

RESEARCH AREA & SOURCE	DESCRIPTION & MAIN FINDINGS/ARGUMENTS
<p>Teacher Quality / Action Research</p> <p><i>Paper presented at the 2006 AREA conference.</i></p>	<p>O'Connor, K., Greene, H. & Anderson, P. (2006) <i>Action Research: A Tool for Improving Teacher Quality and Classroom Practice.</i> A study done with graduate students who were supported in engaging in action research projects in their classrooms.</p> <p>Main Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participants overwhelmingly found analyzing the data to be the most difficult aspect of engaging in action research ● Engaging in action research was reported by participants as having a positive impact on the teaching and learning process for both teachers and students, though the direct impact on student learning was reported by participants to be less than the impact on teaching. Researchers believe this is because much of the impact on teaching was reported by participants as being things they felt they could improve for the future. ● The participants overwhelmingly felt that participating in action research and built their confidence and empowered them as teachers, by increasing the amount of regular reflection they engaged in. Reflection helped them understand why students performed better and thus enabled them to make systematic improvements in their teaching. ● Such empowerment allows teachers to implement programs that are best for individual students.
<p>Teaching Strategies / Educational Change / Assessment</p>	<p>Hayes, D., Mills, M., Christie, P. and Lingard, B. (2006) <i>Teachers and Schooling Making a Difference: Productive pedagogies, assessment and performance. Crows Nest : Allen & Unwin</i></p> <p>This is a book written using the results of the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (2001), which launched the New Basic program in Queensland. The study began by observing classrooms attempting to determine the pedagogical and assessment practices which correlated with student achievement, then moved on to attempt to determine the school structural characteristics which supported those pedagogies. They distilled 20 elements of what they termed productive pedagogy and grouped them into four dimensions. Some of the major findings as reported in the book are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pedagogy and assessment do make a difference to student achievement, especially for disadvantages students ● The intellectual quality of classroom activities correlated strongly with student academic achievement ● Supportive classroom pedagogies also correlated strongly with student academic achievement ● Connectedness to the world correlated with students academic achievement but not as strongly as intellectual quality or supportive classroom pedagogies ● There was no correlation between valuing difference and academic achievement but this did correlate with significant positive social outcomes. ● A crowded curriculum reduces the latitude for teaching for depth of understanding ● What the study termed as productive pedagogies, assessments and performances were not widely found to be in practice in classrooms ● There was a widespread absence in classrooms of expectations for students to understand other cultural knowledges. ● There was a large disconnect between what teachers reported as their goals for their students' education on surveys and the practices that took place in their classrooms both in pedagogy and assessment ● Students who received intellectually challenging tasks mediated by supportive classroom pedagogies are more likely to remain engaged in learning ● The structural aspects which supported productive pedagogy and assessment were: valuing of teachers and their knowledge and ongoing learning, dispersed leadership across the school, a culture of linking teachers' ongoing learning to the enhancement of student learning, a culture or professional dialog and pedagogically focused leadership.

	<p>The four dimensions and 20 elements of productive pedagogy were: <u>Intellectual Quality</u> - problematic knowledge, higher-order thinking, depth of student understanding, substantive conversation, metalanguage <u>Connectedness</u> – connectedness to the world beyond the classroom, knowledge integration, background knowledge, problem-based curriculum <u>Supportive Classroom Environment</u> – student direction, explicit quality performance criteria, social support, academic engagement, student self-regulation <u>Working with and Valuing Difference</u> – cultural knowledges, active citizenship, narrative, group identities in learning communities, representation</p>
<p>Educational Change <i>International Journal of Science Education</i> 28, 919 – 944.</p>	<p>Waters-Adams, S. (2006) The Relationship between Understanding of the Nature of Science and Practice: The influence of teachers’ beliefs about education, teaching and learning. Case studies of 4 teachers using action research as a vehicle to expose the dialectical relationship between teacher’s beliefs about education, understanding of the subject of science and classroom practice.</p> <p>Main Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All four teachers in the study espoused a hypothetico-deductive approach to science teaching, but this was not evident in their practice, which emphasized the transmission of received knowledge ● The author posits the existence of a tacit understanding in addition to the teachers’ espoused understanding as he says that situational factors external to the teacher do not account for the disconnect.. ● By the end of the study 3 out of 4 teachers had come to a position where their espoused beliefs were much more closely aligned with their teaching practice. ● The teachers began to have confidence in their teaching only when it accorded with their deeply held beliefs about the purpose of education and so were much more confident at the end of the study (931). ● The change from tacit understandings driving teaching to espoused understandings driving practice came about through teachers appraising their espoused beliefs and exploring the implications in practice (933). ● Teacher’s general beliefs remained constant - their understanding of how those beliefs might appear in practice changed.
<p>Instructional Supervision <i>Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education</i> Vol. 20, pp. 85 - 110</p>	<p>Ovando, M. & Ramirez, A. (2007) Principal’s instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students’ academic success. The study used open-ended interviews to determine the actions that principals in successful schools took within the teacher appraisal system in place in a Texas School District.</p> <p>Main Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Three views of teacher evaluation have and continue to prevail in schools: past: evaluation focuses on rating teachers on the basis of style or trait criteria. Present: evaluation focuses on analyzing teaching on the basis of accepted practices. Future: evaluation focuses on analyzing teaching on the basis of what students and teachers learn. ● Three common appraisal practices were found in the successful schools: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Principals set clear expectations regarding how the appraisal system would work and what was expected of teachers. 2. Walk-throughs (unannounced classroom visits) were used regularly to monitor instruction. Some kind of written feedback was given as a result of these visits. 3. Performance evaluation was explicitly connected to staff development.

<p>Instructional Supervision / Action Research</p> <p><i>NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 89, No. 643, pp. 17 - 27</i></p>	<p>Glanz, J. (2007) Action Research as Instructional Supervision: Suggestions for Principals.</p> <p>This paper examines two case studies of action research being used by principals as an instructional supervision strategy and then makes some recommendations for principal's wishing to implement AR .</p> <p>Main Arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principals, as instructional leaders, are first and foremost responsible for promoting best teaching practices. • The field of supervision has moved towards more collaborative, participatory and reflective methods. • Action research can be used to help principals and teachers discover which pedagogical practices are most effective in raising achievement levels for particular classes or students in a given school. • Both case studies used demonstrate that action research can be used to engage teachers in reflection that leads to improved instructional practices.
<p>Instructional Supervision</p> <p><i>Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Chicago, April 13, 2007.</i></p>	<p>Glanz, J., Shulman, V. & Sullivan, S. (2007) Impact of instructional supervision on student achievement: Can we make the connection?</p> <p>This paper is the third in a series examining instructional supervision in New York City public schools. The paper looks at the connection between instructional supervision practices and student achievement using a single school as a case study. The school was chosen as an example of a school with successful instructional supervision practices.</p> <p>Main Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview data revealed that the school administration believed the following factors were critical to improved student achievement: <i>1. Building a collaborative and collegial culture; 2. Building teacher supports; 3. Building capacity (teachers are responsible for PD and mentoring colleagues); 4. Administrators as instructional leaders; 5. The use of student information to support classroom instruction.</i> • Administrators at the school spend a good part of their day in classrooms and in informal meetings with teachers. • Over the two years since the new building principal was hired the number of students in the school eligible for free or reduced lunch rose from 73.1% to 93.7% and the number of students with limited proficiency in English rose from 173 to 268 out of 755. At the same time average standardized test scores rose from 69.6 to 80.9 in English and from 73.4 to 88.2 in Math, with the number of students falling below standards on both areas decreasing over the same period. • Though the connection between achievement and supervision is correlative rather than necessarily causal, the researchers claim that supervision that is critical for enhancing teacher growth in this way is also clearly central in promoting student achievement. • The researchers link the practices in the school to a model described by Gordon (1997): <i>1. A collegial rather than a hierarchical relationship between teachers and formally designated supervisors; 2. Supervision as the province of teachers as well as formally designated supervisors; 3. A focus on teacher growth rather than teacher compliance; 4. Facilitation of teachers collaborating with each other in instructional improvement efforts; 5. Teacher involvement in ongoing reflective inquiry.</i>
<p>Instructional Supervision / Action Research</p> <p><i>Journal of</i></p>	<p>Marzano, R. (2007) Using action research and local models of instruction to enhance teaching.</p> <p>This article outlines a model of instructional supervision which aims to improve teaching practices by creating a school-based 'model of instruction', and collecting data about teacher success with the model.</p> <p>Main Arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools should define a set of instructional strategies that are effective in their particular contexts using action research.

Instructional Supervision Articles

<p><i>Personnel Evaluation in Education</i> Vol. 20, pp. 117 - 128</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once the instructional model is defined it should be used initially as a basis for discussing effective teaching. • Teachers should then be given opportunities to observe master teachers (teachers who consistently produce learning in their classrooms) implementing the strategies. • Data should be collected (self-report and observation) on teachers' use of the instructional model and on its effects on student learning and engagement. • The data should be used by teachers and supervisors to set individual teacher goals that are aimed at improving student learning.
<p>Teacher Quality / Instructional Supervision / Teaching Strategies</p> <p><i>Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education</i>, Vol. 20, pp. 165 - 184</p>	<p>Stronge, J., Ward, T., Tucker, P., Hindman, J. (2007) What is the relationship between teacher quality and student achievement? An exploratory study.</p> <p>This study identified the top and bottom quartiles of teachers in terms of effectiveness in promoting student learning (while controlling for factors such as gender, previous achievement, socio-economic background etc.) and then conducted in-depth case studies of teachers within each of the two categories (most effective and least effective teachers) to see which instructional strategies were most useful in promoting student learning.</p> <p>Main Findings:</p> <p>Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective teachers provided more complex instruction with a greater emphasis on meaning than memorization. • Effective teachers demonstrated a broader range of instructional strategies, using a variety of materials and media to support the curriculum. <p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective teachers provided more differentiated assignments <p>Learning Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective teachers were more organized, with efficient routines and procedures for daily tasks. • Behavioral expectations for students were higher in the classrooms of effective teachers <p>Personal Qualities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effective teachers showed a higher degree of respect for and fairness toward students <p>Teacher Questioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective teachers asked seven times as many higher-level questions as ineffective teachers, though the number of lower-level questions did not vary between the two groups. <p>Student Off-Task Behavior</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective teachers had incidences of disruptive behavior about once every two hours whereas ineffective teachers had a disruptive event approximately every 12 minutes. <p>Results can be summarized around three distinct differences: (1) Differentiation and complexity of instructional strategies; (2) questioning strategies and; (3) level of disruptive student behavior.</p>
<p>Instructional Supervision</p> <p><i>ED 480 159</i></p>	<p>Goldrick, L. (2002) Improving teacher evaluation to improve teaching quality. Issue brief.</p> <p>The author proposes a number of steps that can be taken to ensure teacher evaluation is used to improve teaching quality. A rationale for each step is provided along with a description of what is happening in various US states with respect to that particular suggested step.</p>

<p><i>National Governor's Association. Center for Best Practices.</i></p>	<p>Main Arguments: The steps are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Define teaching quality - using standards that describe what a quality teacher needs to know and be able to do.2. Focus evaluation policy on improving teacher practice3. Incorporate student learning into teacher evaluation4. Create professional accountability - perhaps using career ladders or professional classifications that result from evaluation.5. Train evaluators6. Broaden participation in evaluation design - to ensure acceptance by all involved. <p>The author claims that fully realized, such an approach would enable reforms such as pay-for performance.</p>
---	---