

Methodological Appendixes

Supplement to

Peer Review and Teacher Leadership

LINKING PROFESSIONALISM AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Jennifer Goldstein

Copyright © 2010 by Teachers College, Columbia University All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the publisher.



Teachers College
Columbia University
New York and London

Contents

Appendix A:

Study Design and Methods 3

Design 3

Qualitative Methods and
Analysis 4

Quantitative Methods and
Analysis 7

Study Limitations and Areas for
Future Research 8

Appendix B: QSR NUD*IST/Nvivo Coding Schema 12

Appendix C:

Interview Protocols 16

C1: Fall Coach and Panel Member
Protocol 16

C2: Winter-Spring Principal
Protocol 18

C3: Spring Participating Teacher
Protocol 19

C4: Spring Coach and Panel Member
Protocol 20

C5: Spring Superintendent
Protocol 23

C6: Spring 2002 Follow-up
Protocol 24

Appendix D:

Survey Instruments 26

D1: Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)
Survey for Coaches, Panel Members,
and Principals 26

D2: Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)
Survey for Participating Teachers,
Spring 2001 37

D3: Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)
Survey for Participating Teachers,
Spring 2002 43

Appendix E:

Year 1 Survey Results 46

Appendix A: Study Design and Methods

In 1999, California became the first state to pass legislation implementing peer assistance and review (PAR). While many California districts and/or teacher unions shied away from the idea of PAR and focused merely on compliance with the new legislation, key leaders in Rosemont intended to implement the new policy as fully as possible, making the district a rich site in which to study PAR in California at the time.

I selected the Rosemont Unified School District (a pseudonym) as my case site after conducting a pilot study in the district. The site was selected based on the degree of "interruption" (Weick, 1995) occurring, by which I mean there was an opportunity to witness new rules for teachers' roles in teacher evaluation being written. In addition, the site was chosen because it had a prior experiment with PAR, perhaps increasing the potential for meaningful implementation in the first year of the program. In other words, while all districts needed to have a PAR program in place to continue receiving state mentor funding, many districts intended to limit the program to the minimum required by the new law—namely something available to those teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations from principals, typically a very small number. By contrast, I sought out a site that was planning a more comprehensive program than that required by the law. Because of Rosemont's prior experience with PAR, key figures in the district saw the state legislation and attached funding as an opportunity to do what they previously could not afford. In addition, examining the initial development and implementation of the program matched the study's goal of witnessing the process of sensemaking.

Finally, I was fortunate to be granted wide access in Rosemont. In the fall of 1999, leaders

in Rosemont—both district office administrators and teacher union leadership—invited me to document their implementation of PAR. Rosemont's leadership and I arranged a win-win situation. I would observe and document their implementation of AB 1X during the first year of the program and provide them with a year-end report. I, in turn, could have full use of the data I collected for my doctoral dissertation. I was given wide access to program participants and events, but in no way acted as a participant in the process during this time. At the end of this period, in June following the first year of program implementation, I provided a written report and two presentations—one to coaches and one to panel members—highlighting notable successes and challenges from the year (many of which were wholly unrelated to my research questions). Relationships established during this time allowed me to also conduct follow-up interviews and focus groups at the end of the second and fourth years of implementation.

We agreed that the identity of the district would remain confidential, given the sensitive nature of aspects of PAR and discussions surrounding employment decisions. As such, I have intentionally left out many contextual details about the district that might be useful to a reader, but that would simply be too identifying.

DESIGN

The study employed an embedded single-case design (Yin, 2003). The embedded structure of the study allowed me to examine the process of making sense of PAR, as it occurred for both teachers and administrators, while the single-case design allowed for a fine-grained

examination of one situated process of role shift and related “sensemaking” (Spillane, Reisen, & Reimer, 2002; Weick, 1995).

The study examined PAR in Rosemont in-depth for a year and a half, with follow-up data collection occurring in the second and fourth years of the program. In addition, I had already collected data during Rosemont’s pilot program, two years prior to the primary phase of research.

The study used a role complement sample (Little, 2000), which allowed for a focus on the coaches, while also looking across levels of the system based on which other actors were primarily connected to the coaches. The primary actors in the study were the district’s nine members of the PAR oversight panel (teachers and administrators) and ten PAR coaches from year one of implementation. This sample of 19 core teachers and administrators included 3 African-American women, three Latina women, 1 Chinese-American woman, 6 White women, and 6 White men.

Three of the ten coaches were chosen for more in-depth data collection—Bob (the lead coach), Sarah, and a third. This choice was influenced by their demography (years of experience, gender, and ethnicity) and degree of sensemaking about the reform as observed in ongoing meetings. I then included participating teachers (PTs) (such as Regina) and principals based on their connection to these three case study coaches. In addition, as the study progressed I included principals and PTs who might represent divergent or unrepresented viewpoints (Miles & Huberman 1994). Kim and Timothy became central in this way—as divergent PT cases—and as a result coaches Eva and Caroline also became central.

In the 2nd year of the program, Rosemont added 2 coaches, one of whom eventually took over Bob’s lead coach role and participated in follow-up interviews in year four. Similarly, in the fourth year of the program, a new union president took office and was interviewed.

A note on the principals involved in the research is warranted. One major way the district chose where to place limited PAR resources in the 1st year of implementation was principals’ interest in the program; PAR was placed in schools where the principal had signed up for it. The field of potential principal informants was narrowed further by the self-selection of those who were willing to participate in the research.

Finally, the study’s sample focused on the educators involved with PAR, as they were the ones engaged in making sense of the policy. In year one of PAR in Rosemont, because implementation was only partial, knowledge of the program was minimal beyond those directly involved. The purpose of the study was not to gauge the spread of knowledge about the policy, but rather to examine the ways those responsible for initially enacting the policy did so.

The study relied primarily on observations, interviews, and surveys.

QUALITATIVE METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Prior to the passage of AB 1X, I observed a collection of meetings during Rosemont’s experiment with a pilot program that included many elements of PAR. Following AB 1X, my observations began with the inception of the panel in the spring prior to the 1st year of policy implementation. They then included the selection of the coaches by the panel, a three-day summer professional development retreat for panel members and coaches that brought them together as a group for the first time, and another week of coach meetings in August just prior to the start of school. In this way I was able to document the environment of messages about PAR into which the actors were entering and beginning their new roles.

I then attended all panel meetings and hearings (approximately once a month) and

almost every coach meeting (weekly) for one year, which provided rich opportunities to view the implementation of the policy and how Rosemont’s educators made sense of it. Panel meetings were usually 2 hours in length, while panel hearings and coach meetings typically lasted a full day. I scripted these meetings, a process that involves creating an approximately verbatim account of interactions

that looks like the script of a play. Meetings were also tape recorded, allowing me to fill in gaps or make corrections to the script after the conclusion of meetings. In total I observed and scripted approximately 311 hours of meetings, plus an addition 22 during the 1997–1998 pilot (which were not tape recorded). Please see Table A1 (book Table 2.1) for a breakdown of observation hours.

Table A1: Observations—Number of days (total hours)

Data Source	Fall Year -2	Spring Year -2	Spring Year 0 ^a	Summer-Fall Year 1	Winter Year 1	Spring Year 1	TOTAL
Panel meetings	3 (9)	3 (13)	3 (8.5)	3 (6)	1 (2)	2 (4)	15 (42.5)
Panel hearings				3 (28.5)	2 (19)	3 (21)	8 (68.5)
Coach meetings				17 (108)	7 (42)	8 (48)	32 (198)
Coach professional development				3 (24)			3 (24)
TOTAL	3 (9)	3 (13)	3 (8.5)	26 (166.5)	10 (63)	13 (73)	58 (333)

^a Year 0 is defined as the year AB 1X passed, such that “Year 1” is the first year of state legislated PAR implementation (2000-2001). A pilot program involving elements of PAR occurred prior to AB 1X, in “Year -2.”

In addition to observing meetings, I conducted 74 semi-structured individual interviews and two focus groups over the duration of the study. I interviewed panel members and coaches in the fall and spring of the 1st year of implementation, and the three case study coaches in the winter as well. These interviews lasted between one and three hours; all but 3 were tape recorded and transcribed.

I also conducted semi-structured interviews lasting between 30 minutes and 1

hour with 11 principals, 15 PTs, and three key district level administrators including the superintendent, for a total of 67 interviews total in year one. Seven additional interviews with key stakeholders, and two focus groups (involving six participants), were conducted in years two and four. See Table A2 (book Table 2.2) for a breakdown of individual and group interviews conducted. Please see Appendix C for the interview protocols.

Table A2: Interviews Conducted

Data Source	Fall Year 1	Winter Year 1	Spring Year 1	Spring Year 2	Spring Year 4	TOTAL
Panel members (n =10) ^{b c}	9		9	2	5 ^d	25
Coaches (n =11) ^e	10	3	8	2	4 ^f	27
Principals (n =11)		6	5			11
Participating Teachers (n =15)			15			15
Additional district office administrators (n =3)	1	1	1			3
TOTAL	20	10	38	4	9	81^g

^b The Ns in this column represent the total number of interviewees in the stakeholder category, not the universe of participants in the study.

^c The 10 panel members interviewed were the original 9, plus the new union president in Year 4.

^d 3 of the 5 panel members were interviewed as part of a focus group in Year 4.

^e The 11 coaches interviewed were the original 10, plus the new lead coach in Year 4.

^f 3 of the 4 coaches were interviewed as part of a focus group in Year 4.

^g 80 interviews were actually conducted, because one principal was also a member of the panel and is counted twice in the spring Year 1 tally.

I interwove data collection and analysis from the outset of the study. Ongoing analysis with a variety of tools informed the data collection process: summaries of fieldnotes; analytic memoing; and coding (descriptive and interpretive early on, moving towards patterns later in the study) (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Earlier stages of the process emphasized exploration, moving towards theory development and confirmation as the study progressed. I originally used the qualitative software QSR NUD*IST 4 for data management. While such software can sometimes force researchers into analytic schema too early, I did not create my NUD*IST coding schema until all data had been collected. In addition, I created the schema from my own progressive coding patterns, unassisted by the software. In this way, I utilized the software for data management only. The coding schema was both expandable and flexible, as themes

and categories emerged over the data collection and analysis process. Multiple researchers coded interviews at the outset of analysis to verify the reliability of the thematic coding schema. Once reliability was established, I coded all subsequent interviews.

The original analysis focused on the role of the PAR coaches, in particular the negotiation of jurisdiction for teacher evaluation with principals. The main thematic coding nodes focused on making sense of new roles, supporting standards for teaching quality, and professionalizing teaching. Please see Appendix B for the full-coding schema.

For a second wave of analysis focused on the role of the panel, I converted the database to QSR NVivo and expanded the original coding schema. In particular, codes for various “distributed accountability” (Goldstein, 2007c) themes were added to the original coding tree, after the panel

emerged as a key factor in the findings from the original study (Goldstein, 2003). Transcripts of interviews and panel hearings were then recoded for the new themes. Specifically, the original coding node “distribution/sharing of role tasks and functions” (1 5) was expanded to include the subset “distributed accountability” (1 5 1). The coding rule for distributed accountability read, “pertaining to a distribution of leadership involving holding one another accountable for practice.” The distributed accountability node was in turn broken into five sub-nodes addressing accountability between specific PAR roles, as shown in Appendix B. Accountability between coaches and PTs was so central to the original study that it already existed as a separate node unto itself, prior to the expansion of the coding schema (see nodes (2 1) to (2 9)).

QUANTITATIVE METHODS AND ANALYSIS

A multiwave survey approach complemented the continuous fieldwork (Miles and Huberman, 1994) by (1) drawing attention to themes to look for in the

fieldwork; (2) serving as a method of triangulation for findings in the fieldwork; and (3) broadening the sample of principals and mentees beyond those interviewed. In year one, all panel members and coaches completed a survey. Sixteen out of 28 principals returned surveys (57%); together with interview data, 20 principals were included in the study (77%). Fifty-seven out of 91 PTs returned surveys (63%); together with interview data, 61 mentees were included in the study (67%).

A survey was also collected from PTs ($N = 143$) at the end of the second year of the program, with a response rate of 78% ($N = 112$). In addition to providing longitudinal data, this second year survey filled gaps left after the first year of the study. Specifically, the question of PTs’ trust or lack of trust in their coaches emerged as a theme in the year one interviews, but was not asked directly in surveys administered to all participants during the first year of the program. It was therefore added to a survey of PTs in year two. For a breakdown of survey data collection, see Table A3 (book Table 2.3). Please see Appendix D for the survey instruments.

Table A3: Surveys Returned

	Surveys Disseminated Year 1	Surveys Returned Year 1	Surveys Disseminated Year 2	Surveys Returned Year 2
Panel members	9	9		
Consulting teachers	10	10		
Principals	28	16		
Participating teachers	91	57	143	112
TOTAL	138	92	143	112

At various places throughout the book, survey responses for three groups of respondents—coaches, panel members, and principals—are reported as one mean score on items rating PAR’s effect on a variety of outcomes, as there were no significant between groups differences. These survey responses involved Likert scales, in which 1 was a very negative effect and 5 was a very positive effect, not always repeated throughout for parsimony.

Five items from the fifty-seven item year two PT survey were reduced to create a construct for “trust in PAR coach,” discussed in Chapter 6. The five items were placed together based on their perceived face validity, but the reliability analysis revealed a much stronger alpha for “trust in

STUDY LIMITATIONS AND AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A study’s design determines the data gathered and hence the universe of possible findings, while simultaneously, of course, delimiting what will not be gathered. Accordingly, there were a number of limitations to this research that provide direction for future studies.

Scope of Data Collection

Future research should expand the scope of data collection in several ways.

Intervention Cases

This study intentionally focused on beginning teachers in PAR rather than veterans, not only because beginning teachers made up the lion’s share of participating teachers in Rosemont, but for pragmatic reasons. At the outset of the program, as coaches were nervous about their new jobs and intervention cases were facing new accountability measures, I made the decision that interviewing and/or observing intervention teachers, had they agreed to

PAR coach” when two items were separated out. Two different constructs were therefore created: (1) Trust in PAR coach (TRUST, $\alpha = 0.90$), and (2) Lack of trust in PAR coach due to evaluative role (LACK OF TRUST, $\alpha = 0.79$). These constructs were derived using factor analysis and concerns for face validity. Reliability analysis was then used to generate an alpha value (α), where greater than 0.7 indicates a strong relationship between the items.

These two outcome variables (as well as five additional construct variables, see Goldstein, 2007b) were then analyzed using correlations, multiple regressions, analysis of variance, and multivariate analysis of variance.

it, was too risky. The reality was simply that those involved did not yet know what the process would look like, and I did not want to risk complicating the outcome, for an intervention case or the program, by a possible misstep on my part. Given the small number of intervention cases year one (three), the trade-off did not seem worth it. I relied instead on secondary data sources for information about intervention cases, namely coaches’ descriptions of their work with veterans produced through interviews, and descriptions of veterans’ cases in coach meetings and panel hearings. Future research should certainly attempt to gather data directly from intervention cases.

Coach–PT Joint Work and Evaluation Paperwork

This study involved minimal direct observation of coaches and PTs working together, and it did not examine the teacher evaluation paperwork completed by the coaches. Instead the research largely relied on the self-reporting of stakeholders in meetings and interviews. While I used triangulation to verify findings, concerns

about self-reporting remain. Future research should closely examine PAR's evaluation paperwork in order to speak more concretely to the reliability and validity of the evaluations. Similarly, direct examination of the support provided—and likely observations of PTs' teaching over time—would allow for greater findings on the quality of support.

Retention and Development as a Professional

Future research could track PTs and coaches returning to the classroom to see how their retention in the district and the profession compares to national retention averages for teachers at the same career stage. Following PTs and coaches into further years of their teaching would also allow a study of their development as professionals, to gauge such things as the quality of their practice; their conception of the role of teacher (is it different from teachers at the same career stage who did not participate in PAR?); their attitude about teacher leadership and their commitment to self-regulation; and their relationships with colleagues, including their principal.

Educators Beyond PAR

In addition to changes in depth, a broader study would examine district educators not directly involved with PAR in order to draw comparisons about conceptions of PAR and roles in it. While I attempted to do this on a small scale, the response rate was too small to proceed.

A broader study that compared full-time PAR coaches to full-time mentors not conducting evaluations would allow for the possible isolation of evaluation as a factor in mentoring, given the same demographic and contextual issues. This study was in fact originally intended to include full-time BTSA mentors as a comparison group, but in the first week of the school

year their positions were eliminated and they returned to positions as full-time classroom teachers. It was not feasible to change the site of the study at that point, and I simply continued the research without the comparison group.

Replacement Teachers

Future research should track the quality of the nonrenewed teachers' replacements. An increased rate of removal leads to improved teaching quality only if the removed teachers' replacements actually teach better. A comparison between the quality of the teachers removed and the quality of their replacements was beyond the scope of this research.

Student Outcome Data

Finally, future research could seek to establish a relationship, over time, between the presence of a PAR program and student learning gains.

Anecdotal claims have been made regarding Ohio's three longstanding PAR programs and student performance gains on standardized tests, but empirical research has yet to establish such a relationship. As I note in the introduction to the book, standardized test scores are one narrow slice of possible student learning, and I do not want to suggest that a PAR program's success or failure could be measured by such scores. Nonetheless, given the current interest in test score gains, future research on PAR might incorporate such data. More substantially, future research could seek to gather data on student learning defined more broadly than achievement test scores.

Selection Bias

Given Rosemont's approach (in year 1) of placing PAR in schools where the principal signed up for it, and the reality of

voluntary participation in research, there was clearly a selection bias from the whole universe of principals in the case district to those who were captured in the study. Principal enthusiasm for the program must be viewed in this context, while principal resistance to the program can be seen as particularly salient. Future research would ideally be conducted in a PAR site or sites that have placed the program in schools in a less biasing manner. Rosemont, for example, moved from this model year one to placing the program in designated low-performing schools in year two.

In addition to the programmatic selection bias of principals, there was also self-selection bias in the choice of case coaches. While case coaches were chosen based upon demography and engagement in making sense of the reform, the pool of possible choices was narrowed by coaches who preferred not to be a case study. Similar to the reasons for not interviewing intervention cases, I felt strongly that I needed to be as small an intrusion into the lives of my study participants as possible. Unlike the panel members who invited me into the district and gave me wide access, the coaches inherited my presence and were not uniformly excited about it. Accordingly, it felt necessary to respect their varied comfort levels with the research process.

Survey Instrument

In Chapter 7, data is presented showing that all groups of respondents preferred coach and principal “collaboration” in teacher evaluation. Given the ambiguity and positive connotation of the word collaboration, and the negative reaction to the alternate “limited” principal involvement, future surveys would reap more meaningful results by specifying concrete examples of coach and principal involvement (e.g.,

Little, 1982) and avoiding language characterizing that involvement. An expanded and more specific list of response options on the survey for ideal coach and principal roles in evaluation would generate more fine-grained data.

Participating Teacher Characteristics

I did not analyze the year 1 data for PT characteristics such as credential status, gender, and teaching placement. Analysis of the year two survey suggests that uncredentialed teachers with two or more years of teaching experience, and those teaching at the secondary level, were generally less trustful of their coaches. The group sizes were quite small, but this may be an area worth future attention, especially in light of the lead teacher’s opinion that nonrenewals dropped in year three due to fewer uncredentialed teachers in the program. In addition, there was a high proportion of uncredentialed men nonrenewed in year one, perceived by some coaches and panel members to be related to authority issues with female coaches. No statistically significant gender differences were found on the year two survey, however. It would be an interesting area for future research. In addition, coding surveys so that they can be confidentially tied to respondents and hence disaggregated by ultimate employment status would also be useful.

Principal Characteristics

This study did not attend to the particular qualities and qualifications of principals. Research suggests that principals’ personal qualities play a large role in their ability to accept leadership by teachers (Sebring, Hallman, & Smylie, 2003), and that more expert principals are actually more successful at recognizing expertise in mentors, stepping back, and facilitating the mentoring process from afar (Carver, 2002; Youngs, 2003). As Smylie, Conley,

and Marks (2002) note, it “is a paradox of teacher leadership that it requires administrative leadership to be effective” (p. 182). Future research on PAR and distributed leadership should examine this important factor.

Single District

Finally, this is a study of one district. The depth of data collected from one site was key to uncovering sensemaking processes. In addition, the topic was sensitive in nature, involving the loss of a job for some respondents and participation in creating

that loss for others. The level of researcher immersion that was possible through the case approach was critical, yielding important lessons to be learned from the study. While the surveys yielded some important findings, this study also showed that the import of the survey data was largely revealed through in-depth interview data. The fine-grained approach possible by limiting the study to one district proved fruitful. That said, future research on PAR can explore cross-site comparisons, as Susan Moore Johnson and colleagues have begun to do (2009).

Appendix B: QSR NUD*IST/NVivo Coding Schema

(Note: Some specific terms have been edited for confidentiality)

Making sense of new roles (1)

- Definitions of roles (1 1)
- Program ambiguity (1 2)
 - Program coherence (1 2 1)
- Role ambiguity (1 3)
 - Role clarity (1 3 1)
- Role tension (1 4)
 - Role ease (1 4 1)
 - Should/can a mentor do evaluations? (1 4 2)
- Distribution/sharing of role tasks and functions (1 5)
 - Distributed accountability (1 5 1)
 - Teacher union and school district (1 5 1 1)
 - Panel and coaches (1 5 1 2)
 - panel support to coaches (reciprocity) (1 5 1 2 1)
 - panel holding coaches accountable (1 5 1 2 2)
 - for support of PTs (1 5 1 2 2 1)
 - for accountability of PTs (1 5 1 2 2 2)
 - ineffectively (1 5 1 2 2 3)
 - Panel and principals (1 5 1 3)
 - Coaches and principals (1 5 1 4)
 - Principals and PTs (1 5 1 5)
- Jurisdiction for teacher evaluation (1 6)
- Relationships (1 7)
 - Site administrator- CT (1 7 1)
 - Coach-participating teacher (1 7 2)
 - Site administrator-participating teacher (1 7 3)
 - Lead teacher-lead teacher (CT/CT or panel teacher/panel teacher) (1 7 4)
 - Site administrator-panel (1 7 5)
 - Coach-panel (1 7 6)
 - Coach-lead Coach (1 7 7)
 - Panel administrator-panel teacher (1 7 8)
- Teacher leadership (1 8)
- Public/Education resistance to/perception of PAR (1 9)
- Survey questions 16-19 (1 10)

Teacher quality standards (2)

- Support to PTs (2 1)
- Evaluation/gatekeeping/accountability (2 2)
- Quality of practice (teaching outcomes) (2 3)
- New teacher retention (2 4)
- PD/evaluation of other (middle) teachers (2 5)
- Equity (2 6)
- Unsatisfactory veteran teachers (2 7)
- Professional development for coaches (2 8)
- Definition of teacher quality (2 9)
- Credential issues (2 10)
 - Strong teachers (2 10 1)
- PD for panel (2 11)
- Support to principals (2 12)

Professionalizing teaching (3)

- Professionalism/beliefs and values (3 1)
 - Shared knowledge base (3 1 1)
 - Concern for client welfare (3 1 2)
 - Collective responsibility for professional standards (3 1 3)
 - Norms of initiative (3 1 3 1)
 - Professional judgment (teacher trusting self as a professional) (3 1 4)
- Professionalization/structures (3 2)
 - Induction (3 2 1)
 - Career ladders (3 2 2)
 - Would you ever want to be a principal? (3 2 2 1)
 - Job structure (work day), including "being a teacher" issues (3 2 3)
 - Treatment by district (\$, HR, etc.) (3 2 4)
 - Institutionalization of the program (3 2 5)
- PAR vision (3 3)

Roles (as subject) (4)

- Panel administrator (4 1)
- Coach (4 2)
- Lead Coach (4 3)
- Principal (4 4)
- New teacher (4 5)
- Veteran teacher (4 6)
- Self (4 7)
- Panel (4 8)
 - Panel hearing (4 8 1)
- Quad (4 9)

Union (4 10)
PAR program (4 11)
Superintendent (4 12)
Panel teacher (4 13)
Team of coaches (4 14)
District (4 15)
Gender (4 16)
Age (4 17)

Events/Programs (5)

Start of 2000–2001 school year (5 1)
Contract negotiation of PAR (5 2)
Coach selection (5 3)
BTSA (5 4)
State University (5 9)
Pilot Standards-based Teacher Evaluation System (5 10)

District history: norms, structures, politics (6)

Hiring practices (6 1)
School re-organization (6 2)
Organizational behavior/change (6 3)
 Loose coupling (6 3 1)

Program history/context and politics (7)

Pilot (7 1)

Case studies (8)

Case study 1 (Timothy) (8 1)
Case study 2 (Kim) (8 2)
Case study 3 (Regina) (8 3)
Coach 1 (8 4)
Coach 2 (8 5)
Coach 3 (8 6)

Base codes (9)

Data source (9 1)
 Panel administrator (9 1 1)
 Coaches (9 1 2)
 Principals (9 1 3)
 New teachers (9 1 4)
 Panel meeting (9 1 5)
 Panel hearing (9 1 6)
 Coach Friday meeting (9 1 7)

Quad meeting (9 1 8)
Archival document (9 1 9)
Panel teacher (9 1 10)
Miscellaneous (9 1 11)
Date (9 2)
Winter 97–Spring 98 (9 2 1)
Fall 99–Spr 00 (9 2 2)
Fall 00 (9 2 3)
Winter 01 (9 2 4)
Spring 01 (9 2 5)
Fall 01–Spr 02 (9 2 6)
Spring 04 (9 2 7)

JUICY (10)

Appendix C: Interview Protocols

C1: FALL COACH AND PANEL MEMBER PROTOCOL

Intro

1. Can you tell me a bit about your career history?
2. What's important for me to understand about this district as a place to work? Tell me about teaching in (district). What's it like for teachers here?

PROBE for special positives and negatives.

3. Think for a moment about a teacher you know who in your opinion exemplifies high quality teaching. Can you tell me a bit about him or her? What makes him/her a good teacher?

Now the same question for a principal. What makes a good principal?

Program Specifics

4. Tell me about something that you have enjoyed so far about being a coach/panel member.
5. Tell me about a challenge that you have encountered as a coach/panel member.
6. What did you think about the coach selection process?
7. What has been like working with the other coaches/panel members?
8. What has it been like working with your panel/coach pair?
9. [For coaches only] What has it been like working with your participating teachers?
10. [For coaches only] What has it been like working with principals?
11. What's the difference, if any, between the coach position and a teacher on special assignment?
12. How do you feel that the implementation of this program is going so far in (district)?
13. This year, for a teacher in the PAR program, who is ultimately responsible for their evaluation?

PAR Background

14. What are your goals/your vision for PAR in (district)?
PROBE: How will we know whether PAR in (district) is successful? What will that look like? How will it be measured/can that be measured? How are you defining success?
15. Do you foresee any obstacles to implementing PAR? (in general? specific to district?)
If so, what?
PROBE: District/union relations? Administrators' union? Teachers' concerns?
Finances? District politics?
16. What do you think about teachers evaluating other teachers?

17. What do you think about the teachers' union participating in the evaluation of teachers?
 PROBE: How do you think this might affect labor relations in the district?
18. What type of teacher do you think is drawn toward being a PAR coach?
 PROBE: To what degree, if at all, do you view the coach positions as a lead teacher? What does it mean to be a teacher leader?
19. Fast-forward 2 or 3 years. Best case scenario- the district has a PAR program successfully in place (fill in with some of the descriptors of success they named earlier). (District) is lauded as having a model PAR program for the state. Take a moment to visualize what life for educators in the district looks like. Can you tell me how things are different than they are now?
 PROBE: For teachers? For principals? For recruitment of teachers to the district?
 For retention of new teachers? For teachers performing below standard?
20. Is there anything you wish I had asked that I didn't?

C2: WINTER–SPRING PRINCIPAL PROTOCOL

1. Do you remember when you first learned about PAR? What were the circumstances? What were you told?
2. What was your reaction to PAR when you first learned it would be implemented in (district) this year?
3. How do you feel about the PAR program now?
4. [If there has been a change] What contributed to your change in opinion?
5. Let's say I'm a principal from out of state, and I say to you I've heard you have this PAR program, how would you describe it to me?
6. What (if anything) are the positive effects you are seeing from PAR?
7. If you could have PAR for all your new teachers next year, would you want it?
8. What (if anything) are you seeing that is problematic about PAR?
9. What do you think about teachers evaluating other teachers?
10. This year, for a teacher in the PAR program, who is ultimately responsible for their evaluation?
11. What has it been like working with the PAR coaches?
12. How, if at all, is your relationship with your new teachers in PAR different than your relationship with your other new teachers?
13. How was the decision made about which teachers would be in PAR? Would you do that any differently? How so?
14. Think for a moment about a teacher you know who in your opinion exemplifies high quality teaching. Can you tell me a bit about him or her? What makes him/her a good teacher?
How about the same question, but for principals? What makes a good principal?
15. Fast-forward 2 or 3 years. Best case scenario: the district has a PAR program successfully in place. (District) is lauded as having a model PAR program for the state. Take a moment to visualize what life for educators in the district looks like. Can you tell me how things are different than they are now?
PROBE: For teachers? For principals? For recruitment of teachers to the district? For retention of new teachers? For teachers performing below standard? What will the role of the principal look like?
16. Is there anything you wish I had asked that I didn't?

C3: SPRING PARTICIPATING TEACHER PROTOCOL

1. What has it been like working with (name of coach)? How much time per week do you spend talking with him/her? What types of things do you do together? How valuable is it to you?
2. What has it been like working with (name of principal)? How much time per week do you spend talking with him/her? What types of things do you do together? How valuable is it to you?
3. How is different working with (coach) than (principal)?
4. Who do you talk to when you need help with something? Can you give me an example of a time when you were struggling with something, and what you did?
5.
 - a. Who will formally evaluate your teaching this year?
 - b. [If coach:] Some people think that a mentor should not also evaluate. What do you think? How has that been for you?
 - c. [If principal:] What is (coach's) role in your evaluation, if any?
 - d. Some people think that a mentor should not also evaluate. What do you think? How has that been for you?
6. Some teachers say that all members of a teaching staff should be equals. Others say that there should be ranks of teacher from "beginner" to "master"—similar to the university system of lecturer, assistant, associate, and full professor. How do you feel about that?
7. If you could change something about your experiences as a teacher so far, what would it be?
8. Do you think you will stay in teaching? Why or why not?
9. Is there anything you wish I had asked that I didn't?

C4: SPRING COACH AND PANEL MEMBER PROTOCOL

1. a. I'd like you to reflect on your new role as a [coach/panel member] this year. What aspects of the role have you enjoyed or found rewarding, if any? What aspects of the role have you found particularly challenging or difficult, if any?
- b. If you could, are there any aspects of this role you would change for next year?
2. a. How supported did you feel this year to do your job as a [coach/panel member]?
PROBE: Can you give me an example or two that helps illustrate this?
- b. What, if anything, made your job more difficult this year?
- c. [For panel members:] How do you think the coaches have been supported this year to do their jobs well?/ What, if anything, made the coaches' jobs more difficult?

For Coaches

3. a. What do you see as the benefits for the PTs of the coaching process? The problems? How have your PTs responded to you in your new role this year? In what ways do you think you were able to help PTs improve their practice? Can you give me an example? How receptive would you say your PTs were to your suggestions/efforts? How has this affected your work?
- b. How would you characterize your relationships with the site administrators with whom you have worked this year? How clearly do you feel principals you've worked with understood this program and how it is meant to operate? How has this affected how you've approached your work? How receptive do you feel these principals have been to your role as an "evaluator"? How has this affected your work?
- c. How would you characterize your relationships with panel members this year? How receptive were they to supporting you in your role as coach? In what ways were they able to help you do your work? How did you feel making presentations to the panel?
- d. How have other experienced teachers responded to you in your new role this year? How would you say this affected you, and how you feel about your new role?
- e. How has it been working with the other coaches this year? What are the benefits of PAR for the coaches? The problems? Can you give me an example?

For Panel Teachers

- f. How would you characterize your relationships this year with the coaches? [if request clarification: do you consider yourself colleagues? how so?] In what ways do you think you were able to help coaches improve their practice? Can you give me 2 examples?
- g. How have other experienced teachers responded to you in your new role this year? How would you say this affected you, and how you feel about your new role?
- h. How have site administrators responded to you in your new role this year? How would you say this affected you, and how you feel about your new role? How clearly do you feel the PAR principals have understood this program and how it is

meant to operate? How has this affected the operation of the program this year? How receptive do you feel these principals have been to having a teacher do formal evaluations of other teachers? How has this affected the operation of the program this year?

- i. How has it been working with panel administrators this year? How would you say this affected you, and how you feel about your new role?

For Panel Administrators

- j. In what ways do you think you were able to help coaches improve their practice? Can you give me 2 examples?
- k. How would you characterize your relationships this year with the teachers who have served as panel members and coaches? [if request clarification: do you consider yourself colleagues? how so?]
- l. How clearly do you feel PAR principals have understood this program and how it is meant to operate? How has this affected the operation of the program this year? How receptive do you feel these principals have been to having a teacher do formal evaluations of other teachers? How has this affected the operation of the program this year?

For All

(For 4A-B, have their survey- looking at questions 16-19 (see Appendix D))

4.
 - a. Explain why you most strongly agree with the description in question # [question they marked most favorably of survey questions 16-19]. If I were to change the wording in #18 to specify coach responsibility for standards 1-5 and principal responsibility for standard 6, would that make any difference?
 - b. Which description most closely resembles the PAR program that you have had this year?
 - c. Tell me about a case or example where the panel operated just as you believe it should have. What are the specifics of the example? What made it successful? (IF NECESSARY: Can you give me a second example that involves the panel making a decision in a hearing? What contributed to the good decision?)
 - d. Tell me about an example where you were troubled by the decision making process of the panel, if there is one. What are the specifics of the example? Why were you troubled?
 - e. What kind of evidence is ideal to present to the panel?
 - f. Do panel members have equal voice in their decision-making? Who would you say has the most influence on the decisions? Do you think this is a good thing for the quality (accuracy) of the decisions? If so, why? If not, why not?
 - g. Do coaches and principals have equal voice in the decisions? Who would you say has the most influence on the decisions? Do you think this is a good thing for the quality (accuracy) of the decisions? If so, why? If not, why not?
5.
 - a. How, if at all, has PAR affected teacher accountability in (District) this year? How, if at all, has PAR improved the quality of decisions about employment continuation? Not improved? Can you give me an example (that helps me

- understand what this looks like in practice)? How is it different having a teacher do evaluations compared to a principal?
- b. [For coaches:] How has it been for you to negotiate between your assistance and review roles?
 - c. How, if at all, has PAR affected teaching practice this year in classrooms that have had PAR support? Can you give me an example (that helps me understand what this looks like in practice)?
 - d. How, if at all, has PAR affected teachers and teaching collectively in (District), not just those who are involved in the program? To put it another way, how has PAR affected the quality of schools? Can you give me an example (that helps me understand what this looks like in practice)?
 - e. How has PAR affected administrators' and teachers' views of a professional role for teachers?
 - f. How, if at all, has your involvement with PAR this year affected you professionally? PROBE: development of knowledge and skills? career goals?]
6.
 - a. Is there any part of the program design that you hope to change for next year?
 - b. [For panel:] Is there anything about the coach selection process that you hope to change for next year? How do you feel about the coaches you selected and the job they did this year?
 7. Is there anything you would like to talk about that I didn't ask?

C5: SPRING SUPERINTENDENT PROTOCOL

Teacher Evaluation

1. One of the things I have heard this year is that it is very important to you for principals to be instructional leaders. Can you tell me what that means to you?
2. Within that vision, what ideally would be principals' and teachers' roles in teacher evaluation? Do you believe that ideal can be implemented within the reality of the school district? (Why or why not?)
3. [Only if necessary:] I'm going to show you five statements about teacher and principal involvement in the evaluation of teachers, and I would like you to tell me which if any comes closest to your vision, and why:
 - a. Expert teachers should only be involved in the formative assessment of other teachers (assistance), not their summative personnel evaluations (review).
 - b. Expert teachers should participate in the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, in collaboration with principals.
 - c. Expert teachers should have primary responsibility for standards 1-5 (classroom teaching) in the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, and principals should have primary responsibility for standard 6 (out of classroom performance).
 - d. Expert teachers should have primary responsibility for the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, with limited principal involvement.
 - e. Expert teachers should have sole responsibility for the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, with no principal involvement.
4. What responsibility do teachers have for guarding professional standards, if any? What should their role be?

PAR

5. Do you remember when you first learned about PAR? What were you told? What was your reaction at that time?
6. How do you feel about PAR now?
7. (if there has been a change) What contributed to your change in opinion?
8. You have come to PAR panel meetings a couple of times. What did you think about what you saw?
9. Let's say I'm a superintendent from another district, and I say to you, I hear you have PAR in (District). How does it work? What is it?... How would you respond? How would you describe PAR?
10. AB 1X specifies that both the district and the teacher union must sign off on the PAR program. How if at all does this affect union-district relations?
11. Since the PAR program brings a lot of money to the district, some might argue that the legislation creates a leveraging point for the teacher union. How if at all does PAR affect the power dynamics between the union and the district?

C6: SPRING 2002 FOLLOW-UP PROTOCOL

FOR COACHES

I know there must be many changes and developments in the program this year. Contrasting the PAR program this year with last year, what are the significant changes, the large categories that you see? In order to keep to our time limit, I can then choose which ones I want to ask you about.

Improvements or Disappointments

1. a. Contrast your role as a coach this year with last year. Has anything changed? How, if at all, is your attitude about conducting evaluations different this year? The way you negotiate between your assistance and review roles?
- b. Last year I gave you a range of statements about coach and principal involvement in the evaluation of PTs, from coaches only being involved in formative assessment to coaches having sole responsibility for summative assessment. This year, I'd like you in your own words to give me a statement describing how responsibility for the evaluation of PTs was distributed or shared between coaches and principals. [How is that different from last year?]
- c. Who was ultimately responsible this year for the formal evaluation of a teacher in PAR?
2. Contrast your relationships with principals this year with last year. Has anything changed?
 PROBE: principals' understanding of program? their receptiveness to the coach role?
3. Contrast your relationships with panel members this year with last year. Has anything changed?
 PROBE: your presentations to the panel?
4. Contrast the impact on teaching and learning that the program had this year with last. Has anything changed?
 PROBE: use of standards? teacher accountability?
5. How, if at all, has your involvement with PAR affected you professionally (your career goals)?
6. Contrast your relationships with PTs this year with last year. Has anything changed? Examples of success/less than success?
7. Is there anything you would like to talk about that I didn't ask?

FOR PANEL MEMBERS

I know there must be many changes and developments in the program this year. Contrasting the PAR program this year with last year, what are the significant changes, the large categories That you see? In order to keep to our time limit, I can then choose which ones I want to ask you about.

Improvements or Disappointments

1. a. Contrast your role as a panel member this year with last year. Has anything changed? How, if at all, is your attitude about coaches conducting evaluations different this year?
 - b. Last year I gave you a range of statements about coach and principal involvement in the evaluation of PTs, from coaches only being involved in formative assessment to coaches having sole responsibility for summative assessment. This year, I'd like you in your own words to give me a statement describing how responsibility for the evaluation of PTs was distributed or shared between coaches and principals. [How is that different from last year
 - c. Who was ultimately responsible this year for the formal evaluation of a teacher in PAR?
2. Contrast the relationships between coaches and principals this year with last year. Has anything changed in how they work together?

PROBE: principals' understanding of program? their receptiveness to the coach role?
3. Contrast your relationships with coaches this year with last year. Has anything changed?

PROBE: coach presentations to the panel?
4. Contrast the impact on teaching and learning that the program had this year with last? Has anything changed?

PROBE: use of standards? teacher accountability?
5. How, if at all, has your involvement with PAR affected you professionally (your career goals)?
6. Contrast the relationships between coaches and PTs this year with last year. Has anything changed in how they work together? Examples of success/less than success?
7. Is there anything you would like to talk about that I didn't ask?

Appendix D: Survey Instruments

D1: PEER ASSISTANCE AND REVIEW (PAR) SURVEY FOR COACHES, PANEL MEMBERS, AND PRINCIPALS

The information provided through this survey is strictly confidential. This information will not contribute to an evaluation of ANY individuals, including yourself.

Section 1: Please fill in the blanks.

1. How many years of classroom teaching do you have? _____
2. Of those years *teaching*, how many have been in this District? _____
3. How many years of service to this District do you have total? _____
4. In what positions have you served in this District other than classroom teacher (if any)?

5. In which schools in this District have you worked? _____
6. In what professional role do you hope to serve in 5 years? _____
10 years? _____
7. (optional) How do you identify yourself ethnically? _____
What is your gender? male _____ female _____

Section 2: Please circle your response.

8. I feel knowledgeable about the PAR program in this District.	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
9. I would like more information about the PAR program in this District.	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10. What was your reaction to PAR when you first learned it would be implemented in the District this year?	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Uncertain	Somewhat opposed	Very opposed
11. How do you feel about the PAR program now?	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Uncertain	Somewhat opposed	Very opposed
12. If your answers to questions 10 and 11 are different, what contributed to the change? (If there has been NO change in your opinion, you may skip to Section 3.)					
•attending a PAR panel hearing		Large effect		Small effect	No effect
•working with a PAR Coach		Large effect		Small effect	No effect
•talking to a participating teacher		Large effect		Small effect	No effect
•talking to a principal		Large effect		Small effect	No effect
•talking to a panel member		Large effect		Small effect	No effect
•reading about PAR in other districts		Large effect		Small effect	No effect
•other (please specify) _____		Large effect		Small effect	No effect

Section 3: Please make a check in the box for your response.

	Strongly Agree (S)	Agree (A)	Uncertain (U)	Disagree (D)	Strongly Disagree (SD)
13. At this time, teaching is a profession.					
14. At this time, teachers are professionals.					
15. PAR makes teaching in this district a more attractive career choice.					
16. Expert teachers should only be involved in the formative assessment of other teachers, not their summative personnel evaluations.					
17. Expert teachers should participate in the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, in collaboration with principals.					
18. Expert teachers should have primary responsibility for the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, with limited principal involvement.					
19. Expert teachers should have sole responsibility for the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, with no principal involvement.					
20. Whose role should it be to set performance standards for teaching?	SA	A	U	D	SD
• district administrators					
• site administrators					
• teachers					
• the teachers' union					
• universities					
• the community					
• the state					
• other _____					

21. Whose role should it be to assess whether those teaching standards are being met?	SA	A	U	D	SD
	• district administrators				
	• site administrators				
	• teachers				
	• the teachers' union				
	• the community				
	• universities				
	• the state				
• other_____					
22. Whose role should it be to assist teachers to improve their teaching?	SA	A	U	D	SD
	• district administrators				
	• site administrators				
	• other teachers				
	• the teachers' union				
	• universities				
	• education consultants or other non-district educational organizations				
	• other_____				
23. Whose role should it be to remove those teachers not meeting standards from the classroom?	SA	A	U	D	SD
	• district administrators				
	• site administrators				
	• teachers				
	• the teachers' union				
	• the community				
	• the state				
	• other_____				

24. A profession is defined in part by...	SA	A	U	D	SD
• salary					
• prestige					
• responsibility for professional standards					
• freedom in defining one's day-to-day tasks					
• expertise					
• a focus on serving the well-being of one's "clients"					
• other (please specify) _____					
25. PAR contributes generally to a more collaborative relationship between teachers and administrators.	SA	A	U	D	SD

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

Section 4: Please make a check in the box for your response.

	Very positive effect	Some positive effect	No effect	Some negative effect	Very negative effect
26. Rate PAR's effect on each item below.					
• the quality of teaching by teachers served by a PAR coach					
• student learning in classrooms directly served by a PAR coach					
• student learning in classrooms NOT directly served by a PAR coach					
• job satisfaction among new teachers served by a PAR coach					
• teaching quality among veteran teachers					
• building the teaching expertise of new teachers served by a PAR coach					
• building the teaching expertise of the PAR coaches					
• teacher professionalism in the district					
• recruitment of teachers to the district					
• educational equity					
• public confidence in the education provided by the District					
• mentoring of teachers in the District					
• teacher evaluation in the District					
• use of teaching standards in the District					
• relations between the teachers' union and the District					
• principals' ability to do their jobs well					

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

Section 5: The following questions are for ADMINISTRATOR members of the PAR Panel.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Uncertain	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
27. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of CREDENTIALLED teachers.					
28. Coaches' time working with credentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
29. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of UNCREDENTIALLED teachers.					
30. Coaches' time working with uncredentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
31. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of VETERAN teachers.					
32. Coaches' time working with veteran teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
33. In my interactions with the teacher members of the panel, I treat them more as colleagues (equals) than as subordinates.					
34. In my interactions with the lead coach, I treat the lead coach more as a colleague than as a subordinate.					
35. In my interactions with the coaches in my quad, I treat them more as colleagues than as subordinates.					

36. I think Coaches could benefit from the following professional development:

37. I think the PAR panel could benefit from the following professional development:

38. I think principals could benefit from the following professional development:

YOU ARE DONE. THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

Section 5: The following questions are for TEACHER members of the PAR Panel.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Uncertain	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
27. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of CREDENTIALLED teachers.					
28. Coaches' time working with credentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
29. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of UNCREDENTIALLED teachers.					
30. Coaches' time working with uncredentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
31. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of VETERAN teachers.					
32. Coaches' time working with veteran teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
33. In my interactions with the administrator members of the panel, I am treated more as a colleague (an equal) than as a subordinate.					
34. In my interactions with the lead coach, I treat the lead coach more as a colleague than as a subordinate.					
35. In my interactions with the coaches in my quad, I treat them more as colleagues than as subordinates.					

36. I think Coaches could benefit from the following professional development:

37. I think the PAR panel could benefit from the following professional development:

38. I think principals could benefit from the following professional development:

YOU ARE DONE. THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

Section 5: The following questions are for COACHES.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Uncertain	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
27. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of CREDENTIALLED teachers.					
28. Coaches' time working with credentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
29. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of UNCREDENTIALLED teachers.					
30. Coaches' time working with uncredentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
31. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of VETERAN teachers.					
32. Coaches' time working with veteran teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
33. In my interactions with ADMINISTRATORS on the panel, I am treated more as a colleague (an equal) than as a subordinate.					
34. In my interactions with TEACHERS on the panel, I am treated more as a colleague than as a subordinate.					
35. In my interactions with the lead coach, I am treated more as a colleague than as a subordinate. (Do not answer if you are the lead coach!)					
36. In general, when I was a classroom teacher principals treated me as more of a colleague (an equal) than a subordinate.					
37. In general, principals treat me as more of a colleague now than they did when I was a classroom teacher.					

38. In my interactions with the individual principals with whom I currently work, I am treated more as a colleague than as a subordinate. (Please answer this question separately for the number of principals with whom you work, putting them in any order.)	SA	A	U	D	SD
with principal 1					
with principal 2					
with principal 3					
with principal 4					
with principal 5					
39. My work as a PAR coach has given me a greater appreciation for the challenges inherent to teacher evaluation.					
40. My participation with PAR has given me a greater appreciation for the challenges inherent to the principalship.					
41. I think Coaches could benefit from the following professional development:					

42. I think the PAR panel could benefit from the following professional development:

43. I think principals could benefit from the following professional development:

YOU ARE DONE. THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

Section 5: The following questions are for PRINCIPALS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Uncertain	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
27. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of CREDENTIALLED teachers.					
28. Coaches' time working with credentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
29. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of UNCREDENTIALLED teachers.					
30. Coaches' time working with uncredentialed teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
31. PAR has helped to improve the teaching of VETERAN teachers.					
32. Coaches' time working with veteran teachers is a good use of PAR resources.					
33. If I could have PAR available at my school site next year for all of my beginning teachers, I would want it.					
34. PAR has improved the quality of teacher evaluations at my site this year.					
35. PAR has increased the focus on performance standards for teaching at my site this year.					
36. I could name all the members of the PAR panel.					
37. I could name the members of the PAR panel who are administrators.					
38. In my interactions with the PAR panel, I am treated as a colleague (an equal).					

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

39. In my interactions with the individual PAR coaches with whom I currently work, I treat them more as colleagues (equals) than as subordinates. (Please answer this question separately for the number of coaches with whom you work, putting them in any order.)	SA	A	U	D	SD
with Coach 1					
with Coach 2					
with Coach 3					
with Coach 4					
40. I could name the PAR coaches who work at my site.					
41. I could name the school(s) in which my PAR coach(es) taught last year.					
42. I think Coaches could benefit from the following professional development:					

43. I think the PAR panel could benefit from the following professional development:

44. I think principals could benefit from the following professional development:

YOU ARE DONE. THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

**D2: PEER ASSISTANCE AND REVIEW (PAR) SURVEY
FOR PARTICIPATING TEACHERS, SPRING 2001**

The information provided through this survey is strictly confidential. This information will not contribute to an evaluation of ANY individuals, including yourself.

Section 1: Please fill in the blanks.

1. How many years of classroom teaching do you have (including 2000-2001)? _____
2. Of those years *teaching*, how many have been in this District? _____
3. How many years of service to this District do you have total? _____
4. In what positions have you served in this District other than classroom teacher (if any)?

5. In which schools in this District have you worked?

6. In what professional role do you hope to serve in 5 years? _____
10 years? _____
7. (optional) How do you identify yourself ethnically? _____
What is your gender? male _____ female _____
8. What is your teaching credential status? (Please check one.)
Pre-intern (emergency, may have passed CBEST) _____
Intern (passed CBEST and MSAT or PRAXIS) _____
Preliminary _____
Clear _____

Section 2: Please make a check in the box for your response.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. I intend to return to my school in 2001-2002.					
9. I intend to return to this District in 2001-2002.					
10. I intend to remain in teaching in 2001-2002.					
11. I expect that I will still be teaching in 5 years.					
12. I expect that I will still be in the field of education in 5 years.					

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

Section 3: Please make a check in the box for your response.

	Strongly Agree (SA)	Agree (A)	Uncertain (U)	Disagree (D)	Strongly Disagree (SD)
13. At this time, teaching is a profession.					
14. At this time, teachers are professionals.					
15. PAR makes teaching in this district a more attractive career choice.					
16. Expert teachers should only be involved in the formative assessment (assistance) of other teachers, not their summative personnel evaluations (review).					
17. Expert teachers should participate in the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, in collaboration with principals.					
18. Expert teachers should have primary responsibility for the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, with limited principal involvement.					
19. Expert teachers should have sole responsibility for the summative personnel evaluations of teachers in PAR, with no principal involvement.					
20. Whose role should it be to set performance standards for teaching?	SA	A	U	D	SD
• district administrators					
• site administrators					
• teachers					
• the teachers' union					
• universities					
• the community					
• the state					
• other _____					

21. Whose role should it be to assess whether those teaching standards are being met?	SA	A	U	D	SD
	• district administrators				
	• site administrators				
	• teachers				
	• the teachers' union				
	• the community				
	• universities				
	• the state				
• other_____					
22. Whose role should it be to assist teachers to improve their teaching?	SA	A	U	D	SD
	• district administrators				
	• site administrators				
	• other teachers				
	• the teachers' union				
	• universities				
	• education consultants or other non-district educational organizations				
	• other_____				
23. Whose role should it be to remove those teachers not meeting standards from the classroom?	SA	A	U	D	SD
	• district administrators				
	• site administrators				
	• teachers				
	• the teachers' union				
	• the community				
	• the state				
	• other_____				

24. A profession is defined in part by...	SA	A	U	D	SD
• salary					
• prestige					
• responsibility for professional standards					
• freedom in defining one's day-to-day tasks					
• expertise					
• a focus on serving the well-being of one's "clients"					
• other (please specify) _____					
25. I feel knowledgeable about the PAR program in this District.					
26. I was informed about the PAR process and its components of assistance and review (evaluation).					
27. I would like more information about the PAR program in this District.					

Section 4: Please make a check in the box for your response.

28. The person/people <i>primarily</i> responsible for my personnel evaluation this year is/are (mark only one option):	
• my PAR Coach	
• my principal	
• the PAR panel	
• my PAR Coach and my principal	
• my PAR Coach and the PAR panel	
• my principal and the PAR panel	
• my PAR Coach, my principal, and the PAR panel	

29. The PAR program has helped me...	SA	A	U	D	SD
a. improve my classroom management.					
b. improve my classroom environment.					
c. improve my ability to write lesson plans.					
d. improve my long-range planning.					
e. increase my repertoire of teaching strategies.					
f. become familiar with District performance standards for teaching.					
g. become familiar with District content standards for my grade or subject area.					
h. utilize student assessments to guide instruction.					
i. increase my attention to equity and diversity.					
j. utilize effective teaching strategies to work with students who have different skills and strengths.					
k. understand the way my school and administration work.					
l. utilize the resources at my school site.					
m. network with additional resources and programs beyond my school site.					
n. handle job-related stress.					
o. decide whether to remain in teaching.					
p. improve my overall teaching quality.					

30. If I were struggling with the following issues, I would <i>initially</i> seek assistance from (check only one of the three options):	My PAR Coach	My principal or A.P.	Other (please specify if possible)
• classroom management			
• subject/content areas			
• lesson planning			
• working with a challenging student			
• balancing work and personal life			
• getting materials/ resources			
• communicating with students' families			
• working with colleagues			
• credentialing information			
• career decisions			
31. PAR Program commendtions:			

32. PAR Program recommendations:

33. Other comments:

YOU ARE DONE. THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

**D3: PEER ASSISTANCE AND REVIEW (PAR) SURVEY
FOR PARTICIPATING TEACHERS, SPRING 2002**

1. My gender:	(A) Male (B) Female
2. My ethnicity:	(2-A) African-American (3-A) Latino (2-B) Chinese (3-B) Native American • For question 2, use answer (2-C) Filipino (3-C) Other Non-White sheet questions 2 and 3; (2-D) Japanese (3-D) Other White please mark only one. (2-E) Korean (3-E) Decline to State
4. This is my ___ year of teaching.	(A) first (B) second (C) third (D) fourth (E) fifth +
5. My current teaching assignment:	(A) K-3 (B) 4-5 (C) 6-8 (D) 9-12 (E) Other
For Middle and High school teachers (Elementary teachers please skip to question 7):	
6. My content area(s) is/ are:	(A) English (B) Foreign Languages (C) Mathematics (D) Science (E) Social Studies
7. I provide instruction to English Language Learner (ELL) students.	(A) Yes (B) No
8. I am a Special Education teacher.	(A) Yes (B) No
9. My teaching credential/certificate:	(A) Pre-Intern Certificate (B) Intern Credential (C) Preliminary/Clear Credential (D) Emergency Permit/Waiver (E) Another Credential
If you hold an Emergency permit or waiver (if not, please skip to question 11):	
10. Have you met the subject matter requirements for the credential you are pursuing?	(A) Yes (B) No
11. My contract type:	(A) Temporary (B) Probationary (C) Emergency
12. This year I began teaching in:	(A) August (B) September (C) October-November (D) December-January (E) February-March
13. This year I began working with my PAR coach in:	(A) August (B) September (C) October-November (D) December-January (E) February-March
14. I attended [a summer orientation institute sponsored by the district]:	(Yes) (No)
15. I communicated with my PAR coach:	(A) more than once per week (B) once per week (C) every other week (D) once per month (E) less than once per month
16. I felt evaluated by my PAR coach:	(A) in all of our communications (B) often (C) occasionally (D) only during my formal observation cycles (E) never

Please answer questions 16-55 using the following rating scale to tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements:

(A) Strongly Agree (B) Agree (C) Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (E) Do Not Know

16. I intend to return to my school in 2002-2003.
17. I intend to return to this District in 2002-2003.
18. I intend to move to another District in [this region] in 2002-2003.
19. I intend to move to another District outside of [this region] in 2002-2003.
20. I expect that I will still be teaching in 5 years.

(A) Strongly Agree (B) Agree (C) Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (E) Do Not Know

21. I expect that I will still be in the field of education in 5 years.
22. I feel able to speak openly and honestly with my coach.
23. My coach supports me to take risks and try new instructional strategies.
23. Expert teachers should only be involved in the mentorship and support of other teachers, not their evaluations.
24. Expert teachers should have primary responsibility for the evaluations of teachers in PAR, in collaboration with principals.
25. Expert teachers should have sole responsibility for the evaluations of teachers in PAR, with no principal involvement.
26. I was informed about the PAR process and its components of assistance and review (evaluation) at the beginning of my PAR participation.
27. The PAR program has helped me improve my classroom management.
28. The PAR program has helped me improve my classroom environment.
29. The PAR program has helped me improve my ability to write lesson plans.
30. The PAR program has helped me improve my long-range planning.
31. The PAR program has helped me increase my repertoire of teaching strategies.
32. The PAR program has helped me become familiar with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.
33. The PAR program has helped me become familiar with District Curriculum Content and Performance Standards for my grade or subject area.
34. The PAR program has helped me utilize student assessments to guide instruction.
35. The PAR program has helped me increase my attention to equity and diversity.
36. The PAR program has helped me utilize effective teaching strategies to work with students who have different skills and strengths.
37. The PAR program has helped me utilize effective teaching strategies to work with ELL students.
38. The PAR program has helped me utilize effective teaching strategies to work with Special Education and GATE students.
39. The PAR program has helped me understand the way my school and administration work.
40. The PAR program has helped me utilize the resources at my school site.
41. The PAR program has helped me network with additional resources and programs beyond my school site.
42. The PAR program has helped me handle job-related stress.
43. The PAR program has helped me decide whether to remain in teaching.
44. The PAR program has helped me improve my overall teaching quality.
45. The PAR program has helped me work successfully with families and the community.
46. The PAR program has helped me use computer technology to support student learning.
47. PAR makes teaching in this district a more attractive career choice.
48. I sometimes don't share my thoughts and feelings with my PAR Coach because he/she is also my evaluator.
49. I am sometimes reluctant to try out new teaching strategies when my PAR Coach is observing me.
50. I feel supported by my PAR Coach.
51. The requirements and expectations for PAR participation were clear.
52. The Essential Elements on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession were clear.
53. How my PAR Coach would use the Essential Elements in my evaluation were clear.
54. The "Meets Standards" requirement for renewing my contract with [the District] was clear.
55. The role of the ILP (Individual Learning Plan) in focusing my professional goals and growth was clear.

PAR Program commendations:

PAR Program recommendations:

Other comments:

Appendix E: Year 1 Survey Results

**Table E1: Year 1 Ratings of PAR Effectiveness by Panel Members ($N = 9$),
Coaches ($N = 10$), and Principals ($N = 16^*$)**

5-Point Likert Scale, 1=Very Negative Effect and 5=Very Positive Effect

Rate PAR's effect on each item below:	<i>n</i>	mean	SD
The quality of teaching by teachers served by a PAR coach	33	4.58	.56
Student learning in classrooms directly served by a PAR coach	32	4.34	.55
Student learning in classrooms NOT directly served by a PAR coach	28	3.54	.58
Job satisfaction among new teachers served by a PAR coach	31	4.26	.89
Teaching quality among veteran teachers	30	3.83	.87
Building the teaching expertise of new teachers served by a PAR coach	31	4.74	.51
Building the teaching expertise of the PAR coaches	32	4.66	.55
Teacher professionalism in the district	32	4.53	.62
Mentoring of teachers in the District	32	4.63	.55
Teacher evaluation in the District	34	4.60	.70
Use of teaching standards in the District	34	4.60	.63
Relations between the teachers' union and the District	32	4.44	.72
Principals' ability to do their jobs well	34	4.41	.56
Educational equity	27	4.04	.76
Public confidence in the education provided by the District	29	4.07	.75
Recruitment of teachers to the district	24	3.69	.69

* One principal was also a panel member, so the total N is 34.
Methodological Appendixes supplement to *Peer Review and Teacher Leadership*

Table E2: Year 1 Ratings of PAR Effectiveness by Participating Teachers (*N* = 57)

5-Point Likert Scale, 1=Strongly Disagree and 5=Strongly Agree

The PAR program has helped me...	<i>n</i>	mean	SD
improve my classroom management.	57	3.95	1.11
improve my classroom environment.	57	3.93	1.03
improve my ability to write lesson plans.	56	3.48	1.16
improve my long-range planning.	56	4.04	1.03
increase my repertoire of teaching strategies.	57	4.23	.89
become familiar with District performance standards for teaching.	57	4.19	.91
become familiar with District content standards for my grade or subject area.	57	3.79	1.22
utilize student assessments to guide instruction.	57	3.36	1.14
increase my attention to equity and diversity.	57	3.37	1.03
utilize effective teaching strategies to work with students who have different skills and strengths.	57	4.05	.89
understand the way my school and administration work.	56	3.30	1.13
utilize the resources at my school site.	57	3.47	1.14
network with additional resources and programs beyond my school site.	56	3.96	1.00
handle job-related stress.	56	3.75	1.19
decide whether to remain in teaching.	53	3.22	1.23
improve my overall teaching quality.	57	4.21	0.98

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the publisher.

TEACHERS COLLEGE PRESS

Teachers College, Columbia University
1234 Amsterdam Ave, New York, NY 10027
800.575.6566 • www.tcpress.com