance evaluation process, teacher self-efficacy in the areas of classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies was also examined. Associations among these variables were examined in order to understand how they influenced one another. Exploratory analyses were also conducted to look for differences in teacher self-efficacy and perceptions of the teacher performance evaluation process based upon the type of evaluation tool used.
Overall, findings of the association between teacher perceptions of components of the teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy and study limitations are discussed in this chapter. This chapter concludes by addressing the study’s implications and the future direction of ongoing research.

Findings and Interpretations

The first research question examined the association between teacher-perceived quality of the performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy. It was predicted teachers who reported a higher quality performance evaluation process would also report greater levels of self-efficacy. This prediction was supported. A significant proportion of the total variation in overall teacher self-efficacy was accounted for by the overall quality of the evaluation process. Therefore, this study’s findings supported this prediction.

Results of the current study are similar to Wagner and Hill’s (1996) findings. They studied 52 tenured Tennessee elementary and middle school teachers to identify the activities, processes, and structures used to link a teacher evaluation program to professional growth and motivation. Two different teacher programs, one new and one traditional, were examined. A case study approach was used to determine the impact of the teacher evaluation programs. The group using the new program participated in professional dialogue and goal setting with administrators as a part of the evaluation process. The other group of teachers were evaluated using a more traditional standards-based checklist evaluation approach. The results showed differences between teachers who were evaluated using the new and teachers who were evaluated using the more traditional approach. Informal observations, goal-setting, and frequent professional dialogue between the teachers and evaluators yielded the greatest amount of teacher growth
Wagner and Hill’s study showed teachers who perceived their evaluation to be of high quality grew professionally. Research shows when effective teacher performance evaluation systems are properly implemented, they provide teachers with opportunities to reflect on their practice, receive constructive feedback, and increase opportunities for professional growth (PEAC, n.d.).

According to PEAC (n.d.), when properly implemented, effective teacher performance evaluation systems afford classroom teachers more opportunities to reflect on their practice, receive constructive feedback, and increase opportunities for professional growth. Feeney (2007) also noted constructive and meaningful feedback is needed to promote reflection and assist teachers in setting and achieving goals. In order for teachers to be provided quality feedback, Feeney recommended a structure needs to be in place to promote reflective inquiry and conversations about professional learning. Social persuasion, or persuasive communication and evaluative feedback from others, can influence a person’s self-efficacy beliefs. This source of self-efficacy beliefs is most effective when the person communicating the information is viewed as knowledgeable, trustworthy, and credible (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). The teacher performance evaluation procedures also impact the evaluation’s quality. Performance criteria and performance standards should be focused on important aspects of the teaching and learning process, be observable, and be communicated to teachers (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). While research shows that effective performance evaluation systems can benefit teachers’ practice and evaluation procedures can impact the quality of an evaluation, the current study also showed teachers who reported a higher quality performance evaluation process reported greater levels of self-efficacy.

The second research question examined the association between teacher perceptions of the performance evaluation system’s procedures, the evaluative feedback received by the teacher,
the context of the evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy in the area of student engagement. It was predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in student engagement. In this study, an association was not found between the performance evaluation system procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, the context of the evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy in the area of student engagement. Thus, the original prediction was not supported. Van Uden et al.’s (2013) study of 195 prevocational and vocational teachers in the Netherlands found teacher self-efficacy was important in predicting student engagement. The teachers who rated themselves higher in areas of interpersonal teacher behavior, importance of didactic and pedagogical competence, and self-efficacy perceived their students as being more engaged. Guo et al. (2011) examined factors related to pre-school teacher self-efficacy and found pre-school teacher self-efficacy was predicted by the interaction between teacher sense of collaboration and student engagement.

These two studies showed teacher self-efficacy can predict student engagement and teacher self-efficacy can be predicted by the intersection of teacher collaboration and student engagement. However, this does not necessarily mean the level of teacher satisfaction with performance evaluation system components is related to teacher self-efficacy in student engagement. During the course of their careers, teachers develop outcome expectations and teacher self-efficacy expectations (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Gibson & Dembo, 1984) that can have a strong influence upon their classroom interactions and willingness to use effort with students of different abilities and interest levels (Brophy & Good, 1986). It is thought that teacher outcome expectations and self-efficacy expectations could have been already developed based on previous experiences of teachers in the current study and that may be one reason why
an association was not found between the performance evaluation system procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, the context of the evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy in the area of student engagement.

The third research question examined associations among procedures of the performance evaluation system, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, the context of the evaluation and teacher self-efficacy in the area of instructional strategies. It was predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies. This study’s findings partially supported this prediction. Results of the simultaneous multiple regression analyses were significant. Together, the three TEP subscales in the analysis accounted for almost 10% of the variability in the TSES Instructional Strategies subscale score. The TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System subscale and the TEP Feedback Received subscale emerged as unique predictors. These results indicate that as teacher perceptions of the procedures of an evaluation increase, so does a teacher’s reported self-efficacy in instructional strategies.

Conversely, as quality of feedback increases, teacher perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies decrease. The context of the evaluation did not emerge as a unique predictor in this study. The TEP questions that addressed procedures asked teachers to report the extent to which several sources, such as a self-evaluation and student performance, were considered as part of the performance evaluation process. Results showed teachers who reported many of these sources were used in their performance evaluation were more confident in their abilities in the area of instructional strategies, since results showed that as the quality of feedback increased, teacher self-efficacy in instructional strategies decreased. This may be due to the fact that evaluators gave more specific, thorough feedback to teachers who needed support in the area of
instructional strategies. It is also possible administrators focus their feedback on teachers who need more guidance rather than those teachers who already demonstrate high-quality instructional skills. Guskey (1988) conducted a study to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions known to be shared by highly effective teachers and teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional practices. Data analysis showed a statistically significant relationship between teacher perceptions of instructional effectiveness and teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional methods. Teachers who were less effective appeared to be less receptive to instructional innovation. In the current study, as quality of feedback increased, teacher self-efficacy in the area of instructional strategies may have decreased because the teachers were less effective in this area, needed more specific suggestions and feedback in this area, and therefore were not as receptive to implementing new instructional strategies. Perhaps the evaluation’s context did not emerge as a unique predictor in the current study because other aspects of the evaluation process, such as feedback from a supervisor, may have had a stronger influence upon teacher self-efficacy in the area of instructional strategies.

The fourth research question examined the association between the performance evaluation system procedures, evaluative feedback received by the teacher, the context of the evaluation and teacher self-efficacy in the area of classroom management. It was predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in classroom management. This study’s findings did not support this prediction. Research indicates teacher self-efficacy is linked to effective classroom management (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Gordon, 2001; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Efficacious teachers tend to persist with struggling students (Gibson & Dembo) and are more
likely to expect student behaviors to improve (Gordon, 2001). Efficacious teachers are also more likely to be motivated to successfully manage the classroom and learning environment (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). Therefore, Research Question Four predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in classroom management. This prediction assumed a teacher’s level of satisfaction with teacher evaluation was related to teacher self-efficacy in the area of classroom management. For example, it was assumed if a teacher believed his or her evaluative feedback was of high quality, the teacher would be more likely to feel efficacious in the area of classroom management.

Gordon’s (2001) study compared elementary teachers with high and low self-efficacy in factors related to classroom management and discipline of at-risk students. Gordon (2001) found teachers with high self-efficacy were less likely to judge difficult students as having chronic behavior problems; more likely to expect student behaviors to improve; less likely to feel angry, embarrassed, or guilty about student misbehavior; more likely to like difficult students; and more likely to feel confident about managing student misbehavior. Gordon’s (2001) study supports the idea that teacher self-efficacy is an important indicator of teacher effectiveness in classroom management. In addition, efficacious teachers have been found to persist with struggling students and criticize less when students provide incorrect answers (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Efficacious teachers are more likely to be motivated to successfully manage the classroom and learning environment (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). In the current study, results did not show an association between teacher perceptions of teacher performance evaluation system and teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. Therefore, future research is needed to explore these constructs further to determine the situation as to why this association
was not found.

Additional exploratory research questions were also examined. The first exploratory question looked for differences in teacher self-efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management for teachers who were evaluated using the Danielson Framework and teachers who were evaluated using the non-Danielson model. PERA has directed Illinois public school districts to either develop their own teacher performance evaluation model or use all or part of the state designated “model,” based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Professional Practice (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]; 2015b). While PERA did not require school districts to adopt the Danielson system, any alternative teacher performance evaluation system was expected to emphasize and utilize “research-based practices that promote student learning” (ISBE, n.d.). Results of the first exploratory research question were not significant and indicated teacher perceptions of self-efficacy are not associated with the type of performance evaluation tool used. It is possible teachers who report high self-efficacy in these three areas would do so no matter what type of performance evaluation tool is used. It has been found teacher self-efficacy is linked to teacher effectiveness in classroom management, instructional strategies and student engagement. Research shows teacher self-efficacy is linked to effective teaching and learning (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). It is also possible there were no significant differences in self-efficacy between teachers evaluated with the Danielson Model and those evaluated with the non-Danielson model because both districts have high socioeconomic status. It is possible that socioeconomic status of the district may influence teacher self-efficacy more than type of teacher performance evaluation tool used.
Results from a variety of achievement tests show students with self-efficacious teachers outperform students with less efficacious teachers (Anderson et al., 1988; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992). In addition, research shows teacher self-efficacy is linked with effective classroom management (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Gordon, 2001; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Self-efficacious teachers tend to persist with struggling students and criticize less when students provide incorrect answers (Gibson & Dembo). Self-efficacious teachers are also more likely to be motivated to successfully manage the classroom and learning environment (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

Van Uden et al.’s (2013) study sought to determine whether teacher self-efficacy, as well as other variables, could predict teacher perceptions of student engagement. Results showed teacher self-efficacy was important in predicting perceived student engagement. Teachers who rated themselves higher in self-efficacy perceived their students as being more engaged. In Putman’s (2012) study, an examination of domain-specific subscales for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management showed pre-service teachers and novice teachers were significantly lower in the area of self-efficacy than the experienced teachers, but they did not have significantly different beliefs. Therefore, more experienced teachers were more self-efficacious. It is possible the number of years of teaching experience may influence teacher self-efficacy more than a teacher performance evaluation model. While research shows teacher evaluations are at the very center of the educational enterprise and can be catalysts for teacher and school improvement (Toch, 2008), teacher perceptions of self-efficacy in the current study were not significantly different based on the type of performance evaluation tool utilized.

The second exploratory research question asked about differences in teacher perceptions of their own attributes, their evaluator, the evaluation system, feedback received, and context of
the evaluation system based upon whether the Danielson or a non-Danielson evaluation tool was used. Results of the overall MANOVA were significant and results of the follow-up ANOVAs for the TEP subscales showed significant mean differences were found between groups on the TEP Attributes of the Teacher subscale, the TEP Procedures of the Evaluation System subscale, the TEP Feedback Received subscale, and the TEP Evaluation Context subscale. In all four cases, the Danielson group scored higher than the non-Danielson group. No group difference was found with the TEP Perceptions of the Evaluator subscale. These results indicate differences in teacher perceptions of various aspects of performance evaluations depending on if a teacher is evaluated using the Danielson model or not. In sum, teachers evaluated with the Danielson model have better perceptions of their own personal attributes, evaluation procedures, the quality of feedback received, and the context of the evaluation.

This information is significant for school leaders as they implement teacher performance evaluation models. Teachers evaluated with the Danielson model had better perceptions of their own personal attributes, such as overall teaching competence, willingness to take risks in the classrooms, and knowledge of curriculum content. This could mean the Danielson model contributes to these self-perceptions although this would need to be explored in further research. Teachers evaluated with the Danielson model rated evaluation procedures higher than the teachers in the non-Danielson group. This could mean the teachers who were evaluated with the Danielson model reported more sources of information being used in their evaluation and more frequent evaluations. In addition, teachers evaluated with the Danielson model may have had better perceptions of the quality of feedback received than teachers who were evaluated with the non-Danielson model. This can be attributed to the quality and frequency of feedback obtained by teachers participating in the Danielson model of performance evaluation. Danielson’s
Framework can serve as the foundation for professional conversations among teachers seeking to enhance their teaching skills. The Danielson model allows for these formal conversations about teaching to take place between a teacher and evaluator. Past research indicates meaningful feedback yields professional growth (Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Wagner & Hill, 1996). This study also found teachers evaluated with the Danielson model had better perceptions of the context of the evaluation than teachers who were evaluated with the non-Danielson model. This suggests teachers who were evaluated with the Danielson model believed more time was dedicated to the evaluation process, more time was spent on professional development and training related to the process, and there was a clear purpose for the evaluation process. These results show a high level of teacher satisfaction with the Danielson model of teacher performance evaluation. Overall, teachers in the current study who were evaluated with the Danielson model were satisfied with the model. However, this did not necessarily translate into better self-efficacy. These findings need to be explored further in future research.

Interestingly, although there were differences in the procedural aspects of the evaluation process between the Danielson and non-Danielson groups, there were no differences in how teachers perceived the skill of their evaluator. Perhaps the teachers who were surveyed in this study perceived the skill of their evaluator regardless of the evaluation tool being used.

Summary of Findings

This study examined the association between teacher self-efficacy and different aspects of the teacher performance evaluation model in two Illinois suburban school districts that employed different performance evaluation tools. One school district employed the Charlotte
Danielson Framework and the other school district used a more traditional teacher performance evaluation model.

The first research question examined the association between a teacher's perceived quality of the performance evaluation process and a teacher's self-efficacy. It was predicted teachers who reported a higher quality performance evaluation process would also report greater levels of self-efficacy. The study’s results supported this prediction. Research shows high quality teacher performance evaluation models provide teachers opportunities for goal setting and reflection, allow for dialogue between teachers and evaluators about instruction, and allow for professional growth (Wagner & Hill, 1996). This study showed teachers who reported using a high-quality teacher evaluation process also reported greater levels of self-efficacy.

The second, third and fourth research questions examined the association between the performance evaluation system procedures, evalulative feedback received by the teacher, the context of the evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy in three different areas: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. In the area of student engagement, it was predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evalitative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in the area of student engagement. However, this study did not find an association between these variables. The teacher self-efficacy research question in the area of instructional strategies predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evalulative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in instructional strategies. This study’s findings partially supported this prediction because results showed an association between teacher perceptions of the procedures of an evaluation and a teacher’s reported self-efficacy in instructional strategies.
A similar association was not found between quality of feedback and teacher perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies. As quality of feedback increased, perhaps teacher self-efficacy in the area of instructional strategies decreased because teachers who were less effective in this area needed more specific suggestions and feedback in this area and therefore were not receptive to implementation of new instructional strategies. The context of the evaluation did not emerge as a unique predictor. Perhaps this was because other aspects of the evaluation process, such as feedback from a supervisor, may have had a stronger influence upon teacher self-efficacy in the area of instructional strategies.

The research question about teacher self-efficacy in the area of classroom management predicted teachers who reported higher satisfaction levels with the evaluation system’s procedures, evaluative feedback received, and the context of the evaluation would also report higher self-efficacy in classroom management. The study’s findings did not support this prediction. Research shows teacher self-efficacy is linked with effective classroom management (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Gordon, 2001; Soodak & Podell, 1993; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Efficacious teachers are also more likely to be motivated to successfully manage the classroom and learning environment (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). The researcher’s prediction for this research question assumed a teacher’s level of satisfaction with teacher evaluation is related to teacher self-efficacy in the area of classroom management. However, if this association did exist it is not surprising that the findings did not support the researcher’s prediction.

Exploratory Research Question One examined differences in teacher self-efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management based upon the type of evaluation tool used. Results indicated the type of performance evaluation tool used was
not associated with teacher perceptions of self-efficacy. It is possible teachers who reported high self-efficacy in these three areas would have done so regardless of the type of performance evaluation tool being used.

The second exploratory research question examined differences in teacher perceptions of their own attributes, their evaluator, procedures of the evaluation, feedback received, and context of the evaluation system based upon the type of evaluation tool used. Results indicated significant differences in teacher perceptions of various aspects of performance evaluations depending upon whether a teacher was evaluated using the Danielson model or the more traditional model. The teachers who were evaluated with the Danielson model had better perceptions of their own personal attributes, evaluation procedures, the quality of feedback received, and the context of the evaluation. This finding is significant because it shows teachers who were evaluated with the Danielson model felt better about themselves and believed they had received quality feedback. It also shows teachers believe the Danielson model’s procedures are effective. McGreal (1982) stated evaluation procedures, processes, and instrumentation must complement the purpose of the evaluation system in order for the system to be effective. When properly implemented, effective teacher performance evaluation systems provide teachers with opportunities to reflect on their practice, receive constructive feedback, and increase opportunities for professional growth (PEAC, n.d.). This study showed teachers in the school district implementing the Danielson model thought highly of the evaluation procedures, the quality of feedback received, and the context of the evaluation.

The only non-significant difference, i.e., perceptions of the evaluator, indicates no differences in how teachers perceived the skill of their evaluator. The current study revealed no differences in how teachers evaluated with the Danielson model perceived the skill of their
evaluator and how teachers who were evaluated with the non-Danielson model perceived the skill of their evaluator. Perhaps this was because teachers either believed their evaluators had strong evaluation skills or poor evaluation skills regardless of the evaluation tool being used.

Strengths and Limitations

Study Strengths

To date, there has been little research focused upon examining the association between teacher self-efficacy and teacher performance evaluation. No studies were found investigating teacher perceptions of performance evaluation from a Danielson and non-Danielson perspective. It is important to examine the teacher performance evaluation process from this perspective because PERA directed Illinois public school districts to either develop their own teacher performance evaluation model or use all or part of the state-designated “model.” The state-designated model is based upon Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Professional Practice. PERA also mandated that a school district’s teacher performance evaluation plan was to be aligned with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]; 2015b.).

Study Limitations

The limitations of this study include small sample size, sample population, and the use of self-reported data. The small sample size, i.e., the number of survey respondents, is one of the study’s limitations. The resulting sample size limits the study’s generalizability. Another limitation of this study is the sample population. Two Illinois suburban school districts were selected for participation in this study and one of the school districts had a small number of
participants. The sampling decision was based upon the availability of school district staff. Surveying only teachers in two Illinois school districts limited the ability to generalize the results to teachers in other Illinois school districts or in other states. The study’s final limitation is the use of self-reported data. Although the study’s survey had established reliability and validity, relying upon self-reported data is subjective by nature and can be influenced by individuals who may rate themselves dishonestly or differently than how someone else may rate them on the same measure(s). Teachers may not always complete self-report measures honestly on the topics of teacher evaluation or teacher self-efficacy for fear of judgment or criticism.

Concluding Remarks

Study Implications

Limited information showing how components of the teacher performance evaluation process may impact teachers’ ability to make a difference in the classroom. As a result of PERA, many Illinois public school districts have recently adopted new models for teacher performance evaluation. Therefore, the examination of the association between components of the teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy is timely. Since few previous studies have examined the association between components of teacher performance evaluation process and teacher self-efficacy, the current study will aid school leaders in understanding how various components of the performance evaluation process may impact teachers’ self-efficacy.

Results of the study indicated teachers who reported using a high-quality teacher evaluation process also reported greater levels of self-efficacy. This is significant because it shows the quality of the teacher evaluation process may be linked with teacher self-efficacy.
Also, an association was found between teacher perceptions of the procedures of an evaluation and a teacher’s reported self-efficacy in the area of instructional strategies. This is important because effective instruction is one of the most critical factors in increasing student academic achievement (Schmoker, 2006). Although the study’s results indicated the type of performance evaluation tool used in a school district was not associated with teacher perceptions of self-efficacy, perhaps self-efficacy may be impacted in the future, and additional research is therefore warranted.

The study did indicate significant differences in teacher perceptions of various aspects of performance evaluations depending upon whether a teacher was evaluated using the Danielson Framework or a more evaluation traditional model. Teachers who were evaluated with the Danielson model reported more positive perceptions of their own personal attributes, evaluation procedures, the quality of feedback received, and the context of the evaluation. Thus the information gained from this study will be useful to school leaders as they implement and refine the performance evaluation process to better support effective teaching practices.

**Directions for Future Research**

To date, little research has examined the association between teacher self-efficacy and teacher performance evaluation. Future research should examine the association between teacher self-efficacy and aspects of teacher performance evaluation models as teacher evaluation continues to be an important area of focus for school districts. In addition, future research could examine teacher self-efficacy and teacher perceptions of performance evaluation in school districts with lower socioeconomic status. No studies were found that examined teacher perceptions of performance evaluation from both a Danielson and non-Danielson model.
perspective. This is an important area for future research because it is important to determine the effectiveness of the Danielson Framework of teacher evaluation from a teacher perspective.
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APPENDIX A

CONTRACT LETTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT
Dear Superintendent,

My name is Amy Marks. I currently serve as the Principal at Woods Creek School in Crystal Lake Community Consolidated School District 47 and am currently participating in a doctoral program at Northern Illinois University in the Department of Educational Leadership.

As federal and state laws are requiring school districts to change teacher performance evaluation systems, I am interested exploring components of these performance evaluation systems in the districts in Illinois. Exploring these systems can potentially improve outcomes for teachers and students. In addition research has shown that teacher self-efficacy, or teachers’ beliefs about their capabilities to successfully carry out a particular course of action, has positive effects on teachers and students. Therefore, I would like to examine the relationship between teacher performance evaluation systems and teacher self-efficacy.

The purpose of my dissertation entitled "Predictors of Teacher Self-Efficacy: Implications for Performance Evaluation Tools" is to explore teacher self-efficacy through the lens of social cognitive theory that was advanced by Albert Bandura, and to look for a relationship between teacher self-efficacy and various components of teacher performance evaluation systems. The study will advance the body of scholarly work in an area that has not received much attention and will provide insights for educators and school districts as they seek to improve outcomes for both teachers and students.

Participation in this study is voluntary and will require participants to complete an on-line survey. The survey tools used will be The Evaluation Profile (TEP) developed by Stiggins and Duke (1988) and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Tschanen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) portion of the survey will be used to collect data about teacher perceptions of components of the performance evaluation process in the school district. The Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) portion of the survey will be used information about teacher self-efficacy.

I would like to request that you allow me to survey elementary and middle school teachers in your school district as a part of my study. The survey should take teachers approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. In the survey, teachers will be asked to indicate their opinion about several statements related to their self-efficacy beliefs and will be asked to indicate their thoughts about components of the teacher performance evaluation process in their district. Finally, they will be asked to answer basic demographic questions about themselves, their district, and their most recent performance evaluation.

All information gathered during this study will be anonymous. No information that could conceivably link teacher responses to any particular teacher will be collected. Please consider allowing me to ask your teachers if they will voluntarily participate in this important study. You may preview the survey by clicking on the following link:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1AMeee7XMK1vMSy1QYwi703IC19e8J1JFvtxmuwTfuaE/viewform.

If you have any questions about the study please contact me via e-mail or phone at (815) 444-4801. You may also contact my Dissertation Committee Chairperson: Dr. Kelly Summers, Assistant Professor at Northern Illinois University in the Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Foundations at 630-386-7301.

With regards,

Amy Marks, Doctoral Student
Northern Illinois University
APPENDIX B

TEACHER RECRUITMENT EMAIL
Dear Teacher,

My name is Amy Marks. I currently serve as the Principal at Woods Creek School in Crystal Lake Community Consolidated School District 47 and am currently participating in a doctoral program at Northern Illinois University in the Department of Educational Leadership.

Your role as a teacher is essential, but also extremely complex as federal and state laws have recently changed education in many ways. One of the changes is the teacher performance evaluation systems school districts have been implementing across the state of Illinois. Exploring components of these performance evaluation systems is important in order to improve outcomes for teachers and students. Research has also shown that teacher self-efficacy, or teachers’ beliefs about their capabilities to successfully carry out a particular course of action, has positive effects on teachers and students. Therefore, it is important to examine the relationship between teacher performance evaluation systems and teacher self-efficacy.

The purpose of my dissertation entitled "Predictors of Teacher Self-Efficacy: Implications for Performance Evaluation Tools" is to explore teacher self-efficacy through the lens of social cognitive theory that was advanced by Albert Bandura, and to look for a relationship between teacher self-efficacy and various components of teacher performance evaluation systems. The study will advance the body of scholarly work in an area that has not received much attention and will provide insights for educators and school districts as they seek to improve outcomes for both teachers and students.

Participation in this study is voluntary and will require participants to complete an on-line survey. The survey tools used will be The Evaluation Profile (TEP) developed by Stiggins and Duke (1988) and the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). The Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) portion of the survey will be used to collect data about teacher perceptions of components of the performance evaluation process in the school district. The Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) portion of the survey will be used to collect information about teacher self-efficacy.

The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. You will also be asked to indicate your opinion about several statements related to your role as a teacher. You will also be asked to indicate your thoughts about different components of the teacher performance evaluation plan in your school district. In addition, you will be asked to answer basic demographic questions about yourself, your district, and your most recent performance evaluation. All information gathered during this study is anonymous. No information that could conceivably link responses to any particular teacher will be collected.

If you are interested in voluntarily participating in this important study, please click on the following link:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1AMeee7XMK1vMSy1QYwi7O3ICI9e8JIlFvtxmuwTfuA/viewform?usp=send_form

This link will navigate you to the consent document and the on-line survey.

If you have any questions about the study please contact me via e-mail or phone at (815) 444-4801. You may also contact my Dissertation Committee Chairperson: Dr. Kelly Summers, Assistant Professor at Northern Illinois University in the Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Foundations at 630-386-7301.

With regards,
Amy Marks
APPENDIX C

TEACHER BELIEFS AND EVALUATION: SURVEY QUESTIONS
Informed Consent for Participation in Study

You are invited to complete survey questions for the research about teacher beliefs and perceptions of Evaluation by Amy Marks, doctoral student at Northern Illinois University. The purpose of the study is to examine teacher beliefs and the relationship to key components of teacher evaluations. If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey that will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

All information gathered during this study is anonymous. The information gathered will be used for the purposes of completing a doctoral dissertation and may be presented in the future at scientific meetings or published in scientific journals. No school district names will be used.

If you choose to participate, please know participation is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time without penalty or prejudice. If you have any additional questions concerning this study, contact the Chair of this dissertation research, Dr. Kelly Summers, Assistant Professor at Northern Illinois University in the Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Foundations at 630-386-7301.

If you would like further information regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the Office of Research Compliance at Northern Illinois University at (815) 753-8588.

If I choose to participate.................

I understand that the intended benefits of this study include increasing the body of scholarly work and understanding in the area of teacher performance evaluation as related to teacher beliefs.

I have been informed that potential risks and/or discomforts I could experience during this study are minimal. My anonymous responses will be closely managed by the researcher.

I understand that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I might have as a result of my participation, and I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form. (Please print this page if you would like a hard copy).

Thank you.
Amy Marks
Doctoral Student
Northern Illinois University
ammarks@d47.org

I Agree to Participate in this study. *
__Yes, I agree
__No, I do not wish to participate. (Please note selecting this option will exit you from the survey).

Demographic Information

1. Is this your first year in a teaching position in this school district? *
   __Yes (please note if you choose "yes" you will be exited from the survey. This study is about teachers with at least one year of experience in their current district).
   __No

2. Are you a teacher who provides grades to small or large groups of students?
Yes, I am a general education teacher, special education teacher, reading specialist, or other teacher responsible for providing grades for small or large groups of students.

No, I am not responsible for a classroom. I am considered related service personnel (social workers, school psychologists, nurses, counselors, speech pathologists, etc.)—You will be exited from the survey. This study is specific to teachers.

3. Your current teaching assignment grade level (select the answer that best describes your current position)
   __Pre-K through K
   __Grades 1 through 4
   __Grades 5 through 8
   __K-8

4. Highest degree completed
   __Bachelor's Degree
   __Master's Degree
   __Educational Specialist
   __Doctoral Degree]

5. Your gender
   __Female
   __Male

6. Was your last performance evaluation conducted using the Danielson Framework?
   __Yes, it was conducted using the Danielson Framework
   __No, it was not conducted using the Danielson Framework

7. Date of your most recent performance evaluation
   __During the academic year 2013-2014
   __During the academic year 2012-2013
   __Between 2010-2012
   __Prior to 2010

My Beliefs
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are anonymous.

Answers range from 1 (Nothing) to 9 (The most)

1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?
4. How much can you do to motivate your students who show low interest in school work?
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?
9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?
19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

Perceptions of Teacher Performance Evaluation:
Section One: Overall Rating
Please reflect on your most recent experience (not including the 2014-2015 school year) with the performance evaluation process in your school district. Consider the ENTIRE evaluation process from start to finish, including any meetings you had with your evaluator, formal and informal observations, or other procedures and feedback.

1. Rate the overall quality of the evaluation
   1 (Poor quality) to 5 (Very high quality)
2. Rate the overall impact of the evaluation on your professional practices. (Note: A rating of 5 would reflect a strong impact leading to profound changes in your teaching practices, attitudes about teaching, and/or understanding of the teaching profession. A rating of 1 would reflect no impact at all and no changes in your practices, attitudes, and/or understanding.)
   1 (No impact) to 5 (Strong impact)
3. Rate the overall impact of the evaluation process on your professional growth as an educator. (Note: A rating of 5 would reflect a strong impact on your professional growth whereas a rating of 1 would reflect no impact at all on your professional growth).
   1 (No impact) to 5 (Strong impact)

Section Two: Perceptions of Teacher Evaluation: Personal Attributes
Describe yourself in relation to the following attributes:
1. Rate your overall competence as a teacher
   1 (I am minimally competent)---5 (I am an outstanding teacher)
2. The strength of your professional expectations of yourself
   1 (I demand little)---5 (I demand a great deal)
3. Orientation to risk taking
   1 (I avoid risks)---5 (I take risks)
4. Orientation to change
   1 (I am relatively slow to change)---5 (I am relatively flexible)
5. Orientation to experimentation in your classroom
   1 (I don't experiment)---5 (I experiment frequently)
6. Openness to criticism
   1 (I am relatively closed)---5 (I am relatively opened)
7. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching
   1 (I know a little)---5 (I know a great deal)
8. Knowledge of curriculum content
   1 (I know a little)---5 (I know a great deal)
9. Experience with teacher evaluation prior to most recent experience
   1 (Waste of time)---5 (Very helpful)

Section Three: Perceptions of the Evaluator
Rate your perceptions of the person who conducted your most recent performance evaluation.

10. Credibility as a source of feedback
    1 (Not credible)---5 (Very credible)
11. Working relationship with you
    1 (Adversary)---5 (Helper)
12. Level of trust
    1 (Not trustworthy)---5 (Trustworthy)
13. Interpersonal manner
    1 (Threatening)---5 (Not threatening)
14. Temperament
    1 (Impatient)---5 (Patient)
15. Flexibility
    1 (Rigid)---5 (Flexible)
16. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching
    1 (Not knowledgeable)---5 (Very knowledgeable)
17. Capacity to model or demonstrate needed improvements
    1 (Low)---5 (High)
18. Familiarity with your particular teaching assignment
    1 (Unfamiliar)---5 (Very familiar)
19. Usefulness of suggestions for improvement
    1 (Useless)---5 (Very useful)
20. Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions
    1 (Not persuasive)---5 (Very persuasive)

Section Four: Perceptions of Procedures
Rate your perceptions of the procedures used during your most recent evaluation.
21. Were standards used to evaluate your performance communicated to you?
   1 (Not at all)---5 (In great detail)
22. Were the standards used to evaluate your performance clear to you?
   1 (Vague)---5 (Very clear)
23. Were standards used to evaluate your performance appropriate for your teaching assignment?
   1 (Not appropriate)---5 (Highly appropriate)
24. Were the standards used to evaluate your performance the same for all teachers or unique to your needs?
   1 (The same for all)---5 (Tailored to your unique needs)

Section Five: Evaluation Procedures
To what extent were the following sources of performance information considered as part of your evaluation? For questions 25-31, rate on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not considered and 5 being used extensively.

25. Observation of your classroom performance
26. Meetings with evaluator
27. Examination of artifacts (lesson plans, materials, home/school communications)
28. Examination of student performance
29. Student evaluations of your performance
30. Peer evaluations of your performance
31. Self evaluation

32. In your most recent evaluation cycle, what was the total number of formal observations you had?
   __0 observations
   __1 observation
   __2 observations
   __3 observations
   __4 observations

33. In your most recent evaluation cycle what was the total number of informal observations you had?
   __0 observations per year
   __1 observation
   __2 observations
   __3 observations
   __4 observations

Section Six: Type and Quality of Feedback
Please rate the feedback you received during your last performance evaluation experience.

34. Amount of information received
   1 (None)---5 (Great deal)
35. Frequency of formal feedback
   1 (Infrequent)----5 (Frequent)
36. Frequency of informal feedback
   1 (Infrequent)---5 (Frequent)
37. Depth of information provided
   1 (Shallow)---5 (In-depth)
38. Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback
   1 (Low)---5 (High)
39. Specificity of information provided
   1 (General)---5 (Specific)
40. Nature of information provided
   1 (Judgmental)---5 (Descriptive)
41. Timing of feedback
   1 (Delayed)---5 (Immediate)
42. Feedback focused on standards of teaching
   1 (Ignored the standards)---5 (Reflected on the standards)

Section Seven: The Evaluation Context
Please rate the following questions about the evaluation context.

43. Amount of time spent on the process, including your time and that of your evaluator
   1 (None)---5 (Great deal)
44. Time allotted during the semester for professional development
   1 (None)---5 (Great deal)
45. Availability of training programs and models of good practice
   1 (None)---5 (Great deal)
46. Clarity of policy statements regarding the purpose of evaluation
   1 (Vague)---5 (Very clear)
47. Intended role of evaluation
   1 (Teacher accountability)---5 (Teacher growth)

Additional Information
Not including the 2014-2015 school year, how many years have you taught in your current district?
   Options ranging from 1 to 20 or more years
If you have taught in more than one district, what is the TOTAL number of years you have been teaching?
   Options ranging from 1 to 20 or more years
What was your most recent summative performance evaluation rating?
   Options of Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory, I prefer not to answer
Teacher Beliefs and Evaluation

Your response has been recorded. As a reminder, if you have any questions or concerns you may contact Amy Marks at (815) 444-4800 or Dr. Kelly Summers at (630) 386-7301. If you would like further information regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the Office of Research Compliance at Northern Illinois University at (815) 753-8588.