

12-2016

A Study of Theatre Teacher and School Administrator Perceptions of Traits, Characteristics, and Instructional Practices and Their Possible Role in Teacher Evaluation

James D. Chrismon
Gardner-Webb University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/education_etd



Part of the [Art Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chrismon, James D., "A Study of Theatre Teacher and School Administrator Perceptions of Traits, Characteristics, and Instructional Practices and Their Possible Role in Teacher Evaluation" (2016). *Education Dissertations and Projects*. 164.
https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/education_etd/164

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons @ Gardner-Webb University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Dissertations and Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Gardner-Webb University. For more information, please see [Copyright and Publishing Info](#).

A Study of Theatre Teacher and School Administrator Perceptions of Traits,
Characteristics, and Instructional Practices and Their Possible Role in Teacher Evaluation

By
James D. Chrismon

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Gardner-Webb University School of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Gardner-Webb University
2016

Approval Page

This dissertation was submitted by James D. Chrismon under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Gardner-Webb University School of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Gardner-Webb University.

Steven Bingham Ed.D.
Committee Chair

Date

Harriet Jaworowski, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Date

Christopher Nelson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Date

Jeffrey Rogers, Ph.D.
Dean of the Gayle Bolt Price School
of Graduate Studies

Date

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Steven Bingham for his guidance and mentorship in the process of the dissertation. Additionally, the committee members who pushed me further and challenged me to think deeper that consisted of Dr. Harriet Jaworowski and Dr. Christopher Nelson. I would also like to thank Dr. Ray Dockery for his initial guidance in this study.

I would like to thank the teachers and administrators who participated in this study. I count it a privilege and a joy to know so many fine theatre educators. I appreciate the honesty and candor with which you spoke. It is my hope that your voices are represented well and that your work will continue to inspire great work and change.

I would also like to thank the theatre educators in my life that have inspired me to challenge myself and give my very best in all I do for my students and craft. Your passion, expertise, mentoring, and continued friendships inspire me daily. Thank you Jeanne Agan, Matt Webster, Missy Thibodeaux- Thompson, Barbara Mager, and Lorraine Shackelford.

During the darker times of this process, Dr. Adam Carter was a source of light who kept me focused and working toward the goal of completion. I am eternally grateful for your assistance in all aspects of this process and for your encouraging words to cross the finish line.

Finally, I would like to thank my mother and father, Chris White, my Gardner-Webb University cohort, my professors throughout the program, Stephen Gundersheim, the South Carolina Theatre Association, and my amazing students past and present.

Abstract

A Study of Theatre Teacher and School Administrator Perceptions of Traits, Characteristics, and Instructional Practices and Their Possible Role in Teacher Evaluation. Chrismon, James D., 2016: Dissertation, Gardner-Webb University, Theatre Teacher/School Administrator/Arts Education/Teacher Evaluation

This applied dissertation was designed to gather similarities and differences in the perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators regarding instructor traits, instructor characteristics, and instructional practices of effective theatre teacher. Current teacher evaluation systems focus on teacher effectiveness on student learning, and typically do not provide valuable feedback for teachers in highly specialized fields such as the arts, and specifically theatre arts.

One-on-one interviews were conducted with eight theatre teachers and eight administrators from eight different schools across the state of South Carolina to gather qualitative data on the similarities and differences in perceptions of instructor traits, instructor characteristics, and instructional practices of effective theatre teachers. From these interviews a survey was developed and administered to South Carolina theatre teachers to collect quantitative data.

Analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data revealed more commonalities than differences in theatre teacher and administrator perceptions. The data suggested there is a need for improvement in the evaluation process of theatre arts teachers. This data suggested alternative evaluation methods for theatre arts teachers and provided a holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does in their classrooms and rehearsals for productions.

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Research Question	4
Conceptual Base	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
Deficiencies in the Evidence	6
Audience.....	7
Overview of Methodology.....	7
Definition of Terms	8
Limitations.....	9
Organization of the Study.....	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review	11
Teacher Evaluation	11
Education Reform in the United States	24
History of Theatre Education	39
Teacher and Administrator Views on Theatre Education	42
Qualities of Effective Arts Teachers	46
Various Forms of Teacher Evaluation.....	55
Content Specific Factors for Theatre Teacher Evaluation.....	63
Summary.....	67
Chapter 3: Methodology	69
Research Context.....	69
Research Design	70
Sampling and Participants	71
Instruments and Materials Used	73
Procedures	74
Data Analysis.....	75
Limitations.....	77
Summary.....	78
Chapter 4: Results	79
Research Question	80
Overview of Participants	80
Qualitative Analysis	83
Instructor Traits	83
Instructor Characteristics.....	94
Instructional Practices.....	104
Quantitative Analysis	126
Summary.....	130
Chapter 5: Discussion	133
Summary of Findings	133
Instructor Traits	134
Instructor Characteristics.....	137

Instructional Practices.....	139
Conclusions	145
Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research.....	151
References	155
Appendices	
A Part One: Interview Questions for Theatre Teachers	178
B Part One: Interview Questions for Administrators	180
C Survey of Theatre Teachers.....	183
D Study Participant Consent Form.....	186
E Debriefing Statement.....	188
F Email 1.....	190
G Email 2.....	192
Tables	
1 Qualities of Effective Teachers.....	47
2 Qualities of Effective Art Teachers	50
3 Qualities of Effective Theater Arts Teachers.....	54
4 Demographic Information for Theatre Teachers Interviewed	81
5 Demographic Information for Administrators Interviewed	82
6 Chi-Square Test Results for Questions 1-12.....	128
7 Rotated Component Matrix	129
8 Survey Components as Suggested by the PCA	130
Figure	
Overview of Presented Findings.....	83

Chapter 1: Introduction

It may be argued that a school administrator/evaluator can identify good teaching without being an expert in the observed content area. However, research shows the observer rarely goes beyond vague and promotional descriptions (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011; Marzano, 2012; The New Teacher Program [TNTP], 2009). Observation rubrics are often merely check lists to help make the cumbersome and time consuming process of teacher evaluation streamlined for administrators whose duties typically include much more than evaluation of teachers. This strips the humanity and the point of teacher evaluation that strengthens teaching and student learning (Stake & Munson, 2008). This is especially true if the administrator/evaluator has not had training or experience in the arts (Duke & Blackman, 1991). If the evaluator lacks the pedagogical background in the evaluated subject, the task of providing critical feedback leads to vaguely worded praise and a focus on management rather than content specific feedback regarding teacher performance that influences professional development plans for teachers to improve their practice (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012). When there are no clear evaluative criteria the feedback is highly general and may or may not be of value to the teacher.

In most cases the teacher, more than the administrator/evaluator, is the expert in the content field and the pedagogy that goes into teaching a highly specialized subject like theatre (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). This position seems to suggest that the current evaluation process has limited value in evaluating teachers. Quality teaching must be looked at within the specific context and content of the teacher teaching. All teachers can be assessed on general characteristics of teaching and assessment, but this makes little practical sense for specialized arts educators until the evaluation is applied to

specific arts teaching and learning situations (Stake & Munson, 2008). Evaluations must reflect what is being dealt with in the arts education curriculum, with a vocabulary of artistic and educational activity, and not simply a general core of facts (Zerull, 1990). Research supports that quality teaching is discipline-specific and affects the nature of learning, teaching practices and perceptions, and how to evaluate it, thus, advocating for discipline-specific evaluation systems (Alok, 2011; Aubrecht, 1984; Braxton & Hargens, 1996; Cashin, 1990, 1995; Geis, 1984; Hutchings & Shulman, 1999). A content-specific evaluation system would seem then to build on an understanding of what both effective teachers and teaching look like in all subjects, especially in theatre arts.

Statement of the Problem

There is a major shift in the educational tides taking place as greater emphasis on teacher effectiveness in what is called “value-added scoring” which places greater emphasis on a teacher’s impact on student learning as related to a measurable outcome on student test scores (Shuler, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, 2009). However, research shows that only about 20% of teachers teach courses with a standardized test. This raises equity concerns for the remaining 80% of teachers and how they are evaluated under value-added scoring (Hourigan, 2011; Marshall, 2012). With high-stakes decision making (pay raises and pay for performance, tenure, hiring and firing) in the hands of test scores and complex statistical evaluation, what this means for teachers in physical education, the arts, and foreign languages to name a few, is still in question (Hourigan, 2011). Some states, such as North Carolina, tried developing standardized tests in all areas to attempt to answer this question. This was found to be difficult when assessing subjects like the arts in a multiple-choice format, or even an intense process of reviewing portfolios, as evidence of student learning. North Carolina began exploring new options

of teacher assessment involving what is called Analysis of Student Work (ASW). This involves teachers collecting and submitting evidence of student work electronically for evaluation by content-area experts (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 2014). Many states plan to utilize the whole school value-added data for Math and English Language Arts testing and attribute that to a percentage of a non-tested subject's teacher's value-added score (Hourigan, 2011). This raises equity concerns. If this is the case, states could begin to look to one-shot performance competitions and festivals for evidence of student learning and teacher effectiveness. When looking at the process of such festivals and competitions, this is essentially the same high stakes testing situation that standardized tests create (Hourigan, 2011).

Most arts education programs are culturally narrow and oriented in promoting stars and star-makers and are rarely recognized for being responsive to the broader aims of education (Stake & Munson, 2008). Arts educators often feel extremely isolated in their practice despite working with hundreds of students each week (Shuler, 2012). Arguably arts education assessment has not matured. The current evaluation systems in place for evaluating teachers are not sensitive to the diverse and complex accomplishments of teachers and students. The dialogic practices that link experiential understanding of what students and arts teachers do should stretch arts teacher evaluation in all classrooms toward qualitative, experiential, contextualized descriptions (Stake & Munson, 2008).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators in South Carolina in order to get a more holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does. Findings may inform teacher

evaluation in theatre arts by administrators for the purposes of assisting theatre arts teachers and developing these teachers professionally. This study will add to the body of knowledge of teacher evaluation specifically in theatre arts. Dr. Shelley Nowacek conducted research in 2008 with her study “A Critical Examination of Practices and Perceptions of Current Performance Evaluation Models for Theatre Arts Teachers in Virginia,” by providing a picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does for administrators who evaluate them. If this research is not conducted theatre teachers may continue to miss opportunities to improve and grow through specific and appropriate professional development.

Research Question

What are the perceived commonalities and differences of theatre teachers and their administrators regarding effective instructor traits, characteristics, and instructional practices?

Conceptual Base

Teacher evaluation is a major function of building administrators. According to research, effective teacher evaluation systems are ones that provide specific feedback on a teacher’s performance in the classroom for the purposes of furthering the professional growth of the teacher, decision making in hiring and firing, and measuring teacher effectiveness on student growth. While research supports the use of value-added scoring to evaluate teacher effectiveness (TNTP, 2012), other means of assessing teacher effectiveness must be considered. Research shows that multiple measures must be utilized to fully evaluate a teacher (Hershberg & Robertson-Kraft, 2010; Hong, 2006; Shirbagi, 2011; Strong, Gargani, & Hacifaziloglu, 2011). Quality teaching should be measured through conversations, observations, and the lived moments of teaching (Stake

& Munson, 2008). Arts educators are primarily evaluated informally with limited response to exhibition of student work, praise for the teacher, repertoire questioned, and quality of classroom work felt, but rarely measured. Evaluation may lead to needed support for basic program operations, but evaluation of teacher quality and student learning is rare (Hatfield, 2007).

Significance of the Study

Research shows teacher evaluations by administrators rarely give specific feedback to assist in improving teacher quality when they are not administered with fidelity, follow up conversations, and creating a professional growth plan to improve teachers' work in the classroom. When it comes to the fine arts, and in particular for this study—theatre arts, more emphasis is being placed on non-tested subjects like theatre arts to be responsible for contributing to the total curriculum being taught in the schools. Research shows administrators, teachers, and students alike all see importance in theatre arts and their impact in the school (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991), however most administrators are not specialists when it comes to theatre arts as a subject and what nuances are required for effective teaching in these subjects. With the shifting focus to the entire faculty, the professional growth of all teachers is imperative for the education of every child.

In order for teacher evaluation to be meaningful, differentiation in evaluation is needed to provide appropriate professional growth plans. If the quality of teaching, and thus student learning, in every subject is the focus of teacher evaluation, then it is imperative that administrators know what is actually going on in classrooms. More importantly, it is essential for administrators to understand quality in arts education is also a matter of experience (Seidel, Tishman, Winner, Hetland, & Plamer, 2009; Stake &

Munson, 2008) and regular encounters with classroom practice and regular reflection between administrators and arts teachers to improve their arts programs quality (Seidel et al., 2009). The significance of this study, then, builds on identifying the comparative perceptions of theatre teacher traits, characteristics, and instructional practices, and then using what is learned to improve teacher evaluation.

Deficiencies in the Evidence

Branscome (2012) states, “Understanding that we are poised on the threshold of change, we must face the reality that forthcoming innovations will directly impact music education” (p. 113). This may also be true in theatre education. Stake and Munson found in their 2008 study “the characteristics of program development and operation are similar in all arts, although content and expression are not” (p. 13). Over the history of theatre education, the role of the theatre educator has changed. It began in the form of a “generalist,” meaning a teacher out of the content area of theatre and without formal training in theatre, such as an English teacher, would direct the school play or teach a Theatre Appreciation course. Today, the theatre educator is a “specialist” that has been trained in theatre or theatre education. Most schools in the United States have a teacher whose duties primarily include teaching various types of theatre specific courses such as Acting, Playwriting, Musical Theatre, Technical Theatre, and Theatre Appreciation (Omasta, 2012). With this shift to a “specialist” from the “generalist” role of the teacher, more and more the feedback from administrators is general and tends to be a student-centered evaluation that is literally a checklist of generic good teaching indicators instead of a teacher centered evaluation that is content specific to enhance teaching in the specified content of theatre (Henninger, 2002; Maranzano, 2000; Nowacek, 2008; Peterson, 2000; Rush, 1997; Stronge, 2006). Music education has yielded many studies

on teacher evaluation, assessing effective music teachers, qualities of great music educators, and preparing teachers for effective music teaching. However, there is a great lack of information in the body of knowledge specific to theatre education and, more specifically, theatre teacher evaluation. Despite the evidence in the research that supports the need for content and context specific evaluation for teachers, most schools and school districts use a system of evaluating teachers that does not differentiate for these different contexts and contents. For purposes of this study Stake and Munson's (2008) findings were applied and any relevant research from across arts disciplines (theatre, music, dance, and visual art) was considered.

Audience

It was the goal of this mixed methods study to explore the unique traits, characteristics, and instructional practices of effective theatre arts teachers. This may impact policy makers, school districts, administrators, teacher evaluators, teachers, and students by strengthening administrator/evaluator feedback to theatre teachers on their practice, thus benefiting theatre teachers with meaningful feedback and helping them grow professionally.

Overview of Methodology

This mixed methods study explored perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators in South Carolina in order to get a more holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does through generic qualitative inquiry and survey methodology utilizing purposeful sampling. The perceptual data gathered from face-to-face interviews recorded on digital voice recorders and transcribed by the researcher were analyzed for content and strength coded to identify themes through a constant comparative method and open coding. A confirmatory survey of members of

the state professional theatre association was administered electronically and run through statistical analysis of component analysis, Cronback's Alpha and Chi Square, to triangulate the findings of the interviews.

Definition of Terms

In order to keep consistent with Nowacek's (2008) research the following definitions of terms will be consistent with her work conducted in her study, "A Critical Examination of Practices and Perceptions of Current Performance Evaluation Models for Theatre Arts Teachers in Virginia," which serves as a basis for this study and will continue her work.

Administrator. For the purposes of this study, administrator refers to any licensed personnel with supervisory responsibilities who provide information that is used in creating either formative or summative evaluations.

Assessment. A set of processes designed to improve, demonstrate, and inquire about student learning.

Characteristics. A distinguishing quality of a person that can be shaped, molded, or taught.

Evaluation. The systematic process of determining the merit, value, and worth of someone (the evaluatee, such as a teacher, student, or employee) or something (the evaluation and, such as a product, program, policy, procedure, or process).

Instructional practices. The approaches a teacher may take to engage students in the learning process actively. They drive a teacher's instruction as they work to meet specific learning objectives and ensure that their students are equipped with the tools they need to be successful. These can be shaped, molded, and taught.

Performance evaluation. All activities associated with teacher evaluation

regardless of form and include all aspects of both formative and summative evaluation processes; examples can include, but are not limited to, observation, portfolio review, and written evaluations.

Theatre arts. Theatre arts is an art form, which involves an actor and an audience and any additional elements that enhance that relationship. Some theatre arts programs include elaborate facilities while others may involve a simple classroom space. It is sometimes referred to as drama.

Theatre arts teacher. For the purposes of this study, theatre arts teachers refers to those teachers whose major responsibilities include teaching theatre arts as well as handling after school performances of any kind, including one act play festivals, musicals, stage plays, or other theatrical performances.

Traits. A distinguishing quality or characteristic of a person that is inherited.

Limitations

Small sample sizes are common among qualitative studies. However, larger sample sizes are required for quantitative studies. This mixed methods study utilized a small purposeful sampling of theatre teachers and administrators that evaluate those theatre teachers from across South Carolina for the qualitative interviews. A significant return percentage for the surveys administered is noted, however a larger sample size may have yielded even more significant results.

A limitation to the survey administered to theatre arts teachers across the state of South Carolina was further demographic data could have been collected regarding years of experience. Additionally, further questioning could have been conducted regarding after-school work expectations and stipends that stipulate what those expectations are. These would have been helpful in further analysis of the survey data.

Another limitation of this study could be administrators were not surveyed as part of the data collection process. Due to time constraints and no access to databases for administrators, these surveys were not administered. Inclusion of this data could have further assisted in distinguishing the differences and similarities on a larger scale of effective traits, characteristics and Instructional practices of theatre teachers. However, the literature supports the theatre teacher is the content expert in the field and could provide more meaningful feedback than administrators, thus the researcher's decision not to pursue and include this data.

The researcher's subjectivity should be considered a limitation as well. The researcher is a high school theatre arts teacher in South Carolina. Therefore, due to the personal and professional experiences and understandings of the craft of theatre and educational theatre, the researcher shares many of the same beliefs and experiences as the theatre teacher participants. The researcher's knowledge of theatre education can be considered a benefit to the study as well as a limitation.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 of this mixed methods study provides a background of the topic, the statement of the problem, the purpose, conceptual base, and significance of the study, the research question, intended audience, and the limitations. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical foundation and a critical review of the literature organized by the conceptual framework for the study. Chapter 3 presents the mixed methods research methodology used in this research. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study through emergent themes. Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the findings relevant to the literature, as well as implications for practice and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators in South Carolina to get a more holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does. Current teacher evaluation systems by design lack the capacity to provide specific feedback for arts teachers, specifically theatre arts teachers. Study findings may inform teacher evaluation in theatre arts by administrators tasked with assisting and developing these teachers professionally. The related literature discusses: the types and purposes of teacher evaluation, a history of education reform in the United States, a history of theatre education, teacher and administrator views on theatre education, qualities of effective arts teachers, various forms of teacher evaluation, and content specific factors for theatre teacher evaluation.

Teacher Evaluation

The literature on teacher evaluation suggests it serves two purposes: to measure teacher competence and to foster professional development and growth (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Namaghi, 2010; Peterson, 2000; Shirbagi, 2011; Warburton, 2006; Weems & Rogers, 2010). Measuring teachers and developing teachers are two very different processes (Marzano, 2012). This can also be looked at as summative evaluation and formative evaluation. Summative evaluation seeks to license, hire, give tenure to, promote, demote, or dismiss teachers based on an understood set of criteria and where judgments, and the aforementioned decisions, are formed about a teacher's work based on these criteria (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Namaghi, 2010; Peterson, 2000; Shirbagi, 2011; Warburton, 2006; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999). On the other hand, formative evaluation seeks to gather evidence based on an understood set of criteria and suggestions and plans are made and developed to support the teacher's work in the classroom,

strengthen practice and instruction, and impact student learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Namaghi, 2010; Peterson, 2000; Shirbagi, 2011; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999).

Weems & Rogers (2010) developed the Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Growth to provide flexibility for both the school system and the educator; The Focused Assessment and Professional Growth components of this plan allows the teacher and administrator/evaluator to effectively tailor the evaluation to align with identified student needs, educator needs, school improvement plans, and system needs, as well as building on the existing knowledge of an educator's performance. Stake and Munson (2008) explored the complicated issues of assessment in the arts from a qualitative perspective: experiential, naturalistic, and ethnographic interpretation. They gave special attention to the practices of teaching, learning, and administration of arts education. They claimed quality is sought with emphasis on observations and judgment rather than instruments and measurement. When specific and objective procedures and standards are established for evaluation that relate to important teaching skills (Stake & Munson, 2008; Weems & Rogers, 2010) evaluators can gather the needed evidence through assessment procedures (Warburton, 2006). Evaluators can then focus their feedback on building quality instruction in the classroom (Weems & Rogers, 2010), which research shows is the primary objective of teaching, and thus, the primary reason for evaluating teacher performance (Warburton, 2006; Weems & Rogers, 2010; Zerihun, Beishuizen, & Van Os, 2012). Teacher evaluation systems should be formative giving useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity to learn new teaching techniques, and counsel from principals and other teachers on how to make changes in their classrooms (Centra, 1993; Marzano, 2012; Weems & Rogers, 2010).

Evaluation of the quality of teaching encompasses several aspects including

academic rigor, skills in teaching difficult material, accessibility to students, interest in students' progress academically, and the ability and willingness to assess thoroughly and fairly indicating that student assessment, teacher assessment and program assessment are intertwined (Stake & Munson, 2008; Weems & Rogers, 2010). Due to the interconnectedness of these assessments in evaluation, difficulty in evaluating teacher effectiveness is inevitable. Teaching involves the teacher, students, outside influences, inside the school environments, and subject matters in dynamic interactions. Prior to the current focus on teacher evaluation including student achievement data, research was focused on defining, measuring, and evaluating skills that might demonstrate effective teaching. These traits were featured in classroom observer charts, rating scales, checklists, rubrics, and narrative descriptions that looked similar from district to district, were meant to be objective, and required few inferences or judgments by the evaluator to determine if teachers were displaying those behaviors (Strong et al., 2011; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999). Most teacher evaluation systems rely on a single measure of performance such as an observation or achievement data, and as a result, do not reveal enough information about the quality of instruction (Hershberg & Robertson- Kraft, 2010). Utilizing a "one-size fits all" approach to identifying a single kind of effective teacher is possible, but not valid or appropriate (Brand, 2009).

Teachers often view the evaluation process as perfunctory (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011; TNTP, 2009). In 2009 The Widget Effect study found that most teachers are evaluated infrequently and according to low standards, teachers rarely receive feedback that helps them improve and in the end, and the entire profession suffered from these negligent practices (TNTP, 2009; 2012). This is consistent with research that found most teachers are rated good or great, novice teachers receive no

scrutiny, poor performance goes unaddressed, administrative observations are infrequent, rarely inform teacher assignment, professional development, or promotion decisions. (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011; Mickle & Frontier, 2012; OECD, 2005, 2009; Peterson, 2000; Perrine, 2013; TNTP, 2009). The effect of such negligence is a lack of feedback. This leads to teachers feeling alone and isolated within their practice (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011).

Teachers have varying experiences with teacher evaluations, typically linked to teacher observations, and thereby improve as teachers or become complacent (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011). These experiences are dependent on the evaluator, who typically has minimal guidance, even less training on managing and executing teacher evaluations, and on the focus of the observation and to whom the responsibility for teaching and learning falls (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011; TNTP, 2009; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999). Generally this falls on the teacher (Yarbrough & Henley, 1999). When evaluators/observers focus on specific aspects of instruction, they may have different perceptions than other evaluators who focus on other aspects of instruction and therefore, much of the nature of observation experiences has to do with the evaluation/ observation instrument and training of evaluators to improve teaching practice (Henninger, 2002).

Nathan (2000) observed the conflicts and challenges of evaluation and professional development with mixed levels of success at Boston Arts Academy (BAA). Nathan detailed how BAA staff members linked professional development activities with school-wide and individual goals. Nathan found when professional development and evaluation were closely linked and clearly explained and defined; improved student achievement became more attainable. The research also found teachers craved a system of evaluation that gave feedback that reflected the competencies they valued and that

made a difference to students (Nathan, 2000).

Similarly, Cantrell and Scantlebury (2011), in conjunction with the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, discussed how strong, transparent feedback and evaluation systems were needed that recognized the inevitability of classification errors, but worked to reduce them as much as possible. They found teachers valued evaluation systems that were coherent (interconnection among the parts of the system), reliable (unreliability undermines trust), and valid (is the system focused on the things it should be focused on; Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011). Teacher evaluation systems must be comprehensive and specific, focused on development that employs a scale or rubric that teachers can use to guide and track their skill development, and acknowledges and rewards growth (Marzano, 2012).

Teacher evaluation development has been neglected and is a widespread activity schools. Good practice should be common. Poor practice that is infrequent and unsystematic in teacher evaluation is quietly accepted and ignored, according to teachers, administrators, and researchers unless there are problems with poor performing teachers (Peterson, 2000). Most personnel decisions are based on judgments, which are only slightly more accurate than they would be if they were based on pure chance (Medley & Coker, 1987). With the present focus on the measurable teacher influence on student learning, the best emerging teacher evaluation systems push teachers to do better than which they should have been doing all along by identifying what is most important in curriculum: assessing student achievement and improving instruction (Shuler, 2012).

Most teachers now assert that teaching can be measured (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010). There is evidence that assessment should be gathered from multiple data sources for the most accurate measure of a teacher's effectiveness for impact on

student learning (Hong, 2006; Shirbagi, 2011; Strong et al., 2011). Rigorous frameworks that rely on multiple extended observations by multiple observers over the course of the year give a more robust look at what a teacher does in their classroom and a more accurate look at their work with students (Hershberg & Robertson-Kraft, 2010). Classroom observations should only be one part of a rich, intensive, and productive measure of teacher performance, but may only continue to be viewed as ineffective altogether in the current state (Strong et al., 2011).

New evaluation systems should adopt a balanced approach that uses multiple ways to assess teacher performance and recognize outstanding performance (Hershberg & Roberts-Kraft, 2010). The use of multiple measures is meant to compensate and balance the strengths and weaknesses of the other components in the system (Kane & Cantrell, 2012). What those other components are is still part of current debate. Under the education reform of Race to the Top a significant increase of attention was given to teacher evaluation. Most states went through major reform and created systems that used multiple measures (TNTP, 2012). Many states included the value-added score from teachers as a component of their teacher evaluation system (Hershberg & Robertson-Kraft, 2010). This score derived from statistical analysis of a student's standardized test data and was used in evaluating teachers. Many argued that this was not an accurate measure because standardized tests were not made to measure teacher performance (Marshall, 2012). Others claimed it was the strongest indicator of a teacher's impact on student learning and performance (Hershberg & Robertson-Kraft, 2010).

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the 2015 legislation that reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and did away with No Child Left Behind (NCLB), gave states much more freedom in determining what they would use to

determine accountability for student progress and teacher evaluation, as well as better prepare students for college and career readiness (Darrow, 2016).

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2010) conducted one of the most detailed studies ever on teacher evaluation. Launched in 2009, the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project was designed to help teachers and school systems close the gap between their expectations for effective teaching and what is actually happening in classrooms. Six different school districts, including 3,000 teachers, took part in the three year study to build and test measures of effective teaching and find out how evaluation methods could best be used to tell teachers more about the skills that make them most effective and to help districts identify and develop great teaching and was an exercise in building trustworthy feedback and evaluation systems. The study cost almost \$50,000,000 (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010; Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011). Teacher reflections, teacher pedagogical knowledge, student perceptions of the classroom instructional environment, and teachers' perceptions of working conditions and instructional support at their school represented different facets of teaching and learning that individually and collectively support student learning gains and outcome measures such as state performance assessments (TNTP, 2012; Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011).

In 2012 the final results of The MET Project were released and analyzed by The New Teacher Project. Their findings were summarized into four areas:

1. Teachers managed their classes well, but struggled with fundamental instructional skills.
2. Classroom observations can give teachers valuable feedback, but were of limited value for predicting future performance because classroom performance varied from day to day.

3. Value-added analysis, which used student achievement data over time to measure the learning gains students made and through complex statistical analysis, produced a rating that was supposed to show the teacher's impact on student growth. This was more powerful than any other single measure in predicting a teacher's long-term contributions to student success. Teachers with high value-added scores had a major and enduring influence on their students' lives outcomes. However, value-added scores should not be the only measure used in teacher evaluation.
4. Evaluations that combined several strong performance measures produced the most accurate results.

MET researchers confirmed that utilizing multiple measures of teacher performance (value added data, rigorous classroom observations, and surveys of student perceptions) was the right approach (TNTP, 2012).

As MET served to test an increasingly popular idea—multiple measures—it fully recognized that the promise of multiple measures was not that there were more measures, but that these measures represented different facets of teaching and learning that individually and collectively supported student learning gains and outcome measures such as state performance assessments (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011). For example, relying on student achievement data results, or value-added scoring, may provide some information on teacher performance, but the feedback may not be timely, or detailed enough on classroom practices needed to shape improvements in teaching, that student perceptions surveys and classroom observations may be able to provide in a more appropriate time to make a difference in the school year to impact student learning greater (Nathan, 2000).

Danielson's (2011) Framework for Teaching was a prominent component in the development of the MET Project. It is a set of 22 components of instruction and 76 smaller elements that are clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility. The elaborate framework is intended for many purposes, but is truly geared toward serving as the foundation for professional conversations among practitioners to enhance professional teaching practice. Intense training is needed for using the framework. More than 20 states have adopted the Framework for Teaching as their model for teacher evaluation (Danielson, 2011).

Another example of teacher evaluation assessment came in the form of a comparison study by Simon (2012) that looked at the elements of the Montgomery, Maryland model and the model in Washington, DC called IMPACT. The plans were implemented differently and thus, produced very different results in success. The Montgomery Model was developed with administrators, teachers, and the teacher's union. It had intense training for evaluators, quality control through peer assistance and review, less frequent evaluations, and a culture focused on teaching and learning. The DC Model was not developed with administrators, teachers, and teacher's union and evoked opposition from the teacher's union and teachers. It was a one-size fits all process with minimal training for evaluators. Student test scores were originally 55% of the teacher's evaluation (later lowered to 40%, despite recommendations of only up to 33% of a teacher evaluation derived from value-added scoring). There was significantly less buy-in from the stakeholders in the DC Model than in the Montgomery Model. More teachers were fired in the DC Model despite colleagues and students considering them excellent teachers.

In Cincinnati, Ohio, Taylor and Tyler (2012) utilized practice-based assessment

that relied on multiple, highly structured classroom observations conducted by experienced peer teachers and administrators to see if well-developed evaluations might fill the gap that existed in the teaching profession by providing individualized information about performance to teachers. Evaluators and administrators received extensive training for the process. By having teachers gain information over the course of a year through the formal scoring and feedback routines of the Teacher Evaluation System (TES), encouraging teachers to be more self-reflective, and creating more opportunities for conversations with other teachers and administrators about effective practice they found students instructed by teachers, who have been through TES, scored higher on standardized student achievement tests. They found evidence that the effectiveness of individual teachers improves during the school year when they are evaluated and that these improvements persist and, in fact, increased in the years after evaluation. They also found that experienced teachers provided with detailed information through written and dialogic feedback improved substantially (Taylor & Tyler, 2012).

Strong et al. (2011) developed the Rapid Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness (RATE) designed to effectively and efficiently determine teacher competence in the classroom. It utilized 10 categories of teacher behavior that ranked teachers in terms of pedagogical skill. Marzano (2012) developed an elaborate model of classroom strategies and behaviors with 41 indicators that helped evaluators identify effective instruction based on these indicators.

However, opposition to the infrequent observations with lengthy and bulky rubrics that create heavy workloads and less time for more frequent informal classroom visits and interactions with teachers exists. Often they are seen as a weak system for improving teacher performance (Dufour & Marzano, 2009; Marshall, 2012).

It was previously stated that teacher evaluation is meant to serve two purposes: quality assurance (summative assessment) and professional development (formative assessment). Some systems of teacher evaluation focus on the summative rather than the formative. The inherent drawbacks of such focus include:

1. An open honest and pedagogical dialogue is not fostered between administration and teachers.
2. Tension and anxiety about communicating areas of weakness are raised.
3. It doesn't promote reflective practice for student success.
4. It does not give clear direction for improved teaching.
5. It does not promote weak teachers to improve and good teachers to achieve excellence. (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Peterson, 2000; Namaghi, 2010; Church, 2012)

The need for valid teacher evaluation systems that measure teacher performance and contribute in their professional development is great (Kyriakides, 2005). Evaluation that ignores giving useful feedback and support is viewed as punitive by teachers (Arreola, 2007). Teachers are typically left out of the evaluation equation and therefore evaluation reform is limited (Namaghi, 2010). Effective evaluation requires time for direct observation of teachers work (TNTP, 2012; Mickle & Frontier, 2012). Ellett and Garland (1987) studied evaluation practices in 100 schools and a follow up study ten years later by Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugatt (1997) found little change in that teacher evaluation was rarely used to help teacher professional development and primarily used for summative purposes. This was consistent with information gathered in a study by Kyriakides & Campbell (2003) focusing on other countries around the world where teacher evaluation systems were used for summative purposes.

It is widely accepted that teaching is complex and occurs in many forms and contexts. Therefore quality should be looked at from multiple measures (McGreal, 1983; Kyriakides, 2005). However, current models require evaluators to diagnose weaknesses and prescribe solutions in a summative manner (Kyriakides, 2005; Stronge & Ostander, 1997).

Teacher observation is not a strong enough indicator on its own for a reliable source in a teacher evaluation (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012; Stronge & Ostander, 1997). There is an artificial nature of scheduled observations, infrequent observations, failure to include teacher responsibilities outside the classroom, and the fact that only a tiny portion of what a teacher does can be observed in the observation that must be considered when evaluating teachers based on observations alone (Stronge, Helm, & Tucker, 1995). Research shows administrator ratings show statistical inaccuracy and lead to low levels of respect for the evaluation systems within the profession (Kyriakides, 2005; Peterson, 1995). Although research indicates that teachers have the greatest impact on student achievement, school leaders have a powerful, albeit indirect, impact on student success (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Nettles & Harrington, 2007; Range, Duncan, Scherz, & Haines, 2012) by helping teachers improve their practice (Green, 2010; Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Stronge, n.d.; Zepeda, 2012). The supervision (formative) and evaluative (summative) processes must work in tandem to evaluate teacher effectiveness through multiple data sources (Green, 2010; Ovando & Ramirez, 2007; Range, Grant, & Stronge, 2011; Stronge, n.d.; Zepeda, 2007).

Despite the two purposes of teacher evaluation being clearly defined, most districts utilize the two purposes as one in the same. Principals must understand how to

connect both and make teacher evaluation meaningful (Green, 2010; Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Nathan, 2000). Many districts use detailed comprehensive evaluation systems to make high stakes decisions regarding teachers. However, they often only use the systems as a one shot method of evaluation. When districts, administrators, and teachers fail to use the system throughout the year, with focused work on development, self-reflection, with multiple opportunities for dialogue and practice to develop, they are using only half of the intended evaluation system (Mickle & Frontier, 2012). However, when this is done successfully they do indeed serve two purposes: accountability, and teacher improvement/professional development (Range et al., 2012; Stronge, n.d.; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, & Bernstein, 1984). Educators must not lose sight of professional development as a goal of teacher evaluation (Church, 2012; Marshall, 2005).

Teacher evaluation should be linked to professional development (Marshall, 2005). Shagrir (2012) defined professional development as “an ongoing and systematic process that includes activities such as discussion, investigation, experimentation with new practices, learning, expansion of knowledge, acquisition of new skills, and the development of approaches, stances, knowledge, and work tools” (p. 23). Current education reform is linking teacher evaluation to student learning. If educators do this, they must provide high-quality professional growth opportunities for teachers that are strategically based on evaluation feedback (Church, 2012). Research shows evaluation that is job embedded, focused on data, driven by teachers, and sustained over time facilitates teacher growth in novice teachers to experienced teachers and leads to improved student achievement (Hershberg & Robertson-Kraft, 2010; Marshall, 2005; Namaghi, 2010; Nathan, 2000). Teachers will use feedback when it is trustworthy and when they believe it will improve their practice (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011;

Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012).

Professional development is often viewed as an irrelevant add-on that only somewhat links to student achievement. Therefore the professional development opportunities for teachers must be relevant to their classroom work, the individual goals of staff members, and school wide goals (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012; Nathan, 2000). Research shows principals want evaluation systems that support teacher growth (Nathan, 2000).

Education Reform in the United States

The changes that education in the United States has gone through were inspired by numerous stimuli over the years and have had lasting impacts on students and education in the United States for better and worse. This history is imperative to understand how the current focus on rigorous student achievement testing climate and teacher evaluation has evolved (Brand, 2009).

The launch of Sputnik in 1957 was a key moment in education reform for the United States. President Dwight Eisenhower immediately led the charge to funnel hundreds of millions of dollars into public education to increase math and science skills in order to compete with the rest of the world, specifically the Soviet Union while politicians and the media blamed the American educational system for failing to provide rigorous education. The National Defense Education Act was born (Brucoli, Bondi, & Baughman, 1994).

President Lyndon Johnson established the ESEA legislation in 1965. This effort to improve educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged students has been the most far-reaching federal legislation affecting education ever passed by Congress (Viteritti, 2012). The bill aimed to provide equal access to education, establish high

standards and accountability, and shorten the achievement gaps between students. It has been renewed every five years since its enactment (Viteritti, 2012).

In 1983, President Ronald Reagan's National Commission on Excellence in Education published their report, *A Nation at Risk*. This report alerted the nation to the fact it was falling behind the rest of the developed world in academic achievement, high rates of adult illiteracy, declining scores on college entrance exams, and a rise in remedial programs in colleges, corporations, and the military. This is also known as the beginning of the Standards Movement, which demanded for educators to stop inflating grades, colleges raise entrance requirements, and increased standardized testing in schools (Viteritti, 2012).

Under President George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton's administrations, *Improving America's Schools Act* of 1994 and *Goals 2000* were enacted. They offered financial incentives for states to develop improvement plans to help meet the learning gap between races and rich and poor students that had remained constant through the 1980s and 1990s. They were similar in their goals to strengthen math, science, and literacy, as well as increasing the graduation rate. This was also a time of reform where *National Standards for Arts Education* were established for the first time (Viteritti, 2012).

President George W. Bush, passed with bipartisan support (Levine & Levine, 2012; Viteritti, 2012), the *NCLB Act* in 2002. It was based on "The Texas Education Miracle" introduced in 1984 and was in place when he was governor of Texas and was developed by business tycoon and billionaire H. Ross Perot. Business and industry in Texas saw a need to create a way to measure and document student achievement, teacher evaluation, and high stakes decisions for teachers based on test scores (Levine & Levine, 2012). The *NCLB* legislation also mandated testing and standards as a condition for

funding. It gave states the authority to develop their own tests, set their own standards, and define “proficiency” (McCluskey, 2011; Viteritti, 2012). States also had to set annual targets to improve achievement and closing gaps in performance among discrete groups of students. It also addressed the need for better-prepared teachers by requiring all teachers to be highly qualified, which had not been met by any state as of 2007 (Taylor, 2006). The arts were declared for the first time a “Core” academic subject under the NCLB (Taylor, 2006). The inherent problems of the high stakes testing led to low criteria being set so students would appear to be performing better than they actually were, outright cheating by districts, and narrowing of the curriculum (Daggett, 2005; Levine & Levine, 2012; Viteritti, 2012). Levine and Levine (2012) coined the “new high tech solution” while legislators came up with as “blame the teachers.” Schools were run more and more like a business with a business plan, which attracted businesses to NCLB according to publishing giant NCS Pearson (Levine & Levine, 2012).

Since the National Defense Education Act in the 1950s, the United States has been in a constant quest to be the top in the economical, technological, business, and competition in the global job market. The U.S. education system has yet to keep up with the demands of business. Many believed the heavy focus on testing in the U.S. has led to a limiting of young people’s chances of succeeding in the global real world. A focus on endpoints, benchmarks, and attainable targets being measured by significantly rigorous evidence led to merely writing objectives on the board, activities in linear progression and mechanical work with no animation. This focus connoted concentration on the clinical, statistical measurement and comparison of control and treatment groups reducing education to experimental trials on children. High achievement meant increased test scores leaving little room for teacher research, action inquiry, and reflective practice

(Taylor, 2006). Research shows students under NCLB merely sought the “right answers” as opposed to being critical and creative thinkers that could apply what they learned in school to the real world. They were less engaged in the learning process in part because the teacher had so much material to cover to be ready for the test. High stakes test achievement was now the finish line, but business and government still say we are losing the race (Daggett, 2005). Research shows that if school performance continued to be measured by the percentage of students meeting proficiency it would continue to fail. Many felt schools were rewarded based on who they taught rather than how well they taught (Harris, 2009).

The need for students to explore for themselves the relevance of what they were learning was lost under NCLB (Daggett, 2005). Research indicated career and technical education programs and the arts provided the opportunity for students to do just that (Daggett, 2005), yet Mathematics and English Language Arts were the tested subjects under NCLB.

The impetus for the current standards push is the failure of NCLB (McCluskey, 2011). President Barrack Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan introduced new legislation called Race to the Top (RTTT) in 2009 as NCLB was expiring. Under this legislation states competed for funding, adopted internationally benchmarked standards, improved recruitment, retention, and compensation for teachers and school administration, improved data collection, and implemented strategies to turn around failing schools. Student achievement data was used for evaluating teachers and principals, merit pay was a component, and increased funding for charter schools.

This all led to the development of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS; McCluskey, 2011). This was a move by the federal government using its powers to move

the country towards national standards designed collectively by the states (Braun, 2011; Montes, 2012; Viteritti, 2012). The National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the Thomas B. Fordham Institute developed a common set of standards to be taught that would meet the need of business and higher education to prepare students better for the job market, the global job market, and college/university studies (McCluskey, 2011; Taylor, 2006). Their hope was that by putting everyone on the same standards and benchmarks, the problems with low standards that were a result of NCLB would be fixed and states could not hide behind the inflated data (McCluskey, 2011).

Following nearly 20 years of intense debate and education reform, the Obama administration was successful in having 45 states, one territory, and the District of Columbia adopt the National Governor's Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers' CCSS for English Language Arts and Mathematics (Anderson, Harrison, & Lewis, 2012; CCSS Initiative, n.d. a, b; Montes, 2012). With \$4 billion earmarked for states participating in RTTT and \$330 million for two consortia of states, Smarter Balance and PARC, to develop common tests to accompany the standards, it was the hope that the new standards and assessments will benefit students in learning 21st Century Skills and these skills would have them engaged and useful in the workplace and society (Braun, 2011; Foster, 1999; McCluskey, 2011; Ohler, 2013). Since NCLB there has been a growing concern that the "one right answer" mentality has left students with the inability to seek, confront, and solve non-linear, divergent, open-ended problems. This is what is creating a gap in the preparation of future citizens and leaders. They are not prepared to meet a world in continuous change without the ability to engage in creative thinking (Liu & Noppe-Brandon, 2009).

Twenty-first century skills are components of NCLB and RTTT. They are defined as (a) critical thinking and problem solving skills, (b) collaboration, (c) adaptability, (d) initiative, (e) effective oral and written communication skills, (f) accessing and analyzing information, and (g) curiosity and imagination by Wagner (2010) in his book, *The Global Achievement Gap*. These skills are the focus of the Common Core State Standards and revised standardized testing as new ways of teaching and testing to better prepare students for college and careers. These skills need to be taught through academic content every day, at every grade, and in every class (Wagner, 2008). Teaching effectiveness is critical for this initiative (Alok, 2011).

RTTT had points that merit praise (Perrine, 2013). The program was not mandatory. It gave states the autonomy to develop their own approaches to teacher evaluation and encouraged the involvement of teachers and principals in the development of fair assessments (Perrine, 2013).

Assessments designed to fully reflect the CCSS and will continue teaching to the test mentality as it drives standardized testing (Black, Williams, & You, 2011; Braun, 2011; Levine & Levine, 2012; Ohler, 2013; Prio, Wiemers, & Shutt, 2011). Some believe teaching to the test may indeed help raise test scores, but will fail to develop understanding (Scherrer, 2011), which is a primary concern of the focus on 21st Century Skills. The grade level performance standards are intended to indicate if a student is on track for college and career readiness.

Shuler (2012) stated “teacher evaluation was traditionally based on the extent to which educators used strategies and exhibit behaviors deemed desirable by experts” (p.8). Prompted in part by business models, teacher evaluation is now about the bottom line questions of how much and how well did the students learn (Shuler, 2012). RTTT

defined effective teachers as those whose students achieve high rates and requires teachers be evaluated using student growth measurements and multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance or evidence of leadership roles (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). However, research suggested many high school graduates are not college and career ready. Demands on students and teachers will increase. States must make substantial investments in providing targeted, high-quality professional development (Braun, 2011).

The professional development language in RTTT stated all professional development must be data informed and ongoing and job embedded (Hourigan, 2011; Whitcomb, Borko, & Liston, 2009). When it comes to teachers of the arts, physical education, foreign language and other non-standardized tested subjects, how do districts offer this kind of professional development when there is no data for their subject in regards to standardized testing? Hourigan (2011) suggested these teachers may learn to teach reading, math, science, and English during professional development workshops and that all other professional development may disappear altogether. Hourigan found Indiana was allowing teachers to add content areas to their certification without education or special training, among other changes. School administrators were also allowed to hold all professional development in house and focus on test scores rather than professional development that were differentiated for the teachers' needs. These changes were met with backlash because they were hastily decided in order to receive RTTT funding and with little input from stakeholders. Rhode Island and California faced similar challenges (Hourigan, 2011).

In 2010, Tennessee's First to the Top law assisted in receiving the RTTT grant monies. Their law required up to 50% of teacher and principal evaluations be based on

student achievement data of which 35% will be the value added score for the teacher or some other comparable measure of student growth and the remaining 15% will be based on material selected by the individual being evaluated from an approved list of measures established by the State Department of Education. The remaining 50% of the evaluation is based on the summative rating against a qualitative appraisal instrument (observations, surveys, or other methods) approved by the Department of Education (Tennessee State Government, 2010; Piro, Wiemers, & Shutt, 2011). Colorado, Oklahoma, and Louisiana also required at least 50% for student achievement data. Arizona and New York required 35-50%; Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, and Michigan require student achievement data, but did not specify how much; and California, Maine and Nevada had an optional use of student achievement data as part of their teacher evaluation systems. Many other states are in the process of incorporating student achievement data as they flesh out their evaluation plans as well (Piro et al., 2011).

There was concern over using standardized test scores to evaluate teacher effectiveness, since this was a component to qualify for the funds from RTTT. When this happens, teachers, and by extension those who train teachers, can be objectively evaluated and held accountable for their successes and failures (Cochran-Smith, 2007; Perrine, 2013). This statistical technique is known as a Value-Added Model (Montes, 2012).

Value-added measures (VAM) were initially designed by economist Hanushek (2006) based on an application of the production function to education. In theory, it provides a better approach to measure the impact of teacher quality on student achievement. The average change, or growth of all students (usually over a multiyear period) based on pre-tests and post-tests, of a classroom in a particular achievement test

score is then attributed to the teacher, and called teacher quality (Ballou, Sanders, & Wright, 2004; Doran & Fleischman, 2005; Fulcher & Willse, 2007; Glazerman, et al, 2010; Montes, 2012; Scherrer, 2011). Controversies with VAM exist for several reasons. Differences in pedagogy between high VAM scores and low VAM scores are not known (Montes, 2012). Montes (2012) stated “VAM should not be used for the majority of subjects because it was created for core subjects where hierarchically aligned tests exist,” (p. 340) and attributing growth to an individual in a team teaching situation is difficult, and even more so when the curriculum and the test are not perfectly aligned, which is often the case. Scherrer (2011) claimed that VAM isolated teacher effects making for a fairer comparison between teachers, but also noted it should not be the sole measure of teacher effectiveness. They erroneously assume all achievement levels ought to be expected to gain at the same rate and that the teacher is the one responsible for the growth (Scherrer, 2011).

Some believe the emphasis placed on mathematics and English language arts test scores will lead to science, history, health, and the arts disappearing from the curriculum (Rothstein, Jacobsen, & Wilder, 2008; Scherrer, 2011; Taylor, 2006). Others claim VAM will pit teachers against one another because they will be compared to one another. Teachers are fearful of the high stakes hiring and firing decisions that will likely be made based on the data alone (Glazerman et al., 2010). Educators express concerns such models are too statistically difficult to understand (Darlington, 1997; Doran & Fleischman, 2005). Viteritti (2012) claimed since the student performance assessments are still being developed; the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers is fraught with problems. As teachers are evaluated based on student learning as seen on test scores, testing will be changing due to Common Core. The value added score will thus be

affected differently with the new standards and testing.

Contrary to the negative views on VAM, Glazerman et al. (2011) found although the system is not perfect in design and the uncertain consequences, VAM can complement observations, parent feedback, and personal reflections on teaching far better than any alternative. It can guide administrators in deciding where resources are most needed. It can aid in identifying strengths and weaknesses of teachers. The research also supported if student achievement is the outcome, value-added is the best method of classifying teachers and predicting future performance (Glazerman et al., 2011).

As with NCLB, RTTT maintained a focus on teacher effectiveness to accelerate student progress and close achievement gaps (Hershberg & Robertson-Kraft, 2010; Hourigan, 2011). Research repeatedly shows the best school predictor of student outcomes is a high quality, effective teacher as defined by performance in the classroom (Goldhaber, 2002; Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000; Hanushek, Kain, O'Brien, & Rivkin, 2005; Hershberg & Robertson-Kraft, 2010; Strong et al., 2011; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). Glazerman et al. (2010) cited the need for teacher evaluations that can distinguish teacher effectiveness, and VAM as the strongest indicator. Controversy should not stand in the way of developing effective systems for measuring teacher quality. RTTT, by design opened the door to a wide variety of approaches to teacher assessment. When it comes to assessment of the arts and other hard to assess content areas, there was often little consideration given to the particular needs of those teachers (Perrine, 2013). Shuler (2012) claimed that evaluating teachers in the arts based on test scores in subjects they do not teach or based on school wide scores that include students they do not teach is absurd.

Test scores alone will not truly measure a teacher's impact on student learning.

Standardized tests were never designed by their publishers to map the achievement of schools (Haladyna, Nolen, & Haas, 1991; Hourigan, 2011; Viteritti, 2012). Consistent with the MET Project by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2010), the research supports overwhelmingly the need for using multiple measures for measuring a teacher's effectiveness (Fulcher & Willse, 2007; Glazer et al., 2011). There has been such a focus on the measurable; we tend to forget the impact and strength of the arts lies beyond the measurable. Arts classrooms are sapped of energy and passion (Evans, 2009).

The United States has not been competitive in the global market in terms of labor cost and information processing (Wagner, 2008). However, it has maintained its lead in entrepreneurial ideas that produce growth in science, technology, and the arts (Ohler, 2013). The United States neglects creativity in its educational systems because we don't see creativity as a practical skill that every student can and should develop- just like the ability to read and write (Ohler, 2013). The standards fail to support the US reputation for creativity in the global community and put itself at risk of becoming a poor nation (Ohler, 2013). Creative, innovative, and original are words rarely found in the ELA and Literacy standards for CCSS (Ohler, 2013). Countries that do well on standardized tests typically perform poorly on creativity markers on international assessments of creativity (Zhao, 2012). Some feel the arts should be treated as the "4th R" and taught as literacy, not simply a content area (Ohler, 2013).

On December 10, 2015, President Obama signed into law the ESSA legislation. This reauthorized and amended the ESEA of 1965 and replaced NCLB (Whitehouse, 2015). ESEA is the primary federal law that authorizes federal spending to support K-12 schooling, and represents the nation's commitment to equal education for all students regardless of race, ethnicity, disability, English proficiency, or income (Darrow, 2016).

ESSA addresses problems such as accountability and testing requirements, distribution and requirements for grants, fiscal accountability requirements, and the evaluation of teachers. Finally it focuses on reducing federal oversight of education and increases state flexibility in the use of funds (Darrow, 2016; Whitehouse, 2015).

This new legislation gives more opportunities for state and district led accountability, specifically in regards to testing. A major goal of ESSA is to prepare all students for success in college and careers by requiring college and career counseling and advanced course work being made available to all students. States determine their own definition of progress with multiple measures (test scores, graduation rates, and English-language proficiency) as well as the weight each of those measures has in evaluation. States are required to adopt challenging academic standards. These could be the Common Core State Standards, but these are not required, nor can the government require they be. States are no longer required to do teacher evaluation through student outcomes, as they did under NCLB waivers. NCLB's "highly qualified teacher" requirement no longer exists (Education Week Research Center, 2016).

As far as arts teachers are concerned, ESSA includes music and the arts in its definition of a "well-rounded education." Arts and music are now specified as eligible to receive Title I funding which ensures equitable access to a complete education for all students. The arts and music are also eligible for student support and academic enrichment grants, which include support for the arts in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) education. Finally, arts and music are eligible for support under expanded learning time provisions of ESSA. This involves afterschool and expanded learning time, English-language learners, and literacy and advocates for local and state policymakers to use their federal funds in these areas to support arts and music education

(Darrow, 2016; Education Week Research Center, 2016).

In 2006, a Gallup poll found 85% of Americans believed participation in school music was linked to better grades and higher test scores (Evans, 2009). Winner and Cooper (2000) found schools that value the arts may also promote innovative, inquiry-oriented, project-based academic work. They tend to attract the best kinds of academic teachers who are energetic, innovative, and imaginative (Winner & Cooper, 2000). These schools may attract students from families who value the arts who may also value academic achievement (Winner & Cooper, 2000). Studying the arts may lead to the development of cognitive skills that in turn lead to heightened achievement in academic areas (Winner & Cooper, 2000). Studying the arts leads to greater engagement in school, which in turn may lead to greater academic achievement (Winner & Cooper, 2000).

Creativity and critical thinking should be taught in tandem. Teachers must teach students how to innovate and provide opportunities to innovate. The blending of the two would be ideal in teaching problem solving (Ohler, 2013). Students should be baffled, frustrated, question and debate, fail to reach consensus, experimental, and playful in their learning (Taylor, 2006). Bruner (1960) said students should be engaged in discovery learning through involvement in “real world” processes. Parnes’s (1988) Creative Problem Solving Model generated multiple solutions that were neither right nor wrong, but can be successful in the right context (Milbrandt & Milbrandt, 2011). This model dealt with a cycle of problems and fact finding, analysis, idea generation, and judgment (Milbrandt & Milbrandt, 2011). Creativity is not just about generating ideas. It involves making judgments. Critical thinking is part of the nature of the creative process (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Ohler, 2013; Robinson, 2011).

Evans (2009) found the arts teach a specific set of thinking skills rarely addressed

elsewhere in the school curriculum. These include learning to engage and persist, learn from mistakes and press ahead, committing to something and following through, and learning to envision, or thinking about that which they cannot see (Evans, 2009). A focus on outcomes inhibits arts educators from activating their classrooms as sites for critical thinking (Taylor, 2006). There is a need for assessment to be something teachers engage with students in and meant to make students demonstrate their abilities in multiple modalities (Hong, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2003; Woodson, 2004). The arts do this through observing, listening, role-play, movement, drawing, concept mapping, written and oral reports, thinking and communicating in, through, and about the art form, describe, and show. Students can see the need to be aware of the big picture. It educates the emotions (Evans, 2009; Hong, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2003). Research points out when students have had an experience similar to the character in the story through the arts, they comprehend better when they think about the connections they make between the text, their lives, and the larger world (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000; Hong, 2006; Kelin, 2007; Ministry of Education, 2003; Taylor, 2006).

Other benefits of involvement in the arts include cooperative group work, positive self-esteem, fluency in oral communication, the use of imagination, a vehicle for the teaching and learning of other subjects, outreach or entertainment into the community, focusing, close observation, critical, divergent, and independent thinking, problem solving and problem finding, self-confidence, perseverance, high standards, bonding, positive mentors, and stress reduction (Hong, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2003; Wagner, 1998; Winner & Cooper, 2000; Woodson, 2004). There is the assumption the arts are for pleasure, fun, relaxing, easy to learn, and require little effort and not instruction. But, the nature of the arts is to get something out of them by experiencing

them over time and with effort to learn as they are complex (Beals, Cameron, Hipkins, & Watson, 2003; Efland, 1993; Hong, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2003; States, 1994).

Justification for arts in the curriculum rests on the need of teaching them well. If a teacher is an ineffective teacher, there is greater likelihood the program in the school will simply be removed while poor teaching in mathematics and English lead to education reform to improve instruction (Efland, 1993). Arts experiences are constructed by contextual circumstances and the social health of any given classroom (Taylor, 2006). Arts classes cannot thrive in creativity, critical thinking, and problem solving if they are focused on scientific models that reduce the role of the teacher to delivering a checklist (Taylor, 2006; Greene, 1978).

In the arts, production (outcomes) should be the focus of the artistic experience, understanding and the ability to adopt different stances as audience, critic, performer, and maker are even more important to the development of knowledge in the arts (Gardner, 1991; Warburton, 2006). One shot competitions and festivals, and auditions are equivalent to high stakes testing; however, this is indicative of the real world of the arts in a professional setting (Warburton, 2006). Warburton described “intelligence-fair” assessments that require assessment to be contextualized or authentic, and ongoing. A true assessment of arts students can only be measured by evaluating the individual over time, by using multiple measures (Warburton, 2006). The arts require assessments that are performance-based (Warburton, 2006). However, most innovators of authentic assessment focus on what students actually understand about the subjects they learn and if they can demonstrate their understanding in performance (doing) with comprehension (explaining; Baron & Wolf, 1996; Darling-Hammond, Acness, & Falk, 1995; Warburton, 2006; Wolf, Bixby, Glenn, & Gardner, 1991). The standards movement in the United

States requires arts teachers to return to key educational concerns: questions such as what should we assess, how should we assess, and when should we evaluate students (Bonbright, 1999; Warburton, 2006).

History of Theatre Education

With each instance of education reform, it can be noted the public has turned to its political leaders, who propose solutions that have resulted in arts education reform. The shifts in arts education curriculum, advocacy, and philosophy are direct results of these education reforms (Branscome, 2012). Over the course of educational theatre history, rationales for educational theatre generally were to increase students' self-confidence and self-understanding, to think creatively, develop interpersonal skills, and strengthen student appreciation and understanding of human values (Omasta, 2012; Peluso, 1970; Seidel, 1991). Landy (2006) chronicles the history of theatre education that identifies the paradigm shifts that impacted where educational theatre is today.

In the early twentieth century, educational theatre found its origins with Henry Caldwell Cook (1917). He was a British English teacher who saw the need for play and "doing" in learning and taught children's stories through drama. Influenced by John Dewey (1966) and Heinrich Pestalozzi (1951), American educators like Winifred Ward (1930) began experimenting with drama approaches in classroom learning around the same time through improvisational drama. This later developed into what is now known as creative dramatics.

Inspired by the work of Rudolf Laban (1960), Peter Slade (1954), and Richard Courtney (1973), British drama educators introduced philosophical and psychological foundations of developmental sequences of learning through drama based on Piaget's (1962) model of cognitive development. Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton developed

more constructivist theories and approaches that helped children learn that drama was not only about physical action, but also moments of contemplation, reflection, and discussion (Bolton, 1984; Johnson & O'Neill, 1991). Inspired by the works of Abraham Maslow (1963), Carl Rogers (1961), Mochael Polanyi (1966), Fritz Perls (1969), and Herbert Kohl (1970) different theatre groups around the world emerged in the 1960's and 1970's.

The Living Theatre, The Open Theatre, and El Teatro Compesino developed theatre that served oppressed or underrepresented people and raising awareness to social issues during the anti-war protests of the 1960's (Landy, 2006). This was based on the assumptions of educators and practitioners of theatre that dramatic learning was transformative for both teachers and students. This focus led to a process-oriented versus product-oriented approach (Landy, 2006).

In 1970, Ann Shaw translated Benjamin Bloom's learning domains into behavioral objectives in creative drama which led to drama teachers stating specific aims and objectives of drama education and measuring students' ability to meet these objectives. Around the same time, California established the predecessor to the current school standards in theatre that are based on learning objectives fully in the art form in originating, performing, producing, and responding, rather than behavioral objectives introduced by Shaw (1970). The framework was called Drama/Theatre Framework for California Public Schools, a Process-Concept framework for a Program in the theatre Arts for All Students Kindergarten through Twelfth Grade (Shaw, 1970). In 1998, David Hornbrook challenged theorists and practitioners to quantify their work and be held accountable for student achievement in drama and theatre which has continued to this day through NCLB and RTTT in educational theatre (Landy, 2006)

Arts educators in the United States typically fall into two theoretical categories in

education. The first is that of educational. This school of thought is common in elementary school and emphasizes development of creativity, imagination, subjectivity, and a problem solving approach. The second school of thought is that of the professional curricular model. The main focus is on training highly skilled artists and works for presentation. Mostly found in secondary schools teachers focus on technique, and occasionally compositional skills, with little time for creative or conceptual work (Warburton, 2006).

Over the past decades educators in the United States sought to bridge this divide and created a third curricular model known as art approach and emphasized quality of the process and the product resulting from the experience (Warburton, 2006). This enabled arts education to shift from “window dressing” in the whole school curriculum to being recognized increasingly as adding educative value and a strong link to 21st Century Skill acquisition (Hong, 2006). More and more schools around the world are mandating studies in the arts for students and even being considered as part of the core curriculum in some school districts (Ministry of Education, 2000). In 2012, 76 % of surveyed administrators in the United States required students to take at least one course in the arts during their enrollment and schools that offered theatre classes had approximately 23% of their school’s students in at least one theatre course during their enrollment (Omasta, 2012). This is indicative of the shift in focus in education that the arts enable students to interconnect their learning with other subjects and their lives (Hong, 2006). Arts education requires students to attain a rehearsed sense of quality assessment and the rooting in experience (Kushner, 2000). It is an exercise in personal judgment and looks a lot like what is done in assessment and evaluation (Kushner, 2000). The arts teaches from the part to the whole so natural connections among the parts are made invariably

(Kushner, 2000).

Teacher and Administrator Views on Theatre Education

Seidle (1991) and Omasta (2012) in association with The Educational Theatre Association conducted exhaustive studies that surveyed educational theatre and gave the most comprehensive looks at school theatre programs in the United States. Seidle's (1991) survey report related and analyzed the results of an exhaustive survey study of the status of theatre in U.S. high schools. The report is divided into six sections: a general description or "snapshot" of the status of educational theatre, the people who teach theatre, an examination of theatre in the high school classroom, production facilities and activities, an analysis of the survey findings to define and identify effective theatre programs, and a comparison with the findings of Peluso's 1970 study of the same subject.

Omasta (2012) discussed the results of "A Survey of the Status of Theatre in United States High Schools," conducted by the Educational Theatre Association and Utah State University. Theatre educators and secondary school administrators in the U.S. were surveyed using census methodology regarding a wide range of topics in theatre education and it mirrored much of Seidle's (1991) study. Many of Omasta's findings were similar to those of Seidel (1991) with only slightly higher marks in some areas as theatre education has become more common place in schools with increased programming (Omasta, 2012).

Research showed most educators want their students to have experience with quality and this is true within the arts. Quality encompasses quality materials to work with, outstanding products, passionate and accomplished teachers modeling the artistic process, powerful ensemble work, rewarding practice, and excellence in technique and expression (Seidel et al., 2009). Arts teachers, theatre teachers in particular, viewed their

art as a means to reach students in a manner that traditional education cannot (Woodson, 2004).

Administrators also have a high opinion of the value of theatre to students involved in classes and shows, but are less aware of the value to the rest of the student body and school community (Seidel, 1991). Abril and Gault (2006) found administrators believe the arts are highly successful in helping students meet both artistic and broad educational learning goals. In numerous studies (Greenwood, 1991; Liddell, 1977; Payne, 1990; Punke, 1972; Stroud, 1980), school administrators demonstrated their support for music (arts) education, but this support reflected the view that nonmusical (arts) outcomes were of equal import as musical (arts) outcomes (Abril & Gault, 2012). Research also showed that administrators considered arts teachers to have the greatest positive impact on a program when they were effective, and have the strongest negative impact on the music program when they were perceived to be ineffective (Abril & Gault, 2012).

Some interesting observations made in the two studies are worth noting. Teachers rated class work and productions as having roughly equal potential for teaching students and 90% of theatre programs do some sort of production every year and 81% of teachers considered play production work to be part of their theatre course work (Seidel, 1991). 93 % of teachers and 95% of administrators surveyed said extra-curricular activities in theatre were available to their students (Omasta, 2012). Theatre teachers reported an average of 50 hours per week spent to fulfill all of their duties including theatre and non-theatre, and classroom and production work and 85% reported receiving stipends for the directing work in productions in 1991 while that only increased by 1% in 2012 even though 60% reported their position was a secondary assignment (Omasta, 2012; Seidel,

1991). This could be a reason that many theatre teachers still consider themselves to be inadequately trained for some of the requirements of their jobs, particularly in technical theatre where more specialized training would be required for, and why only 2 to 3 respondents claimed their curriculum was aligned to the standards (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991).

Forty eight percent of teachers reported they regularly attended competitions and festivals (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991). Most teachers indicated using methods of student assessment they felt were more effective than their administrators believed including performance/practical demonstration and written exams. Rarely used were portfolios and oral exams (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991). This is consistent with other research that found music teachers also believed more time and energy is invested on performance goals than on other musical goals such as improvising and composing (Abril & Gault, 2007; Williams, 2007). However, principals rated theatre program assessment methods more highly than did the teachers themselves. Interesting as well, the most reliable assessment efforts for what might be considered the least concrete skills (self-confidence, personal growth, and acting) were rated higher than more concrete skills like playwriting by teachers and administrators indicating the more structured and objective the assessment method, the lower its rating by both principal and teachers (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991).

Interestingly, administrators and teachers agreed for the most part that theatre plays an important role in developing skills necessary to work with others to solve problems (leadership, problem-solving/critical thinking, and social/cross-cultural skills; Abril & Gault, 2012; Omasta, 2012). Both groups also indicated administrators support theatre teachers using class work and productions to examine social issues and both

reported the most important job responsibilities of theatre teachers were listening, guiding and directing productions (Seidel, 1991).

As far as involvement in productions, 82% of administrators reported that theatre was in the upper 50% of activities in terms of overall importance to all students, 97% said play productions were very valuable to the students directly involved, 82% felt they were very valuable to the parents of the students directly involved, and 89% felt the productions were somewhat valuable to the other students in the school (Omasta, 2012). This is consistent with Woodson's (2004) research that showed more specifically administrators, parents, teachers, and artists all seem to focus on either the theatre's ability to connect, to teach its audience/ participants, or to build skills used in everyday life.

School and district administrators were highly influential in determining what course offerings were made available to students. Abril and Gault (2012) found that music teachers felt that NCLB and the focus on standardized test scores had the most negative impact on their programs. However, principals indicated NCLB (49%) and standardized tests (57%) had no effect on their music programs. Only 38% and 26% respectively felt they negatively impacted their music programs. However, what principals felt most negatively impacted their music programs were financial and schedule-related issues more so than other variables (Abril & Gault, 2012).

When it comes to arts teacher assessment and evaluation, administrators typically utilize a mixed methods approach of qualitative and quantitative assessment. Most typically they emphasize one more than the other (Stake & Munson, 2008). This is greatly dependent on the administrator's personal experience with the art that is being evaluated and thus tends to lean more towards the qualitative approach (Stake & Munson,

2008). Qualitative is personal and rooted in experience. It is attractive to evaluators because it is holistic, contextual, and empathetic. There is meaning in the whole experience because of its context and circumstances (Stake & Munson, 2008).

Quantitative is scalar, multidimensional, and based on criteria. It is based on ratings and scores that are impersonal and objective more than subjective. It emphasizes expressed standards and comparability (Stake & Munson, 2008). These are how most evaluation systems are set up so administrators, school boards, and legislators support their qualitatively driven conclusions (Stake & Munson, 2008).

Qualities of Effective Arts Teachers

There is evidence in research that teaching is a complex art (Duke & Simmons, 2006; King, 1998) and there are many characteristics of effective teachers. Lists have been developed with indicators defining various qualities of these exceptional teachers, however these are often based on a mechanistic view of teaching, with little consensus in the research supporting a definitive list to look for when observing teachers at work (Duke & Simmons, 2006; King, 1998; Ryan, 1986; Weimer, 1987). Teacher characteristics and behaviors explain more variance in student achievement than any other school factor (Coleman, 1966; Hanushek, 1992; Kyriakides, 2005; Looney, 2011) therefore in depth analysis of exemplary teachers is beneficial to educators (King, 1998).

When it comes to the characteristics of effective teachers in general the literature suggested many qualities/attributes an excellent teacher should possess (see Table 1).

Table 1

Qualities of Effective Teachers

Attribute	Sources
Fosters high student on task behaviors	Kyriakides, 2005; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992; Yarbrough, Dunn, & Baird, in press; Yarbrough & Madsen, 1998
Utilizes positive reinforcement	Blocher, Greenwood, & Shellahamer, 1997; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Miller, 2000; Price, 1983; Stamer, 1999; Van Rossum, 2004; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999; Yarbrough & Price, 1989
Maintains a positive attitude	Hicks, 2004; Kelly, 2007; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Van Rossum, 2004; Walker, 2008
Treats and grades fairly	Franklin, 2005; Looney, 2011; Louis et al., 2010; O'Day, 2002; OECD, 2001; Stamer, 1999; Walker, 2008; Wolfe, 1997
Personal and approachable with students	Walker, 2008; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999
Deals with student problems compassionately and is sensitive to the emotional needs of students	Hinton & Fischer, 2010; Immordino-Yang & Dimasio, 2007; Looney, 2011; Walker, 2008; Wolfe, 1997
Forgiving	Walker, 2008
Admits mistakes	Walker, 2008
Uses scaffolding	Borich, 1992; Kyriakides, 2005; McAllister, 2008; Sanden, 2012
Utilizes a variety of instructional strategies and behaviors	Efland, 1993; Marzano, 2013; Popp, Grant, & Stronge, 2011; Range et al., 2012
Demonstrates collegiality and professionalism	Looney, 2011; Louis et al., 2010; Marzano, 2013; O'Day, 2002; OECD, 2001; Wolfe, 1997
Is reflective	Marzano, 2013; Shuler, 2012
Has strong interactive skills and delivery	Madsen, 1990
Observes other teachers	McAllister, 2008
Changes social behavior at just the right time	Madsen, Standley, & Cassidy, 1989; Yarbrough, 1975
Utilizes body movement	Kelly, 2007
Use of voice	Kelly, 2007
Moves around the room	Kelly, 2007

Just as important as qualities of effective teaching are those of ineffective teaching. In a study by Range et al. (2012) sought to explore the perceptions of Wyoming school leaders concerning the traits of incompetent teachers, administrative strategies used with incompetent teachers, and barriers to their dismissal. The descriptive study used an online survey to measure school leaders' perceptions. Range et al. (2012) identified some of these as defined by school administrators: weak classroom management skills, weak communication with parents, lack of lesson planning, poor professional judgment, resistance to school or district initiatives, low levels of student achievement, large numbers of parent complaints, poor attitude toward teaching responsibilities, behavior causing low morale among students, inability to express content, negative relations with superiors, failure to teach curriculum prescribed, negative relations with colleagues, lack of professional development, refusal to obey school rules, excessive student drop outs, lack of subject matter knowledge, and poor reading or writing skills.

It is important to note that little in the way of specific characteristics of effective theatre arts teachers is available. The limited knowledge of what constitutes effective theatre arts teachers requires one to look at the collective body of knowledge available from the various art forms (music, theatre, dance, and visual art). Research supports the characteristics are highly similar, therefore one can generalize across the domains in which anyone is offering content-specific practice based on expertise in the given content field (Duke & Simmons, 2006; Terry, 1992; Van Rossum, 2004).

Teachout (1997) found students and administrators valued personal skills and teaching skills (pedagogy) to be more important to initial teaching success more so than musical skills, or specified content skills in the arts. Musicianship does not necessarily

mean effective teaching; competency in performance at contest or concert does not address how rehearsals are conducted and the teaching quality within those rehearsals (Brand, 1983). Miller (2000) found that knowing the craft of the art form is not the same as having to teach the craft of the art form, suggesting the two different skill sets and the importance of pedagogy with the skill set of the art form.

The context in which a teacher teaches is important (Chin & Qualls, 1995; King, 1998). Observation instruments with different observation tasks, formats, and foci may affect evaluations of teaching by observers (Prickett & Duke, 1992; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999). Arts educators agree assessment is complicated, evolving, and cultural (Stake & Munson, 2008) suggesting the need for observations geared toward the context in which the teacher teaches to better understand what quality in arts education looks like.

The assumption that quality in arts education exists (Stake & Munson, 2008) and that it should be observed in its context suggests the ways in which an arts classroom operates, the interactions between teachers and students, and the approaches arts teachers take to engage students in the learning process are different and should be addressed in teacher evaluation and what it means to be an excellent teacher (Shehan Campbell, 1991; Duke & Simmons, 2006).

When it comes to the effective teachers in the arts, the literature suggested information in terms of the qualities/attributes an excellent arts teacher should possess and even fewer specific to theatre educators (see Table 2 and Table 3)

Table 2

Qualities of Effective Arts Teachers

Attribute	Sources
Provides immediate, related feedback that is linked to past work	Blocher et al., 1997; Borich, 1992; Cazden, 1986; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Franklin, 2005; Kyriakides, 2005; McAllister, 2008; Price, 1983; Stamer, 1999; Van Rossum, 2004; Watkins, 1993; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999; Yarbrough & Price, 1989
Teaches with an intense and rapid pace	Brand, 1983, 1985; Brophy & Good, 1986; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Grant & Drafall, 1991; Hattie, 2009; Kyriakides, 2005; Looney, 2011; Madsen, 1990; McAllister, 2008; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999; Yarbrough & Madsen, 1998
Establishes clear and high expectations or standards	Brand, 1983, 1990, 2009; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Kyriakides, 2005; Porter & Brophy, 1988; Sanden, 2012; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; Stake & Munson, 2008; Teachout, 1997; Thompson & Joshua-Shearer, 2002; Walker, 2008; Woodson, 2004
Has a sense of humor	Kelly, 2007; King, 1998; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Walker, 2008; Wolfe, 1997
Has excellent classroom management	Brand, 1983; Hattie, 2009; Korteweg, 1989; Looney, 2011; Popp et al., 2011; Range et al., 2012; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Sanden, 2012; Van Rossum, 2004
Balances instruction	Borich, 1992; Brand, 1983; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Efland, 1993; Kyriakides, 2005; Looney, 2011; Popp et al., 2011; Range et al., 2012; Rice, 2003; Sanden, 2012
Provides instructional density and higher order thinking activities	Franklin, 2005; Kowalcek, 1992; Popp et al., 2011; Range et al., 2012; Sanden, 2012; Seidel et al., 2009; Wolfe, 1997
Student learning is at the heart: not the quality of artwork	Brand, 1990; Looney, 2011; Louis et al., 2010; O'Day, 2002; OECD, 2001; Popp et al., 2011; Range et al., 2012; Seidel et al., 2009
Possesses innate talents and is a master practitioner of their craft	Brand, 1990, 2006; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Madsen, 1990; Miller, 2000; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Van Rossum, 2004; Wolfe, 1997
Has a broad and thorough understanding of their content	Brand, 1990, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Efland, 1993; King, 1998; Looney, 2011; Miller, 2000; Porter & Brophy, 1988; Rice, 2003; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Van Rossum, 2004; Wolfe, 1997
Inspires and motivates	Brand, 1990, 2009; Hinton & Fischer, 2010; Immordino-Yang, & Dimasio, 2007; Looney, 2011; Miller, 2000; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Van Rossum, 2004

(continued)

Attribute	Sources
Has energy, enthusiasm, and commitment	Brand, 1983, 1985, 1990, 2006; Erbes, 1987; Kelly, 2007; Madsen, 1990; Miller, 2000; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Wolfe, 1997
Understands young people and youth culture	Thompson & Joshua-Shearer, 2002; Wolfe, 1997; Woodson, 2004
Deals with students as individuals	Miller, 2000; Thompson & Joshua-Shearer, 2002; Van Rossum, 2004; Wolfe, 1997; Woodson, 2004
Creates advocates for the arts	Wolfe, 1997; Woodson, 2004
Gives students control of their knowledge	Duke & Simmons, 2006; Kelly, 2007; Shuler, 2012; Teachout, 1997; Woodson, 2004
Teaches classic literature with artistic goals of high worth	Brand, 1990; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Stamer, 1999; Streznewski, 1999; Van Rossum, 2004; Woodson, 2004
Possesses leadership skills (decisiveness, educational value judgment, leadership, oral communication, organizational ability, personal motivation, problem analysis, range of interest, sensitivity, stress tolerance, and written communication)	Boyer, 1995; Brand, 1983; Creemers & Reezigt, 1996; Kyriakides, 2005; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Shirbagi, 2011; Teachout, 1997; Wolfe, 1997
Time spent in performance in rehearsal is primary	Blocher et al., 1997; Watkins, 1993; Yarbrough & Price, 1989
Teaches for artistic understanding while preparing for performance	Blocher et al., 1997; Duke & Pierce, 1991; Markle, Johnson, Greer, & Meichtry, 1990
Has strong teaching skills over musical skills	Madsen, 1990; Porter & Brophy, 1988; Teachout, 1997, Van Rossum, 2004;
Delivers clear and brief instructions	Brand, 1983; Hattie, 2009; Kyriakides, 2005; Looney, 2011; Rohwer & Henry, 2004
Utilizes good questioning techniques	Borich, 1992; Cazden, 1986; Franklin, 2005; Kyriakides, 2005; Popp et al., 2011; Range et al., 2012; Rohwer & Henry, 2004
Content in classes and rehearsals is serious business	Brand, 1983, 1990; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Kyriakides, 2005; Walberg, 1986
Understands their students	Brand, 1983, 1990, 2006; Porter & Brophy, 1988; Teachout, 1997
Models and demonstrates for students	Duke & Simmons, 2006; Franklin, 2005; McAllister, 2008
Challenges students	Duke & Simmons, 2006; Shirbagi, 2011; Stamer, 1999; Streznewski, 1999; Van Rossum, 2004; Von Suest, 1997

(continued)

Attribute	Source
Involved in professional learning communities specific to content	Looney, 2011; Louis et al., 2010; O'Day, 2002; OECD, 2001; Seidel et al, 2009; Sofras & Emory-Maier, 2005
Plans and prepares lessons	Duke & Simmons, 2006; Kyriakides, 2005; Madsen, 1990; Marzano, 2013; McAllister, 2008; Van Rossum, 2004; Walker, 2008
Seeks and leads professional development	Brand, 1983; Miller, 2000; Seidel et al, 2009
Has personal, social, and academic experience in their craft	Anning, 1998; King, 1998; Richardson, 1996; Stake & Munson, 2008; Van Rossum, 2004; Warburton, 2006; Wilson; 1996
Uses approving facial expressions and nonverbal feedback	Brand, 1983; Kelly, 2007; King, 1998; Madsen, 1990; Stamer, 1999; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999
Maintains eye contact	Brand, 1983; Grant & Drafall, 1991; Hamann, Baker, McAllister, & Bauer, 2000; Kelly, 2007; Madsen et al, 1989; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999; Yarbrough & Price, 1981;
Gives verbal feedback and approval	Brand, 1983; Duke & Simmons, 2006; King, 1998; Madsen, 1990; Stamer, 1999; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999
Establishes sequential patterns and routines	Brand, 1983; King, 1998; Van Rossum, 2004; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999
Cultivates a sense of belonging	Walker, 2008; Wolfe, 1997; Woodson, 2004
Respects students and does not embarrass them	Shirbagi, 2011; Stamer, 1999; Walker, 2008
References pop culture	Woodson, 2004
Takes artistic and personal risks	Flannery, 1968; Woodson, 2004
Has a pleasant personality	Brand, 1990; Kelly, 2007; King, 1998; Teachout, 1997
Maintains a quality environment	King, 1998
Individualizes instruction for students	Franklin, 2005; Stake & Munson, 2008
Sets goals and strategies to achieve them	Boyer, 1995; Duke & Simmons, 2006
Speaks the language of administrators	Boyer, 1995; Wolfe, 1997
Is flexible	Wolfe, 1997
Has a variety of available class resources	Brand, 2006; Wolfe, 1997
Practices assessment in processes	Wolfe, 1997

(continued)

Attribute	Source
Their work is seen publicly	Wolfe, 1997
Listens	Blocher et al., 1997; Watkins, 1993; Yarbrough & Price, 1989
Confident	Kelly, 2007; Rohwer & Henry, 2004
Mature	Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997
Manages stress	Rohwer & Henry, 2004
Patient and tolerant	Brand, 2006; Rohwer & Henry, 2004
Passionate about their art form	Brand, 1990; McAllister, 2008; Van Rossum, 2004
Has theatrical flair	Brand, 1990, 2006
Their classes are exciting	Brand, 1990
Their students are involved	Brand, 1990; Franklin, 2005
Not easily satisfied	Brand, 1983
Their students feel supported	Kyriakides, 2005; Stamer, 1999; Walberg, 1986
Their classes are based on creating, performing, and responding	Duke & Simmons, 2006; Franklin, 2005

Table 3

Qualities of Effective Theatre Arts Teachers

Attribute	Sources
Is creative with a pocketful of games and tricks	Brand, 1990; Flannery, 1968; Kowalcek, 1992; Walker, 2008
Plans complex outcomes to serve multiple purposes for each student	Brand, 1990; Flannery, 1968; Kowalcek, 1992; Walker, 2008
Teaches artistic skills and techniques without making them primary	Duke & Simmons, 2006; Seidel et al., 2009
Develops aesthetic awareness	Seidel et al, 2009
Provides ways to pursue an understanding of the world	Hicks, 2004; Seidel et al, 2009
Engages with community, civic, and social issues	Hicks, 2004; Seidel et al, 2009; Woodson, 2004
Provides a venue for students to express themselves	Seidel et al, 2009
Helps students as individuals	Flannery, 1968; Franklin, 2005; Seidel et al., 2009; Van Rossum, 2004; Wolfe, 1997
Has outstanding communication skills	Brand, 2006; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Miller, 2000
Has no need for ego gratification	Flannery, 1968; Miller, 2000
Understands human behavior	Efland, 1993; Miller, 2000
Is a role-model	Miller, 2000
Is critical without being hurtful and teaches students how to handle criticism	Brand, 1983; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Miller, 2000; Van Rossum, 2004
Their students leave with more than having a good time	Miller, 2000; Van Rossum, 2004
Tours productions	Seidel, 1991
Invites theatre artists visit the school	Brand, 1983; Seidel, 1991
Produces 3 or more plays annually	Seidel, 1991
\Is a member of professional organizations	Seidel, 1991

(continued)

Attribute	Sources
Provides student directing opportunities	Seidel, 1991
Continues training as a lifelong learner	Brand, 1983; Miller, 2000; Seidel, 1991; Shuler, 1996
Has taught theatre for longer than 11 years	Seidel, 1991; Warburton, 2006
Has non-high school directing experience	Seidel, 1991
Majored in theatre in college	Seidel, 1991; Warburton, 2006
Teaches every student, not just the most talented	Flannery, 1968; Miller, 2000

Various Forms of Teacher Evaluation

The research is replete with evaluation systems that are intended to distinguish effective from ineffective teachers. Stronge (1997) developed a model called “Goals and Roles” that established two phases of evaluation called Development and Implementation in which needs, duties, and performance standards were established followed by a documentation of performance, evaluation of performance, and improvement of performance.

Danielson (2011) developed the “Framework for Teaching” that was a set of components of instruction, aligned to the International Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. Teaching was divided into 22 components and 76 smaller elements, clustered into four teaching domains: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. This multipurpose framework was intended to engage practitioners in conversations to enhance practice and to link mentoring, coaching, professional development, and teacher evaluation together to strengthen teachers’ work.

Marzano's (2013) Teacher Evaluation Model was intended to identify the direct cause and effect relationship between teaching practices and student achievement, help teachers and leaders make informed decisions to yield the greatest benefits for their students, made steady, measurable increases in student achievement an achievable goal through moving the teacher through four domains of (a) teach—classroom strategies and behaviors, (b) plan—planning and preparing, (c) reflect—reflecting on teaching, and (d) share—collegiality and professionalism all to benefit student achievement.

Peterson (1987) identified eight lines of evidence including student reports, parent surveys, student achievement data, teacher tests, peer review, administrator reports, documentation of professionalism, and an open category as a reliable teacher evaluation model. Airasian and Gullickson (1997) cited self-evaluation, pedagogy and subject matter knowledge, teaching competencies, and contributions to the school, community, and the profession as components to their evaluation model. Swartz, White, & Stuck (1990) identified two factors of effective teaching. Patrick and Smart (1998) identified three factors. Ramsden (2003) suggested seven while Marsh and Duncan (1992) cited nine factors to consider (Shirbagi, 2011).

This suggests that in some significant way teachers contribute to student achievement. However, the characteristics of effective teachers and ways to gather the data on effective teaching are not agreed upon (Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008; Goe & Stickler, 2008; Harris & Sass, 2009; Piro et al., 2011). Research suggests multiple measures of teacher effectiveness should be used to get a true holistic picture of what a teacher does and how that looks in terms of effectiveness including supervisor observation, student surveys, self-analysis and reflection, and peer observation and collegial dialogue (Maranzano, 2000; Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011; Mickle & Frontier, 2012).

The area of arts teacher evaluation possess great opportunities for further study over longer periods of time including more inclusive models for performance documentation, utilizing multiple sources of data, and self-evaluation (Maranzano, 2000). Common to the aforementioned teacher evaluation systems was the need for intense and thorough training of the evaluators and teachers involved in the processes (Airasian & Gullickson, 1997; Danielson, 2011; Marsh & Duncan, 1992; Marzano, 2013; Patrick & Smart, 1998; Peterson, 1995; Ramsden, 2003; Stronge, 1997; Swartz et al., 1990).

According to Weems and Rogers (2010) the goal of classroom observations is to obtain a representative sample of a teacher's performance in the classroom. To accurately assess a professional arts teacher well, it should be conducted in action and situated in real-life conditions as they happen (Efland, 1993; Stake & Schwandt, 2006; Stake & Munson, 2008). Competence and quality fit different situations differently and judgment of quality in arts instruction should extend beyond a focus on teacher talents and a prescribed checklist of behaviors to include the teacher attending to the whole student and whole class and a shift in focus to student learning (Stake & Munson, 2008; Ellett, 1997; Haertel, 1991).

Observations are usually limited to as few as one (Weems & Rogers, 2010) and it is not possible for evaluators to accomplish appropriate evaluation with a small sample of work gained through minimal observation (Boyd, 1989). Maranzano (1999) suggested eliminating the "snap-shot" approach for arts educators and adopt a "feature film" approach for evaluators to capture the benefits of student/ teacher interaction. Maranzano (2000) cautioned the development of a content specific observation instrument that is a checklist because an arts specialist may need to be employed to evaluate properly, in lieu of building level administrators meaning more money to accommodate this. This

suggested a need for appropriate and adequate training of evaluators since the evaluations were based on the evaluators' professional judgment (Looney, 2011).

If the only goal is to determine competence in the classroom, current administrator observation instruments will suffice (Weems & Rogers, 2010). However, if the goal is to promote professional growth, then the methods must be expanded to include content specific criteria to be observed (Weems & Rogers, 2010).

Weems and Rogers (2010) stated, "the main goal of peer/ mentor observation is to change the manner in which they operate and adjust to the changing times, students and situations" (p. 21). Through this process the mentee receives helpful outside feedback and the mentors also benefit from seeing other instructional practices, which can serve to benefit their own instruction as well (Weems & Rogers, 2010; Shuler, 2012).

Peer evaluation should not be used for summative evaluation. It is meant for formative feedback and improvement (Nathan, 2000). It can reduce the demand on the administrator's time, provide content specific expertise, allow the teacher perspective to be a greater presence in the evaluation process, and encourage teachers to play a greater role in their profession. Research finds teachers are more receptive to peer feedback than administrator feedback and there is improvement throughout schools as a result of peer observation systems that are open and rigorous, clear performance guidelines in place with explicit instructional standards, ongoing training, and effective supervision (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Taylor & Tyler, 2012).

The feeling of isolation among arts teachers is a reality as they are often the only one of their kind in a school, therefore receiving content specific feedback that is useful is not always easily found. However, advances in communication technology have made it possible to receive feedback from colleagues not in the school building (Shuler, 2012).

Teachers working together in pairs to set and monitor goals together and across disciplines can benefit both teachers as they observe different pedagogies, ways of approaching content, and ways of interacting with students in action (Nathan, 2000).

When it comes to value-added models and standardized testing for the arts, research supports multiple choice testing and assessments of students in the arts is of little value because it is difficult to measure artistic creation and performance (Efland, 1993; Shuler, 2012; Stake & Munson, 2008; Zerull, 1990). Summative assessment suggests there is a final destination in education. Summative evaluation in the arts is not appropriate because it only examines a limited memory of concepts, facts, and technical judgments and says nothing about whether a student can actually make the art (Perrine, 2013; Zerull, 1990). In 2012, Omasta cited in his study of theatre education in the United States that 79% of theatre teachers reported their teacher evaluation was not linked to test scores or other assessments of student achievement, 20% said yes, and 1% said they were not sure. However, with most states now on board with RTTT, significant changes to how theatre and other related arts teachers are evaluated will surely take place in coming years.

Research supports there are several factors that make standardized testing or assessment in the arts problematic (Alok, 2011). Teaching effectiveness alone cannot account for learning outcomes (Alok, 2011) since there is a lack of standardized arts curriculum, the subjective nature of the arts, the highly individualized character of arts instruction, and varying access to resources in arts programs (Zerull, 1990). The element of subjectivity must be addressed when it comes to arts education (Zerull, 1990). Zerull (1990) stated arts assessment should be formative as it deals with the learning process and how it affects the end result and the richness of the interaction between student and

teacher.

Teachers argue if tests are narrow and superficial, then teaching will follow suit (Zerull, 1990) and therefore the tests cannot reveal whether teachers are effective in arts classes (Perrine, 2013). Acknowledging this, some states are moving to a more inclusive model and creating value-added models for arts educators that allow teachers the flexibility to establish student learning objectives (SLO) within the context of their arts classes to measure student growth. Ohio is currently implementing this model where 50% of the teacher evaluation is based on the SLO data and 50% based on teacher performance on standards. Using these multiple measures in conjunction with classroom observations, a more holistic evaluation of what the arts teacher does in their classroom is hoped to be achieved (OHDOE, 2013).

South Carolina is modeling their value-added model for arts teachers in similar fashion. The South Carolina Department of Education is working in conjunction with task forces made up of arts educators from all levels of education to create models for evaluation of teachers in the arts. They are including in the language of their value-added model proposals that no school wide VAM scores are to be attached to teachers in the arts, measurable student achievement collected through SLO, and portfolios of student and educator work to be reviewed by content specific evaluators or blind-peer review, trained in the art form and evaluation (SCDOE, 2013, 2014; SCMEA, 2013).

Florida music teachers support that adjudicated performance events are an appropriate means of assessing students and teachers. Florida and North Carolina even changed the names of their state festivals to “Music Performance Assessments” (MPA; Perrine, 2013). Perrine argued, these are equivalent to a standardized test in that it is a one-shot assessment; there is no pre-test to measure growth, and does not track individual

achievement or student learning. And thus, requires a teacher to teach to a test, which is the vocal argument arts educators put forth they want to avoid if the final outcomes are not means to understanding quality in the arts education as a whole (Perrine, 2013; Stake & Munson, 2008).

Continuous self-reflection and discussions about quality teaching and how to achieve it are catalysts and signs of quality that exemplify authentic assessment (Seidel et al., 2009; Warburton, 2003). Self-appraisal questions like, “What did I learn? What risks did I take? and, What will change?” reflects the highest levels of assessment because one is evaluating his/ her personal strengths and weaknesses (Warburton, 2006).

However, words alone may not always express progress and quality, and audiovisual examples to demonstrate quality are needed (Hong, 2006). Another form of authentic assessment is teacher portfolios (Weems & Rogers, 2010). A portfolio is a collection of work produced by a teacher to highlight and demonstrate their knowledge and skills in teaching, to provide a means for reflection, and give teachers the opportunity to critique and evaluate their own instruction and interpersonal interactions with peers (Weems & Rogers, 2010).

Student evaluations of instruction are the most common method used in higher education to assess instructors and believed by many to be the most accurate assessment of teaching (Fresco & Nasser, 2001; Kyriakies, 2005). Students are the direct recipients of the teaching and learning process and are in a prominent place to give feedback about the work of their teachers because they experience on a regular and consistent basis instruction, interaction and rapport, and evaluation and feedback (Aleamoni, 1981, Kyriakides, 2005; Peterson, 1987, Stronge & Ostander, 1997; Weems & Rogers, 2010). These student evaluations of teaching are typically anonymous surveys that gather

information about the quality of teaching in terms of teaching methods, use of sources of knowledge and teaching means, expertise in the field of teaching, and interrelationship with the learners (Earl, 2008; Howell & Symbaluk, 2001; Weems & Rogers, 2010). The ratings in the survey offer appropriate ways of gathering student feedback for instructional improvement (formative; Abrami, 2001; Alok, 2011; Safavi, Bakar, Tarmizi, & Alwi, 2013). Murray (1997) conducted a study on the usefulness of student ratings of teaching in higher education and found the majority of faculty (73.4%) agreed that student ratings provided useful information and most (68.8%) agreed student ratings led to improved teaching.

The research also suggests teaching is more than something the teacher does to make students learn, rather it is an activity that is accomplished by students with the guidance of the teacher and that student engagement in the learning process is more important for learning (Biggs, 1999; Chickering & Gamson 1987; Shuell 1986; Zerihun et al., 2012). Therefore, it may prove difficult to truly assess teacher effectiveness on learning if the focus of student evaluations remains on teacher behavior instead of the perceptions and experiences leading to student engagement in the learning process facilitated by the teacher (Biggs 1999; Cabrera, Colbeck, & Terenzini, 2001; Chickering & Gamon 1987; Hattie 2003; Oliver, Tucker, Gupta, & Yeo, 2008; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Zerihun et al., 2012) and given responsibility for their own learning (Weimer, 2002). If the student feedback from the evaluations reflects what they learn and how they learn it, then teachers can truly use the results as formative feedback, reflect, and make changes to impact future instruction (Zerihun et al., 2012). Another benefit of student ratings is the process of filling out the surveys requires students to reflect on their educational experiences and the role they played in the educational

process (Shirbagi, 2011).

There is evidence that younger students may provide effective feedback on the quality of their learning experiences (Looney, 2011). Murray (1997) and Marsh (2007) found student ratings in higher education provided accurate feedback on the quality of their teachers. Hattie (2009) and Looney (2011) found younger students valued similar qualities in the practices of their teachers to improve student learning as do college and university students. This was because they did not feel constrained by the surveys since they were in kid-friendly language. Furthermore, students observed the teacher on a daily basis and were well-placed to comment on the teacher's impact on their learning (Hattie, 2009; Looney, 2011) even more so than administrators (Marshall, 2012).

Stake and Munson (2008) stated, "Student performance is more complex than any checklist that a teacher or assessment expert can make" (p. 16). It is important for educators to see the whole experience in arts education, not just the final product or performance (Greene, 1995; Stake & Munson, 2008). It is imperative to recognize the experience of the students. If student learning through experience in the arts, practical assignments, connections with the student's life, and providing a place of personal expression is what is to be measured, a limited checklist that lessens the vitality of the discipline of the arts is not appropriate (Dewey, 1934; Stake & Munson, 2008).

Content Specific Factors for Theatre Teacher Evaluation

Alok (2011) stated, "Teacher efforts can be better appreciated by evaluating their job-related behaviors" (p. 228). Assessments or evaluation instruments must be sensitive to the specifics that accompany the complex nature of fine arts instruction and must come from the vocabulary of artistic instruction and general educational dimensions instead of a general core of facts or descriptors that describe general good teaching (Maranzano,

2000; Taebel, 1990a, 1990b, 1992; Zerull, 1990;).

Evaluating arts teachers can be a complex dilemma for administrators trying to fit the intricacies of the arts into a “one-size fits all” approach due to there not being enough comprehensive information needed to make important educational decisions regarding arts instructors (Maranzano, 2000). These traditional models do not transfer well when evaluating the complex and specialized world of the arts (Maranzano, 2000; Good & Mulryan, 1990). They don’t capture higher-level teacher-student interactions or make finer distinctions between effective and mediocre teaching. Problems in validity and reliability in teacher evaluation are greater when it comes to the specialized training required in the arts (Maranzano, 2000). This is further supported due to the lack of coherence and agreement among arts professionals regarding how to properly evaluate arts instruction (Grant & Drafall, 1991; Maranzano, 2000; Taebel, 1990a, 1990b). Reimer (1971) identified six basic aesthetic behaviors in which people who interact with the arts find appropriate for evaluation, competency, and accountability: Reacting, producing, conceptualizing, analyzing, evaluating, and valuing (Reimer, 1971; Zerull, 1990) which is further supported by Maranzano (2000) who found the characteristics identified in music teacher performance research translates across disciplines.

Research supports the need for extensive training of evaluators in teacher evaluation in general, but even more so for the highly specialized work teachers in the arts do. Henninger (2002) found observers trained in specific skills tended to respond differently to the performance of that skill than those who have not received formal training. The level of expertise in a discipline may have affected the observers’ perceptions of what they saw in the classroom; experts saw deeper (Henninger, 2002).

Kent (2005) found a teacher’s understanding and view of the art form he/she

taught had great effect on how the teacher assessed their students' works. By extension, an evaluator of a teacher's work may be affected by their experience and understanding of the subject they are evaluating the teacher in (Orr, 2011). Eisner (1985) discussed this notion as "qualities of a connoisseur," which meant to form judgment or criticism required a highly developed sense of perception and memory; educational evaluation required this same specialization (Eisner, 1983; Zerull, 1990).

Henninger (2002) placed observations of teachers into two categories: (a) the nature of the observation itself, and (b) the characteristics the observer brings to the observation. Music (arts) teachers are rarely observed by helpful observers (Shuler, 2012). Most arts teachers are evaluated by a principal, other administrator, or a department chair (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991; Weems & Rogers, 2010) and arts teachers have legitimately argued that evaluation credibility may be lowered by subjective judgments imposed by administrators not trained in arts methodologies and therefore, lowered reliability of the evaluation process in general (Colwell & Davison, 1996; Maranzano, 2000).

Testing of students has rarely been used in part of the evaluation process of teacher performance (Seidel, 1991), however this is changing with the data driven education reform that began in 1983 and continued with the ESSA authorized in 2015. Omasta (2012) found schools rarely used peer-assessment (3%) or student assessment of teachers (less than 2%). Many common evaluation systems hinder a creative teacher (Marzano, 2012). Some administrators take a superior or manager oriented style of evaluation that gives teachers little voice in the evaluation process and thereby makes the process a monologue (one person speaking) rather than a dialogue (multiple people in conversation). This can hinder a creative teacher's risk-taking ability and self-reflecting

behaviors, which are essential and critical components to a creative person's way of operating and teaching (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Johnson, 1990; Maranzano, 2000).

Theatre (fine arts) education is fundamentally a dialogue, or conversation. Listening and responding in a respectful manner is at the heart of the theatre experience (Kent, 2005; Orr, 2011; Woodson, 2004).

Another fundamental component to evaluation in the arts is the focus on process over product. The product is only a part of the teaching. Evaluation of teachers must include process as part of the criteria. The product (concert, play, art exhibit, or festival performance rating) must not be the focus of evaluation (Zerull, 1990).

Research supports the notion that no one knows the work of the student better than the teacher does and this is particularly true in the arts. Often arts teachers see students develop over the course of several years. This enables arts teachers to more accurately assess student work and progress over time (Zerull, 1990). Teachers in the arts should require students to assess and evaluate their work and others' works through reflection (Zerull, 1990). By extension, evaluation of teachers in the arts should extend over time with reflection. This can easily be evidenced through portfolios where there is a focus on product, perception, and reflection and work is collected over time (Brandt, 1987; Gardner, 1991; Zerull, 1990).

It is worth noting arts teachers teach a variety of courses that are highly specialized. Omasta (2012) reported 79% of schools surveyed offered at least one theatre course similar to a theatre appreciation course. Additional courses were offered in technical theatre design (29%) and acting (27%), musical theatre (14%), directing, theatre history, playwriting, stage management, and theatre management. Often times, there is one teacher to teach all these courses requiring multiple preps for a teacher, and

sometimes multiple preps within one class period.

Omasta (2012) also found most teachers are expected to produce theatrical productions outside the regular school hours; this was consistent with Seidel's (1991) findings in his similar study. Maranzano (2000) cited music educators have many activities that took place after school hours or off school grounds. Current evaluation practices tend to dismiss the valuable work that extends outside the typical school day and contributes to the instructional programs of the arts. These are valid sources of authentic instruction that can and should be assessed (Maranzano, 2000). Due to the nature of the extended hours of instruction arts teachers are involved with, and the nature of product or performance exhibition that is indicative of healthy arts programs (Omasta, 2012), involvement in the community, parents, and the school as a whole are also rich sources of evidence of instruction, planning, knowledge of subject matter, adaptation of instructional materials, support and rapport with students, and collegiality and professionalism (Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990).

Consistent with research in general education, the theatre (arts) teacher is the most significant factor in high school theatre (arts) education (Seidel, 1991). Teacher quality is the key to raising student achievement (Weems & Rogers, 2010). Assessment and support through professional development that is content specific helps the arts teacher to grow, and therefore the program grows (Seidel, 1991). There is a need for further research in accurately evaluating the performance of arts teachers in schools (Maranzano, 2000).

Summary

The related literature in the field of theatre teacher evaluation has left a gap in the research that is available. The need for a better understanding in what defines an

effective theatre teacher exists. Administrators, evaluators, and policy makers must understand these qualities along with how an effective theatre classroom looks in order to conduct well-informed observations and evaluations so they may support appropriate professional development opportunities. Targeted professional development for these teachers may improve classroom performance and student growth in the theatre arts classroom.

This chapter discussed many facets of theatre education and evaluation. The types and purposes of teacher evaluation discussed the framework for the types and purposes of teacher evaluation in general. A brief history of education reform in the United States and a history of theatre education frame the discussion for the constant changes in education and the development of theatre education were presented. Teacher and administrator views on theatre education were explored as well as the qualities of effective teachers, arts teachers, and theatre arts teachers. Finally, various forms of teacher evaluations and content specific factors for theatre teacher evaluation were discussed. This mixed methods study aimed to fill in the gap with further research into this phenomenon. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology of this mixed methods study.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators in South Carolina in order to get a more holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does. Findings may be used to lay a foundation for what effective teaching in theatre arts classes look like. This may better inform teacher evaluation in theatre arts by administrators for the purposes of assisting and developing theatre arts teachers professionally (Peterson, 2000; Stake & Munson, 2008). This study focused specifically on theatre arts and investigated the following research question:

What are the perceived commonalities and differences of theatre teachers and their administrators regarding effective instructor traits, characteristics, and instructional practices?

Chapter 3 outlines and describes the general methodology of this study, the research context and site, the participants and sampling practices, the instruments and materials used, the procedures followed, the data analysis made, and the limitations involved in this study.

Research Context

The nature of theatre is a non-reproducible experience, collaborative, and is personal (Nowacek, 2008). Taylor (1996) wrote theatre should be studied in ways that make sense to study theatre. Theatre is designed based on an anthropological premise- the study of culture (Nowacek, 2008). Because qualitative research is the study of learning (in culture) through art and science (Nowacek, 2008; Rossman & Rallis, 2003), and because research in theatre arts is grounded in the natural setting of theatre activity (Carroll, 1996, Nowacek, 2008), it therefore becomes important to use the voices of the

theatre teachers and their administrators in the qualitative methods of collecting data. Otherwise the study will lose a unique set of social relationships and experiences that can provide rich analysis and study (Carroll, 1996; Nowacek, 2008). In teacher evaluation research the voice of the teacher is often overlooked. It is often perceived that the voice of the teacher does not matter, their opinions do not count, and they are not theorists (Greene, 1978; Nowacek, 2008; Taylor, 1996).

Research Design

The design of this study followed a mixed methods approach of pragmatism and generic qualitative inquiry and exploratory sequential mixed methods. Generic qualitative inquiry uses qualitative methods such as in-depth interviewing to answer straightforward questions to understand the perspectives and worldviews of the people involved in real-world settings to solve problems, improve programs, or develop policies (Caelli, Ray, & Mill, 2003; Cooper & Endacott, 2007; Merriam, 1997; Patton, 2015). Pragmatism strives for practical understandings and wisdom about concrete, real-world issues by inquiring into practical questions in search of useful and actionable answers and making pragmatic decisions while conducting the inquiry based on real-world constraints. It also allows for mixing methods and adapting data collection as the fieldwork unfolds by opening the door to multiple methods, different worldviews, and different assumptions as well as different forms of data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009; Patton, 1999).

Exploratory sequential mixed methods is a strategy intended to develop better measurements with specific samples of populations and to see if data from a few individuals (qualitative phase) can be generalized to a large sample of a population (in quantitative phase; Creswell, 2014; Morgan, 1998; Morse, 1991). It is meant for

exploring a phenomenon and expanding on the qualitative findings in a three-phase approach: Phase 1—the researcher gathers qualitative data and analyzes it, Phase 2—uses the analysis to develop an instrument, and Phase 3—subsequently administers to a sample population (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

Specifically, the researcher interviewed a sample of theatre arts teachers and their administrators (qualitative), developed a survey instrument based on the qualitative data gathered, and surveyed (quantitative) a larger sample of theatre arts teachers in South Carolina. In this mixed methods study it was essential to gather the perceptions of those who are the practitioners in this field: those who teach theatre arts and those who evaluate them. The target population for this study was high school theatre teachers and the administrators- evaluators responsible for teacher evaluations in South Carolina. Therefore, a qualitative design was appropriate to studying theatre teachers' and administrators' perceptions. Furthermore, a quantitative component utilizing surveys of theatre teachers based on information gathered from the interviews was utilized to explore the phenomenon further, expand on the qualitative findings, and triangulate the data for further statistical analysis.

Sampling and Participants

Purposeful sampling indicates that the researcher is intentionally selecting individuals and sites to learn or understand the topic of the study (Creswell, 2012). Typical sampling is a purposeful sampling strategy that addresses what is “normal” or “typical” for those unfamiliar with the situation (Creswell, 2012). Working with the theatre teachers and administrators willing to participate in the study at the various schools provided data based on a typical situation and align with the cultural norms of the schools in which the teachers and administrators work. In qualitative research it is

important to limit the sample size to keep the research manageable (Creswell, 2012). It was important to ensure theatre teachers selected for the study had experience in teaching theatre in a high school classroom setting. It was not important to the study for administrators to have experience in theatre arts, but it was hoped that a wide array of sampling would provide the most beneficial information.

The sample consisted of sixteen professionals in eight different high schools from across South Carolina. One theatre teacher and one administrator/evaluator were selected from each of the eight schools. The sixteen participants were selected based on having taught or served in the capacity of an administrator or teacher evaluator for 5 years or more. This study required certified theatre teachers who teach theatre as their primary content area at the high school level. Additionally, they maintained a theatre program within the school day and after school hours (competition/ festival participation, full theatre productions, or a combination of these). Theatre teachers are typically expected to produce theatrical productions outside the regular school hours and current evaluation practices tend to dismiss the valuable work and sources of authentic instruction that can and should be possessed that extend outside the typical school day. (Maranzano, 2000, Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991). The study required that the administrator/evaluator in charge of teacher evaluations (principal, assistant principal, program coordinator) for the school, in which the theatre teacher works, be willing to participate in the study as well. With this requirement, the willingness of the administrator was an important component in this study.

Subsequent to collection of interview data with the eight pairs of school professionals, a survey was administered to South Carolina theatre teachers by utilizing a listserv from the state theatre organization, The South Carolina Theatre Association, with

appropriate permissions granted. A survey was developed and administered electronically utilizing the online survey platform QuestionPro, an independent research firm to field confidential survey responses. One hundred eleven surveys were sent out via email and 24 emails were returned, due to personnel attrition in the school districts, school districts changing email platforms, and incorrect information on the listserv. Of the 87 surveys actually delivered, 49 were completed (56.32 %) in the two-week window allotted for completion. Email reminders were sent at the halfway interval as well as postings on social media sites relevant to theatre teachers in South Carolina.

Instruments and Materials Used

The researcher-developed interview questions were approved by the researcher's committee prior to administration of the interviews to the participants in order to ensure congruence to the research question. The one-on-one interview for theatre teachers consisted of observations of gender and race/ethnicity, and 5 questions pertaining to demographics for the teacher and their teaching context. There were 11 open-ended questions for the theatre teacher to answer pertaining to the research question (see Appendix A). The one-on-one interview questions for administrators consisted of observations of gender and race/ethnicity, 6 questions pertaining to demographics for the administrator and their leadership context. There were 14 open-ended questions for the administrator to answer pertaining to the research question (see Appendix B). The interviews were conducted in person and on site with each participant.

The qualitative data gathered from these interviews and evidence from the body of literature informed the theatre teacher survey developed by the researcher. The theatre teacher survey that was developed by the researcher underwent an external audit by a panel of high school theatre teachers outside of South Carolina and College and

University Theatre Education professors selected by the researcher. This panel assisted in making suggestions, additions, and changes to the survey to ensure the intended audiences understood what the survey was asking. This survey was administered to South Carolina High School teachers in cooperation with the South Carolina Theatre Association in order to gather further data from a larger sample size and for triangulation purposes.

Procedures

The design of this study followed a mixed methods approach of pragmatism and generic qualitative inquiry and exploratory sequential mixed methods. The qualitative data of this study were collected through interviews of the study participants. The experiences of the teachers and administrators in the study provided the common themes. These themes were determined using a constant comparative method and served as the basis for the theatre teacher survey that was developed (see Appendix C).

Eight theatre teacher and administrator/evaluator pairs were selected based on a minimum of 5 years of teaching or administrative experience from across the state of South Carolina by the researcher. The local school district offices, with respect to the application processes and interviews, granted access to the sites with district office personnel per the requirements of each district. Each theatre teacher and administrator signed a consent form (see Appendix D) that detailed the purpose of the study and their role as a participant in the study as well as other critical information needed to comply with IRB requirements for studies involving human subjects. Pseudonyms were assigned in the coding process and the key was destroyed upon completion of the study by the researcher so that any results or findings shared will not be able to be linked back to individuals in the study.

Interviews were recorded via a digital voice recorder at the sites where the theatre

teacher and administrator/evaluator pairs work in a one-on-one setting. Once the interviews were conducted, the researcher transcribed the interviews verbatim. Once transcriptions were completed, the digital files of each interview were saved for the appropriate time as determined by IRB, then destroyed so there was no longer access to the data. All interviews were conducted and all responses coded through a constant comparative method. Pseudonyms were used to ensure confidentiality and trustworthiness of responses by the researcher. The researcher disaggregated the qualitative data and developed a theatre teacher survey based on the common themes that emerged from the interviews and the relevant literature.

Data Analysis

Once the interviews were reviewed, coded, categorized by the researcher, the common themes that emerge were reported through a narrative and appropriate tables to document the data by the researcher through a constant comparative method. The constant comparative method is a method for analyzing data. Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggest that when used to generate theory, the comparative analytical method they describe can be applied to social units of any size. This process involves making decisions regarding initial collection of data based on one's initial understanding of the phenomenon. Further data collection cannot be planned in advance of analysis and the emergence of theory and the rationale for selecting comparison groups is their theoretical relevance for fostering the development of emergent categories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Strauss and Corbin (1990) describe open coding as, "the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data" (p. 61). This coding process continues until a strong theoretical understanding of an event, object, setting or phenomenon has emerged (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The qualitative data was written

in a narrative description to summarize the findings of the study.

The quantitative data from the survey instrument was statistically analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Principal component analysis is a variable-reduction technique that reduces a larger set of variables into a smaller set of “artificial” variables (called principal components) that account for most of the variance in the original variables (Laerd Statistics, 2015). A principal component analysis (PCA) was run on a 12-question survey that measured traits, characteristics, and instructional practices of theatre teachers that derived from the themes that emerged from the qualitative interviews.

Based on the results of the PCA, in conjunction with the qualitative data from the interviews, three distinct components were confirmed. Cronbach’s alpha was then used to measure the internal consistency of each of the three confirmed themes. This analysis was chosen to determine how much the items on the scale measured the same underlying dimension.

Relevant descriptive statistical analysis was utilized with the quantitative data gathered from the surveys. Relevant descriptive statistical analyses were used including a one-sample Chi-square test for the Likert-like scale survey items. A one-sample Chi-Square test was used to determine if what was observed in the distribution of frequencies was what you would expect to occur by chance (Salkind, 2013). The degrees of freedom were calculated by the number of categories minus 1, and the significance level was set at .05. The null hypothesis stated there was no significant difference between the expected and observed frequencies. The alternative hypothesis stated they were different. The Chi-square provides the table value for the Chi-square (see Table 6). If the Chi-square observed value was equal to or greater than the table value, then the null hypothesis was

rejected. Rejection of the null showed differences in the collected data are not due to chance alone.

Limitations

One possible limitation to this study was the researcher's bias. Safeguards were imbedded to do everything possible to keep the bias of the researcher out of the study and truly reflect the perceptions and reflections of the participants. The study acknowledged the researcher shares a history of having taught the same subject matter as the teacher participants in the study. The researcher is a Caucasian male in his mid-thirties with bachelor's and master's degrees in theatre education and serves as a state representative elected by South Carolina theatre teachers to the state's professional theatre organization, The South Carolina Theatre Association. This professional affiliation provides access to the database of theatre teachers across the state.

A second possible limitation to this study was ensuring commitment and buy-in for the duration of the study from both theatre teachers and administrators. It was imperative for all study participants to be invested in the study and available to give information rich responses in the interviews.

Another limitation for this study was that it was limited to theatre arts. However, further research can be conducted for other fine arts teachers in other disciplines like music, visual art, and dance. Growing evidence indicates that many of the characteristics identified in the research on effective music teacher performance do translate across disciplines, despite content and expression of the art forms (Maranzano, 2000; Stake & Munson, 2008), so it can be presumed that findings from this study may be applicable to other specialty areas in education.

The small number in the study was also a limitation as it did not take into account

all high school theatre teachers and administrators in South Carolina. The study participants in the interviews represented a typical sample from across the state and gave insight to the phenomenon of theatre teacher evaluation for the purposes of this study. The survey administered was developed to sample a larger pool of theatre teachers to gain further information to triangulate the qualitative data with quantitative data.

Finally, it was imperative that the panel of experienced, knowledgeable and respected individuals in the field to be utilized in this study validate the survey created. Their expertise in the chosen fields was vital to the study as they conducted the external audits to ensure validity and clarity.

Summary

This chapter outlined how the researcher collected and analyzed the data for this mixed methods study of the perceived commonalities and differences of theatre teachers and their administrators regarding effective instructor traits, characteristics, and instructional practices. By utilizing the qualitative method of pragmatism and general qualitative inquiry through one-on-one interviews with theatre teachers and their administrator/evaluators, the quantitative analysis of surveys administered to theatre teachers across South Carolina was based on the emergent themes from the interviews. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings and present recommendations based on this study.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators in South Carolina in order to get a more holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does. Using existing teacher evaluation instruments, administrators are ill equipped to provide either adequate feedback or fair evaluations of theatre teacher practice. Findings may inform teacher evaluation in theatre arts by administrators for the purposes of assisting theatre arts teachers and developing these teachers professionally. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the data analyses for this study. Graphical displays are provided where appropriate.

This mixed methods approach of pragmatism and generic qualitative inquiry (Patton, 2015) and exploratory sequential mixed methods (Creswell, 2014) utilized typical purposeful sampling. Face to face interviews were conducted with each participant representing typical theatre education situations across South Carolina. Eight theatre teachers and an administrator responsible for each theatre teacher's evaluation were selected. Interviews were conducted between March and June of 2015 with appropriate permissions acquired from each participating school and district in the study. All 16 participants agreed via email to be interviewed. Each participant completed an agreement to participate in the study (see Appendix D) as well as agreed to be debriefed once the interviews were completed (see Appendix E). Each theatre teacher was asked 16 questions that were approved by the researcher's committee. Each administrator was asked 18 questions that were approved by the researcher's committee. All participants completed the study and no participant exited the study. All interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder and later transcribed verbatim by the researcher. The qualitative data of the participant interviews were reviewed, categorized by topic, and coded for

common themes that emerged relevant to the related literature through a constant-comparative method.

In discussing the findings of the study, excerpts were used from the participants' interviews to support the researcher's findings in relation to the relevant literature as well as new emergent and contrary findings. The research question guided the development of the interview questions and was used in the reporting and analysis of the findings.

Upon reviewing the qualitative data from the interviews, a survey was developed by the researcher and reviewed by theatre education professors and high school theatre teachers from out of state. The survey consisted of 12 Likert-like questions and three open-ended questions to confirm themes discovered from the interviews. Statistical analyses of the survey were run including a PCA, Cronbach's Alpha, and Chi-square. In discussing the findings of the study, relevant data and graphical displays were used to support the researcher's findings in relation to the qualitative data gathered during the interviews. The research question guided development of the survey and was used in the reporting and analysis of the findings.

Research Question

What are the perceived commonalities and differences of theatre teachers and their administrators regarding effective instructor traits, characteristics, and instructional practices?

Overview of Participants

Each participant, identified hereafter by a pseudonym, worked in a public high school in South Carolina during the two academic years 2014-2016. The theatre teachers were all certified to teach Theatre Arts, or were under special proviso from the state to do so with appropriate credentials to support the proviso. All teachers had a minimum of 5

years of teaching experience and conducted work relevant to their jobs as theatre teachers during after school hours (see Table 4).

Table 4

Demographic Information for Theatre Teachers Interviewed

Teacher	Degree	Years Experience	Job Requires Work After School
Thomas	BA and Masters	7	Yes
Kimberly	BA and 2 Masters	11	No, but does afterschool work
Lisa	BA	25	Yes
Catherine	BA and Masters	10	Yes
Alice	BA and MFA	13	Yes
Mary	2 BA and Masters	22	No, but does afterschool work
Kenneth	BFA	11	No, but does afterschool work
Hannah	BA and Masters	16	Yes

All administrators (principals and assistant principals) held appropriate credentials in Administrative Leadership or Curriculum and Instruction. The range of experience as an administrator in the current administrative position, as well as classroom experience as a content teacher varied greatly. Half the administrators interviewed had experience in Theatre Arts as a student, teacher, or participant on stage, while the other half had no experience aside from seeing productions and watching their theatre teachers teach (see

Table 5).

Table 5

Demographic Information for Administrators Interviewed

Administrator	Professional Credentials	Years in Current Position	Teaching Experience	Experience in Theatre
Jonathan	BA and 2 Masters	8 years current, (20 total)	28 years	Yes
Maria	BA and 2 Masters	8 years	10 years	No
Scott	BA, 2 Masters, and currently working on Doctorate	1 year	3 years	No
Beverly	BA, 2 Masters, and Doctorate	7 years	14 years +5 years instructional specialist	Yes
Amy	BA, Masters, and Doctorate	3 years	Yes	Yes
Justin	BA and Masters	8 years	Yes	No
Patricia	BA and Masters	8 years	3 years	No
Heather	BA and 2 Masters	4 years	18 years	Yes

Qualitative Analysis

The framework for disclosure of results is derived directly from the research question and consists of the data broken down into themes of characteristics, traits, and instructional practices. It is further broken down into researcher-identified sub themes of time, content, and soft skills with even more specific themes within. The figure below illustrates an overview of presented findings.




Figure. Overview of Presented Findings

Instructor Traits

The theatre teachers and administrators were asked what traits, characteristics, and instructional practices do theatre teachers demonstrate that are specific to theatre teachers. As previously defined, traits are any distinguishing quality of a person that is

inherited. In the following narrative, the researcher identifies quotes pertinent to the trait-related subtheme: Soft Skills (General, Affective Domain, Relationships, and Passion).

Soft skills. Some general comments that did not fit specifically into further sub themes beyond soft skills came from three of the theatre teachers and four administrators. Thomas, a teacher, spoke of evaluating the soft skills.

I don't know how you would even judge the successes of getting kids to graduate. If you hadn't been there, had that play, and had that program they wouldn't have finished school. It's so difficult to evaluate a teacher's successes because we don't know what it is down the road until we hear about it later. (Thomas, personal communication)

He further added, "How do you evaluate the life lessons, the individual students that you have transformed and changed into better people? I don't know how you would do that." He followed up with, "The personal growth of students as individuals, as people... I don't know if there is a test for that." He finally added, "Well, you and I both know that when a child is involved in a play, they are improved on so many levels artistically, socially, mentally, physically."

Alice, a teacher, spoke of the need to foster curiosity within her students and being able to admit when she doesn't know an answer. She uses those as opportunities to learn with her students.

If a question is asked and I honestly don't know it, we as a class will look it up we will do a deep dive into that. For instance, when we were talking about Greek theatre and masks, my 6th graders asked something in regards to masks and what they served as. And I said, "Well, it denoted character. Some people say it was amplification." And they said, "They could've been used to shield them from the

sun.” And I said, “I don’t know. What a great idea. Let’s look at that.” So, we kind of do these side explorations and excavations. It’s typically on bringing up what they find interesting.

I think that also fosters in them a need for curiosity and creativity and looking at things in different ways, which are so inherent to our art form. But, the standards, or the observation tool, do not care about that. And, I think if we don’t have people who are creative and questioning then we are not going to get anywhere. To act to create something that’s what you need to do, right? (Alice, personal communication)

Hannah, a teacher, spoke of the different approaches that theatre teachers take to teaching and how their individual personalities make evaluation difficult. “Everybody is different. Everybody is going to approach teaching differently based on his/ her personality. What works for one person is not going to work for somebody else because they don’t have the same personality” (Hannah, personal communication).

Administrators further commented on general comments regarding soft skill traits in effective theatre teachers. Jonathan said an effective theatre teacher will, “Teach the kids to think, to think in a different realm, think outside of the box, think outside of their provincial surroundings, think outside of the fact that they are in abject poverty and this is an escape.” He also added, “A superior theatre teacher teaches the child to appreciate a global view.” He further spoke of what effective theatre teachers do by saying,

An effective theatre teacher is a piper. She or he is able to take the most gregarious or the most timid child to a place where they have never been. He or she is able to show them the finer points of why theatre is important to the human

experience, why it expresses the realm of emotions in a way where they can be cathartic or just laugh out loud. The effective theatre teacher teaches kids to enjoy the human predicament as tragic or as humorous as it may be. The effective theatre teacher shows them the value in sharing that experience and that love with others. (Jonathan, personal communication)

Maria, another administrator, said, “I think that an effective theatre teacher is going to be able to see natural talent in a kid and foster that.” Beverly and Justin, administrators, also spoke of soft skills in terms of traits of an effective theatre teacher. Beverly echoed what Hannah said regarding every teacher is different when she spoke of teacher eccentricities.

I have a dance teacher. Her major was not dance. Her major was theatre. But, she incorporates the theatre in her dance. I don’t think there is any way you can measure a person’s eccentricities, but it all works for the greater good as far as I’m concerned. (Beverly, personal communication)

There’s engagement. There are things going on. I’ve been in several times in the auditorium to get a student. Sometimes before I get the student, I just stand there and watch, because for me not doing those things growing up, I think it is amazing that a kid can do those things. Whether it is singing or acting... to me it’s just amazing that you’re that young and you have that kind of talent. I think it’s kind of like being a coach. (Justin, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered add to the findings in the interviews regarding the general traits of effective theatre teachers with respect to soft skills. One quote from the survey says, “Changes lives, one play at a time.”

Affective domain. Three major sub themes emerged under soft skills for traits:

affective domain, relationships, and passion. In this study, the participants spoke of the affective domain they impact within their students. The notion that theatre teachers teaching to the students' affective domain through their work in the theatre curriculum was noted by two of the theatre teachers and three administrators. The affective domain refers to one of three domains in Bloom's Taxonomy, with the other two being the cognitive and psychomotor (Bloom, Krathwohl, & Masia, 1956). The affective domain (Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1973) includes the manner in which we deal with things emotionally, such as feelings, values, appreciation, enthusiasms, motivations, and attitudes.

The success of a child, the transforming experience that two months can have of simply speaking in front of an audience or talking to other students in stronger ways, I don't know how to assess that. A student from the beginning of a process to the end, even over two months in one show you see the change. (Thomas, personal communication)

Thomas, a teacher, further added, "An effective theatre teacher changes lives. For the better, hopefully." Hannah, a teacher, went on to add in addition to life skills and ensemble building, there are other things she does as a theatre teacher with her students that are not measured by evaluation instruments.

The life skills portion of what we do, the team building, making eye contact, making connections, building relationships. To be successful in theatre you have to be able to do those things. That's across the board. Even a techie [technical theatre personnel] has to be able to communicate and sell themselves. On top of building relationships, you have to build them up, give them the confidence to do something 100%, and then you tweak it. Then you push them. Then you fix it.

Then you direct them. (Hannah, personal communication)

Three administrators supported the sub theme of effective theatre teachers teaching to the affective domain.

The current system doesn't really contemplate, care, address, the affective domain. It doesn't it just simply doesn't. We are looking for quantifiable data driven, results in the instrument. We are not considering the benefit that the program has for the whole child. (Jonathan, personal communication)

Scott, an administrator, said, "It benefits the kid's self-confidence, their self-esteem, public speaking skills, work ethic, all of those core components that sometimes, quite frankly, are more difficult to hit in a science class."

An effective theatre teacher helps students grow intellectually/ academically and personally. One of the things I would always say to my Drama 1 students is it's not my goal for anyone in here to go win a Tony, you know, if that happens, that's great and I hope I get a thank you in the speech, but it really is just to get you comfortable in your own skin, able to speak in front of people, able to use those improvisation skills to think on your feet, and to react appropriately and quickly when the need arises. And, for those theatre students who are more advanced then you really hope that you are growing them as artists, and that they get to the point where they consider themselves to be artists. (Heather, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support to the findings in the interviews regarding the traits of effective theatre teachers specific to affective domain with respect to soft skills. Some quotes from the survey are, "Collaboration, concentration skills, creativity, etc.," "Affective domains," "Collaboration, work ethic,

self-direction, creative problem solving, willingness to take risks, play,” “Responsibility,” and “Creates a safe space in his/her classroom that promotes emotional growth. My students may not learn many definitions or dates or terms, but they definitely learn how to empathize, compromise, work together, problem-solve, and be self-motivated.”

Relationships. Most theatre teachers (five) spoke at great length about the importance of relationships with their students and how vital it is to the work they do as theatre educators. Most administrators (six) agreed with the theatre teachers on the sub theme of relationships. Not only is it important to establish those relationships amongst the students through ensemble building, but it is important to know their students as well.

I have never approached this as an 8:45- 4:00 PM type job. And I, in the past, have never approached this in a way that I wasn't invested personally in the students. My approach is that I know them. To figure out who it is you're teaching and how to get them motivated. It's very important to build a rapport with these kids. We see them so much. We invest so much time in building them, creating better versions of themselves, and making them better people that there is more of a personal investment. (Thomas, personal communication)

I don't see myself as a teacher of Broadway stars. I want to give as many students the opportunity to go “Wow, that was cool!” Maybe the bug will bite and maybe it won't, but I'm at least giving you the chance to see what it feels like to be on stage. Now the kids who are like, “I never want to be on stage,” those are my technical theatre kids because that's the one class that you never have to perform in. I want them to have that buzz, and maybe it's only like for 30 minutes... for that moment they had a buzz. (Lisa, personal communication)

It's become a huge thing here and we laugh when we go to the training

and they say, “Take time to greet your kids when they come in the classroom. Find out about their lives.” They spend more time with us than they do at home. We are their lives. We just kind of laugh about it. Capturing the kids’ hearts? We have the bodies. We are here with them all the time. And, the evaluation system does not address that. At all. It’s what we do best, and why we do capture kids. (Catherine, personal communication)

Alice, a teacher, stated, “We create relationships with students and with their parents and with other teachers. And those relationships are what usually get us through a project.” She went on to add,

I think our focus on relationships. Every theatre teacher I know knows his or her kids. The in’s and out’s of them. We know our parents and we know our community and what our strengths and weaknesses are. And, because of that we usually are able to thrive with virtually nothing. That is not shown. And, that is inherent to any good theatre program. (Alice, personal communication)

Hannah, a teacher, said, “I just think that a huge part of teaching is making connections and relationships with your students, and successful teaching.” She spoke at length on the topic of the relationships with her students being what drives her instruction and practices.

The bonds and relationships that are developed that trump everything else when push comes to shove. It’s a good day when a kid comes in and decides to pull an attitude and they decide to become ostracized because they are being a jerk to me. Like when the whole class says, “Dude, don’t talk to her like that.” That’s huge! They’ve learned we are a family, and we’re together. It works, the kids know that I care about them and I care what happens to them, every single one of them.

And, the ones that are difficult, I love them even more. It works. The relationships that you form with the students, that connection that the teacher has with the students in the class, it makes a difference. And, you can walk into a room and tell. We observe each other here all the time. We watch each other teach all the time and we learn from it. (Hannah, personal communication)

Six of the administrators supported the theatre teacher thoughts as they spoke at length about the importance of relationships theatre teachers have with their students and how vital it is to the work they do.

I think there are many different facets to truly understand when teaching is going on to see how the students react to the teachers, if they are supervising cafeteria duty, or bus dismissal, or at an extracurricular event, there are a lot of ways to gauge if there is true teaching and learning going on, because it's about relationships. And, so if the teacher is building the proper relationships and maintaining the type of atmosphere that is conducive to teaching and learning, and that atmosphere can look different from in a math class and a science class than it does in a theatre class. But, obviously, the end product, the producing of a one act play, or the designing of a set, or lighting design, whatever it might be that we are teaching in our technical theatre or theatre program, can be measured in different ways other than traditional observational purposes of being in a classroom. (Jonathan, personal communication)

You talk about professionalism, which is another thing for people in the performing arts. You have to be, I mean, I think it's harder to separate yourself from the kids when you're working with them in that way. That is something that is extremely important for our arts teachers just in general. (Maria, personal

communication)

Scott, an administrator, said it was important for an effective theatre teacher to, “Build relationships.” He spoke of the theatre teacher at his school and her influence on students because of the relationships she forms with them when he said, “She’s got a group of students that she can connect with. There’s impact there because they’re part of something. They’re part of the school and they feel valued” (Scott, personal communication).

Beverly, an administrator, said an effective theatre teacher, “Builds relationships, works with the kids on strengths, but more so on the kids’ weaknesses.” To this point she added an effective theatre teacher,

knows the students. Does not cater to the kids’ strengths, but maybe more so addresses the students’ weaknesses. Because some kids say, ‘I’ve got to have an art credit to go to a public university so I’ll take theatre.’ But, the kid might be the shyest kid in the whole world. The effective theatre teacher has to pull that kid out of his shell in order to be successful in the theatre class. (Beverly, personal communication)

Regarding effective theatre teachers, Justin, an administrator, said, “Most of them have great rapport with the kids and the kids love them.” As a former theatre teacher turned administrator, Heather said,

I think that relationships piece is huge. Often times, the theatre is a place of refuge for kids who are involved in a theatre program, and it may be the only place they feel safe in the school. You don’t really see that in an evaluation instrument. The sense of community that is built in an effective theatre program is another thing that isn’t really captured on an evaluation instrument. (Heather,

personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered add to the findings in the interviews regarding the traits of effective theatre teachers specific to relationships with respect to soft skills. Some quotes from the survey are, “Relationship with students, time and energy commitment, effective scheduling, season creation, curriculum creation, student progress,” “Relationships among teacher/student and student/student,” “Find a connection with every single student in his or her classroom to ensure trust,” and finally,

Teaches students to work collaboratively, and use their creativity in a way that benefits their community or ensemble; builds trusting relationships with students and is able to bring the best out of students; creates an effective curriculum that scaffolds a holistic theatre education; produces quality plays and musicals with students controlling and participating in as many roles as possible (on/off stage)

Passion. Passion is different from the affective domain. Passion is defined as a strong feeling of enthusiasm or excitement for something or about doing something. Based on the interviews, this is specifically related to the theatre teacher’s feelings, not the student’s feelings as in affective domain. Two theatre teachers and two administrators spoke to the sub theme of passion. They spoke about the passion the teachers have for theatre as a subject and for teaching. They believe that is a trait of an effective theatre teacher and they want to pass that passion on and impact their students.

My love for my content area. I love it. And, I want them to love it. So, me geeking out over it is part of my form of teaching; that they see my enthusiasm. Hopefully they’ll mimic and eventually it’ll be authentic. (Alice, personal communication)

I think theatre is the best discipline to teach out of any of them. I think we

can teach more about those children having a successful life than any other subject. And I just feel everyone should take theatre, because then I'm going to find where you fit in the program. I am very passionate about teaching theatre and the importance of theatre. (Hannah, personal communication)

Similarly, Jonathan and Maria, administrators, spoke about the passion they expect their theatre teachers to have for teaching and their subject and the impact that has on their students.

We can just about train anybody to be a teacher, but teachers aren't made they're born. The person [teacher] must have the fire in the belly for the kids and know that it's not about him/herself. It's not about the school. It's about those students. (Jonathan, personal communication)

I think any teacher is going to be passionate about their subject area. And, especially in performing arts, you've got to have someone who is really passionate about what they're doing. It has to just be everything that they are. And, that's going to translate to the kids and they're going to perform for you. (Maria, personal communication)

Instructor Characteristics

As previously defined, characteristics are any distinguishing quality of a person that can be shaped, molded, or taught. In the following narrative, the researcher identifies quotes pertinent to Characteristics-related subtheme: Content (Jack-of-all-trades) and Soft Skills (General, Life Skills, Ensemble, and Process).

Content. Some general comments that did not fit specifically into further sub themes beyond content came from teachers Lisa, Catherine, and Alice. Lisa spoke of the way she plans for instruction and how it differs from most teachers.

I start out with the end product and figure out how to get them there. That's not typical as a teacher. Usually teachers are like, "we have to get to unit A. Then we can get to unit B. We can build off of A and B to get to C." They seem to start at the beginning and figure out what they're going to do. (Lisa, personal communication)

Catherine and Alice spoke of how theatre teachers provide feedback to students.

We provide feedback that is not punitive, but allows them to know where they need to work, and also what their strengths are. We help them find out what their voice is and who they are. But, I think objective feedback is really important. I think as arts teachers sometimes we don't want to do that, but I think it's important. (Catherine, personal communication)

We ask students to do things that they need to do... We provide experiences for them to understand and love theatre. We tell them when they are not great. We tell them when they are great. (Alice, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the general characteristics of effective theatre teachers with respect to content. Some quotes from the survey are, "Multi-tasking while teaching, classroom management when there are multiple different projects going on, encouraging participation, reading a student's emotional state," and "all students may be engaged in the process, even though they may have to wait for their part."

Jack-of-all-trades. The sub theme that emerged for content under characteristics was the notion of a theatre teacher needing to be a "jack-of-all-trades." The theatre teacher should be able to teach all things theatre and be a master of their craft. This alludes to the breadth of content knowledge a theatre teacher must master and be able to

teach due to the nature of the subject. Four theatre teachers and two administrators spoke to this notion.

Alice, a teacher, specifically stated, “We are a jack-of-all-trades. We do everything.” She went on to add along with other teachers, “We provide content that is in some cases broad and in other cases very distinct and we ask students to do things that they are not going to want to do” (Alice, personal communication).

General knowledge of our craft. And, the breadth of knowledge that we have to have to be an effective theatre teacher. In a snap shot of what we are doing in one class, one lesson we have to be such a jack-of-all-trades to be an effective theatre teacher. (Catherine, personal communication)

I think that effective theatre teachers teach all things theatre even if they don’t necessarily do them all well. I am the worst lighting designer ever, but I teach it. I am honest with them. I think that every theatre student if you’re in a beginning level class should have an overview of all things. (Mary, personal communication)

Administrators/ evaluators just don’t realize how many things theatre touches on; how many content areas. I taught a lesson on stage lighting and our assistant principal observed me, and I talked about angles and focusing and degrees. He was like, “oh my god that could be a math lesson in itself.” (Kenneth, personal communication)

Administrators, Beverly and Amy, also supported the sub theme jack-of-all trades. Beverly discussed a theatre teacher needing to be able to know more than just the technical aspects of theatre. She said, “A theatre teacher is not so much necessarily the stage tech teacher, but the theatre teacher’s got to be able, and understand enough so that

when they explain to the kids, when you do sets and things like that.”

Amy proposed, “Good teaching is good teaching.” She further added regarding having a vast knowledge in the content,

Is it any different than what any other effective teacher does? An effective theatre teacher knows their content and they know their students and they know how to bring those two together in a way that creates a great learning environment. For theatre that does result in great performances, great understanding of the genre, a breadth of awareness that is specific skills in the area. But, they know their content and they know their kids. (Amy, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the theatre teacher needing to be a jack-of-all-trades. Some quotes from the survey are, “Having a broad spectrum of knowledge and resources is beneficial,” and “A theatre teacher is necessarily a generalist, responsible for teaching all aspects of the subject, including technical theatre as well as performance.”

Soft skills. The sub theme of soft skills addresses things that cannot be touched or are not definite or clear to the mind. A theatre teacher impacts a student through their teaching beyond the curriculum. Regarding what a theatre teacher does for their students beyond the classroom, Kenneth, a teacher, stated,

With some of these kids it’s not all about theatre. They signed up for theatre, or they got put into theatre because their guidance counselor put them there. I think it’s important to be held accountable for that. We can connect their learning to other areas they are learning about. (Kenneth, personal communication)

The administrators made some general comments regarding the soft skills that a theatre teacher addresses beyond the general curriculum. These comments differed from

the theatre teachers.

Maria spoke of the effective theatre teacher needing to provide the opportunity to take risks for students. She said, “I think an effective theatre teacher is going to put a kid in a situation that is a little bit uncomfortable and force them to adapt to that. They put them on the spot and force them to perform.” Scott spoke of the impact of the theatre teacher on the whole school when he said, “An effective theatre teacher needs to sell their program, put a good product out, and be an integral part of the school.” Patricia echoed Scott’s thoughts about marketing the theatre program.

An effective theatre teacher generates an interest for performing arts, markets his/her program, puts on productions for the school, but in the process he/ she does what every teacher does. He/ she is helping students become young productive adults, responsible adults, and respectful people that leave here with possibly a passion, or an exposure to a program, that maybe they’ve never had. (Patricia, personal communication)

Life skills. Three major sub themes emerged under Soft Skills for characteristics; Life Skills, Ensemble, and Process. Life skills are different than soft skills. Soft skills are the intangibles that cannot be measured or quantified that a theatre teacher teaches through their curriculum. Life skills are the 21st century skills that businesses look for in the work force. The notion that theatre teachers teaching life skills beyond the general theatre curriculum was noted by six of the theatre teachers and one administrator.

Teaches kids life skills in addition to the ins and outs of theatre. I feel like if we can teach kids how to communicate more effectively, how to be on time, not like myself today. (Laughs) How to have confidence and understand their self worth and understand that by working very hard you can reach your potential and all of

your goals. (Thomas, personal communication)

Lisa, a teacher, said it is her hope, “To give them that sense of confidence. So that it may not be on stage, but in a job interview or a public speaking moment that they can do it.”

Catherine, a teacher, shared how she feels theatre arts teachers teach 21st century skills and business skills the best.

Some of the other related skills that we are teaching because our class runs as a small business and I always laugh that the business classes, the virtual business enterprise or the school store gets all this acknowledgement for they’re running their own business, they’re doing their own marketing, they’re doing this and they are self supporting, uh, hello? We are running our own business kids do their own marketing, they are learning in design and design programs, they are learning Photoshop and they teach each other so that they maintain they are teaching longevity of a program they are teaching the responsibility of if my job doesn’t get done It s not just a bad grade, it affects everybody else, so that personal accountability. All of those business skills that are not remotely addressed by teacher evaluations that are way more important to being a good employee... and if that’s what the current focus is, on teaching vocational business skills, we’re teaching it better than anybody. Even the business department I believe.

(Catherine, personal communication)

Alice, a teacher, stated, “We foster a love and appreciation for theatre and hope to find that they provide skills that are going to reach out beyond the theatre world. I always say life skills through stage skills; that’s my motto.”

I think it’s important for an effective theatre teacher to connect what they are

learning to everyday life. I am well aware of the fact that not all my kids are going to go on to be theatre artists. By no means is it my goal to influence or push them to be. It is my job to however, help them connect things and skills they are learning in theatre that they can apply in their real life in careers they hope to have in the future. And, to me, above all of the flashy productions and the nice presentations that my students put on, to me that is the number one priority: that they are connecting prior learning to everyday life skills. And then, if I have that kid every once in a while who is really passionate about it, I will try to foster that passion and guide them and push them on their way to something bigger and better beyond high school. (Kenneth, personal communication)

Hannah, a teacher, said, “I feel like in the arts we teach life skills. Good academic teachers do that too, but we don’t have a choice to teach life skills, to be successful arts teachers.”

Administrator Jonathan spoke at length regarding creative problem solving in the theatre classroom. He referenced this as a need in teaching 21st Century skills in the classroom and how theatre teachers do this well.

The instruments don’t take into account, non-traditional methods of learning. And, unfortunately, that is short sighted because critical thinking comes from when students are able to explore and to make a mistake. Sometimes, if a math teacher is showing a student how to solve a particular problem, we get locked into, “Do it my way.” Well, why are you doing it that way? There is more than one way to solve a problem. And, what I love about the electives, by and large is that they offer students a wide variety of opportunities to explore their problem solving mindset outside of the rote memorization or “do the formula my way.”

There's more than one way to skin a cat, but sometimes we forget that. I think we make teachers in the electives sometimes that are square pegs fit into a round hole to make it work for the instrument. And, that does a disservice; we should be taking a look more at are they truly learning the skills needed, the 21st century skills, and are they able to communicate. (Jonathan, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered add to the findings in the interviews regarding the characteristics of effective theatre teachers specific to life skills with respect to soft skills. One quote from the survey says, "Teach content, but more importantly, teach life skills."

Ensemble. Three of the theatre teachers spoke specifically about the concept of ensemble and how a theatre teacher builds and utilizes ensemble. Ensemble is a concept that takes into account all the parts of the group when looking at the whole. This group works together for a common goal. Thomas, a teacher, spoke about humor as a means to develop ensemble when he said, "We use a lot of humor, a lot. Humor is a very, very powerful tool. And, often times it helps to build ensemble quicker as a class." Other teachers added,

The team-based work is not addressed in the standards. We teach so much about working in groups and finding your strengths and weaknesses within group work. This is what the business people are saying they want and what we do so well. We provide an environment where students feel comfortable exploring and taking risks. We provide a safe place for students to get to know one another and create relationships with one another. I don't think they can take risks until they do that and until they feel that their place is safe. (Catherine, personal communication)

Mary, a teacher, spoke of creating an ensemble by saying, "You've got to keep all

your kids involved and make them feel like there's a place for them." She went on,

I think building the ensemble is so very important. I do that in every class I teach including Introduction to Theatre. They all feel like it's a safe place to come and be whom you are. It's easier when you have an advanced acting class or even an intermediate class like playwriting. That's such an intangible thing that it almost feels like a family. There's no way to measure that or evaluate that. But, a good theatre teacher fosters that. (Mary, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the subtheme of ensemble for characteristics of effective theatre teachers with respect to content. One quote from the survey says, "Developing a sense of community."

Process. Process involves the ability to take a student from one point and move them to another in terms of growth. It also includes a variation of the aforementioned process by developing students and works of theatre through rehearsal and performance. The teachers were asked about what current evaluation systems do not address in terms of theatre teachers and four theatre teachers spoke of the importance of process in the work they do with their students.

Lisa, a teacher, spoke of process in productions when she said, "They have gone through a process and they can make things happen in their lives. They give themselves opportunities to not be afraid to try things. Really that's the most important thing."

Other teachers echoed her thoughts.

We have lots of kids that take theatre that have stage fright. And, saying, "At the beginning of the year these kids were not interested in getting on the stage." Then an administrator came and observed me at the end of the year and, "Oh my God!

They're all up on stage.” It doesn't evaluate us on how that student comes out of the class. (Kimberly, personal communication)

It's not just about the finished product. It's about teaching the process and what happens in the process. We teach process a great deal. More than half of my class is process. (Alice, personal communication)

It's a process. You're not going to get everything that I do from one observation. So if you come in and just observe one rehearsal you've seen a rehearsal, but that's not addressing the fact that it's a process from A to Z. And, Z is the product. So, if you come in on day 12 of this rehearsal, you're going to see a little snippet, but you're not going to see the overall picture. That doesn't get addressed at all, the fact that you came in one day and it looked like mass chaos. But, that's the way the process is. I don't want them to come in and just observe the product either, because that's not a good, or fair evaluation of my teaching either. It's all of it. It's the whole package. If you're going to come in and observe me, you need to come in several times and see the growth. (Mary, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the characteristics of effective theatre teachers specific to process with respect to soft skills. Some quote from the survey are, “Instilling the messiness of process,” “Differentiation of content for student strengths. Ability to manage teach and evaluate students performing multiple tasks Teaching the creative process and allowing students to fail (not grades, but in the creative process),” “Process is most important, but it's not a Theatre Program unless there is Product, too. The “doing” of Theatre is what separates it from an English course (the studying about Theatre.),” “The coaching that

goes on in rehearsal of scenes and monologues in class prior to performance in class and on stage. Administration indicates how impressed they are with performances, as if the students did it without guidance,” and “The creative process in the classroom. We often aren't given time for the incubation period.”

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the general characteristics of effective theatre teachers with respect to soft skills. One quote from the survey says, “Time management, ensemble building, teamwork, retention of students in the program, post production/performance reflection, self-initiated professional development.”

Further qualitative data from the survey administered add to the findings in the interviews regarding the general characteristics of effective theatre teachers with respect to time. One quote from the survey says, “Balance between teaching, producing, and managing; co-curricular expectations.”

Instructional Practices

As previously defined, instructional practices are the approaches a teacher may take to engage students in the learning process actively. They drive a teacher's instruction as they work to meet specific learning objectives and ensure that their students are equipped with the tools they need to be successful. These can be shaped, molded, and taught. In the following narrative, the researcher identifies quotes related to the Instructional Practice subtheme: Time; Content (Evaluator Understanding, Strategies, Production, Evaluation); and Soft Skills (General).

Time. Time, specifically, was a topic that seven of the theatre teachers and two administrators felt was important when thinking about what an effective theatre teacher does. Time refers to the amount of time outside of the normal school day that the job of a

theatre teacher typically requires. As noted in the interviews, this is not taken into account when evaluating theatre teachers. Thomas, a teacher, spoke at length regarding the topic of time.

The nature of the job requires us that we spend time working beyond the school day. A major way to attract interest in taking our classes is by doing productions and competitions. And, so, a massive amount of time is spent outside of school. We've done everything from haunted trail fundraisers to pageants, to any sort of fund raising activity you can imagine in addition to full main stage productions in the spring always, and many times in the fall in addition to the state one-act competition. I tracked my hours one time, back in I guess it was 2009, when I directed *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* just to see how much time is actually spent. It was 350 hours, which equates to more than a quarter of the school year if you add it up.

It's tough because you and I know how much is done outside the classroom, and I find, if I had to be honest, I find that I am probably more effective with my students who are actually interested in the subject after school, than I am during school. Often times as an elective there are many students that are put in, or as we say, dumped in to Drama One who do not want to be there and have no interest in the subject, and do all they can to resist any form of work whatsoever which brings the class down. And, the handful of students in the class who are actually interested in the subject don't get as much out of it as they do if they are cast in a production after school, if they work on the competition show, come in on work days, are involved in the thespian society, or all of these things where they can actually apply all the things we teach them in class. It's hard to

evaluate all of that after school. (Thomas, personal communication)

Kimberly, a teacher, is not required to do afterschool work per her contract, as the other theatre teachers interviewed are, but she does do afterschool work to benefit her program.

I did that last year and it was a lot of fun. I was reaching kids who weren't taking theatre. This past year, we held afterschool auditions for our play with the idea that I was not going to get any money for it. It was on my own time and that was successful. (Kimberly, personal communication)

Regarding what evaluations do not measure for theatre teachers, Lisa, a teacher, said, "The number of hours that I am working for the sake of the program."

When asked what an effective theatre teacher does, Catherine, a teacher, laughed and said, "I can tell you what they don't do...Sleep." When asked if her job requires work outside the typical school day, she laughed and said,

Afterschool, late night... I have weekly rehearsals with my honors ensemble.

During production of our main stage, our fall play, and our musical have rehearsals after school. So, during the musical I'll have 8-9 weeks of afterschool rehearsals that run to 6:00 or 7:00 every night plus 4-5 Saturdays. Then during tech week we will have rehearsals until 9:00 PM. For the fall play, I am just in charge of technical aspects so I am building after school and with tech weeks until 9:00 PM. In the spring we do student directed plays so we do auditions and things. I'm here probably until 6:00 two days a week through the spring. 5:00 or 6:00 two days a week. On showcase nights, and we have 7 or 8 showcases, I'm here until 10:00 PM. Through the course of the year I'm still expected to be here at 7:45 the next morning for faculty meetings when required. That's the bulk of it

I guess. Then planning and professional groups that I am a part of outside like SCSTA [South Carolina Speech and Theatre Association] and SCTA [South Carolina Theatre Association]. During the summer I try to do a lot of the planning and design work for the musical and we do a lot of our production meetings. Those aren't with students, but they are still things we do outside of the school day. (Catherine, personal communication)

Similarly, Alice, a teacher, laughed when asked the same question about work beyond the normal school day. She said,

They can be rehearsals, coaching, building, and crafting items to use in plays. Shopping for plays, working with students, for plays, and they typically will go week on week off and I will be here anywhere from at the earliest 5:00 AM to the latest 10:00 PM. (Laughs) And, I am here on weekends as well for the same purpose. (Alice, personal communication)

Alice made note of not only the work she does outside the school day with and for her students, but also, "The work that I do within our community and within our district."

Kenneth and Hannah, teachers, also spoke of the time outside of the school day that they work and how they wished it were part of their overall evaluation that is not measured as a theatre teacher.

I'm not required to do afterschool productions. I can keep them within my classroom environment. But, there is an expectation of producing theatre productions. I am lucky in the sense that I have a 501 c 3 booster club, which is a parent group. What we do with theatre productions, in and outside of the school day, I think is important and it doesn't get looked at. That's where a lot of the theory and all the things that we teach get put into practice. So, I almost feel like

they should, or could, observe some of that in action too. My classes are very production and participation oriented. There's not a lot of teacher lecture. There's a lot of doing. But, still I feel like that is something that is not addressed that could, and should, be addressed in observations. (Kenneth, personal communication)

Not only the obvious which is rehearsal, but you also have the paperwork that is involved as an active theatre teacher. There's no way you can get it all done during the regular school day. That would include registration forms, buses, and hotels. There's so much paperwork involved, not grading papers, paperwork to give your students other opportunities that requires a lot of work after school. On top of that, most theatre teachers either do the pageant, the talent show, or something extra as well. (Hannah, personal communication)

Administrators Jonathan and Beverly discussed the notion of time in their interviews as well. Concerning what evaluation systems do not measure, Jonathan said, "It doesn't consider the hours and hours and hours that the teacher puts into the program."

It doesn't consider the time that person is having parents coordinate meals for the cast and crew as they are preparing for their production. It doesn't count the time that he or she goes out and buys ten pizzas and brings them back to the school to feed the kids who are there working on the production. It doesn't encapsulate that. It doesn't even begin to think about the whole child. It's a check off. We don't live in a check off world, there's an awful lot more to the world than just a check off. So, it doesn't consider the inordinate amount of time that an excellent theatre teacher is going to put in to the lives of their children. That's hard to

quantify. But, you know it, and I know it; the proof is in the pudding when the kids perform at the high level that they perform. (Jonathan, personal communication)

Beverly similarly noted, “Nobody ever sees the co-curricular activities that they all do. And, they all work together.” She also spoke of the impact of the teacher’s time commitment beyond the students to the community and faculty as well.

The current evaluation system doesn’t deal with how many hours are put into a theatre production. That’s part of professionalism, but it goes above professionalism and that’s not measured at all. Because the countless hours that she spends putting on a performance that we’re all going to enjoy, not just the kids in performing it, but all of us are going to enjoy it. So, it just doesn’t come close to even addressing the countless hours that she spends. (Beverly, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the instructional practices of effective theatre teachers with respect to time. One quote from the survey says, “It is a life style choice. Not a job you can leave when the whistle blows.”

Content. Most theatre teachers and administrators spoke candidly about general concerns when it comes to content of a theatre arts class. They spoke of administrators/evaluators not understanding theatre content in an observation and therefore get/give little to no useful feedback to assist theatre teachers in growing professionally.

Evaluator Understanding.

You know a lot of times in the arts, in theatre especially; there are people who don’t consider themselves to be “play people.” They sort of dismiss, or put

on a shelf or distance themselves. They say, “well I don’t do that, therefore I can’t even begin to fathom what this means, this artsy fartsy stuff that you weird people can do. This magic, I can’t understand this. I’m not going to try.” Our standards are so broad and we have so much control over what we do and there’s no end of course exam, there’s a lot of independence and autonomy and how you choose to go about things that I think a lot of administrators might be baffled at what they’re looking at. (Thomas, personal communication)

I really wish they would observe me more because I want them to know what I’m doing in here. It’s not just silly stuff. We’re not just playing games. My kids are actually learning. And, I think, that would give theatre a better name or more respect if they knew, “Oh this is what they’re working on?”

Managing the classroom with a theatre class is a whole different world. So when it looks like there’s chaos in the room, most of the time they’re learning; which they [administrators] may not know. If they’re being loud and screaming, that might be part of their scene. Whereas it may look like chaos, it’s not. They’re actually engaged. (Kimberly, personal communication)

I’ve got administrators that come, and I even have one administrator, he kind of signs up for evening performances because, his wife likes theatre. So, they come in and they can actually critique a show for the sake of theatre. But, you don’t get that all the time. They know that I’m really good at what I do, but they don’t know why. They couldn’t measure it. I’m not the only one that’s different. If they can figure out the gym class, an art class, the music classes, then, it’s pretty obvious those that know and can think outside of the box and those who are like, “Oh, no. I’m outside the box.” (Lisa, personal

communication)

Catherine, a teacher, said, “I think it probably depends on the evaluator. Whether they are looking to fit us into a box or whether they are looking at what we really do.”

Alice, Mary, and Kenneth, teachers, spoke at length about evaluators not understanding theatre content.

We had a new vice principal who came and observed me; I scored very low because she came in on a rehearsal day. She said that there were too many people not being utilized. And I said, “Well, they were not in that scene and they’re turning in feedback for what they are seeing at the end of the class period.” She said, “Well, I didn’t know that.” It was in my lesson plan. I feel like I understand why they have these things that they are looking for, but specifically in our field they may look different. Just as it is in dance, or creative writing, it’s what we do it’s visceral. It’s important to understand and be able to do that.

I don’t feel that how we teach our art form is completely understood by the people who are observing us. I love my kids. I don’t think they [administrators] have had examples of what a good theatre classroom looks like. That’s not to bash them; they have to observe art and math alike. And, art and math have their similarities. But, we don’t sit in desks, well at least in my room we don’t sit in desks, we have tables, a lot of things look different. They just do. (Alice, personal communication)

Nothing is ever said about my lesson itself. It’s always about student engagement, and the atmosphere of the classroom. But, the lesson, the content, nothing is ever said about what I’m teaching because I don’t think they understand what I teach. I don’t think people get it. When they walk through

they go, “Oh, look. They’re having fun. It’s fun and games in here.” But, I don’t think they realize they’re actually learning something. There’s never anything said about the content... ever. Even back in the day when I got formally evaluated, I don’t know that they got what I was teaching. In fact, I can remember one of my formal evaluations, from the early days, one of the administrators put, “You’re too loud. If I had to sit through your class I would have to wear earplugs.” I was teaching a lesson on voice and diction. (Laughs). I was teaching projection. He truly didn’t get what I was teaching, and that was a direct quote.

I want them to know what I’m doing. I want them to sit in on a whole rehearsal. I want them to see us drawing costumes and making costumes and building stuff. I want them to see that it’s not just happy fun playtime over here. It’s frustrating. Because then, when I want support, I don’t get it because they don’t understand. Nobody gets me. (Mary, personal communication)

I feel like I get observed by people who have no clue. So, they’re either so excited there’s a theatre teacher here that it’s like, “Oh, I couldn’t do what you do with those kids.” I don’t feel like that is very effective in the sense that it doesn’t really give me constructive feedback that can help me improve. It’s been a lot of positive reinforcement, which is nice, but critique is good as well. I don’t feel like I am observed by people who feel qualified to critique me so, I get a lot of pats on my back... I really think that is the least helpful part of it; knowing that they don’t know anything about my art form, my standards, or anything like that. It is hard for them to assess it with a critical eye because, in their point of view. It’s just, “Really cool.” (Kenneth, personal communication)

Administrators supported the theatre teachers regarding the lack of understanding of the content in a theatre class on the part of most evaluators. They also addressed the impact that understanding on the content has in giving feedback to theatre teachers.

Jonathan, an administrator, said of theatre teachers, “I don’t have a great understanding, I appreciate what you do.” He went on to address how administrators have to look at theatre arts classes’ differences when evaluating those teachers.

You don’t have to sit and formally evaluate a teacher to know if there is real learning and teaching going on. In theatre arts, it is really easy to see. (Laughs) It’s not a traditional class, just like art, or agriculture. We’re not looking for some of those traditional order things. So, it becomes concretely clear in the electives and particularly the arts if there is not teaching going on. It’s real clear very quickly, even if you’re just popping in or if you’re formally observing for an hour. You will see what’s really going on.

Sometimes folks don’t understand, especially if they are concrete sequential folks, what a theatre teacher might be doing. “Why is the theatre teacher having the kids out in the hallway having a sword fight with foam swords? Why are they doing that? Oh, my gosh, they are destroying the hallway.” People who come from a certain background that are in administration, might not appreciate the activity for what it’s worth and the value that it adds to teaching that, (Jonathan, personal communication)

Good teaching is good teaching. I didn’t teach calculus, but I can go in and see if that person is being effective in that room. So, at the high school level, it [evaluation instruments] is probably least effective with content. Now with theatre teachers, they typically have that presentation part down. (Laughs) so,

that's a strong point with them, but not so much with other people. But, the flip side of that is, sometimes, maybe the theatre teacher may need to hear, "There needs to be more structure in your room." And, I think that goes for the arts all the way around. We have some classrooms that are so highly structured that you feel like you're suffocating. And then, you have the other end of that spectrum. Of course there's a happy medium in between, that area of most effectiveness. (Maria, personal communication)

I feel like people who go into a fine arts classroom need a little bit more training as to what they might be looking for. Good teaching is good teaching. No matter where it is. But, you have to know the language. You've got to know something about the discipline itself, I feel like, in order to give the teachers a fair shake. Because I have a background in the arts, and the humanities, it's easier for me to walk in a theatre classroom, or any other kind of fine arts classroom, and actually see what's going on. For a brand new administrator, I think it's a bit more challenging.

The vocabulary is so important to someone who is observing the class. Somebody might walk in there with little experience observing theatre and go, "Wow, that class was bedlam." When I go to the theatre classrooms I might see three kids sitting here on the floor working with the script here, another five over here working on some more lines, and what they're doing... they're all trying to get to the same end, as far as the expression. Is it believable? Is it real? What are they learning? But, if you don't know that that's what you have to look for in a theatre class you're going to miss the whole thing. They're not having side conversations. They're actually doing what they're supposed to be doing in

groups. (Beverly, personal communication)

Justin, an administrator, spoke of his lack of understanding the nuances of theatre to be able to assist his theatre teacher at his school when he said, “I don’t have that background. I like plays. They’re cool. And, I like seeing good ones, but that’s about as far as it goes.” He went on to add, “Our theatre teacher has to go meet with the other schools. Normally she is by herself. So, going into collaboration, even in PLC’s [Professional Learning Communities], to make her practice better, she’s got to talk to other drama teachers.” Other administrators shared these thoughts on a lack of understanding the content in a theatre arts class.

I couldn’t go in and tell our theatre teacher how to do that makeup better on that face. I couldn’t tell him what brand to buy. And, I couldn’t tell him how to apply the makeup. I just don’t know. So, if he were to ask me questions about that, I’d say you have to find another theatre teacher in the district. I am not sure of what to do in that situation. So, I think giving feedback in those specific content areas might be difficult. (Patricia, personal communication)

Finally, Patricia stated, “I think on the specifics, it’s hard, but you can’t be knowledgeable on every subject, every day in every discipline.”

Strategies. When asked about specific strategies and methods the theatre teachers use in their classes, five theatre teachers and four administrators offered a variety of content-specific ideas.

Thomas, a teacher, said, “We attempt to have them work in groups creatively, creating a lot of original material.” He also said, “Improvisation, thinking creatively, quickly, on your feet, and hopefully creative solutions to problems. A lot of these kids see all the reasons why they can’t do something immediately.” Thomas also gave insight

on the physical environment of the theatre classroom.

It looks a lot different. It's less structured. We aren't lined up in rows and facing a board. Especially at the beginning of the year, if you're walking in on some Viola Spolin [creative dramatics] type exercises that are real abstract and movement-based, that might be very strange to see. (Thomas, personal communication)

Kimberly, a teacher, added, "I'm not going to teach as an English teacher or a science teacher would. I give them the basics and then have them work on it." She also said, "Instructional strategies are very different from other classes." She further added she utilizes, "Solo work, duet work, and group work." She also spoke of teaching her students specific skills in theatre and evaluation of live theatre.

I try to do different instructional strategies. We take notes, then we're on our feet doing it. There's an application component. Like in Pantomime, we're going to read about some rules of Pantomime, show them some examples, then we are going to get up and do some Pantomime. Then they get feedback from me. "Oh, was that in line with everything? Were you consistent with the objects?"

Theatre is not just about getting on stage and performing. It has a whole lot of different areas that you could go into. Giving them an appreciation for the arts and knowing what is good theatre and what is not good theatre? And, if you see bad theatre, what would make it better? I try to give them an all-around experience of what makes theatre. (Kimberly, personal communication)

Regarding teaching professionalism, Lisa, a teacher, said, "An effective theatre teacher, creates a sense of professionalism, that's paramount. What would a professional theatre look like? And, we run it that way."

Catherine, a teacher, felt it was valuable to model skills for your students. She said, “Modeling, making me aware if ever I’m tempted to skip modeling what is a good product. How valuable that is.” She also spoke of high level questioning skills with her theatre students.

The good questioning techniques or individual feedback, as an arts teacher I do evaluate each monologue, and I give them a “critique try”, the equivalent of a rough draft before they’re graded, and they get individual, and they watch individual and do peer evaluation. (Catherine, personal communication)

Catherine also discussed the importance of an effective theatre teacher giving good qualitative and quantitative feedback to their students that is not punitive. She spoke of the need students have to receive that feedback and learn how to receive and process it.

Regarding giving good feedback to students, Catherine said, “The idea of giving good feedback to the students I think as arts teachers we do that so regularly.” She went on to discuss effective theatre teachers giving students quantitative feedback.

They provide quantitative feedback... even though as arts teachers we tend to say, “No, you can’t measure things.” I think we absolutely can measure things, and we need to be able to tell kids what skills they need to work on. We need to be able to analyze what they’re doing and be able to tell what their strengths are and what their weaknesses are so that they start to have a better understanding of what they do well and what they need to work on in a range of skills: voice, body, script analysis, and soft skills like presence and confidence. (Catherine, personal communication)

Alice, a teacher, spoke of differentiation and classroom management in the theatre

classroom.

I think we inherently differentiate within our craft of teaching, but I think that has always helped me remind myself that I can offer the same thing in different ways. Whereas, I typically used to stick with one way and move on, I've found different ways to move on.

Classroom management is going to look different in my class. They can be loud or talking amongst themselves while other things are happening. That might be expected, but they're actually discussing amongst themselves how to give feedback in a constructive way. If someone [an evaluator] comes in and doesn't know that, then that's a problem. (Alice, personal communication)

The four administrators spoke generally to what content related instructional practices theatre teachers utilize in their classes. Patricia said, "I think of theatre as more like a hands-on, practicing, kinesthetic, and active classroom." She went on to add,

Our teacher is doing makeup right now. There is no way an instrument is going to determine how he teaches that standard, or that learning target, but you're going to be able to tell, whether he is able to have classroom management, whether he is inviting, whether he gives praise, whether he motivates students, whether he asks higher level questions, whether he does something safe as opposed to being dangerous, with stuff in the eye or around the eye. To me that would be a demonstration and an opportunity to get in small groups. You can see if he was doing whole group instruction, small groups, individual practice, those kinds of things, and you see that on an observation tool, you can indicate that. (Patricia, personal communication)

What really is imperative is that connection with the teaching and the

learning and the authentic feedback from the students, and authentic feedback from the teacher to the students, to measure if learning and teaching is really happening. I have to go in and see what they are doing and try to wrap my mind around what they are doing. You are going to see a vast degree of craziness at any time. You've got kids over here rehearsing parts. You've got kids over here sewing costumes. You've got kids over here painting props at any given time. They are always performing. They are always performing. That's what they do. So, how can I support you? What tools can I give you? What sort of professional development can I give you that you need? (Jonathan, personal communication)

With a theatre teacher, like some of our other fine arts teachers, you're going to have different performance dimensions that you don't see in a traditional classroom. We have to push some people out of the box. "Get your kids up out of their seats. Do some modeling." That's a theatre teacher's very nature. "I'm going to model it for you. You're going to be out of your seat the whole class. We're going to be moving around." (Maria, personal communication)

We ask the teachers to make sure you're hitting here and pushing them. Make sure you're hitting the middle and pushing them. Make sure you're hitting the high kids and pushing them as well. Theatre is a good example of that. Our theatre teacher, at any given point, may have 3 or 4 levels inside of one classroom. Because we do theatre 1, theatre 2, theatre 3 and 4, and all sort of classes within a class, she has to be able to, and all our teachers have to. You're always going to have that range of levels in your class. (Scott, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the

interviews regarding the instructional practices of effective theatre teachers with respect to time. Some quotes from the survey are, “I require a lot of participation in my class and find it difficult to get those not involved in the arts to understand the importance of this criteria as a requirement for a theatre class,” “Classroom management in a non-traditional space and arts content knowledge from an arts professional, and after school implementation of theatrical content knowledge,” “Rehearsal etiquette. If my students are supposed to be watching rehearsal and actively engaged in rehearsal quietly. My score repeatedly is lowered because it looks as if students aren't doing anything,” “Using acting techniques and character characterization in lesson presentations, i.e.; using accents and props,” “Being able to assess right away and provide a more tailored lesson should be recognized,” “Student led feedback, use of movement to engage students,” “Engages the students and leads them in the study and practical application of theatre of the past and present,” “Creates a program that will provide numerous opportunities for students to collaborate in various areas of theatre,” “Teach the content and produce consumers of the arts,” “Those who conduct evaluations are rarely if ever fully educated in all that we do, it would take someone from the collegiate level providing feedback in order for it to be valuable,” “Classroom management in a theatre setting.” Further quotes from the survey also support general findings for content in instructional practices.

Theatre classrooms tend to be busy places. Classroom management looks different in certain situations. For someone who teaches math they could find the classroom chaotic or disruptive, but for a theatre teacher it is ideas being formulated and ensembles being created.

Often times I get knocked off a few points because my lesson plan does not reflect the current lesson. Though I use it as a guideline I may pick up a

deficiency that would better be tackled in another activity and therefore change.

Assessments can be things that are not written. There will be days that may look chaotic to an outside observer, but sometimes that is when the real work takes place.

Discipline and classroom structure is always a difficult one. With so much going on in the classroom, sometimes it's hard to keep a specific structure. It's not the kind of classroom where you can say "Talking out of line! Detention!" But, it is hard to draw that line (faint as it may be) between contributing and relating to the material and being a disturbance.

Productions. Three theatre teachers and one administrator spoke about the importance of producing live theatre with their students. This not only gives exposure to the program, but it serves as a prime vehicle to put the theory and training found in the classroom to work in an active and engaged way for the students. It could also serve as part of the theatre teacher evaluation.

Thomas, a teacher, believes in the power that theatre productions have. He said, "Often times it's the productions that are the testament of the program you are trying to build. And, that's a very public way of assessing what you are doing." He went on,

I think effective theatre teachers have to produce really good plays in a way that the community buys in to the idea of theatre. That's very important to me. Often times it's all about the play. That's the reason we have the support from the community, financial and otherwise. But, producing good plays that involve a lot of people and that give the students a lot of opportunities is incredibly important in my opinion. (Thomas, personal communication)

The quality of productions, which I think, is like end of course [testing].

You can do techniques. You can do activities. You can look through that textbook. You can do some of the little activities in the textbook. But, unless you're doing a performance of some kind, I really don't think the kids get it.

They need that process. They need to go from here's an idea, here's a script, this is the rehearsal process, and this is the reward. I honestly believe in some form or fashion if you're teaching theatre you need that. (Lisa, personal communication)

Mary, a teacher, spoke of the need to do multiple and a variety of productions to give the students the most exposure to the art form of theatre.

I think it's important that you have production, maybe not in every class, but definitely that you do multiple productions either in class or as extracurricular, or co-curricular. I think it's important to have all kinds of different shows. I think if you always do the same kind of show your students aren't growing as theatre artists. That's why, even though I don't particularly love musicals, I do them. I think it is important to have that because there are kids that love musicals. So, I don't let my own personal bias get in the way. Even though it is not something that I love. But, I do it. I do it for them. Not for me because it's not about me. It really is about them. And I believe that. (Mary, personal communication)

Administrator Scott spoke of the need to evaluate theatre teachers based on the quality of the product they produce, namely theatre productions, awards, and class size.

When I walk into that classroom there is a certain element of "what's the product?" And I think that should be incorporated into the evaluation system. At the end of the day I am judged on the product. What does the school do? What do we achieve? What did we score? For a theatre teacher, what do you produce what do you put on stage? I think that needs to be a part of it at least. What

product can those students display as a class? What product can you put out there? What percentage of your students are participating in those things, all-state, all region? What are the numbers in your program? (Scott, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the instructional practices of effective theatre teachers specific to productions with respect to time. Some quotes from the survey are, “Having students perform, work in groups collaboratively, practice self-reflection and evaluation, and learn appropriate audience etiquette are all necessary in the theatre arts classroom,” “Taking into account the after school productions would be an interesting addition to the system. These are the greatest achievements in theatre education at my school,” “Extra time spent with students outside of the regular school day,” “The impact of our shows and performances that occur after school and the lasting impact that has on our students and the school as a whole,” and “Rehearsals and performances outside of the classroom.”

Evaluation. A sub theme emerged under content for administrators that was different than that of the theatre teachers. Three administrators mentioned how current evaluation systems tend to help theatre teachers during evaluations. Beverly, an administrator, spoke of her school district’s evaluation tool. She referenced the 1-5 rating system where a 1 is a low performance score, while a 5 is the highest performance score for the teacher.

There’s not one of my fine arts teachers that I have observed that has not fallen into that would be considered a bad lesson would be a two. None of my teachers. They’re closer to the 4’s and 5’s. It works. It really does. (Beverly, personal communication)

Our arts teachers typically outscore our non-arts teachers because of the nature of coaching that goes on in the theatre classroom. Theatre teachers are going to at the beginning of the period, typically they're going to say, here's what we're going to work on today. You know they do state those explicit things as opposed to a math classroom where they might come in and just start working on the board or whatever, there is more verbal interaction. Then also the teacher is giving constant feedback. And that doesn't always happen in a non-arts classroom. There's a lot of individual feedback. I have been able to rate our theatre teachers very highly. (Amy, personal communication)

Justin, an administrator, said, "Luckily here, all our fine arts people bang on. When you go to concerts, when you see those end products in performances, they're awesome. Everybody talks about them through the community."

Soft skills. In terms of soft skills in instructional practices of theatre teachers, Lisa, a teacher, discussed her philosophy of teaching that involved not teaching future stars. She believed an effective theatre teacher teaches kids to love the art form and not to go on and be famous.

Will they end up being theatre people? Maybe, maybe not. Most of them will not, but they love the idea of performing. And, that will be a huge high school memory for them. And, if they don't do theatre, they don't do theatre. I'm not looking to make stars. I'm just looking for them to experience theatre. (Lisa, personal communication)

Administrators Jonathan and Patricia spoke of instructional practices that are soft skills. These are difficult to measure during an evaluation, but are expectations of the theatre teacher.

So, it's not about a teacher being a wealth of knowledge. It's about can I convey the nuances of my understanding of my subject matter and my craft to the students in a way that would make them learn the material, appreciate the material, and be able to use it to critically think. That's really what it comes down to. So, there is nothing more important than fine arts, for that critical thinking. Everybody can sing. Everybody can play an instrument. Everybody can paint. Everybody can dance. Everybody can act only if they have the courage to do so. It's just having the proper skill set to draw it out of kids and to be excited about the craft. Even if you're at the end of your career, you still have to maintain that excitement. (Jonathan, personal communication)

He's been tasked specifically with grow and mold a program that we've really not had a strong sense for years in our school. So, in that he also has a booster club that he has to work with directly. He's also responsible for the school pageant. So, he takes care of that niche of the kids in that program for our school. And then he has to do all the other things, a safe and orderly environment, go to the pep rallies, participate in the fire drills, and all the other teacher professional responsibilities. But, in that he has to take a kid like me who would walk in their 9th grade year and not have any clue how to speak, perform, stand, composure, poise, voice, and he's got to teach me all the components. If I were to be in a one-act play I could do those things without crumbling. He has to take each kid and move him or her forward. (Patricia, personal communication)

Further qualitative data from the survey administered support the findings in the interviews regarding the instructional practices of effective theatre teachers with respect to soft skills. Some quotes from the survey are, "It is about growth in the student's

achievement of stated goals, which can be seen in achieved behavioral objectives,”

“Engagement of the creative process is different for each student and those who do not wish to be in the class will react much differently and should be handled very differently than those who have a genuine interest,” and finally

Theatre is a collaborative art that challenges students to think creatively, critically and to take risks and to be open to new ideas. They learn that there is more than one solution to a problem, more than one way to interpret a scene. They learn to respect and value the contribution of others and to recognize their own strengths and weaknesses, as well as ways to improve. Students gain knowledge of literature beyond the page when they actually bring the work to life onstage.

Quantitative Analysis

The researcher-developed survey was administered to South Carolina theatre teachers by utilizing a listserv from the state theatre organization, The South Carolina Theatre Association, with appropriate permissions granted. A survey was developed and administered electronically utilizing the online survey platform QuestionPro, an independent research firm to field confidential survey responses. One hundred eleven surveys were sent out via email (See Appendix F) and 24 emails were returned due to personnel attrition in the school districts, school districts changing email platforms, and incorrect information on the list serve. Of the 87 surveys actually delivered, 49 were completed (56.32 %) in the two-week window allotted for completion. Email reminders (See Appendix G) were sent at the halfway interval as well as postings on social media sites relevant to theatre teachers in South Carolina.

The research question examined the traits, characteristics, and instructional practices of a theatre teacher. Survey questions 1-12 were presented in Likert-like scale

format. Each of these questions asked respondents to reflect on an aspect of effective theatre teachers that arose from qualitative interviews. Table 6 provides the responses to these questions.

Table 6

Chi-Square Test Results for Questions 1-12

Item	SA	A	N	D	SD	df	P
1	26	19	2	2	1	49	$p < .200$
2	40	8	2	0	0	49	$p < .001$
3	41	8	0	0	0	48	$p < .001$
4	43	6	0	0	0	48	$p < .001$
5	41	7	2	0	0	49	$p < .001$
6	39	8	2	0	0	48	$p < .001$
7	45	4	0	0	0	48	$p < .001$
8	33	12	3	0	1	48	$p < .002$
9	37	10	1	1	0	48	$p < .001$
10	40	8	1	0	0	48	$p < .001$
11	28	20	1	0	0	48	$p < .010$
12	38	8	1	1	0	47	$p < .001$

As shown in Table 6, respondents clearly demonstrated a patterned preference for the Agree-Strongly Agree categories. Except for Item 1, the Chi-square procedure resulted in statistical significance at or below the .01 level. However, Item 1 contained 3 participants for the Disagree and Strongly Disagree categories that resulted in a higher level of statistical significance at .20. Survey responses at the Agree- Strongly Agree categories comprised 90 % (45 out of 50) of survey responses to Item 1. This is congruent with the qualitative data of the interviews conducted and the qualitative survey results indicating theatre teachers and administrators would like the work the theatre teachers do after school to be considered when being evaluated.

The suitability of the PCA was assessed prior to analysis. Inspection of the

correlation matrix showed that all variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.4 PCA revealed four components that had eigenvalues greater than one and which explained 30.5%, 13.8%, 11.9% and 10.6% of the total variance, respectively (see Table 7).

A Varimax orthogonal rotation was employed to aid interpretability. The rotated solution exhibited “simple structure” (Thurstone, 1947). The interpretation of the data indicated that the removal of item 1 and the relocation of item 9 from component 3 to component 1 would increase the Cronbach’s Alpha for both components (see Table 8). These changes resulted in the formation of three components that were consistent with the Traits, Characteristics, and Instructional Practices of effective theatre teachers the survey was designed to measure.

Table 7

Rotated Component Matrix

	1	2	<u>Component</u>	3	4
Q8	.813				
Q10	.703				
Q12	.663				
Q11	.488				
Q7		.931			
Q5		.851			
Q6		.597			
Q2			.888		
Q3			.794		
Q9					.727
Q4					.589
Q1					-.500

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Table 8

Survey Components as Suggested by the PCA

Survey Item	Cronbach's Alpha
2. The relationships I develop with my theatre students are important for me to be an effective teacher.	.532
3. Building an ensemble in my theatre arts classes is important.	
4. It is important to connect theatre content to real- life skills and applications.	
9. An effective theatre teacher must be a “jack of all trades” with a breadth of content knowledge.	
5. My passion for theatre and teaching theatre is vital to the work I do with my students.	.751
6. Evaluators need to understand how to evaluate the subjective nature of theatre arts classes.	
7. The affective domain of learning (instilling confidence, self-worth, work ethic, process, working towards and achieving goals, responsibilities, high expectations, creativity, problem solving, curiosity, etc.) is vital to what I teach in a theatre arts classroom.	
8. Producing theatre productions is necessary to effectively teaching theatre.	.644
10. Evaluators need to understand how learning tends to look different in a theatre arts classroom.	
11. Process is a primary focus in my theatre arts classroom.	
12. Evaluators need to understand classroom management may look different in a theatre arts classroom than other classrooms.	

Summary

The results of this study have been detailed in this chapter. The perceived

commonalities and differences of theatre teachers and their administrators regarding effective instructor traits, characteristics, and instructional practices have been documented through the reporting of results from one on one interviews with 8 theatre teachers and 8 administrators responsible for evaluating the theatre teachers and a survey administered to theatre teachers across South Carolina. The results suggest more commonalities than differences between administrator and theatre teachers in the perceptions of effective traits, characteristics and instructional practices of theatre teachers.

The perceived similarities between theatre teachers and administrators consist of the traits that effective theatre teachers should be focused on the personal growth of their students, teach to the affective domain, develop strong relationships with students, and be passionate about the crafts of theatre and teaching. The similarities also involve characteristics that effective theatre teachers should be a jack-of-all-trades, and teach life skills. The similarities concerning instructional practices of effective theatre teachers finally suggest there is a lack of evaluator understanding of the content of theatre. To further this point effective theatre teachers utilize strategies with their students including group work, solo work, qualitative and quantitative feedback, differentiation, participation, and modeling. It is agreed by the theatre teachers and administrators that theatre classrooms are busy spaces. Effective theatre teachers produce live theatre and utilize this for recruitment to build and sustain their programs. Finally, theatre teachers and administrators agree effective theatre teachers commit great amounts of time beyond the typical school day to accomplish what they need to accomplish for the benefit of their theatre program.

The perceived differences between theatre teachers and administrators exist as

well. Theatre teacher said the traits that were important were individual teacher persona and the ability to foster curiosity while administrators felt fostering talent in students was important. The characteristics theatre teachers felt were indicators of effective theatre teachers were the ideas of building the ensemble and process in the theatre class.

Administrators felt the characteristics that indicated effective theatre teachers were marketing the program, pushing students to take risks, and the impact the theatre program has on the whole school. The differences concerning instructional practices of effective theatre teachers finally suggest teachers recognize more instructional strategies specific to the content of theatre than administrators do. The administrators feel theatre teachers almost always score well on evaluations. Finally, theatre teachers felt effective theatre teachers teach an appreciation for theatre, not future stars. Administrators indicated effective theatre teachers foster talent, grow the students, and grow the program.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators in a South Carolina in order to get a more holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does. Current teacher evaluation systems by design lack the capacity to provide specific feedback for arts teachers, specifically theatre arts teachers. This study was conducted so that the findings may inform teacher evaluation in theatre arts for the purposes of assisting and professionally developing the theatre arts teachers. The research question that guided this study was: What are the perceived commonalities and differences of theatre teachers and their administrators regarding effective instructor traits, characteristics, and instructional practices?

The perceived commonalities and differences of theatre teachers and their administrators regarding effective instructor traits, characteristics, and instructional practices has been documented through the reporting of results from one-on-one interviews with theatre teachers and administrators responsible for evaluating the theatre teachers and a survey administered to theatre teachers across South Carolina.

This chapter provides a summary of the findings of this study with regards to relevant literature. It reviews conclusions and implications of the findings of the study, lists suggestions for future research, and addresses the limitations of this study.

Summary of Findings

The research question that guided this study was designed to address three areas specifically: Instructor Traits, Instructor Characteristics, and Instruction Strategies. These were specific to the perceptions of theatre teachers and administrators in the search to find commonalities and differences in views of effective teaching in theatre arts. Findings are summarized with respect to the three areas addressed by the research

question. The findings are also presented with respect to relevant literature.

Instructor Traits

For purposes of this study, Instructor Traits are defined as any distinguishing quality or characteristic of a person that is inherited. These traits cannot be taught. They are part of the makeup of the individual. They can be developed further and strengthened through practice and coaching, but they are innate and unique to the individual.

This study found similarities between theatre teachers and administrators consist of the traits that effective theatre teachers appear to be focused on the personal growth of their students. Survey findings triangulate the data that support theatre teacher perceptions that relationships and relevance matter to theatre teachers. This study suggests that an effective theatre teacher strives to impacts students artistically, socially, mentally, and physically. According to the interview and survey respondents an effective theatre teacher should foster curiosity and creativity. He/she has eccentricities and individual personality traits that can impact his/her teaching. Additionally, an effective theatre teacher strives to help students see things from different perspectives and appreciate those differences. An effective theatre teacher should see natural talent in a student and foster that through coaching. An effective theatre teacher can change students' lives. These soft skills can impact students on levels outside the curriculum. They are difficult to quantify and assess. However, these skills are important to the work of a theatre teacher.

Another similarity this study found among theatre teacher and administrator perceptions of effective theatre instructor traits is they teach to the affective domain. The affective domain refers to one of three domains in Bloom's Taxonomy and includes the manner in which we deal with things emotionally, such as feelings, values, appreciation,

enthusiasms, motivations, and attitudes (Krathwohl et al., 1973). This study suggests that theatre teachers and administrators value what the theatre teacher brings to the theatre classroom in terms of teaching to the whole child. This study suggests theatre teachers and administrators agree the theatre teacher may do this better than most teachers across curriculums. Seidel (1991) and Omasta (2012) found supporting data in their exhaustive studies on theatre education in the United States. They found the most reliable assessment efforts for what might be considered the least concrete skills (self-confidence, personal growth, and acting) are rated higher than more concrete skills like playwriting by teachers and administrators indicating the more structured and objective the assessment method, the lower its rating by both principal and teachers (Seidel, 1991; Omasta, 2012).

Related literature supports the notion that an effective theatre teacher strives to understand young people and youth culture (Thompson & Joshua-Shearer, 2002; Wolfe, 1997; Woodson, 2004) and fosters relationships and good rapport with students (Brand, 1983; Kyriakides, 2005; Miller, 2000; Popp et al., 2011; Range et al., 2012; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; Van Rossum, 2004; Wolfe, 1997). This study suggests an effective theatre teacher strives to develop strong relationships with students. Most theatre teachers and administrators spoke at great length about the importance of relationships with their students and how vital it is to the work they do as theatre educators. Interview and survey respondents underscored the notion that an effective theatre teacher strives to know his/ her students well and understands them.

The relevant literature suggests that effective arts teachers are passionate about their art form (Brand, 1990; McAllister, 2008; Van Rossum, 2004) and have energy, enthusiasm, and commitment (Brand, 1983, 1985, 1990, 2006; Erbes, 1987; Kelly, 2007;

Madsen, 1990; Miller, 2000; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Wolfe, 1997).

This study suggests that an effective theatre teacher is passionate about the crafts of theatre and teaching. Passion is defined as a strong feeling of enthusiasm or excitement for something or about doing something. Passion is different from the affective domain because passion is specifically related to the theatre teacher's feelings, not the student's feelings as in affective domain. According to interview and survey respondents, effective theatre teachers are passionate about theatre.

This study identified a few differences between theatre teacher and administrator perceptions in Instructor Traits. Theatre teachers in this study identified instructor traits of individual teacher persona and the ability to foster curiosity in students as being important to be an effective theatre teacher. The theatre teacher respondents reported that uniqueness was important to take into account when being evaluated as this could impact the environment of the classroom and the manner in which learning takes place in a theatre arts class. Relevant literature supported the notion of fostering curiosity in that an effective arts teacher strives to establish classrooms that are educational labs where there is constant testing and trying new things (Brand, 2006; Flannery, 1968; Shuler, 2012). This study found that theatre teachers felt it was important to strive to foster curiosity in their students. Theatre is exploratory by nature, so an effective theatre teacher should take advantage of opportunities to explore questions, take risks, and go on educational explorations with their students when the moments present themselves. Administrators who do not understand the exploratory nature of theatre may see this as off-task. However, the exploring is where a lot of learning takes place in a theatre arts class. Additionally, an effective theatre teacher should use those moments to strengthen instruction and his/her students. This study found administrators believe fostering talent

in students is important to being an effective theatre teacher. Seeing innate talent and ability is important to teaching theatre. An effective theatre teacher will see it and foster it. Administrators tended to want to see a final product of talent that has been fostered. This suggests the need for evidence of growth with the students for an administrator to be able to effectively evaluate the teacher.

Instructor Characteristics

Instructor Characteristics are defined for this study as any distinguishing quality of a person that can be shaped, molded, or taught. These are qualities that a teacher may not possess innately, but can be learned. The similarities between theatre teachers and administrators perceptions of instructor characteristics are that effective theatre teachers should be a jack-of-all-trades. Survey findings triangulate the data that support theatre teacher perceptions that affect and subjectivity matter.

Relevant literature supports this notion of being a jack-of-all-trades by saying effective theatre teachers possess innate talents and are master practitioners of his/her craft (Brand, 1990, 2006; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Madsen, 1990; Miller, 2000; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Van Rossum, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Wolfe, 1997) and have a broad and thorough understanding of the content (Brand, 1990, 2006; Darling- Hammond, 2006; Efland, 1993; King, 1998; Looney, 2011; Miller, 2000; Porter & Brophy, 1988; Rice, 2003; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Van Rossum, 2004; Wolfe, 1997). The effective theatre teacher should be able to teach all things theatre and be a master of their craft. This alludes to the breadth of content knowledge a theatre teacher must master and be able to teach due to the nature of the subject. In his survey of theatre education in the United States, Omasta (2012) reported 79% of schools surveyed offer at least one theatre course similar to a theatre appreciation course. Additional courses were offered in

technical theatre design (29%) and acting (27%), musical theatre (14%), directing, theatre history, playwriting, stage management, and theatre management.

Relevant literature suggests administrators and teachers agreed that theatre plays an important role in developing skills necessary to work with others to solve problems (leadership, problem-solving/critical thinking, and social/cross-cultural skills; Abril & Gault, 2012; Omasta, 2012). Soft skills are the intangibles that cannot be measured or quantified that a theatre teacher teaches through their curriculum. Life skills are different than soft skills. Life skills are the 21st century skills that businesses look for in the work force. This study found theatre teachers felt theatre teachers do this better than most teachers in the school.

Relevant literature suggests that an effective theatre teacher cultivates a sense of belonging (Walker, 2008; Wolfe, 1997; Woodson, 2004) and his/her students feel supported (Kyriakides, 2005; Stamer, 1999; Walberg, 1986). In this study theatre teachers discussed the idea of building the ensemble. Ensemble is a concept that takes into account all the parts of the group when looking at the whole. This group works together for a common goal. An effective theatre teacher works to develop a sense of belonging and “family” through activities and exercises that develop trust and a sense of community within the class and production.

The notion of process involves the ability to take a student from one point and move them to another in terms of growth. It also includes developing students and works of theatre through rehearsal and performance. Related literature suggests it is important for educators to see the whole experience in arts education over longer periods of time, not just the final product or performance (Greene, 1995; Maranzano, 2000; Stake & Munson, 2008). To further the point, evaluation of arts teachers must include process as

part of the criteria. The product (concert, play, art exhibit, or festival performance rating) must not be the focus of evaluation (Zerull, 1990). This study supported the literature.

In contrast, this study suggests administrators felt effective theatre teachers strive to market the theatre program. Administrators felt effective theatre teachers would do this by recruiting students, producing quality theatre productions, and teaching fun and engaging classes. This is indicative of another contrasting notion that correlates to marketing the theatre program. The impact the theatre program has on the whole school was of significance to administrators. If an effective theatre teacher is marketing their program appropriately the number of students in the program will suggest a thriving need for theatre in the school. Additionally, an effective theatre teacher will strive to be an integral part of the school as a whole. He/she is an active contributor to school initiatives, works with colleagues, is part of professional learning communities within the school, and creates a need for the theatre program to be a part of the school community.

Instructional Practices

This study defined Instructional Practices as the approaches a teacher may take to engage students in the learning process actively. These practices drive a teacher's instruction as they work to meet specific learning objectives and ensure that their students are equipped with the tools they need to be successful. These can be shaped, molded, and taught. The similarities concerning instructional practices of effective theatre teachers finally suggest there is a lack of evaluator understanding of the content of theatre. Furthermore, effective theatre teachers strive to utilize strategies with their students including group work, solo work, qualitative and quantitative feedback, differentiation, participation, and modeling. It is agreed by the theatre teachers and administrators that theatre classrooms are busy spaces. Survey findings triangulate the data that support

theatre teacher perceptions that understanding theatre as a performing art suggests evaluators should assess theatre teaching differently.

Relevant literature suggests evaluators lack an understanding of theatre content. The feeling of isolation among arts teachers is a reality as they are often the only one of their kind in a school; therefore, receiving content specific feedback that is useful is not always easily found (Shuler, 2012). There is a need for intense and thorough training of the evaluators involved in the processes and even more so for the highly specialized work of teachers in the arts (Airasian & Gullickson, 1997; Danielson, 2011; Henninger, 2002; Marsh & Duncan, 1992; Marzano, 2013; Patrick & Smart, 1998; Peterson, 1995; Ramsden, 2003; Stronge, 1997; Swartz et al., 1990). Most arts teachers are evaluated by a principal, other administrator, or a department chair (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991; Weems & Rogers, 2010) and arts teachers have legitimately argued that evaluation credibility may be lowered by subjective judgments imposed by administrators not trained in arts methodologies and therefore, lowered reliability of the evaluation process in general (Colwell & Davison, 1996; Maranzano, 2000). Most theatre teachers and administrators involved in this study spoke candidly about general concerns when it comes to a theatre arts class. They spoke of administrators/evaluators not understanding theatre content in an observation and therefore get/give little/ no useful feedback to assist theatre teachers in growing professionally. Additionally, theatre teachers in this study felt a lack of confidence in the observation and evaluation systems in place and therefore felt the evaluations they receive were of little use to their practice.

Related literature suggests teachers rated class work and productions as having roughly equal potential for teaching students and 90% of theatre programs do some sort of production every year (typically three or more productions) with 81% of teachers

consider play production work to be part of their theatre course work (Seidel, 1991).

Administrators and teachers also indicated the most important job responsibilities of theatre teachers were listening, guiding and directing productions (Seidel, 1991). Finally, an effective theatre teacher strives to teach for artistic understanding while preparing for performance (Blocher et al., 1997; Duke & Pierce, 1991; Markle et al., 1990).

This study confirmed findings in the related literature that an effective theatre teacher produces live theatre and utilizes this for recruitment to build and sustain their programs. This not only gives exposure to the program (comparative to marketing the program), but for theatre teachers it serves as a prime vehicle to put the theory and training found in the classroom to work in an active and engaged way for the students (comparative to process).

Time refers to the amount of time outside of the normal school day that the job of a theatre teacher typically requires and is not typically taken into account when evaluating theatre teachers. Seidel (1991) and Omasta (2012) found most teachers are expected to produce theatrical productions outside the regular school hours and 86 % of teachers receive stipends for their work outside of the school day. Current evaluation practices tend to dismiss the valuable work that extends outside the typical school day and contributes to the instructional programs of the arts and that these are valid sources of authentic instruction that can and should be assessed (Maranzano, 2000). They are indicative of a healthy arts program (Omasta, 2012) and a rich source of evidence of effective instruction (Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990). This study suggests that theatre teachers and administrators agree effective theatre teachers commit great amounts of time beyond the typical school day to accomplish what they need to accomplish for the benefit of their theatre program.

The differences concerning instructional practices of effective theatre teachers finally suggest teachers recognize more instructional strategies specific to the content of theatre than administrators do. This supports the related literature in that most theatre teachers use methods of student assessment they felt were more effective than their administrators believed including performance/practical demonstration and written exams (Omasta, 2012; Seidel, 1991). The related literature suggests that effective theatre teachers model and demonstrate for his/her students (Duke & Simmons, 2006; Franklin, 2005; McAllister, 2008) and the students are involved (Brand, 1990; Franklin, 2005). This study suggests that theatre teachers and administrators agree on a few instructional strategies including modeling and demonstrating and their students are engaged/involved.

As suggested by the related literature, theatre teachers recognize more instructional strategies than administrators. An effective theatre teacher's classes should be based on creating, performing, and responding (Duke & Simmons, 2006; Franklin, 2005). An effective theatre teacher strives to provide immediate, related feedback that is linked to past work (Blocher et al., 1997; Borich, 1992; Cazden, 1986; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Franklin, 2005; Kyriakides, 2005; McAllister, 2008; Price, 1983; Stamer, 1999; Van Rossum, 2004; Watkins, 1993; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999; Yarbrough & Price, 1989) and is critical without being hurtful and teaches students how to handle criticism (Brand, 1983; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Miller, 2000; Van Rossum, 2004). Additionally, an effective theatre teacher has a sense of humor (Kelly, 2007; King, 1998; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Walker, 2008; Wolfe, 1997) with which he/she can balance out the seriousness of constructive feedback and keep a fun and engaging atmosphere with students. This directly links back to knowing his/ her students. An effective theatre teacher individualizes instruction for students (Franklin,

2005; Stake & Munson, 2008). This study suggests effective theatre teachers should strive to know their students in order to be able to most effectively individualize instruction for his/ her students to maximize learning opportunities. An effective theatre teacher works to have excellent classroom management (Brand, 1983; Hattie, 2009; Korteweg, 1989; Looney, 2011; Popp et al., 2011; Range et al., 2012; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Sanden, 2012; Van Rossum, 2004). Due to the active and at times “chaotic” nature of a theatre classroom, an effective theatre teacher should strive to maintain excellent classroom management in order to maintain an effective learning environment.

Warburton (2006) suggests two theoretical categories in arts education: 1—Educational (emphasizes development of creativity, imagination, subjectivity, and a problem solving approach) and 2—Professional curricular model (focused on training highly skilled artists and works for presentation). Additional related literature suggests an effective theatre teacher strives to teach every student, not just the most talented (Flannery, 1968; Miller, 2000). This study suggests theatre teachers felt an effective theatre teacher should teach an appreciation for theatre, not future stars. Most theatre teachers ascribed to the philosophy of teaching that involved not teaching future stars. They believed an effective theatre teacher teaches kids to love and appreciate the art form and the craft of theatre, and not to go on and be famous.

The related literature suggests in evaluations most arts teachers are rated good or great, novice teachers receive no scrutiny, poor performance goes unaddressed, and administrative observations are infrequent and rarely inform teacher assignment, professional development, or promotion decisions (Cantrell & Scantlebury, 2011; Mickle & Frontier, 2012; OECD, 2005, 2009; Peterson, 2000; Perrine, 2013; TNTP, 2009). This study suggests similar findings. The administrators feel theatre teachers almost always

score well on evaluations. They believe current evaluation systems tend to help theatre teachers during evaluations because they are not specific and leave room for evaluators to make subjective decisions. In contrast, theatre teachers believe the evaluations are meaningless and don't accurately assess their teaching. According to theatre teachers in this study, this is attributed to evaluators not truly understanding the theatre content and what effective teaching in theatre looks like.

Finally, administrators suggested effective theatre teachers foster talent, grow the students, and grow the program. This is similar to administrator comments on marketing the program. An effective theatre teacher should strive to be like a coach in that they see talent and develop that talent to put out a good product. This in turn should strengthen recruitment of students and boast strong numbers of enrollment in addition to a strong product to market the school as a whole.

The findings of this study have been detailed in this section. The perceived similarities between theatre teachers and administrators consist of the Instructor Traits, Instructor Characteristics, and Instructional Practices that effective theatre teachers should exemplify in theatre classrooms. These similarities are

1. Affective Domain
2. Relationships
3. Passion
4. Jack of all trades- one person (isolation and burn out)
5. Life Skills
6. Lack of evaluator understanding of content
7. Variety of Strategies (good teaching, differentiation)
8. Productions

9. Time

10. General Strategies (modeling and engagement)

The perceived differences between theatre teachers and administrators consist of the Instructor Traits, Instructor Characteristics, and Instructional Practices that effective theatre teachers should exemplify in theatre classrooms. These differences are

1. Fostering Curiosity- Educational labs (exploratory nature-chaos; teachers)
2. Fostering talent (admin)
3. Ensemble (teachers)
4. Process (teachers)
5. Market the program (admin)
6. More specific strategies (teachers)
7. Not teaching stars (teachers)
8. Good ratings of teachers (admin and teacher)
9. Foster talent, grow students, and grow the program (admin)

Conclusions

Theatre teachers and administrators who evaluate theatre teachers have presented a holistic picture of an effective theatre through this study. It is important to acknowledge the similarities found through this study between perceptions of effective theatre teachers between theatre teachers and administrators. The common ground that is proposed by this study suggests administrators and theatre teachers have an understanding of multiple areas of effective teaching in theatre arts. Both teachers and administrators understand the importance of teaching to the affective domain, developing strong relationships with students, and being passionate about teaching and theatre and

the strength that effective theatre teachers bring to these areas. It is important to establish relationships and build trust amongst the students and teacher to do the work necessary in a theatre class. Relationship building and fostering this relationship may allow effective theatre teachers to take students where they are and create an environment where the student is able to be challenged, take risks, and move forward towards better work in theatre. Passion about theatre and teaching is important to being an effective theatre teacher. It is what he/she loves. It is everything to him/her. He/she wants to pass that passion on and impact their students through their love of theatre. This is evident in the way the teacher teaches, interacts with the students, and how they are able to impact their students desire to learn theatre. There is an energy and enthusiasm in the teacher that can only come from within.

It is also acknowledged that these are not taken into account on current evaluation systems. It is also worth noting effective theatre teachers are perceived to be master practitioners in their field and are teaching more than just curriculum by teaching life skills through theatre content. This is worth noting as typically there is one theatre teacher at a school. The teacher can feel isolated, as there is no one at the school that is like them. He/she is responsible for a heavy course load of very specific classes with very specific needs. In addition to that they are also typically responsible for the productions and other administrative duties that may come along with most teaching assignments (hall and lunch duty, tutoring, facility management, meetings, and committee work) that can lead to not only a feeling of isolation, but burn out as well. The notion that a theatre teacher is a generalist in all things theatre is noteworthy. Theatre teachers often have numerous specialized classes to plan for. However, because of the interconnected nature of theatre an effective theatre teacher must be able to “connect the

dots” for students as many topics in theatre are related and depend on mastery of multiple nuances within the craft to effectively teach the topics. Due to the nature of the work in the theatre, an effective theatre teacher should provide ample opportunities in their instruction to teach life skills through theatre curriculum. Effective theatre teachers strive to have students solve problems, communicate, practice leadership skills, and develop social and cross cultural skills through directing, designing, creating, and producing.

Administrators and teachers both agree there is a great lack of evaluator understanding of theatre content when it comes to evaluating teachers. Most administrators adopt the mindset that “good teaching is good teaching” when they don’t understand what the teacher is teaching. They are able to identify general teaching qualities of classroom management and differentiation, but rarely can give specific feedback to better the theatre teacher within their content. Therefore, the limited number of instructional strategies can be identified when evaluators go into theatre arts classrooms. They may notice a theatre teacher models for their students and actively engages their students more than most teachers, but that is the extent to which administrators and teachers agreed with instructional strategies. Additionally theatre teachers and administrators see the importance of theatre productions but for different reasons as this study suggests. Finally, theatre teachers and administrators both acknowledge the time spent outside of the school day to have an effective theatre program.

It is important to discuss the differences found in this study between theatre teacher and administrator perceptions of effective theatre teachers. The differences that are proposed by this study suggest administrators and theatre teachers have different priorities for and definitions of an effective theatre teacher.

Theatre teachers felt it was important for theatre arts classrooms to be an educational lab. Theatre is exploratory by nature and an effective theatre teacher provides opportunities to foster curiosity within his/her students. This can often times look like chaos in the classroom that theatre teachers felt administrators may not see as effective teaching and learning. It can look out of control, however an effective theatre teacher will still be in control while learning is taking place. Theatre teachers also felt the need to establish a healthy ensemble within classes and productions is critical for effective teaching in theatre take place. The ensemble that is created through this work can enable an effective theatre teacher to challenge students beyond their comfort zone to take risks. It can assist in allowing students to be vulnerable in the creative process of acting, directing, and designing. It can assist in students feeling comfortable to communicate with one another openly in collaborative discussions, rehearsals, and in class situations. It is worth noting that while administrators in this study did not specifically speak to building the ensemble specifically, they did mention that an effective theatre teacher strives to push students to take risks. As noted by the theatre teachers, this cannot be accomplished without a sense of trust being established. That sense of trust, community, and family is vital to students being willing to take risks, being vulnerable, being open to criticism, and being open to giving criticism. That is the very nature of the work agreed upon by administrators and theatre teachers. However, theatre teachers felt administrators do not understand the time and skills it takes to create that ensemble. The teachers felt often times administrators just think there is a lot of fun and games going on in a theatre classroom, when actually a theatre teacher utilizes those games and exercises (creative dramatics) to foster and build that ensemble that is necessary for an effective theatre teacher to work. A direct correlation can be made to

establishing relationships with students and building the ensemble. If the theatre teacher has managed to succeed at these, then there is a trust and comfort level between the teacher and student that is evident to administrators for a theatre teacher to be able to give that critical feedback, link it to the student's past work, and the student appropriately receive that feedback without being hurt by it. Additionally a theatre classroom cannot be focused on creating work, presenting it and responding to it if the teacher does not establish that level of trust.

A quality product is important to effective theatre teachers, but the learning in a theatre class and production takes place within the process, or journey, to get there. Theatre teachers by and large want administrators to see more of their work with students. The effective theatre teacher strives to develop students over time. An effective theatre teacher will work with students to strive to develop trust, build ensembles, push students further to take risks, develop skills through repeated practice, and develop the student's artistic voice. Theatre teachers in this study craved for administrators to be more involved in and aware of that process, not just the final product, because that is where they felt effective teaching is most evident. Theatre teachers in this study felt administrators tend to neglect the process. Administrators don't observe teachers enough to truly capture the process, and in turn, the growth that students make because of the daily rehearsal, giving, receiving, and applying feedback for improvement, building and nurturing the relationships, and teaching new skills and techniques and practically applying them. Theatre teachers acknowledge administrators have a lot on their plates in terms of duties, observations, meetings, and discipline. They also acknowledge when administrators come to their productions and praise the great work on stage. However, they would like for administrators and evaluators to be a bigger

witness to the process that the teacher and students go through together to more accurately assess their work as a theatre teacher.

Along with the notion of administrators being more present in the process was the suggestion that theatre teachers identify more instructional strategies in a theatre arts classroom than administrators do. This is consistent with the findings that teachers and administrators both acknowledge the limited understanding by administrators in theatre content knowledge. The theatre teachers in this study also said they do not teach students to be stars. They strive to teach an appreciation of and provide meaningful experiences in theatre arts. They strive to teach to build soft skills in students as well as life skills through theatre.

It is worth noting that theatre teachers and administrators both acknowledged theatre teachers consistently scoring well on evaluations. However, both identified this for different reasons. Theatre teachers felt they consistently score well on evaluations because administrators don't fully understand what they are seeing when they come into a theatre classroom. They also identified administrators seeing quality productions and that being indicative of strong teaching and learning in theatre classes. Administrators said theatre teachers consistently score well on evaluations because evaluation tools can be subjective and that theatre teachers naturally differentiate instruction and create engaging environments for learning. They also acknowledged strong productions and community response to the work of the theatre arts department. A common phrase from administrators was "good teaching is good teaching," and that administrators can just tell when good teaching and learning is taking place.

Administrators identified different and limited areas than theatre teachers. Administrators identified marketing and growing the program as important to an effective

theatre teacher. Administrators felt a strong product on display for the public to see would increase student participation in the program and benefit the whole school. This is consistent with teachers feeling administrators are product driven instead of process driven. Additionally, administrators felt fostering talent and growing students was important in defining an effective theatre teacher. This is consistent with a product driven and coaching mentality that administrators suggest for theatre teachers in this study; yet different than theatre teachers who claimed they are not teaching students to be stars.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research

Implications for practice. This study provides implications for performance evaluation of theatre arts teachers. The similarities provide useful data that can be used in evaluation of theatre teachers. They provide a base line/ common ground to start from in defining and measuring effective teaching in theatre arts. These known and agreed upon areas could prove helpful in classroom observations, conversations between theatre teachers and administrators about practice, planning for professional development, and teacher evaluations. One recommendation is that an observation instrument should be developed that is specific to the content of theatre arts teachers. Administrators and theatre teachers agree there is a lack of understanding on the part of administrators when it comes to theatre arts content. This study suggests useful information for administrators and theatre teachers on how theatre arts classes are viewed. This can also provide insight to issues in low morale and feelings of isolation that theatre teachers experience in schools. Administrators tend to feel a successful theatre program is one that makes the school look good to the community and the theatre programs benefits the whole school and thus a theatre teacher is effective when they are able to do this. Theatre teachers feel

more of the “real work” they do is evident in class and rehearsals as evidenced over time. It is recommended that administrators look at more opportunities to get into theatre teachers classrooms and rehearsals to experience more of the process in which the teachers and students work to see how the teacher is fostering talent and growing students. The evaluation process is inhibiting the education process. The current product driven mindset is making teachers reach for stellar productions instead of focusing on what they feel is important in the classroom. Administrators and theatre teachers in this study stated administrators tend to feel overwhelmed, school gets in the way of observations, and there isn’t enough time in the school day to get in the classrooms like they would like to. Most teachers are required to work after school on productions. Most even receive stipends for this work. An administrator could use this time after school to conduct observations of these afterschool rehearsals since they are assigned job duties and are extensions of the work they are doing in the classrooms. Theatre teachers can also extend invitations to administrators to come into their classrooms when they are doing work they want seen. They can also invite administrators to afterschool rehearsals. Including administrators in the work they do could assist with the feelings of isolation commonly felt by theatre teachers and administrators can feel welcome to come in and observe and learn more about the content through the experience of observing and even participating in the lessons as active learners. Administrators must also have a shift in mindset of the theatre productions as “window dressing” for the school. This study suggested theatre teachers place far less importance on productions than administrators. This can be attributed to theatre teachers understanding the content better than administrators typically and seeing the big picture as the expert in the field. Administrators who see the product/production as the most important aspect of a theatre

program can miss a wealth of good teaching that goes into creating the product, or may miss a wealth of poor teaching conversely if the teacher knows they are in essence being evaluated on their productions and how good they assist in making the school look. In essence, theatre teachers can be teaching to the test, instead of the process, which they innately feel is more important to their work in theatre.

Implications for policy. This study provides implications for professional development of administrators, theatre teachers, and policy makers. Administrators could be trained in a class for which there is one teacher teaching the content, or a singleton teacher. This would be appropriate as suggested by this study for theatre arts, but can also serve other arts teachers and singleton teachers as well. Additionally, training for administrators to assist in planning professional growth/development plans for theatre arts teachers would be appropriate as well. Theatre arts teachers need specific training. If it is known he/she is the expert in the content area, training for meaningful conversations between administrators and theatre teachers should be developed for planning professional development that is appropriate and meaningful for the theatre teacher to grow as an educator. For example, this study found theatre teachers differentiate instruction and engage students better than most teachers in the school. Professional development focused on these best practices may prove counterproductive for these teachers. Targeted professional development in a particular area of theatre such as directing in a particular theatrical style or historical period of theatre may prove more beneficial for the teacher, his/ her work with students, their practice in the classroom and rehearsals, and strengthened final product in productions. These targeted conversations, observations, and evaluations may strengthen practice of teachers in the classroom. It may also strengthen evaluation practices of administrators in that teachers may not

always score extremely well on evaluations. It could provide meaningful direction to teachers working to improve instead of continuing to work in isolation not knowing if they are truly being effective or not. It may provide more direction for administrators to be educational leaders and strengthen the work of the teacher, thus strengthening the growth of students. Policy makers can benefit from this study in that current evaluation systems and practices are not adequate for all teachers. The information from this study could lead to the development of stronger evaluation systems that are more inclusive of teachers without test scores attached to their classes, are performance based in nature, and are more subjective in nature because of the content that is taught.

Implications for research. This study provides groundwork for future studies to develop and test such an instrument. Such an instrument may prove useful to theatre teachers receiving more specific feedback from administrators to better practice. It could also provide a baseline for conversations between administrators and theatre teachers in planning for professional development. In an effort to make this more beneficial for all parties involved, appropriate and thorough training for administrators should be part of the observation instrument use and evaluation process. This may provide greater confidence for teachers in the evaluation process.

References

- Abrami, P. C. (2001). Influencing judgments about teaching effectiveness using teacher rating forms. *New Directions for Institutional research*, 109, 59-87.
- Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2006). The state of music in elementary school: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 54, 6-20.
- Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2007). Perspectives on the music program: Opening doors to the school community. *Music Educator's Journal*, 93(5), 32-37.
- Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2012). The state of music in secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56(1), 68-81.
- Airasian, P. W., & Gullickson, A. (1997). Teacher self-evaluation. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (pp. 215-247). Newbury Park, CA; Corwin Press.
- Aleamoni, L. M. (1981). Student rating of instruction. In J. Millman (Ed.), *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation* (pp.110-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Alok, K. (2011). Student evaluation of teaching: An instrument and a development process. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(2), 226-235.
- Anderson, K., Harrison, T., & Lewis, K. (2012). Plans to adopt and implement common core state standards in the southeast region states: Summary. (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2012–No. 136). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.
- Anning, A. (1998). Teachers theories about children's learning. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Teachers Professional Learning* (pp. 128-145). London: Falmer Press.
- Arreola, R. A. (2007). Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems (3rd ed.). NJ: Wiley.
- Aubrecht, J. D. (1984). Better faculty evaluation systems. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Changing practices in faculty evaluation: A critical assessment and recommendations for improvement* (pp. 85-91). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ballou, D., Sanders, W., & Wright, P. (2004). Controlling for student background in value-added assessment of teachers. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 29(1), 37-65.

- Baron, J. B, and Wolf, D. P. (1996). Performance-based student assessment: challenges and possibilities. *Ninety-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the study of Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Beals, F., Cameron, M., Hipkins, R., & Watson, S. (2003). An evaluation of professional development to support the arts curriculum in New Zealand. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Biggs, J. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education research & Development*, 18(1), 57-75.
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2010). The measures of effective teaching (MET) project: Working with teachers to develop fair and reliable measures of effective teaching. Retrieved from <https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/Documents/met-framing-paper.pdf>
- Black, P., Williams, M., & You, S.Y. (2011). Road maps for learning: A guide to the navigation of learning progressions. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective*. 9(2-3), 71-122.
- Blocher, L., Greenwood, R., & Shellahamer, B. (1997). Teaching behaviors of middle school and high school band directors in the rehearsal setting. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, (3), 457.
- Bloom, B., Krathwohl, D., & Masia, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Bolton, G. (1984). *Drama as education*. London: Longman.
- Bonbright, J. M. (1999). Dance education 1999: Status, challenges, and recommendations. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101 (1), 33-39.
- Borich, G. D. (1992) *Effective teaching methods* (2nd ed). New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Boyd, R. T. (1989) Improving teacher evaluations. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*, 1(7). Retrieved from <http://ericae.net/pare/92~getvn.html> (retrieved 23 November 2013).
- Boyer, G. (1995). Leadership: What it takes to make and keep quality visual arts programs. *Art Education*, (4), 36-43.
- Brand, M. (1983). *Characteristics of effective music teachers*. ERIC Document No: ED237400
- Brand, M. (1985). Research in music teacher effectiveness. *Applications of Research in Music Education*, 3(2), 13-16.

- Brand, M. (1990). Special focus: The making of a master music teacher. *Music Educators Journal*, 77(2), 22-25.
- Brand, M. (2006). *The teaching of music in nine different Asian nations: Comparing approaches to music education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Brand, M. (2009). Music teacher effectiveness: Selected historical and contemporary research approaches. *Australian Journal of Music Education*, 1, 3-18.
- Brandt, R. (1987). On assessment in the arts: A conversation with Howard Gardner. *Educational Leadership*, 45(4), 30.
- Branscome, E. E. (2012). The impact of education reform on music education: Paradigm shifts in music education curriculum, advocacy, and philosophy from Sputnik to Race to the Top. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 113, 112-118.
- Braun, H. (2011). Can road maps tell us whether we are off course? *Measurement*, 9(2/3), 130-133. doi:10.1080/15366367.2011.599636
- Braxton, J., & Hargens, L. (1996). Variation among academic disciplines: Analytical frameworks and research. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 11. New York, NY: Agathon Press.
- Brophy, J., Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 328-375).
- Brucoli, M. J., Bondi, V., & Baughman, J. (1994). Layman, R. & Tompkins, V. (Eds.), *American Decades: 1950—1959* (Vol. 6). Detroit: Gale Research.
- Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Cabrera, A., Colbeck, C., & Terenzini, T. (2001). Developing performance indicators for assessing classroom performance and student learning: the case of engineering. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(3), 327-352.
- Caelli, K., Ray, L., & Mill, J. (2003). 'Clear as mud': Toward greater clarity in generic qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(2), 1.
- Cantrell, S., & Scantlebury, J. (2011). Effective teaching: What is it and how is it measured. *Annenberg Institute for Social Reform*, Fall, 28-35.
- Carroll, J. (1996). Escaping the information abattoir: Critical and transformative research in drama classrooms. In P. Taylor & M. Green (Eds.), *Researching drama and arts education: Paradigms and possibilities* (pp. 72-85). New York: Routledge Falmer.

- Cashin, W. E. (1990). Students do rate different academic fields differently. In M. Theall & J. Franklin (Eds.), *Students ratings of instruction: Issues for improving practice: New directions for teaching and learning*, No. 43 (p. 113-121). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cashin, W. E. (1995). Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited. *IDEA paper no. 32*. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In Wittrock, M.C. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 432-463).
- Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39(7), 3-7.
- Chin, D. & Qualls, L. (1995). The arts and education. *Performing Arts Journal*. 50(51), 2.
- Church, A. (2012). Making performance-based evaluation work for you: A recipe for personal learning. *Knowledge Quest*, 41(2), 38-41.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2012). Teacher education: Where are we and where are we going? *Collaborative Action for Change*. (15). New York, NY: Rowan & Litchfield Education.
- Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Colwell, R. & Davidson, L. (1996). Musical intelligence and the benefits of music education. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(583), 5-64.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative (n.d. a). Frequently asked questions. Retrieved July 13, 2010, from www.corestandards.org/frequently-asked-questions.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative, (n.d. b). Standards in your state. Retrieved July 13, 2010, from www.corestandards.org/in-the-states.
- Cook, C. (1917). *The play way*. London: Heinemann.
- Cooper, S., & Endacott, R. (2007). Generic qualitative research: A design for qualitative research in emergency care? *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 24(12), 816-819. doi:10.1136/emj.2007.050641
- Courtney, R. (1973). Drama and pedagogy. *Discussions of Developmental Drama* 10. University of Calgary, 56-57.

- Creemers, B. P. M., & Reezigt, G. J. (1996). School level conditions affecting the effectiveness of instruction. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 7, 197-228.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Daggett, W. R. (2005). Achieving academic excellence through rigor and relevance. *International Center for Leadership in Education*. Retrieved from http://www.leadered.com/pdf/academic_excellence.pdf.
- Danielson, C. (2011). *The Framework for Teaching*. Retrieved from The Danielson Group <http://www.danielsongroup.org/article.aspx?page=frameworkforteaching>
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. Ancess, J., & Falk, B. (1995). *Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Darlington, R. B., (1997). The Tennessee value-added assessment system: A challenge to familiar assessment methods. In J. Millman (Ed.). *Grading teachers, grading schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Darrow, A. (2016). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). *General Music Today*, 30(1), 41-44. Doi: 10.1177/104837136658327
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Perigee Press.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education*. New York: Free Press.

- Donaldson, M., & Donaldson, G. A., Jr. (2012). Strengthening teacher evaluation: What district leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 78-82.
- Doran, H. C., & Fleischman, S. (2005). Challenges of value-added assessment. *Educational Leadership*, 63(3), 85.
- Dufour, R., & Marzano, R. J. (2009). High level strategies for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 62-68.
- Duke, R. A., & Blackman, M. (1991). The Relationship between observers' recorded teacher behavior and evaluation of music instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, (4), 290.
- Duke, R. A., & Madsen, C. K. (1991). Proactive versus reactive teaching: Focusing observation on specific aspects of instruction. *Bulletin on the Council for Research in Music Education*, 108, 1-14.
- Duke, R. A., & Pierce, M. A. (1991). Effects of tempo on transfer of performance skills. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 39, 93-100.
- Duke, R. A., & Simmons, A. L. (2006). The nature of expertise: Narrative descriptions of 19 common elements observed in the lessons of three renowned artist-teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 170, 7-19.
- Earl, H. (2008). Looking the other way? Accreditation standards and part time faculty. *Acadame*, 94(2), 103-110.
- Education Week Research Center. (2016, January, 4). The Every Student Succeeds Act: Explained. *Education Week*, 35(14). Retrieved August 26, 2016 from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/12/07/the-every-student-succeeds-act-explained.html>
- Efland, A. D. (1993). Teaching and learning the arts of the future. *Bulletin of the Council in Music Education*. Summer(117). 107-21.
- Eisner, E. (1983). The art and craft of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 40(4), 4-13.
- Eisner, E. (1985). Learning and teaching the ways of knowing. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ellett, C. D. (1997). Classroom-based assessments of teaching and learning. In J. H. Sronge (Ed.). *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (pp. 107-128). Newbury Park, CA; Corwin Press.
- Ellett, C. D., & Garland, J. S. (1987). Teacher evaluation practices in our largest school districts: Are they measuring up to "state of the art" systems? *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1(1), 69-92.

- Erbes, R. L. (1987). A new era in teacher certification. *Music Education Journal*, 73(6), 43-46.
- Evans, K. (2009). Arts and smarts: Test scores and cognitive development. *Cognitive Neuroscience, Education, & Lifelong Learning*.
- Flannery, M. (1968). The artistic teacher of art. *Art Education*, 21(7), 21-27.
- Foster, J. (1999). *Redesigning public education: The Kentucky experience*. Lexington, KY: Diversified Services, Inc.
- Franklin, E. E. (2005). Assessing teaching artists through classroom observation. *Teaching Artist Journal*, 3(3), 148-157.
- Fresco, B., Nasser, F. (2001). Interpreting student ratings: Consultation, instructional modification, and attitudes towards course evaluation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 27, 291-305.
- Fulcher, K. H., & Willse, J. T. (2007). Value added: Back to basics in measuring change. *Assessment Update*, 19(5), 10-12.
- Gaines, R. (2009). Seven principles of highly effective teachers. *Virginia Journal*, 30(1), 33-34.
- Gardner, H. (1991). *The unschooled Mind: How children think and how schools should teach*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geis, G. L. (1984). The context of evaluation. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Changing practices in faculty evaluation: A critical assessment and recommendations for improvement* (pp. 101-107). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Glazerman, S., Loeb, S., Goldhaber, D., Staiger, D., Raudenbush, S., & Whitehurst, G. (2010). Evaluating teachers: The important role of value-added. The Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/evaluating-teachers-the-important-role-of-value-added/>
- Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality- Published report. Retrieved from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/EvaluatingTeachEffectivness.pdf>

- Goe, L., & Stickler, L. M. (2008). Teacher quality and student achievement: Making the most of recent research. *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality-Research and Policy Brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/March2008Brief.pdf>
- Goldhaber, D. (2002). The mystery of good teaching: Surveying the evidence on student achievement and teachers' characteristics. *Education Next*, 2(1), 50-55.
- Goldhaber, D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129-145.
- Good, T. I. & Mulryan, C. (1990). Teacher ratings: A call for teacher control and self evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook for teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. Newbury Park, CA; Corwin Press.
- Grant, J. & Drafall, L. (1991). Teacher effectiveness research: A review and comparison. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 108, 31-48.
- Green, R. L. (2010). *The four dimensions of principal leadership: A framework for leading 21st century schools*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Greene, M. (1978). The artistic-aesthetic and curriculum. In Greene, M (Ed.), *Landscapes of learning* (pp 168-84). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Greenwood, R. A. (1991). *Secondary school administrators' attitudes and perceptions on the role of music and school bands* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9209119).
- Guba, E. G & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA; Sage Publications.
- Haertel, E. H. (1991). New forms of teacher assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 17, 3-29.
- Haladyna, T. M., Nolen, S. B., Haas, N. S. (1991). Raising standardized achievement test scores and the origins of test pollution. *Educational Researcher*, 20(5), 2-7.
- Hamann, D. L., Baker, D. S., McAllister, P. A., & Bauer, W. I. (2000). Factors affecting university music students' perceptions of lesson quality and teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48, 102-113.

- Hanushek, E. A. (1992). The trade-off between child quantity and quality, *Journal of Political Economy*, 100, 84-117.
- Hanushek, E. A. (2006). School Resources. *Handbook in Economics*, 26(2), 865-908.
- Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., O'Brien, D. M., & Rivkin, S. G. (2005). *The market for teacher quality* (NBER Working Paper 11154). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Harris, D. N. (2009). Would accountability based on teacher value added be smart policy? An examination of the statistical properties and policy alternatives. *Education Finance and Policy*, 4, 319-350.
- Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. R. (2009). *What makes for a good teacher and who can tell?* (Working paper #30). Retrieved from the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research: CALDER, The Urban Institute website: <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1001431-what-makes-for-a-good-teacher.pdf>
- Harvey, S. & Goudvis, A. (2000). *Strategies that work: Teaching comprehension in a reader's workshop*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Hatfield, T. A. (2007). Federal government: Where's the beef: A state perspective. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(5), 4-6.
- Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?* Paper presented at the Australian Council for Educational research Annual Conference on Building Teacher Quality, Melbourne, Australia. Abstract retrieved from http://www.acer.edu.au/documents/Hattie_teachersMakeADifference.pdf.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Henninger, J. C. (2002). The effects of knowledge of instructional goals on observations of teaching and learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(1), 37-50.
- Hershberg, T., & Robertson-Kraft, C. (2010). Maximizing the opportunity provided by "Race to the Top." *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, 7(1), 128-131.
- Hicks, J. M. (2004). It's an attitude. *Art Education*, 57(3), 13-17.
- Hinton, C. & Fischer, K. W. (2010). Learning from the developmental and biological perspective, In H. Dumont, D. Istance, & F. Benavides (Eds.), *The nature of learning. Using research to inspire practice*. Paris: OECD.

- Hong, C. (2006). Unlocking dance and assessment for better learning. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Assessment in arts education* (pp. 27-36). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hornbrook, D. (1998). *Education and Dramatic Art* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hourigan, R. (2011). Race to the top: Implications for professional development in arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 112(2), 60-64.
- Howell, A. J., Symbaluk, D. G. (2001). Published student ratings of instruction: Revealing and reconciling the views of students and faculty. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 790-796.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change* 31(5), 11-15.
- Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2007). We feel therefore we learn: The relevance of affective and social neuroscience to education, *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 1, 3-10.
- Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (1991). *Collected writings on education and drama: Dorothy Heathcote*. Northwestern University Press.
- Johnson, S. M. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools*. New York; Basic Books.
- Johnson, S. M., & Fiarman, S. E. (2012). The potential of peer review. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 20-25.
- Kane, T., & Cantrell, S. (2012). *Learning about teaching: Initial findings from the measures of effective teaching project*. Seattle, WA: Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.
- Kelin, D. A., II (2007). The perspective from within: Drama and children's literature. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35, 277-284.
- Kelly, S. N. (2007). High school band students' perceptions of effective teaching. *Journal of Band Research*, 42(2), 57-70.
- Kent, L. (2005). Studio conversation: Approaches for a postmodern context. *Journal of Art and Design Education* 24(2), 159-65.
- Kyriakides, L. (2005). Drawing from teacher effectiveness and teacher interpersonal behavior to establish a teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 40(2), 44-66.

- Kyriakides, L., & Campbell, R. J. (2003). Teacher evaluation in Cyprus: Some conceptual and methodological issues arising from teacher and school effectiveness research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 17(1), 21-40.
- King, G. (1998). Exemplary music educator: a case study. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*. Summer(137), 57-72.
- Kohl, H. (1970). *The open classroom: A practical guide to a new way of teaching*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Korteweg, A. (1989). Het West Point van de dans [The West Point of dance]. *De Volkskrant*, Art and Culture (p.1).
- Kowalcek, E. (1992). *The effects of art knowledge, pedagogical experience and contextual information on art teaching*. (Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University).
- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1973). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, the classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.
- Kushner, S. (2000). *Personalizing evaluation*. London: Sage.
- Laban, R. (1960). *The mastery of movement*. London: Macdonald & Evans.
- Laerd Statistics (2015). Principal Components Analysis (PCA) using SPSS Statistics. *Statistical tutorials and software guides*. Retrieved from <https://statistics.laerd.com/>
- Landy, R. J. (2006). Assessment through drama. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Assessment in arts education* (pp. 83-106). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
- Levine, M., & Levine, A. (2012). Education deformed: No child left behind and race to the top, 'This almost reads like our business plans.' *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, (1), 104.
- Liddell, L. (1977). *A comparison of attitudes toward music education among school board presidents, superintendents, principals, and music teachers in Mississippi public schools* (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 7728557)
- Liu, E., & Noppe-Brandon, S. (2009). *Imagination first: Unlocking the power of possibility*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley 7 Sons.

- Looney, J. (2011). Developing high-quality teachers: teacher evaluation for improvement, *European Journal of Education*, 46(4), 440-455.
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota. Retrieved from <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/CAREI>
- Loup, K. S., Garland, J. S., Ellett, C. D., & Rugutt, J. K. (1997). Ten years later: Findings from a study of teacher evaluation practices in our 100 largest school districts. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 10(3), 203-226.
- Madsen, C. K. (1990). Teacher intensity in relationship to music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 104(38), 38-46.
- Madsen, C. K., & Duke, R. A. (1985). Perception of approval/ disapproval in music. *Bulletin of the Council for research in Music Education*, 85, 119-130.
- Madsen, C. K., Standley, J. M., Byo, J. L., & Cassidy, J. W. (1992). Assessment of effective teaching by instrumental music student teachers and experts. *Update: The Applications of Research in Music Education*, 10(2), 20-24.
- Madsen, C. K., Standley, J. M., & Cassidy, J. W. (1989). Demonstration and recognition of high and low contrasts in teacher intensity. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37, 85-92.
- Madsen, C. K., & Yarbrough, C. (1985). *Competency-based music education*. Raleigh, NC: Contemporary Publishing.
- Maranzano, C. (1999). *New directions for music education performance evaluation*. Paper presented at the Virginia Music Educators 1999 Conference, Hot Springs, VA.
- Maranzano, C. (2000). Music teacher performance evaluation: A call for more inclusive models. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14(3), 267-274.
- Markle, G. Johnston, J. H., Greer, C., & Meichtry, Y. (1990). Teaching for understanding. *Middle School Journal*, 22(2), 53-57.
- Marsh, H. (2007). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and usefulness. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.) *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education. An evidence-based perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Marsh, H. W., & Duncan, M. (1992). Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multi-dimensional perspective. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook on theory and research* (pp. 142-234). New York: Agathon Press.

- Marshall, K. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(10), 727-735.
- Marshall, K. (2012). Fine-tuning teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 50-53.
- Marzano, R. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 14-19.
- Marzano, R. (2013). The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. *Marzano Research Laboratory*.
- Marzano, R., Frontier, A., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Maslow, A. (1963). *Toward a psychology of being*. Princeton, NJ: Norstrand.
- McAllister, L. S. (2008). Evaluating teaching effectiveness in music. *American Music Teacher* 3(14).
- McCluskey, N. N. (2011). Coming soon: The federal department of standardized minds. *Freeman-New Series-Foundation For Economic Education*, 61(6), 14-17.
- McGreal, T. L. (1983). *Successful teacher evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1987). The accuracy of principals' judgments of teacher performance. *Journal of Educational Research*, 80(4), 242-247.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Miekle, P., & Frontier, T. (2012). Keeping improvement in mind. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 10-13.
- Milbrandt, M., & Milbrandt, L. (2011). Creativity: What are we talking about? *Art Education*, 64(1), 8-13.
- Miller, B. (2000). An acting teacher's journey: What does it mean to be a good teacher, and how did you get there? *Teaching Theatre*, 12(1), 1-6.
- Millman, J. & Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. Newbury Park, CA; Sage Publications.
- Ministry of Education (2000). *The arts in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

- Ministry of Education. (2003). The dance exemplars and dance matrix. Retrieved from www.tki.org.nz/r/assessment/exemplars/arts/dance.
- Montes, G. (2012). Race to the top, Value-added models, and the Catholic view of education. *Catholic Social Science Review*, 17, 337-344.
- Morgan, D. (1998). Practical strategies for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: Applications to health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8(3), 362-376.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40(1), 120-123.
- Murray, H. G. (1997). Does evaluation of teaching lead to improvement of teaching? *International Journal of Academic Development*, 2(1), 8-2.
- Namaghi, S. (2010). A data-driven conceptualization of teacher evaluation. *Qualitative Report*, 15(6), 1504-1522.
- Nathan, L. (2000). The art of evaluation and professional development. *Principal Leadership*, 6(1), 32-36.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2014). *ASW frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gLznpK2n7VrLRaN18hUh4wisfWGOk1Rxm6rskYRvVlo/edit?pli=1#>
- Nettles, S. & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82, 724-736.
- Nolan, J. F., & Hoover, L. A. (2008). *Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Nowacek, S. L. (2008). *A critical examination of practices and perceptions of current performance evaluation models for theatre arts teachers in Virginia*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3334931)
- O'Day, J. (2002). Complexity, accountability, and improvement, *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, Retrieved from <http://gseweb.harvard.edu/~hepg/oday.html>.
- OECD. (2001). *Knowledge and skills for life* (Paris, OECD).
- OECD. (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing, and retaining effective teachers* (Paris, OECD).

- OECD. (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS* (Paris, OECD).
- OHDOE (2013). Student learning objectives: overview. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Student-Learning-Objective-Examples/Student-Learning-Objectives-FAQs> on February 9, 2014.
- Ohler, J. (2013). The uncommon core. *Educational Leadership*, 70(5), 42-46
- Oliver, B., Tucker, B., Gupta, R., & Yeo, S. (2008). eVALUE ate: An evaluation instrument for measuring students' perceptions of their engagement and learning outcomes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(6), 619-630.
- Omasta, M. (2012). A survey of school theatre: A landscape study of theater education in United States high schools. *Teaching Theatre*, 24(1), 8-28.
- Orr, S. (2011). 'Being an artist you kind of, I mean, you get used to excellence': Identity, values and fine art assessment practices. *International Journal of Art and Design*, 30, 37-44.
- Ovando, M. N., & Ramirez, A. J. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 20, 85-110.
- Owings, W. A., Kaplan, L. S., Nunnery, J., Marzano, R., Myran, S., & Blackburn, D. (2006). Teacher quality and troops to teachers: A national study with implications for principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 90, 102-131.
- Parnes, S. J. (1988). *Visionizing: State-of-the-art processes for encouraging innovative excellence*. East Aurora, NY: DOK Publishers.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students (Vol 2): A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Patrick, J., & Smart, R. (1998). An empirical evaluation of teacher effectiveness: The emergence of three critical factors. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23(2), 165-178.
- Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research*, 34(5), 1189-1208.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Payne, B. S. (1990). *Justifying music in the American public school: A survey of selected Ohio school personnel* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9031128)

- Peluso, J. L. (1970). *A survey of the status of theatre in United States high schools. Final Report*. Seton Hall University.
- Perls, F. (1969). *Gestalt therapy verbatim*. Moab, UT: Real People Press.
- Perrine, W. M. (2013). Music teacher assessment and race to the top: N initiative in Florida. *Music Educators Journal*, 100(1), 39-44.
doi:10.1177/0027432113490738
- Pestalozzi, H. (1951). *The education of man*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Peterson, K. D. (1987). Teacher evaluation with multiple and variable lines of evidence. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24(2), 311-317.
- Peterson, K. D. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Piaget, J. (1962). *Play, dreams, and imitation in childhood*. New York: Norton.
- Piro, J., Wiemers, R., & Shutt, T. (2011). Using student achievement data in teacher and principal evaluations: A policy study. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(4), 1-9.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Popp, P. A., Grant, L. W., & Stronge, J. H. (2011). Effective teachers for at-risk or highly mobile students: What are the dispositions and behaviors of award-winning teachers? *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 16, 275-291.
- Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the Institute for Research on Teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 45(8), 74-85.
- Price, H. E. (1983). Effect of conductor academic task presentation, conductor reinforcement, and ensemble practice on performers' musical achievement, attentiveness, and attitude. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 31, 245-257.
- Prickett, C. A., & Duke, R. A. (1992). Evaluation of music instruction by musicians and nonmusicians assigned differential observation tasks. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 113, 41-50.

- Punke, W. J. (1972). *A comparison of attitudes between Colorado school administrators and Colorado music teachers concerning music education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication no. AAT 7310991)
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge and Falmer.
- Range, B. G., Duncan, H. E., Scherz, S. D., & Haines, C. A. (2012). School leaders' perceptions about incompetent teachers: Implications for supervision and evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin*, 96, 302-322.
- Range, D. G., Grant, L. W., & Stronge, J. H. (2011). Supervision and evaluation: The Wyoming perspective. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 23, 243-265.
- Reimer, B. (1971). Toward an aesthetic education. *Music Educators National Conference*. 76-77.
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Teacher Education* (2nd ed., pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.
- Robinson, K. (2011). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. Oxford, UK: Capstone Publishing.
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rohwer, D., & Henry, W. (2004). University teachers' perceptions of requisite skills and characteristics of effective music teachers. *Journal Of Music Teacher Education*, (2), 18.
- Rossmann, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2008). *Grading education: Getting accountability right*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Rush, J. (1997). The arts and education reform: Where is the model for teaching "the arts"? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 98(3), 2-9.
- Ryan, D. (1986). *Developing a new model of teacher effectiveness*. Ontario Queen's Printer.
- Safavi, S., Bakar, K., Tarmizi, R., & Alwi, N. (2013). Faculty perception of improvements to instructional practices in response to student ratings. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 25(2), 143-153.

- Salkind, N. J. (2013). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Sanden, S. (2012). Independent reading: Perspectives and practices of highly effective teachers. *Reading Teacher*, 66(3), 222-231.
- SCDOE (2013). Educator support and evaluation guidelines. South Carolina Department of Education.
- SCDOE (2014). *Adept Performance Standards for Classroom Teachers*. Retrieved from <https://ed.sc.gov/agency/programs-services/50/documents/ADEPTStandards.pdf>
- Scheerens, J., & Bosker, R. (1997). *The foundations of educational effectiveness*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Scherrer, J. (2011). Measuring teaching using value-added modeling: The imperfect panacea. *NASSP Bulletin* 95(122).
- SCMEA (2013). South Carolina music educator evaluation: A value-added model for assessing standards-based growth and teaching. Executive Board Final Draft, SC Music Educators Association.
- Seidel, K. (1991). Theatre education in United States high schools: A survey report. *Teaching Theatre*, 3(1), 1-17.
- Seidel, S., Tishman, S., Winner, E., Hetland, L., & Palmer, P. (2009). A study of excellence in arts education. *Principal Leadership*, 10(3), 46-51.
- Shagrir, L. (2012). How evaluation processes affect the professional development of five teachers in high education. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12(1), 23-35.
- Shaw, A. (1970). A taxonomical study of the nature and behavioral objectives of creative dramatics. *Educational Theatre Journal*, 22, 361-372.
- Shehan Campbell, P. (1991). *Lessons from the world: A cross-cultural guide to music teaching and learning*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Shirbagi, N. (2011). Iranian university teachers' and students' views on effectiveness of students' evaluation of teaching. *Quality of Higher Education*, 8, 118-131.
- Shuell, T. J. (1986). Cognitive conceptions of learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 56(4), 411-436.
- Shuler, S. (1996). Assessing teacher competence in the arts: Should Mr. Holland have gotten the gig? Introduction to the symposium on teacher evaluation. *Arts Education Policy Review*, (1), 11.

- Shuler, S. (2012). Music education for life: Music assessment, part 2—instructional improvement and teacher evaluation. *Music Educators Journal*, 98(3), 7-10.
- Simon, M. (2012). A tale of two districts. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 58-63.
- Slade, P. (1954). *Child drama*. London, University Press.
- Sofras, P. & Emory-Maier, A. (2005). Dance educator enrichment program: A model for professional development. *Journal of Dance Education*. 5(3). 90-96.
- Stake, R. & Munson, A. (2008). Qualitative assessment of arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 109(6), 13-22.
- Stake, R. & Schwandt, T. (2006). On discerning quality in evaluation. In I. F. Shaw, J. C. Green, & M. M. Mark (Eds.). *Handbook of evaluation*. London: Sage.
- Stamer, R. A. (1999). Motivation in the choral rehearsal: Asking students what motivates them and working with their responses stimulates the learning atmosphere in the choral rehearsal. *Music Educators Journal*, 85(26), 26-29.
- States, B. O. (1994). *The pleasure of the play*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Streznewski, M. K. (1999). *Gifted grownups: The mixed blessings of extraordinary potential*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Strong, M., Gargani, J., & Hacifazlioglu, O. (2011). Do we know a successful teacher when we see one? Experiments in the identification of effective teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 367-382.
- Stronge, J. H., (n.d.). *Teacher evaluation and school improvement: Improving the educational landscape*. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/7808_Stronge01.pdf
- Stronge, J. H. (1997). Improving schools through teacher evaluation. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (pp.1-23). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Stronge, J. H. (2006). Improving schools through teacher evaluation. In J.H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (2nd ed., pp. 1-23). CA: Corwin Press.
- Stronge, J. H., & Ostander, L. P. (1997). Client surveys in teacher evaluation. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (pp. 129-161). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

- Stonge, J. H., Helm, V. M., & Tucker, P. D. (1995). *Evaluataion handbook for professional support personnel*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, Center for research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation.
- Stroud, B. S. (1980). *A study of the general classroom music programs in the public elementary schools of the Tidewater region of Virginia* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 8108680)
- Swartz, C. W., White K. P., & Stuck G. B. (1990). The factorial structure of the North Carolina Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument. *Education and Psychological Measurement*, 50(1), 175-185.
- Taebel, D. K. (1990a). An assessment of the classroom performance of music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 38, 5-23.
- Taebel, D. K. (1990b). Is evaluation fair to music educators? *A Music Educators Journal*, 76, 50-54.
- Taebel, D. K. (1992). The evaluation of music teachers and teaching. In R. Colwell (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Music teaching and Learning*. (pp. 310-329). New York: Schirmer Books.
- Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). Can teacher evaluation improve teaching? *Education Next*, 12(4), 78-84.
- Taylor, P. (1996). Introduction: Rebellion, reflective turning and arts education research. In P. Taylor & M. Green (Eds.), *Researching drama and arts education: Paradigms and possibilities* (pp. 1-22). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Taylor, P. (2006). Introduction. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Assessment in arts education* (pp. xiii-xxi). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Teachout, D. J. (1997). Preservice and experienced teachers' opinions of skills and behaviors important to successful music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*. 23, 134-146.
- Terry, P. (1992). The psychology of the coach-athlete relationship. In J. S.Bull (Ed.), *Sport Psychology* (pp.103-122). Ramsbury, Marlborough, England: The Crowned Press.
- Tennessee State Government. (2010). Sub-committee minutes. Retrieved from www.tn.gov/firsttothetop/docs/Initial_TEAC_Eval_

- The New Teacher Program [TNTP], (2009). The widget effect In D. Weisberg, S. Sexton, D. Mulhern, J. Schunck, & A. Palcisco (Eds.), (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <http://tntp.org/publications/view/evaluation-and-development/the-widget-effect-failure-to-act-on-differences-in-teacher-effectiveness>
- The New Teacher Program [TNTP], (2012). MET made simple: Building research-based teacher evaluations. Issue Analysis Report. Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_METMadeSimple_2012.pdf
- Thompson, G. L., & Joshua-Shearer, M. (2002). In retrospect: What college undergraduates say about their high school education. *High School Journal*, 85(4), 1-15.
- U.S. Department of Education (2009). Overview information: Race to the top fund: Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year 2010. *Federal Register* 74(221); 59836-59872.
- Viteritti, J. P. (2012). The federal role in school reform: Obama's 'race to the top.' (Symposium: Educational Innovation and the Law). *Notre Dame Law Review*, (5), 2087.
- Van Rossum, J. H. A. (2004). The dance teacher: The ideal case and daily reality. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 28(1), 36-55.
- Von Soest, M. (1997). Alexandra Radius heft nooit meer gedonst [Alexandria Radius never danced again]. *Vrig Nederland*, 58,42, 44.
- Wagner, B. J. (1998). *Educational drama and language arts*. Portsmouth, NH; Heinemann.
- Wagner, T. (2008). Rigor redefined. Retrieved from www.tonywagner.com/resources/rigor-redefined.
- Wagner, T. (2010). *The global achievement gap: Why even our best schools don't teach the new survival skills our children need—and what we can do about it*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Walberg, H. J. (1986). Syntheses of research on teaching, In Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 214-229). New York: MacMillan.
- Walker, R. J. (2008). Twelve characteristics of an effective teacher: A longitudinal, qualitative, quasi-research study of in-service and pre-service teachers opinions. *Educational Horizons*, 87(1), 61-68.

- Warburton, E. C. (2003). Intelligence past, present, and possible: The theory of multiple intelligences in dance education. *Journal of dance education*, 3(1), 7-15.
- Warburton, E. C. (2006). Evolving models of assessing dance. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Assessment in arts education* (pp. 3-21). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Ward, W. (1930). *Creative dramatics*. New York: Appleton- Century-Crofts.
- Watkins, R. C. (1993). Nonperformance time use in middle and junior high school choral rehearsals. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 11(2), 4-7.
- Weems, D. M., & Rogers, C. H. (2010). Are U.S. Teachers making the grade?: A proposed framework for teacher evaluation and professional growth. *Management Education*, 24(1), 19-24.
- Weimer, M. (1987). It's a myth nobody knows what makes teaching good. *The Teaching Professor*. 1(3), 3.
- Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Whitcomb, J., Borko, H., & Liston, D. (2009). Growing talent: Promising professional development models and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education* 60(3), 207-14.
- Whitehouse. (2015). *Every Student Succeeds Act: A progress report on elementary and secondary education*. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/documents/ESSA_Progress_Report.pdf on August 26, 2016.
- Williams, D. A. (2007). What are music educators doing and how well are we doing it? *Music Educators Journal*, 94(1), 18-23.
- Wilson, B. (1996). *Constructivist learning environments: Case studies in instructional design*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Winner, E., & Cooper, M. (2000). Meet those claims: No evidence (yet) for a causal link between arts study and academic achievement. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 11-75.
- Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L. McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1984). *Teaching evaluation: A study of effective practices*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. ERIC Document No. ED 246 559
- Wolf, D., Bixby, J., Glenn, J., & Gardner, H. (1991). To use their minds well: Investigating new forms of student assessment. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of research in education*, 17 (pp. 31-74). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

- Wolfe, P. (1997). A really good art teacher would be like you, Mrs. C: A qualitative study of a teacher and her artistically gifted middle school students. *Studies In Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research*, 38(4), 232-245.
- Woodson, S. E. (2004). Creating an educational theatre program for the twenty-first century. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 105(4), 25-30.
- Wright, S., Horn, S., & Sanders, W. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 57-67.
- Yarbrough, C. (1975). Effect of magnitude of conductor behavior on performance, attentiveness, and attitude of students in selected mixed choruses. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 23, 134-146.
- Yarbrough, C., Dunn, D. E., & Baird, S. L. (in press). Longitudinal study of teaching in a choral rehearsal. *Southeastern Journal of Music Education*.
- Yarbrough, C., & Henley, P. (1999). The effect of observation focus on evaluations of choral rehearsal excerpts. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 4, 308.
- Yarbrough, C., & Madsen, K. (1998). The evaluation of teaching in choral rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46, 469-481.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1981). Prediction of performer attentiveness based on rehearsal activity and teacher behavior. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 29, 209-217.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1989). Sequential patterns of instruction in music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37, 179-187.
- Zerihun, Z., Beishuizen, J., & Van Os, W. (2012). Student learning experiences as indicator of teaching quality. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 24(2), 99-111.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (2nd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2012). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (3rd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Zerull, D. S. (1990). Evaluation in arts education: Building and using an effective assessment strategy. *Design for Arts in Education*, 92(1), 19-24.
- Zhao, Y. (2012). *World class learners: Educating creative and entrepreneurial students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Appendix A

Part One: Interview Questions for Theatre Teachers

Part One: Interview Questions for Theatre Teachers

1. Gender:
2. Race or ethnicity:
3. What professional credentials do you hold?
4. How long have you taught high school theatre?
5. Does your job require afterschool activities related to theatre? If so, describe them.
6. How has the current evaluation system of ADEPT impacted your teaching?
7. How do you prepare for the formal evaluation?
8. How often have you been formally evaluated in the past five years?
9. Does the current evaluation system give you an accurate assessment of your teaching?
10. What areas of your teaching do the assessments seem to be most helpful?
11. What areas of your teaching do the assessments seem to be least helpful?
12. What areas of your teaching does ADEPT not measure?
13. Discuss your positive and negative experiences with teacher observations.
14. Do you feel the current teacher observation system in place at your school provides meaningful feedback for theatre teachers? Why or why not?
15. What do you believe are content specific traits, characteristics, and instructional practices you exhibit and do in your theatre classes that are not addressed by current observation instruments?
16. What does an effective theatre teacher do?
17. What is unique to effective theatre teachers that ADEPT does not address?
18. What area of your teaching would be beneficial for you to receive feedback on from an administrator from a classroom observation that may help you grow professionally as a theatre teacher?

Appendix B

Part One: Interview Questions for Administration

Part One: Interview Questions for Administrators

1. Gender:
2. Race or ethnicity:
3. What professional credentials do you hold?
4. How long have you been in your current administrative position?
5. What experience do you have as a classroom teacher? What did you teach?
6. Do you personally have experience as a participant in a theatre arts class, production, or workshop? If so, please explain.
7. How does the current evaluation system help teachers?
8. Do they seem to give you an accurate assessment of teaching?
9. How do you prepare for the formal evaluation?
10. How often are teachers formally evaluated?
11. What areas of teaching do the assessments seem to be most helpful?
12. What areas of teaching do the assessments seem to be least helpful?
13. What areas of teaching does ADEPT not measure?
14. Discuss your positive and negative experiences with teacher observations.
15. Do you feel the current teacher observation system in place at your school provides meaningful feedback for theatre teachers? Why or why not?
16. What do you believe are content specific traits, characteristics and instructional practices theatre teachers exhibit and do in their classes that are not addressed by current observation instruments?
17. What does an effective theatre teacher do?
18. What is unique to effective theatre teachers that ADEPT does not address?

19. What feedback would be beneficial for your theatre teacher to receive from an administrator from a classroom observation that may help him/ her grow as a theatre educator?
20. What aspects of theatre arts do you feel you understand well to evaluate? What aspects of theatre arts do you feel you do not understand well to evaluate?

Appendix C
Survey of Theatre Teachers

Survey of Theatre Teachers

The purpose of this survey is to explore perceptions of theatre teachers so a more holistic picture of what an effective theatre teacher looks like and does is developed. This may better inform teacher evaluation in theatre arts by assisting and developing these teachers professionally.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this brief survey. The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. You may discontinue the survey at any time or choose to not respond to individual items. Your honest and candid responses are requested.

5 item Likert Scale:

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree Nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

1. The work I do afterschool with students should be included as part of my evaluation.
2. The relationships I develop with my theatre students are important for me to be an effective teacher.
3. Building an ensemble in my theatre arts classes is important.
4. It is important to connect theatre content to real- life skills and applications.
5. My passion for theatre and teaching theatre is vital to the work I do with my students.
6. Evaluators need to understand how to evaluate the subjective nature of theatre arts classes.
7. The affective domain of learning (instilling confidence, self-worth, work ethic, process, working towards and achieving goals, responsibilities, high expectations, creativity, problem solving, curiosity, etc.) is vital to what I teach in a theatre arts classroom.
8. Producing theatre productions is necessary to effectively teaching theatre.
9. An effective theatre teacher must be a “jack of all trades” with a breadth of content knowledge.
10. Evaluators need to understand how learning tends to look different in a theatre arts classroom.
11. Process is a primary focus in my theatre arts classroom.

12. Evaluators need to understand classroom management may look different in a theatre arts classroom than other classrooms.

Open Ended Responses:

13. What do you believe are content specific traits, characteristics, and instructional practices you exhibit in your theatre classes that are not addressed by the current teacher evaluation system?
14. What does an effective theatre teacher do?
15. What area/s of your teaching would be beneficial for you to receive feedback on to help you grow professionally as a theatre teacher?

Once again, thank you for your candid and honest responses. Your time and expertise are greatly appreciated.

Appendix D

Study Participant Consent Form

Study Participant Consent Form

The Development of a Teacher Observation Instrument for Theatre Arts Teachers

I, _____, agree to participate in a study regarding perceptions of educational evaluation. The purpose of this study is to gather and understand experiences regarding observations of theatre teachers in various schools in South Carolina to develop a teacher observation instrument for theatre arts teachers.

As a participant, I understand that I will be interviewed at least once and asked to evaluate my experiences with teacher evaluation. I understand I will have the opportunity to review the information I have provided prior to publication.

I have been informed that I will be identified by an alias that will allow the researcher to determine my identity. At the conclusion of this study, the key that relates my name to the alias will be destroyed. Under this condition, I agree that any information obtained from the research may be used in any way thought best for publication or education. I understand that I will be provided with a copy of the final publication.

I understand that there is no personal risk or discomfort directly involved with this research and that participation is voluntary. I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in this study at any time. If I have questions or problems that arise in connection with my participation in this study, I should contact the dissertation advisor, Dr. Ray Dockery, at [REDACTED] or edockery@comporium.net.

My signature below signifies that I am at least 18 years of age and that I have received a copy of this consent form.

Participant/Date

Investigator/Date

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY GARDNER-WEBB UNIVERSITY INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD ON DECEMBER 11, 2014.

Appendix E
Debriefing Statement

Debriefing Statement


It is important for you to know the value of your input in the interview and questionnaire process of the study. Research has shown the voice of the participants in teacher evaluation is of utmost importance. Your perceptions in conjunction with professional literature in the fields of teacher evaluation, education reform, qualities of effective teaching, and theatre arts education were used to develop a prototype for an observation instrument to be used by administration to evaluate teachers and strengthen their professional development in the field of theatre education.

All information linked to your true identity will be destroyed to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of your participation in the process. Pseudonyms will be assigned to each participant, digital recordings will be erased, and any printed material associated with the study will be destroyed appropriately once the study is complete.

It is the hope of the researcher that this will add to the body of knowledge in teacher evaluation research, specifically in theatre arts education so that administrators and school districts more accurately assess and meet the specialized needs of theatre arts educators.

Upon completion of the analysis and discussion of the data gathered, a copy of the final report will be made available to all participants in the study via electronic mail.

Should you like to contact the researcher with questions and/or concerns, and to request a copy of the results of the study, please feel free to contact:

Principle Investigator
James D. Chrismon
jdchrismon@gmail.com


Research Supervisor
Dr. E. Ray Dockery
edockery@comporium.net

Thank you so much for your participation in the study.

This information was presented to me both verbally and in writing upon completion of my participation in the research and following the data collection.

Signature of study participant

Date

Appendix F

Email 1

Subject: I need your help

Date: Thursday, March 17, 2016 at 9:31 AM

Hello South Carolina Theatre Teachers,

From one theatre teacher to another I am requesting your help. As part of a final component to the research for my dissertation on theatre teacher evaluation, I would appreciate your feedback in a brief online survey. All responses will remain confidential and secure. Thank you in advance for your valuable insights through your candid and honest responses. I appreciate your trust and look forward to serving you in the future. The survey will remain active until Friday, April 1, 2016.

I have contracted with QuestionPro, an independent research firm, to field your confidential survey responses. Please click on this link to complete the survey:

<http://surveyoftheatreteachers.questionpro.com/>

Please contact me at jchrismo@rhmail.org with any questions.

Thank You,
Jimmy Chrismon

Appendix G

Email 2

Subject: Final Reminder: Plea for your help
Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 at 8:38 AM

Good morning, SC Theatre Teachers!

I sent an email last week requesting your help. Many of you have already completed the survey and I thank you sincerely. If you were planning to, but forgot this is a final reminder. As part of a final component to the research for my dissertation on theatre teacher evaluation, I would appreciate your feedback in a brief online survey. All responses will remain confidential and secure. Thank you in advance for your valuable insights through your candid and honest responses. I appreciate your trust and look forward to serving you in the future. The survey will remain active until Friday, April 1, 2016.

I have contracted with QuestionPro, an independent research firm, to field your confidential survey responses. Please click on this link to complete the survey:

<http://surveyoftheatreteachers.questionpro.com/>

Please contact me at jchrismo@rhmail.org with any questions.

Thank You,
Jimmy Chrismon