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ABSTRACT

This research narrated a school principal’s story as he tracked the complexities of teacher evaluation. The principal’s research problem was centered on addressing past evaluation practices that did not account for the vast contexts of teaching proficiencies, nor promote professional efficacy.

The study spanned for two years and amalgamated data from researcher’s Doctor of Education (EdD) coursework; an EdD Consultancy Project; teacher interviews; and sixteen years of evolving administrative experiences. The study described the principal’s journey toward becoming a research practitioner by employing an Appreciative Inquiry framework that engaged in evaluation from a positive and hopeful place (Patton, 2011). Throughout the research, Michael Quinn Patton’s concept of developmental evaluation was incorporated to frame the research methods that made sense of the social dynamics that fostered innovations. The researcher also tracked his pending progress by maintaining a daily journal that described his learning of developmental evaluation practices At the conclusion of the study, the principal shared the impact of his research journal by highlighting potential improvements for teacher evaluation, and corroborating his evolution from a developing principal, to a research practitioner, and then a resolute school leader founded on local knowledge.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Proud Principal of Mililani ‘Ike Elementary

I was fortunately appointed to a principalship early in my career. After seven years as a classroom teacher, I completed the Hawai‘i Department of Education, (HIDOE) training program for school administrators. Following a few short vice-principal assignments, I was appointed, to be the principal of Major Sheldon Wheeler Elementary. I still remember feeling both overwhelmed and honored that I was entrusted to lead a school with over one thousand students. Although I worked at Wheeler Elementary for only three years, my experiences were invaluable in supporting the development of my foundational understandings of school leadership. I began as a principal with a naive philosophy that emerged from the traditional clichés of education such as “developing lifelong learners” and “achieving one’s fullest potential”, but by the time I left Wheeler, I had adopted a more realistic set of core beliefs that were based on an uncompromising commitment to instituting school teams. I learned about the importance of founding school teams by meeting with grade levels over many afternoons to talk about instructional practices and building trust among all teachers. During my second principal placement at Mililani Waena Elementary, I continued to reflect and learn about effective and ineffective leadership practices by focusing on developing teacher leaders. At Mililani Waena, I also learned about the significance of connecting custodial, cafeteria, and office teams.

After two principal assignments, I pursued a new challenge by applying to be the first principal of the Department of Education’s newest school, Mililani ‘Ike Elementary. Upon my selection, I introduced myself to the community as the Proud Principal of Mililani ‘Ike. Even though I had also dubbed myself the proud principal of both Wheeler and
Mililani Waena, I realized being chosen as this school’s very first principal was the ultimate professional privilege. Prior to opening, I had one semester to complete many responsibilities:

- Facilitating a vision team of teachers to craft a school vision, mission and core beliefs.
- Consulting with architects and engineers about numerous construction changes and deadlines.
- Addressing community concerns ranging from choosing the “right curriculum” to school boundaries.
- Building a sense of community by involving parents in selecting a school name and even meeting with students to choose a mascot.
- Inviting parents to many information meetings, and arranging initial parent and school-based organizations.
- Preparing bell schedules, operational procedures and handbooks.
- Interviewing and hiring thirty-five teachers, fourteen classified staff and many casual employees.
- Scheduling and facilitating professional development to create curriculum and enforcing instructional and assessment practices.
- Most importantly, unceasingly promoting the school’s vision of developing a “standards-based positive learning environment”.

I was allocated two million dollars beyond construction costs to purchase everything that was needed to open the school, from toilet paper to textbooks. A major challenge for me was that construction of the school was continuously behind schedule and
I had to work many long hours to meet the opening deadline. But despite the many
challenges, Mililani 'Ike opened to six-hundred and fifty students in temporary quarters
during the Fall of the 2003-2004 school year.

During the ten years that I lead Mililani 'Ike, I continued to develop my leadership
philosophy and practices by maintaining a focus on the school's vision, and continuously
working toward improving teaching efforts by instituting school-wide instructional
practices: The school-wide initiatives that I implemented included:

- Standards Based Reporting
- Response to Intervention (RtI). processes
- Inclusion and Co-teaching practices
- Data Teams and Formative Instruction
- Teacher Leadership development
- Character Education
- Accreditation Self-Study

In addition to the many initiatives that were established at Mililani 'Ike, I believed
my most important leadership impact throughout my principal career was establishing
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). During my principal tenure from 2003 to 2014,
I was deeply involved in the school's weekly PLCs’ meetings. Over the years, the school has
employed the PLC process to address the most complex challenges that teachers faced
while improving their instructional and assessment practices. (See Appendix A:
Professional Learning Team Cycle).

Although the PLCs have evolved over the years, they are generally scheduled weekly
for at least one-hour after school. Groups are guided by a clear agenda, agreed-upon
ground rules, and attended by an administrator or counselor. Grade level teachers are assigned to facilitate meetings and maintain records. Since 2010, the school has also included data teams as part of the PLC process.

Through the years that we worked on the PLC process at Mililani ‘Ike our efforts have been cyclical and ongoing. I think that one of the most important lessons that the teachers learned was that through the empowerment of school teams, every educator had a voice in creating the responsibilities, identifying resources, and determining how they would improve curricular, instructional, and assessment practices (Peery, 2011). The teachers at Mililani ‘Ike have learned that by working together on common assessments and using the assessments to adapt their instruction, they can have a much bigger impact on improving student learning. There is no question that the Mililani ‘Ike teachers were committed to their “collective responsibility for the learning of a group of students who are expected to acquire the same knowledge and skills” (DuFour & DuFour, 2010, p. 2).

**A Principal’s Perspective**

From my first principal appointment to the time that I became the *Proud Principal of Mililani ‘Ike*, responding to the vast day-to-day responsibilities has been almost an impossibly challenging task. Even though I was determined to manage the principal’s tasks by developing collaborative teams and instituting systems, I recognized that the bewildering complexities that schools and their staff encounter couldn’t be easily domesticated by me alone, but only by teams of committed educators who share a common vision of improving instructional and assessment practices. As a result, my principal’s perspective was very resolute. I was not fixated simply on raising standardized test scores. I was unflinchingly focused on improving teachers’ instructional and assessment practices.
I did not subscribe to the view that test scores are the proper measure of teaching practices.

For every year of my career, I had supported HIDOE superintendents from Dr. Herman Aizawa’s “Success Compact”; to Dr. Paul LeMahieu’s “Standards-Based Reform Strategic Plan”; to Patricia Hamamoto’s “Rigor, Relevance, Relationships”; and to Kathryn Matayoshi’s “Race To The Top Strive HI”. Each of the superintendent’s initiatives meant that tremendous amounts of HIDOE resources had been rededicated to implement the new educational direction. Among the huge system-wide efforts, I felt that there were many department successes; however, teachers’ practices did not greatly improve because the evaluation systems were based on summative scores that were not congruent with the dynamics and complexities of teaching and learning. Despite my feelings, I was not critical of HIDOE’s efforts to improve teaching. What perplexed me was that even after sixteen years as a principal, none of the evaluation system that I implement bolstered teaching and learning as effectively as the PLCs. Even though HIDOE has implemented many mandates and strategic plans based on decades of progressive ideas, there was minimal evidence that indicated that teaching practices improved. Thus, I had came to the conclusion that teaching practices could not be fit to summative test scores or teacher evaluation ratings.

My most pressing concern about these evaluation systems was centered on my numerous conversations with teachers about limitations of the classroom observations protocols. During each session, my faculty and I concurred that documenting classroom observations 1) could not account for the multitude of intermingling contexts, and 2) one or even two observations per year could not accurately reflect the achievements of teachers. At the end of most talks, we theorized that documenting observations was
unproductive and unfortunately reinforced compliancy versus learning and improving. In the book *900 Shows A Year*, the author described the observation practices at his school: “The daily patterns of my work were not seen or evaluated, and little was done to improve my skills or morale. Although parents, administrators, supervisors, board members, and colleagues could come into my class, few ever did. Of the nine hundred classes I taught, eight were observed.” (Palonsky 1986 p. 139).

Most teacher evaluations are conducted as a pre-observation followed by a post-observation. Although it seems apparent that increasing a post-observation score should reflect a teacher’s instructional improvements, I learned that a bigger evaluation number did not verify that the teacher was able to improve his or her skills. As a result of my professional evaluation experiences, I recognized that observation practices were often flawed due to the incorrect assumptions related to three factors: the complexity of the social and cultural contexts; formative assessments; and learning and knowledge.

Firstly, the social and cultural contexts cannot be measured by common evaluation tool because important social and cultural factors are different in every situation. To believe that multiple observations from different teachers will calculate a reliable and valid summative score is an incorrect assumption.

Secondly, formative assessments only gauged progress toward predetermined summative expectations. They do not reinforce self-assessment, innovation, or learning. To assume that implementing formative assessments is the best strategy to improve student learning is an incorrect assumption.

Thirdly, appraising student learning is not the same as measuring student knowledge. Numbers and scores on a test cannot be equated to learning because learning is
continuous, often incidental, and never predetermined. Therefore, to believe that evaluation can measure learning is an incorrect assumption.

My project, *Conducting a Developmental Evaluation among HIDOE Data Coaches*, gradually emerged from my experiences and observations gained over the past thirty years. Like superior Scotch whisky malt, my thoughts have been steadily refined. Reflecting on my many years as an administrator has made me realize that my professional knowledge has exponentially increased when I have been able to focus on evaluation as a continuous process rather than summative. As a outcome, I am have proposed to study teacher evaluation by “making sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold.” (Patton, 2011)

As a result of distilling ideas for thirty years, I planned a project that would help me to build and approach to evaluation that would truly improve teaching practices. I opposed evaluation systems that generated summative ratings because they did not drive continuous improvement, and they undervalued the complexity of teaching. In my professional judgment, evaluation systems have to extend beyond speculative pre-test and post-test designs that incorrectly rely on quantitative measures. I acknowledged that quantitative scores do provide interesting central tendency data, but much of this is of little help to principals and teachers working to improve instructional and assessment practices within complex settings.

**Legacy Lessons**

Throughout my career as an educator, I have studied and researched state and school level systems that were designed to improve teaching practices. After teaching for
four years, I wrote a meta-analysis of countering reading approaches (whole language versus phonics) in my 1988 elementary curriculum master’s paper. A year after earning my school administrator certification, I surveyed principals to exam transformational leadership for my 1992 school administration masters paper. In spite of a lot of my extensive reflections, I have come to realize that my main purpose in my thirty-years as an educator has been directed to improving teaching practices. Throughout my career, I have marveled at the abilities of teachers who are renowned as exceptional educators, and I have asked myself: How did they become extraordinary?

Even after three decades, I sometimes feel that I am as far from my quest in finding answers as I was during my probationary years as a 6th grade teacher at Leihoku Elementary. I was very serious about my desire to become a better teacher, and I spent many hours working beyond a forty-hour week to plan, prepare, and revise each of my lessons. Like many teachers, even though I enjoyed some social life, I made it a point to skip Sunday night gatherings with friends because I chose to prepare my lesson plans for the upcoming week.

Even after so many years, I can still remember my talks with students like Renee, Colleen, Natalie, Jacob and Joseph, and I can still picture the twelve-year-old faces of the children who have since aged into mature adults. When I reflected about my early years of teaching, I realize how much I enjoyed talking with my students every single day. Although I cannot recall particular lessons, I certainly remember the details of the conversations I held with my kids.

Because of these remembrances, I recognize the importance of telling stories. Although not tangible, stories are enduring, and they possess the ability to coil together like
strands in a tightly woven rope. In this dissertation, I aimed to weave my experiences together by “telling stories” about the most important legacy lessons that have grown from modest conversations with children and have continued throughout my career in my work with teachers and school leaders (see Appendix B: Context for “Telling Stories”). I initially presumed that a career of hard work would produce dazzling insights into the complex issues of education, but I have been humbled by the reality that my legacy lessons are more modest— reflections that have become the foundations of my qualitative action research project. As Patton wrote, “Qualitative methods are often used in evaluations because they tell the program’s story by capturing and communicating the participants’ stories. Evaluation case studies have all the elements of a good story.” (2002, p. 10)

In reflecting on my experience as a school principal, I have derived three legacy lessons.

**Legacy Lesson 1: Solutions have to match their problems.** Simple solutions are for simple problems and complex solution are for complex problems, but simple solutions cannot resolve complex problems. In 1995, as the newly appointed principal of Wheeler Elementary, I spent my first six months meeting with angry parents almost every day because they were distressed about a multitude of complaints that ranged from student discipline to the dilapidated campus conditions. For six months, I took detailed notes and carefully instituted, after every parent meeting, what I felt was appropriate action. However I was soon overwhelmed and could not cope with the tsunami of persistent complaints. For example, appeasing a parent’s demand by adding more playground balls during recess did not reduce fights. Sending more flyers home did not bridge the communication gap between the school and families. Observing classrooms did not
improve instructional practices. From this I learned the important lesson that complex problems cannot be addressed by simple solutions. I needed to utilize more time, more resources, and more teacher leaders to tackle the plethora of complaints and find ways to collaborate to seek thoughtful solutions. Patton makes a distinction between simple, complicated, and complex situations. He states, “I begin with distinctions between simple, complicated, and complex. I begin by honoring where people are and build on what they know. They know that some things are pretty simple and some things are complicated. And after we talk some, they get it that the complex is different from the complicated. I try to make it a challenge of matching: what works for what situation?” (Patton, 2011, p.84)

“Different approaches are needed for different situations. So I begin by helping people differentiate situations. The rest flows from that.” (Patton, 2011)

Legacy Lesson 2: Teaching cannot be measured by test scores alone. Good teaching involves a commitment to continuously improving one’s skills. In 2001, I still remember meeting with a parent who had attended Mililani Waena when she was a student. I thought that the mother was going to share that she was happy to be a product of the school, but instead she was very upset because her child’s teacher assigned the same reading worksheet to both child and parent (over twenty years apart.) After meeting with the parent, I had to help the teacher accept that circulating the same worksheet for two decades was not acceptable. Although the teacher cited exceptional test scores and references, I held the teacher accountable for updating her teaching practices by scheduling bi-weekly meetings with a grade level colleague to plan instruction. From this I learned the important lesson that test scores are not true measurements of effective teaching, and therefore valid evaluations must include a context rich collection of formative and
summative evidence pieces. Patton refers to learning beyond formative practices that “focus on making an intervention or model better.” Instead he talks about congruency with “developmental, emergent, innovative, and transformational processes.” (2012, p. 127)

Thus, my second legacy lesson involves a commitment to viewing teacher evaluation as developmental, emergent, innovative, and transformational.

**Legacy Lesson 3: Leadership is not rocket-science.** It’s about the leader’s steadfast effort to set a direction, and elicit the support of others to agree and move in those directions. In 2003, prior to opening Mililani ‘Ike, I scheduled a training session for the inaugural team of teachers to learn about standards-based reporting. The training session was very important because Mililani ‘Ike was selected to be a pilot for the HIDOE statewide implementation of the standards-based report card. The original team of teachers was hired from twelve different schools and came with a wide range of backgrounds and experiences. Even though the teachers were very committed to supporting standards-based reporting, their teaching procedures were vastly different. In spite of these differences, I was expected to introduce a new vision consistent with a common set of core beliefs—one that still guides the school today. From this I learned the important lesson that the principal had to be absolutely clear about the school’s direction. And as a result, my unrelenting focus over the years has been to advance instruction at Mililani ‘Ike by helping teachers to improve their collective instructional and assessment practices through professional learning teams. Patton described leadership as committing to actions (2012, p. 104).

He identifies four requirements of effective leadership

1. Create and nurture a results-oriented, reality-testing, learning-focused culture.
2. Lead in deciding what outcomes to commit to and hold yourself accountable for.

3. Make measurement of outcomes thoughtful, meaningful, and credible.

4. Use the results---and model for others’ serious use of results.

Therefore as I transition to Chapter II, I wish to conclude this chapter by stating that it has been critical for me to embrace and even espouse complexity as a way to extend my learning about continuously improving instruction and assessment practices that cannot be resolved by summative measurements. Most importantly, I wish to underscore the significance of researching effective teacher evaluation practices beyond quantifiable scores, through narrative methods that relate authentic life experiences.
CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH PROBLEM

Research Purpose

My doctoral project is aimed at improving my understanding of teacher evaluation based on my years of being a principal. I emphasize, “based on my years of being a principal” because I feel that my professional experiences are fundamental to my research. Building on this experience I wish to gain a deeper understanding of evaluation processes by interviewing state resource teachers using a conceptual framework called Developmental Evaluation originated by Michael Quinn Patton. I define developmental evaluation as my efforts to track and attempt to make sense of the teachers’ thinking that emerged under conditions of complexity, while documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occurred as innovations unfolded. (Patton, 2011, p.7)

As a principal with sixteen years of experience, I have conducted approximately one hundred and sixty (160) evaluation conferences, or about ten evaluations each year. After many hours of observations and conferences, I have been dismayed that my evaluation efforts have only minimally affected the instructional and assessment practices of teachers. Only one teacher among the 160 that I observed has told me that she was thoroughly motivated to change her teaching practices as the result of our evaluation meeting. I find it interesting that while teachers were ostensibly willing to modify their classroom management techniques after our conferences, they were not willing or able to change their instructional practices.

Despite the many lessons that I have learned about education throughout my career, I feel that the most pressing and daunting challenge has been my struggle with valuing
teacher evaluations. Even though there have been many other professional challenges that I did not resolve, teacher evaluation was the most frustrating because I knew that the methods of teacher evaluation that I was tasked with employing were never effective.

My personal goals for researching evaluation are based on a desire to extend the knowledge that I accrued over a long career as a principal. I want to conduct research that is directly connected to my work, and that is practical and useful—research that can help teachers improve their teaching. My three personal goals are:

1. Become smarter about dealing with complexity.
2. Explore the significance of story telling and how it reinforces knowledge.
3. Be able to justify to colleagues and faculty that learning is a continuous process that is inadequately measured by static and/or summative scores.

My professional goal for conducting research pertains to my earlier work connected with the Educational Doctorate (EdD) Consultancy Project. I felt that the practitioner researcher approach was a useful one for me because my professional experiences indicated that training teachers to document their efforts to become practitioner researchers within the contexts and complexities of their classrooms would improve evaluations. Jarvis quotes Giddens (1990) to the effect that we need to rethink the idea of research and its place in society:

Everything is changing all the time, partly driven by the state of knowledge at the time, and as more information is discovered the practice changes in response to it, in an ongoing cycle. The more we know, the more we introduce change, and the more we need to reflect on it. We need to discover if we have a the best solution, since we have found out that the knowledge we
have about the practices we undertake is not necessarily to be equated with
the certainty that we have the best solution–so the more we need to
research. Research, then is built into the very nature of the type of society in
which we live, and all aspiring experts must have researched and discovered
the most recent knowledge about their practices in order to be experts.
(Jarvis, 1999, p.26)

Thus, my personal and professional goals are connected to improving the ways we
think about and conduct teacher evaluations and have provided a vision for my doctoral
journey. These collective goals have provided a map for my journey by marking my starting
and ending points and plotting landmarks along the way. As noted in this chapter, my
commitment to improve my professional practices has been to understand that complex
problems cannot be solved with simple solutions.

**Literature Review**

To address my research purpose and goals, my most important or seminal research
has been directly focused on teacher evaluation. I define evaluation as “the systematic
collection and analysis of evidence on the outcomes of programs to make judgments about
their relevance, performance and alternative ways to deliver them or to achieve the same
results.” (Sridharan, 2012) The central themes of my literature review are:

- Research Practitioner
- Social and Cultural Contexts
- Inductive Analysis
- Developmental Evaluation
- Learning and Pragmatics
**Research Practitioner:** Throughout my educational career, I had to continuously update my professional knowledge. Every year was a new learning opportunity where I had to rely on reading research, talking to colleagues, and practicing my understandings in real classrooms of students. And as a result, my knowledge has never been static, but always changing. I am comfortable with the realization that my teaching practices had to continue to develop based on the new knowledge that I attained in what Schön calls the “unprecedented requirement of adaptability” (2009, p. 15). In addition, I concur with Schön that “If it is true that professional practice has at least as much to do with finding the problem as with solving the problem found, it is also true that problem setting is a recognized professional activity.” (2009 p.18)

Through my research study, I have come to realize that my role as a practitioner researcher is to apply my knowledge to improve my professional practice, while encouraging a positive impact on effective teaching and learning. As Jarvis states:

*As things change, society is forced to confront the outcomes of these changes; in a sense, society itself is becoming reflexive. It is a learning society. It is a society that demands constant reexamination: the risk society demands more than reflectivity; it calls for constant research. The practitioner-researcher is a natural outcome of the risk society.* (1999, p. 61)

John Dewey was clear about the challenges of the practitioner researcher to purposely and continuously improving his/her professional practices by seeking new solutions and not subscribing to predetermined pathways. Dewey states:

*There is no discipline in the world so severe as the discipline of experience subjected to the tests of intelligent development and direction.* Hence the
only ground I can see for even a temporary reaction against the standards, aims, and methods of the newer education is the failure of educators who professedly adopt them to be faithful to them in practice. As I have emphasized more than once, the road of the new education is not an easier one to follow than the old road but a more strenuous and difficult one. (1938 p. 90)

Social and Cultural Contexts: As a result of addressing changing work conditions and outcomes, I have come to appreciate the importance of researching from the stance of a practitioner. I know that this approach is distinct from experimental and theory drive research, but one that seeks pragmatic solutions that can have a direct application to practice. What makes the practitioner valuable is a situational awareness that reflects an understanding of context.

Even after many years as a principal, I failed to appreciate the importance of context; that is, until my EdD coursework, Seminar on the Social and Cultural Contexts of Education. My course journal reflects this developing understanding of contexts:

Indigenous education was difficult for me, but experiencing learning opportunities such as our class articles and visiting the charter school, Halua Ku Mana helped to sensitize me to indigenous issues. My difficult was not generated from stigmatized values, but having unsubscribed values. I was not comfortable about taking a position on Hawaiian indigenous concerns because I did not want to offend others, and more significantly expose my lack of identity and ignorance. As the result of this class, I learned that
indigenous education was not about advocacy and activism, but extending knowledge. (Nakasato, 2012)

In addition, I saw the connection between recognizing contexts and the importance of employing leadership to level learning for all students. As Santamaria and Santamaria state: “Applied critical leadership is the emancipatory practice of choosing to address educational issues and challenges using a critical race perspective to enact context-specific change in response to power, domination, access, and achievement imbalance, resulting in improved academic achievement for learners at every academic level of institutional schooling in the US.” (Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012 p.7) Thus I have come to a much better understanding of how context shapes problems and the fact that I should be careful to avoid generalizations whenever I confronted complex problems.

**Inductive Analysis:** It is important to discern that while researching, I am not trying to deductively generalize outcomes.

We have already noted, however, that the research conducted by practitioner-researchers is about unique and unrepeatable events—that their reports record historical happenings, past events. Because the events are unique, they cannot be replicated in precisely the same way, so the emphasis on laws having predictive value no longer rings true. Indeed, we might go so far as to claim that laws might inhibit the art of practice, so we reject the idea of theory being about laws that have predictive value.

(Jarvis1999, p.141)

Instead, I focus on inductive methods distinguishing new understandings from the perspective of the research practitioner. “This can only augur well for our understanding,
provided that no attempts are made to prescribe practice by reports of past practice rather than recognize the uniqueness of the present and encourage innovative practice based on inductive reasoning and the expertise of the practitioner.” (Jarvis 1999, p.137)

As a result, my approach utilizes an inductive analysis of “discovering patterns, themes, and categories in one’s data. Findings emerge out of the data, through the analyst’s interactions with the data, in contrast to deductive analysis where the data are analyzed according to an existing framework.” (Patton 2002, p.453) It is also important to note that my new understandings are based on a specific notion of thinking as purposeful and directed to problem forming as well as problem solving (Schön, 2009). In addition, I have come to adopt a more open approach that accommodates complexity, new ideas, and innovations—one that Patton described in his research on developmental evaluation.

Developmental Evaluation: We might imagine that the more complex the research, the more complex the evaluation, however that is not necessarily correct. Too often, simple methods are used to address complex problems. However, as Patton points out: “The basic premise here is that evaluation in complex adaption systems is more likely to be useful if the evaluation is informed by complex concepts and understandings. This is a pretty straightforward premise—derived from the importance of matching the evaluation to the nature of the situation.” (2011, p.122)

As a result, researchers need to know when to employ developmental evaluation practices because different kinds of research require different methods of evaluation. “Developmental evaluation is particularly appropriate for a specific kind of situation: complexity. Understanding complexity and its implication for evaluation is critical to recognizing those situations for which developmental evaluation is well suited (Patton,
2011, p.84). Therefore, the definition of developmental evaluation that I have relied upon throughout my research has been, “Developmental evaluation tracks and attempts to make sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold.” (2011, p.7) Developmental evaluation is different because it represents “a relationship between innovators and evaluators, a co-created, dynamic, and ever-emergent relationship. And this developmental evaluation relationship, like sharks, has to keep moving forward or it dies.” (2011, p.339)

Patton invites us to reimagine evaluation: “Another way to ground evaluation in people’s own experiences is to have them generalize and share evaluation and metaphors. Metaphors and analogies help us to make connections between seemingly unconnected things and deepen our understanding of parallel issues.” (2012, p. 30). I compare developmental evaluation with documenting the continuous trials of baking a fancy dessert from a picture in a magazine, while adhering to the dietary aversions of every person, and accepting there is a decision point in the course where the process of improving stops, and the recipe is hard copied. (Presentation during EdD Seminar, November 23, 2013)

Sridharan, provides another rich metaphor that describes developmental evaluation to the assessments of a food critic.

The following slide describes the three types of evaluations: Formative, Summative, and Developmental (Sridharan presentation on July 3, 2012). Sridharan distinguishes evaluation types based on the purpose of the evaluation. He pairs formative and summative evaluations as efforts to provide a comparable score between different meals. Sridharan
shows how developmental evaluation has a different purpose in documenting the process of improving the entrée while recording the new learning that resulted from the process.

**Visual 1 Summative, Formative and Developmental Evaluation**

Learning and Pragmatics: My dissertation focused on a perennial problem arising from my years of being a principal. Throughout the years, I did not use scientific research to resolve problems, but real work experiences and resolute thinking. My solutions were a composite of reactions to the results of preceding interventions. I accepted that “fixing” school problems were an unending struggle. Although my thinking seemed random, I believe it was applied purposefully and with reflection on specific details of each case. Dewey (1910) describes reflection as purposeful. It arises when we come to a forked-road situation.

We may recapitulate by saying that the origin of thinking is some perplexity, confusion, or doubt. Thinking is not a case of spontaneous combustion; it
does not occur just on “general principles.” There is something specific which occasions and evokes it. (p.12)

Jarvis makes the case that practical knowledge is qualitatively different from theoretical knowledge.

We have to highlight the fact that practical knowledge is integrated knowledge driven by the demands of practice, whereas information about practice is often a single academic discipline and driven by the demands of that discipline. These two forms of knowledge are fundamentally different, therefore, and have to be treated differently in discussion about theory. The theory taught in professional schools and universities is information for the learners; until they have tested it out, it does not become practical knowledge. (1999, p.147)

Because practical educational knowledge is built from the exercise of working to resolve school problems, then learning can be viewed as an ongoing self-improvement process. Thus, the most important factor for developing practical knowledge is constant and reflective professional practice. "Practice is always changing. Individual practitioners are learning and researching how to respond in their changing situations.

- Practice is dynamic rather than unchanging.
- Knowledge about practice cannot be measured.
- Practice is personal and subjective phenomenon to the practitioner.
- Precise events can never be repeated, so each practice situation is unique.
- To understand practice fully, it is necessary to undertake qualitative research.
Any published data from research must be treated from a historical perspective, as something relevant to the time when the research was undertaken.” (Jarvis, 1999, p.30)

As a result, researching learning was much more complex than comparing pre and post experimental designs. Instead, learning became much more developmental because it was the result of many interacting pieces that have different weights and bearings on the final behavior outcomes. Patton (2011) shares “we look at complex systems and their relationships we must keep in mind the interconnections between individual actions, organizational dynamics, and interactions of the cultural and social context” (p. 115).

**Research Problem**

After conducting teacher evaluation for sixteen years, about ten evaluations per year or approximately a total of 160 teacher evaluations, I concluded confidently that teacher evaluation practices did not improve professional practice nor create a sense of efficacy among teachers.

As a school principal evaluator, I had employed a range of evaluation tools that all were based on teacher observations. The number of yearly observations ranged from as few as the three required by the Pathwise Classroom Observations to as many as sixty using the Charlotte Danielson's Framework. Each observation followed common steps such as scheduling a prearranged observation period, and documenting evidence during the observation. Each evaluation also ended with post-observation conferences and summative measurements that indicated if teachers demonstrated proficiency.

I learned to administer the Instrument for the Observation of Teaching Activities (IOTA) early in my career. Although I do not recall much about the details of this particular
assessment, I do remember painstakingly marking a three-page foldout of observation charts and struggling to check-off as many IOTA indicators within a teaching lesson. IOTA taught me that documenting the complexities of teaching was overwhelming, and exhausting, and not very helpful in providing useful information to help teachers improve their teaching.

Pathwise is the evaluation tool that I implemented for most of my administrative career. Pathwise is a simple tool to manage because the requirement to document evidence is minimal, and the ratings (Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory) are almost meaningless because administrators are not able to justify an unsatisfactory rating. Pathwise taught me that it was an anemic evaluation tool that was easier to administer than a convoluted three-page foldout.

The Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluation System has offered the most potential because of the strong link between multiple observations and criterion-based improving teaching practices. The primary challenge of the framework lies in documenting teaching evidence in short observation periods. The Danielson Framework, however, has taught me that evaluation tools must incorporate a reflective process that invites professional conversations that extend beyond compliance.

Year after year, in spite of my efforts, the evaluation meetings with teachers have been very stressful to them. The teachers’ anxieties were not due to negative relationships with me, but rather arose from their concerns about an evaluation instrument that did not accurately measure the scope of their teaching. As the evaluator, I was also uncomfortable because I struggled to measure the highest and the lowest performing teachers. I felt that the evaluations were not mindful of the middle group of teachers because the evaluation
tools were limited by mediocre criteria. Nevertheless, I was very concerned that the
teacher evaluations actually encouraged teachers to focus on complying with average
performance, rather than striving to achieve improvement and innovation.

In conclusion, I feel that the evaluation systems that have been implemented by the
Hawai‘i Department of Education have not sufficiently taken account of the different
contexts of teaching, nor the manner or means by which teachers can be encouraged to
improve their practice. I believe strongly that current evaluation systems fail to focus on
the complexities of teaching and on how teachers can improve their practices throughout
their daily work with students.

The following Multi-Flow Thinking Map ® lists ineffective evaluation practices (to
the left) that have led to my research (in the middle). And as a result I identified
constructive practices for evaluating teachers (to the right).

**Visual 2  What is my Research Problem?**
As I transition to the next chapter, I will address the steps that I incorporated to conduct my Action Plan. As noted earlier, my research spanned for two years and included multiple experiences from EdD coursework, UH Consultancy Project, teacher interviews, personal journals, and sixteen years of administrative experiences.
CHAPTER 3: ACTION PLAN

Consultancy Project

While I served as the Proud Principal of Mililani ‘Ike, I had fortunately been accepted to the University of Hawai‘i Educational Doctorate, EdD program. Although I knew that my workload would be enormous, I could not turn away from a learning opportunity that I visualized for years. I enjoyed the EdD class content and the collegial conversations. Besides attending to prescribed coursework, I was assigned to a consultancy project that consisted of doctoral students who agreed to research the implementation practices of the HIDOE data coaches. In total, there was one project manager and sixteen data coaches who were responsible for the statewide implementation of formative instruction and data teams at every school.

The HIDOE Data Coaches were assigned to each DOE complex and held accountable to support school’s formative instruction and data team efforts. As a result, the data coaches helped to facilitate school agreements about proficiency ratings and generating pre-assessments for the data team process. After administering the pre-assessments, grade levels reconvened to implement a five-step data team process. (Cravalho, Kaneshiro, & Nakasato, 2012). The school data teams:

1. Collected and charted the data.
2. Analyzed the data and priority needs.
3. Established SMART goal(s).
4. Determined instructional strategies they will implement in to raise student proficiency.
5. Evaluated data team results. (Peery, 2011, p.3).
During the initial semester, the Consultancy team evaluated the work of the data coaches. The Consultancy attended data coach meetings to administer whole group surveys that were followed up with focus group meetings. (See Attachment D: Consultancy Project Interview Questions) The goal of the consultancy project was to evaluate the project by highlighting the efforts of the data coaches based upon the agreed upon objectives:

- Clarify the role of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support (OCISS) data coaches in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process as a Race-to-the-Top (RTTT) deliverable.
- Define a common understanding of the components of data teams and formative assessment and instruction for all stakeholders.
- Identify the deliverables of data coaches in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process.
- Identify strengths and develop a plan for internal capacity building within the OCISS data coach team.
- Identify evidence of impact in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process via data coaches.

A year later at the end of the EdD Consultancy Project, the team arrived at three recommendations based upon an analysis of data. After supporting the HIDOE data coaches by participating in statewide data coaches meetings, the EdD Consultancy presented their conclusions and identified three recommendations:

1. Improve system-wide communication: The EdD Consultancy recommended communicating a clear message about the RTTT project via keeping the message simple and consistent; demonstrating congruency between the actions of district
level leadership and professed priorities; ensuring the Board of Education (BOE) is aligned and supportive of the district goals and priorities; and, all tri-level leadership speak with one voice and direction.

2. Develop instructional leadership at the school level: The UH Consultancy identified the importance of the school leader and recommended rigorous efforts to develop complex and school leadership through systems such as Professional Learning Communities, (PLCs).

3. Transfer formative instruction and data team process knowledge to the complex and school level from the data coach: The UH Consultancy recommended that the formative instruction and data team knowledge must be transferred to the complex and school level more fluidly and frequently.

The second recommendation highlighted that schools could only be as good as the people within. I have presented my ideas about leadership at training venues because there has not been enough professional development for principals. (See Attachment C: Professional Development for Principals). The research was clear that best strategy for improving schools and districts was developing the collective capacity of educators to function as members of a professional learning community. (Dufour 2011, p.21)

Besides providing important research for HIDOE, the UH Consultancy provided connections to my preliminary dissertation thoughts. By working with the project participants, the consultancy group found great value in the HIDOE's focus on the data team process through formative instruction and assessment practices. This commitment was supported through research regarding formative assessment as an essential component of classroom work, which could raise student achievement and learning (Black
& Williams, 1998). As Ainsworth and Veigut note, "Assessment must be seen as an instructional tool for use while learning is occurring and as an accountability tool to determine if learning has occurred" (2006, p. 27).

During my work on the UH consultancy project, I had come to realize that understanding the complexity of the project during the implementation process involved my active participation. I learned that when facing complexity the leader must probe first, then sense, and then respond. Probing concerns the action directed to questioning assumptions and identifying problems; sensing involves observing; and responding is the adaptation of the process that the leader imposes (Patton, 2011).

In addition, the consultancy project validated my belief that as instructional leaders, principals must accept that leadership is more than taking charge and making decisions. Skillful instructional leaders have the ability to inspire both colleagues and staff to strive beyond compliance, and to make self-determined improvements to teaching and learning. (Pellicer, 1999, p.13) Condensing practices that protect teachers by resolving their conflicts for them caused co-dependency and did not foster professional reflection and self-worth (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p.12). My consultancy project lessons were not new to me, but I began to understand them more deeply because of the authentic opportunities that the project provided to learn from experience. As a result, I made a concerted effort to avoid simply disseminating information, and began to promote reflection on actions that aided the coaches in learning from their experiences.

As I began to learn more about the nature of complex situations and the role of the leader, I continued to extend what I had learned from the EdD Consultancy Project and apply this knowledge to my dissertation. I began by scheduling additional meetings with
the data coaches during the following semester. After securing approval from the data coach project administrator, I scheduled multiple meetings on their future agendas to begin talking more about teacher evaluation and developmental evaluation. (See Attachment E: Consultancy Project Executive Summary)

**HIDOE Data Coaches**

I continued my dissertation work during the Spring Semester of 2013 during which time I arranged three HIDOE data coaches meetings. We met in January (See Appendix K), March (See Appendix L), and April (See Appendix M). The purposes of the meetings were to share ideas about developmental evaluation with the data coaches so that they could infuse the concepts within their work responsibilities. For example, I felt that it was important for data coaches to talk about a broader scope of evaluation that included multiple contexts versus simple summative scores. At the same time, I used developmental evaluation in my work with the teachers to promote their reflections, and to utilize the new ideas to inform their practices.

**The January Data Coaches meeting:** The initial meeting was pre-scheduled to talk about developmental evaluation, and share what my research would look like in the following months. The following visual was the PowerPoint agenda that I facilitated during my initial data coaches meeting. The purpose of my presentation was to open a discussion about avoiding simple solutions for complicated problems.

However my January meeting objectives became unexpectedly derailed because the data coaches had been told without forewarning that they had lost their positions for the following school year. Not surprisingly, many of the data coaches were devastated because they were initially assured that they had been hired for a three-year project. As I learned
through our interviews and meetings, many of the data coaches were especially distraught because they had sacrificed new job opportunities, delayed family plans, and committed to additional financial obligations as the result of being hired in their data team positions.

Visual 3 Presentation: Simple Solutions for Complex Problems

During my first meeting with the data coaches, I took the opportunity to learn more about the concepts of the developmental evaluator and how to communicate these ideas. I initially learned about developmental evaluation from the summer 2012 EdD class, Program Evaluation for Education Leadership taught by Sanjeev Sridharan, and I reread Michael Quinn Patton’s Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use. After struggling for months to effectively define developmental evaluation, I followed Michael Quinn Patton’s advice:

I begin with distinctions between simple, complicated, and complex. I begin by honoring where people are and build upon what they know. They know that some things are pretty simple and some things are complicated. And after we talk some, they get it that the complex is different from the
complicated. I try to make it a challenge of matching: what works for what situations? That’s the starting point. (2011, p. 84)

As a result, I took time to talk about the differences between simple, complicated, and complex problems by using the following presentation slide.

**Visual 4  Simple, Complicated, Complex**

- **Simple**: Knowledge and experience tell you what to do...like baking a cake or “best practices”
- **Complicated**: Situations are less predictable and producing desired outcomes become less certain:
  - Technical Complicated: coordinating 1000s of elements...like sending a rocket to the moon
  - Socially Complicated: different stakeholders with different perspectives...like gun laws
- **Complex**: High uncertainty and high social conflict “high uncertainty about how to produce a desired result fuels disagreement, and disagreement intensify and expand the parameters of uncertainty...like being a good parent. DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATION HANDLES COMPLEXITY

In addition, I saved time for the data coaches to talk about different purposes for evaluation because I wanted them to articulate that developmental evaluation was not for all situations. By the end of our first discussion, the data coaches were able to confirm that developmental evaluation was not for simple problems, but a particularly pertinent tool to address issues of complexity.

**The March Data Coaches meeting**: I scheduled the next meeting with the data coaches a couple of months later because I wanted to give them time to deal with their lost teaching assignments. While preparing for the meeting, I set the following objectives: continue talking about developmental evaluation; begin talking about the project’s research question; and, initiate data collection. I remember feeling very prepared for our March meeting, however the night before the presentation, I was informed that the data coaches were still very upset about the decision to eliminate their positions. Even though I was not responsible and could not I speak on behalf of the decision, I stayed up all night to
adjust my presentation. I wanted to push my research agenda, but I knew that I had to base my meeting on an explanation of why their positions were cut. I didn’t ditch my intention to discuss developmental evaluation further, but I used it constructively to address the data coaches’ prolonged frustrations.

The following visual is the PowerPoint agenda that I used during my March data coaches meeting. The purpose of the presentation was to open further discussions about how simple solutions do not resolve complicated problems, and the consequences of utilizing ineffective solutions for complex problems.

Visual 5  Presentation: Thinking like a Developmental Evaluator

In addition to repeating my previous meeting’s message that simple solutions couldn’t be used for complex problems, I provided a lot of references to learning as a continuous cycle because I wanted to prepare the data coaches to think about evaluation beyond the usual formative and summative approaches with which they were most
familiar. In addition, I introduced them to developmental evaluation tracking and to making sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity by documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold. (Patton, 2011) As result of our March meeting, I felt that the data coaches had begun to better understand that developmental evaluation is a process designated to address complexity and develop innovations in practice.

The April Data Coaches meeting: When I prepared my final presentation, I wasn’t too surprised that the data coaches were still not satisfied about the decision to eliminate their positions. Learning to take the time to listen to the data coaches from my earlier meetings, I presented the following objectives: responding to the leading question; continuing to talk about developmental evaluation; and, discussing my dissertation research question and methodology.

Most importantly, I supported our working relationship by continuing to take the time to readdress the data coaches’ questions about why their positions were eliminated and who was responsible for the decision. The following visual is a PowerPoint agenda that addressed the data coaches’ leading questions. As I responded to the questions, I purposely stated overt connections between the drawback of implementing simple solutions for complex problems, and the probability of down stream consequences.

During my third and final meeting, I was concerned that I might not have enough time because I needed to schedule a discussion about my research timelines and the need for the data coaches to participate in my upcoming interviews. I had to balance my research requirements while still realizing that a semester of unanswered questions might discourage the data coaches from participating. Fortunately, the April meeting ended well
and the data coaches all agreed to continue as participants in my project. At that point, I was profoundly impacted by the lesson I learned about the importance of managing complexity through the time to talk and learn. Consequently, my new wisdom of being patient with complex situations became a necessary component in revising my thinking about the direction of my research.

Visual 6: Presentation: Answering the Data Coaches’ Questions

What happened to the plan?

- What did you hear?
- What have you heard from your schools?
- Was this preventable?
- Why was it not foreseen?

I committed to a lot more talking and learning among my EdD colleagues and advisors. I was definitely committed to developmental evaluation as a means of addressing complex problems, but I knew that had more to learn if I was to feel more comfortable in using it as a means of navigating and helping others move through complex situations and problems. John Medina shared during the 2012 Summer Brain Symposium at Punahou Schools that it takes years for the brain to navigate complexity. Eventually, I was able to stop stressing about my research outcomes that had been prescribed by a predetermined process, and focus on learning more about the topic. I stopped feeling rushed because I
knew that my project was not prearranged by a linear sequence of tasks, but essentially one that would move in different and unanticipated directions. I did not anticipate that the consultancy project and my EdD colleagues would help me to reconcile my anxiety by pushing me toward researching the development of innovations, and admittedly I did not instantly swing towards development evaluation, but over time it became an indissoluble part of my thinking about problems of practice.

Soon after my third meeting with the data coaches, I was assigned to be a Director for the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support, (OCISS) as a directive from the OCISS Assistant Superintendent.

**Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support**

In my new assignment, I continued to work with the data coaches by talking to them about evaluation and transitioning to their new jobs. It was important for me to listening to them about their concerns and frustrations. In most cases, their questions were simple, but compelling. For example, they wanted to know why their positions had been abolished without data-based decisions?

At the same time, I was overwhelmed as I attempted to learn a very different job than my principalship. I was now responsible for managing OCISS administrators for Special Education, Comprehensive Student Support Services. I was also supervising curriculum, instruction, and assessment projects due to a separate administrative position that was vacant. Despite this vast set of responsibilities, I felt that the workload for the school principal was still more demanding and stressful.

Overall, I was surprised that new OCISS responsibilities didn’t adversely affect my research, and in reality, OCISS may have helped me become a better researcher. I spent
more time thinking about my dissertation versus addressing the ubiquitous flow of problems that principals address everyday. Although my work exhausted me, the motivation to continue researching was centered on the many bothersome questions that seemed to poke at me from the consultancy project. For example, while finalizing the consultancy recommendations for the data coaches, I realized that the more I attempted to provide reasons for recommendations from the perspective of a practicing principal of sixteen years, the more I found that data coaches situations were embedded in highly complex and varying contexts. As a result, my responses to the three recommendations from the consultancy project became the basis for my motivation to learn more about developmental evaluation and how it can be employed in complex situations.

As an experienced principal, I believed that I could “fix” all problems, including the most difficult and challenging. However, in reality, the consultancy project taught me that the tools at my disposal were only sufficient to resolve simple problems. I hadn’t grasped that simple and complex problems were qualitatively different and required very different approaches to working with others and different ways of thinking. In many complex scenarios, I felt that it was impossible for one leader to determine solutions without multiple discussions among varying participants. For example, fixing an actual simple problem was made real when I required a probationary teacher to submit her attendance report on time. The “fix” was easy because I only had to monitor her compliance of the school’s procedures. However, when I tried to employ simple solutions to fix complex problems I would get nowhere. For example, I told a teacher (early in my career) to increase her child’s reading scores by changing the reading basal. I realized later that this was rashly simplistic because my approach failed to take into consideration the specific
reading problems of the child and the complicated dynamics of the classroom and home situation. It took me years to understand that the factors influencing reading ability are enormously complex and too vast for a beginning principal to grasp.

In addition, I understood that the reasons behind typical approaches to evaluation in schools were more about compliance than program improvement. I knew that developing a sense of efficacy was essential in motivating individuals to extend themselves. However I was also aware that most evaluations are not completed equally or fairly.

**EdD Coursework:** The EdD coursework offered an early opportunity that started my journey toward my dissertation. I did not anticipate connections between my coursework and my dissertation, but things fortuitously grew from the combination of my past experiences as a principal, the consultancy project, concurrent EdD classes, OCISS leadership, and an undeterminable number of fruitful conversations among colleagues. This alignment of professional experience and coursework was not preplanned, but I cannot deny their importance in shaping the direction of my doctoral project. Importantly, I found that my intellectual relationships with EdD colleagues were important factors, both academically and in terms of providing motivation. As I reflect on the past three years of EdD coursework, I appreciate that I have not been driven by the desire to simply comply but the desire to extend my learning about teacher evaluation. Throughout the consultancy and coursework, my new understandings of evaluation have been transformed and had really shaped the way I approach problems at work. Prior to my admission into the doctorate program, I thought that I understood all there was to know about evaluation. However the experiences and leanings of the past three years have taught me how little I
actually knew. I have also appreciated that knowing so little about teacher evaluation has actually been motivation to learn more.

**Journal Writing:** When I started meeting with the data coaches, I determined to continue writing my journal as an aid to my reflection, and to keep a record of my progress towards my research. Journal writing activities help to document the thinking and observations of practitioner researchers, and this allowed me to go back and review my thinking, acknowledge my own misconceptions, and adjust my thinking accordingly (Stevens & Cooper 2009, p.29) As I wrote my journals, I unexpectedly gained new ideas. For example during the same month that I met for my final meeting with the data coaches, I disentangled an apparent research flaw. I noted this insight in my journal entry on April 14. I wrote (see Attachment I: Journal Entry, April 14, 2013).

```
OMG… After looking back at the ten utilization-focused developmental evaluation design examples from Michael Patton, I’ve realized that he has been describing systems, NOT PEOPLE… Now, am I going to be innovative by focusing my DE on people (because I’m too panicked to think about adjusting my research,) or am I really opening myself to studying something a little different? I’ll share more thoughts tomorrow.
```

After four months of journaling, I had to decide if I was going to change my project or plough on. After months of studying Patton’s work, I felt I hadn’t fully grasped that there was dissimilarity between conducting a developmental evaluation within systems versus among research participants. It was difficult for me to accept that I made such a fundamental mistake and that perhaps I should have taken more time to understand the purposes of developmental evaluation. I don’t know if time constraints had caused me to miss this point. Patton described the job of the developmental evaluator as a researcher who continually adjusts to the varying conditions and problems based on the following skill set.
• Identifies and documents initial conditions and monitors what emerges.
• Provides ongoing timely, and rapid feedback about what is emerging.
• Tracks incremental actions and decisions that affect the paths taken (and not taken).
• Facilitates regular reflective practice about what is developing
• Embeds evaluative thinking in the innovative process. (Patton, 2011).

My April setback actually projected me forward in my understanding of developmental evaluation. I was able to adjust my knowledge and apply my new understanding of developmental evaluation to the contexts of more authentic circumstances. Subsequently, I gained a stronger connection with the foundational elements of developmental evaluation, and I knew that I was better prepared to manage my personal partialities and see things in new ways.

As a result, I recommitted to my project, Conducting a Developmental Evaluation among HIDOE Data Coaches, and started to make preparations for my data collection. I decided that I would begin by interviewing selected data coaches but still frame these sessions within my informal conversational approach, as my reason for conducting this research was not to deductively arrive at statistical generalizations, but rather to inductively extend my learning by ascertaining themes and insights from my data through collegial talks. After selecting the appropriate research methods that would obtain qualitative data, I prepared to collect “observations that yield detailed, thick description; inquiry in depth; interviews that capture direct quotations about people’s personal perspectives and experiences.” (Patton, 2002, p.40) I felt that this approach would continue to develop my knowledge about what I had learned over my professional career as a proud public school student, teacher, and administrator.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODS

Conceptual Framework

My study is an action research project that employs qualitative research methods that focuses on real-life problems that are complex in nature and require sensitivity to context and familiarity with the setting. My approach is non-deductive in the sense that I am not testing hypotheses, or addressing questions generated from empirical research theories. The origins of my project has arisen from my personal and professional experience in evaluation and are directed to supporting others in using developmental approaches to evaluation in the often-complex situations typical of my participants’ work.

I eschewed random sampling, and purposely selected participants who could inform my research questions and were interested in learning about and applying developmental approaches to evaluation. Thus, I have focused on context and conversations with participants that consisted of respectful discussions and personal narratives. I want to research the unique themes that described the range of individualized experiences rather than noting any statistical significance of the occurrence of particular texts or concepts. (Zhang, Y. & Wildemuth, B. M., 2009) Essentially, I feel that it is important, as Jarvis acknowledges, that “underlying the philosophy of all of these programs is recognition that individuals learn during the daily process of working and living. This learning is most frequently incidental.” (Jarvis 1999, p.20) In addition, I concur with him that “the type of learning that we learn in practice is pragmatic: that it is directed to what works for each of us rather than why it works in multiple situations.” (Jarvis 1999, p.43)

In order to collect data for the project I conducted several interviews with three data coaches to explore the nature of how they were understanding and employing
evaluation in their own professional work. I employed much of Patton’s research to
describe my study, and I used the follow visual to support my discussions (Patton, 2011a).

Visual 7  Conceptual Framework: Patton’s Developmental Evaluation

Inquire Framework

Patton refers to this approach as Appreciative Inquiry (AI). AI offered a basis for
“engaging in developmental evaluation from a positive, hopeful place while still asking hard
questions and engaging in serious inquiry” (Patton, 2011, p. 234). AI and developmental
evaluation are balanced because both value community contributions and built on the
“community’s assets and strengths rather than focusing on problems or even problem
solving.” (Patton, 2011, p. 237) In addition, engaging in developmental evaluation is especially appropriate where people had have negative past experiences with evaluation and are leery of being unfairly judged (Patton 2011 p. 261). Thus appreciative inquiry is particularly appropriate in working with my project participants because of their experience in being reassigned to new roles. In most situations, teachers understand that their assignments could change yearly. However, in the case of the data coaches, they were assured that the project would continue for three years before they sacrificed family and personal goals to accept the positions. When the project was cut by one year, the data coaches lost trust in the state system. In consequence, the primary purpose for employing appreciative inquiry was to establish a foundation for building a positive and trusting research relationship with each of them.

As a result, I felt that appreciative inquiry provided me with the appropriate approach to conducting data coach interviews. Prior to each interview, I purposely collected positive comments from the participants’ colleagues that highlighted their personal qualities such as their respected work principles, and leadership abilities. AI also helped me to structure my questions that worked toward seeking responses that were important to the participant. I was especially careful not to impose my expectations on the interviewees or negatively affect the quality and richness of the dialogues. Most importantly, the AI approach determined that interviews were structured around open-ended inquiry, and I had to be comfortable, therefore, about opening the discussion to issues that were important to the participants. Personally, I was very interested in the data coaches’ experiences and thoroughly enjoyed listening to their stories.
Research Methods

“Conducting a Developmental Evaluation among HIDOE Data Coaches” was not meant to “do something” to data coaches. Despite my dissertation title, I accepted early during my Chapter III research that I was not going to “do” a developmental evaluation on data coaches as noted in my April 14, 2013 journal (See Attachment I). After several more days of journaling, my April 28, 2013 journal (See Attachment J) detailed my understanding that led to the completion of my research based on the question: How does developmental evaluation connect to teacher evaluation?

As a result of my research revision, my methods transitioned from analyzing the data coaches’ responses to collecting many data sources, and then coalescing the sources and bonding development evaluation to an effective teacher evaluation process.

My research methods were not about seeking generalities about evaluation processes because it contained different data collections from different time periods. The data collections consisted of data coach interviews, EdD studies, UH Consultancy finding, 2013 journals and the multitude of talks around teacher evaluation. In addition, the data was tied to a sixteen-year principal’s career, and three years as a University of Hawai‘i EdD
student. To add more complexity, each of the data collections and the time periods continuously coincided to construct new contextualized learning.

For example, when I originally prepared my second set of data coach interview questions that were designed to flow from the first set of interviews, my journal reflections forced me to change my interview questions to include more personalized and contextual data. The shifting of my thinking is described in the attached journal entry in reference to EdD coursework that consist of a presentation from Dr. Warren Nishimoto from the University of Hawai'i, Center for Oral History. As a result, I reformatted my future interviews to be centered on an interviewee’s artifact that represented the content of what she/he wanted to share about evaluation.

**Ellen:** The interview was excellent as expected. Ellen answered the questions pretty effortlessly and addressed many of my important points such as evaluation practices, and teaching for the joy of the teaching children. We actually took more time to talk than expected...about an hour and forty-five minutes because we had a lot of sidebar conversations during the interview. We started with the normal casual discussions such as why she transferred to Olamana School...that was great for our after discussion.

During the interview, Ellen was able to nicely connect her current curriculum coordinator experiences to her enjoyment, but continued to make comments about the difficulty of the Olamana contexts...and to highlight the school’s accomplishments. In terms of evaluation, I was not surprised that she was appreciative of her earlier experiences but didn’t remember the specifics. Ellen liked the PEP-T because it was more detailed, but the new Danielson was even better (because of the rubrics.) She also commented that the Olamana teachers were receptive to the observation process.

Knowing that quantitative data was not going to provide me with pertinent information, I purposely planned open-ended questions for formal interviews that solicited a lot of discussion. There were only seven questions. Each was purposely broad but framed around teacher evaluation. Despite the small number of questions, the interviews averaged about forty-five minutes because we had developed previous relationships.
1. Talk about the days when you were most excited about teaching?
2. What makes teaching exciting, creative, and innovative for you?
3. What do you feel is the easy part about teaching and why?
4. What do you feel is the difficult part about teaching and why?
5. Please share your past and present memories about teacher evaluations?
6. How did you feel about your teacher evaluations and why?
7. If you had the powers to change anything, what would you do to improve teacher evaluations?

The foundation for my questions was qualitative and guided by an Appreciative Inquire Framework. As a whole, the interviews were very personal and committed to sharing the teachers’ stories because the teachers’ responses were not limited by quantitative measured limited by summative scores and central tendency averages.

The interviews were held at my work site in the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support (OCISS). OCISS was ideal for interviews because the coaches were very familiar with this facility, and I knew there would be limited distractions during our lengthy interviews. In addition, since the data coaches serviced all school complexes, they generally worked with teams of teachers in conference rooms where confidentiality could not be safeguarded.

**Sampling and Data Collection**

Due to the straightforward approach that I used for sampling and data collection, I employed qualitative practices that started with establishing honest relationships between the data coaches. As a result, I was able to obtain a lot of informative data that thoroughly described the participants’ experiences. The EdD Consultancy team was very cognizant of
building respectful partnerships founded on pre-established communication guidelines and objectives. I relied on my professional reputation as an experienced principal to bond with the data coaches as an authoritative school leader who has implemented comprehensive school initiatives such as data teams and formative instruction.

Moreover based on my professional experiences, I knew that I needed to build positive relationships with the data coaches through their project administrator by first building the administrator’s confidence through continuous conversations. The purposes of the conversations were to confirm common goals and building personal connections. As a result, I was able to advance my research with the project administrator’s blessings and with minimal barriers.

Targeted Participants

The target research participants were HIDOE resource teachers who were originally hired as data coaches for three years, but were told to reapply for new positions halfway through the project. Despite the fact that their positions were eliminated, I felt that it was important for me to continue to work with the coaches in a developmental way. However, I could not continue the work of the consultancy project for my dissertation as originally planned. I therefore rethought the research project so that I could conduct a developmental evaluation among a select group of volunteers from the group of displaced data coaches.

I employed an approach called Typical Case Sampling. I had comparison data from the original questionnaires so I was able to select those whom I felt were “typical” participants and who represent the whole group. The participants were selected from the original group of sixteen data coaches that I worked with during the consultancy project. During that project, each of the coaches completed brief biographical questionnaires. that
provided basic demographic knowledge such as the coaches’ content expertise and years of teaching experience. The demographics highlighted a wide collection of teachers who were from different contexts and backgrounds. The only discernible evidence was that they were strong content specialists who were willing to assume leadership responsibilities. After the data coaches, they stated they were willing to participate I selected the participants who were more accessible. In choosing the three participants, I knew that they were “not in any major way atypical, extreme, deviant, or intensely unusual” (Patton 2002 p. 236). There were no outliers among the data coaches. Most importantly, I felt that Typical Case Sampling supported my research by not attempting to confirm generalizations, but by establishing credibility of the findings from a small sample size.

I was able to secure three research participants who had, by this time, found different positions in the HIDOE after the data coach positions were abolished.

- Dawn was as a Complex Area Mentor and Induction teacher. Prior to being a data coach, Dawn was an elementary teacher for 17 years where she was an innovative classroom teacher with an expertise in the Science content area.
- Holly was as a Complex Area Support Team (CAST) Common Core teacher. Prior to being a data coach, Holly was an elementary teacher for 14 years before working at the district level for seven years as a resource teacher with an expertise in classroom assessments.
- Ellen was a Curriculum Coordinator for an HIDOE alternative school. Prior to being a data coach, Ellen was a classroom and resource teacher for over 20 years and was recognized as an exceptional educator with strong problem solving skills and a nature ability to build positive relationships with peers and students.
Despite their different positions, I believed that the participants were representative of the data coaches because they continued to assume leadership positions, and they were expected to work with colleagues to resolve complex problems. The participants agreed to two interviews over the 2013 fall semester.

In addition to my research participants, I included two more data coaches who were willing to talk about their perceptions when the data coach positions were eliminated. The idea of interviewing additional participants was the result of fulfilling a request from the interview participants. The data coaches felt that the additional interviews would help expose new understandings, and more insights the importance of developing better teacher evaluation practices.

**Reactive Validity**

I feel that my influence could possibly cause the data coaches to respond cautiously because of my OCISS director position. As a principal working on the consultancy project, I had little influence over their work. However as an OCISS director, I did supervise the data coaches’ project administrator. In order to stay alert to the very real possibility that my new position of authority could skew their responses, I brainstormed possible solutions by utilizing a Circle Thinking Map®. The map was framed by my point of view as a research practitioner.

The Circle Map represented my efforts to minimize reactivity issues that might influence the participants’ responses. I made every effort to foster positive relationships consistent with the AI framework and with the principles and guidelines of building professional learning communities. The participants reflected on questions regarding personal contexts, and took the majority of the time to share stories about their work
experiences. The talking sessions were important to set the foundation for a trusting community that was founded on developmental evaluation practices. Patton asks, “Is the purpose and focus of evaluation helping develop something? Is something getting developed? Did something get developed? If so, what? How? With what implications? The focus of developmental evaluation is on (drum roll, please) developing innovations.” (Patton, 2011).

**Visual 8: Reactive Validity**

*Frame of Reference: Point of View (POV) from a Research Practitioner, brainstorming solutions to address validity threats.*

One of the topics that the data coaches and I discussed a great deal was the area of complexity: that the work of education was highly complex and that we are too often
invited to implement simple solutions to complex problems. In addition, working in schools and classrooms often requires innovative thinking and applying and adjusting actions to different contexts. Because of this, I felt that developmental evaluation would be a valuable approach to working with the data coaches.

The next chapter will analysis data coach interviews to describe how I helped them to address problems of complexity through developmental evaluation practices. Patton described the purpose of developmental evaluation as supporting adaptations in complex, uncertain, and dynamic conditions, as well as ongoing development and adaption to changing conditions (Patton, 2011a). The data analysis will distinguish Patton’s key factors that foster “developing innovations” such as: openness to what emerges; adaptive capacity, and tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty.
CHAPTER 5: DATA ANALYSIS

Interviews

I chose the web-based program, Dedoose (Lieber, 2013) to analyze the findings of my research. I chose Dedoose among other web-based programs because it organized, managed, and visually displayed my qualitative data in an efficient manner that I could have not physically completed due to the number of my interview excerpts. After interviewing five participants, I collected 225 passages for a range of themes. In addition to my coded interviews, I added another 418 codes from my 2013 journals. All together, I believed that Dedoose improved the quality and quantity of my research because it encouraged me to incorporate more quotations than a manual collection. The attached is a visual of the home page of my participant interviews.
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I used the Dedoose program to implement a provisional coding technique that began with a "starting list" of categories. The categories were based on my recent research reflections, past professional practices, and many conversations among EdD and school colleagues. Provisional codes were closely aligned to the conceptual framework of the dissertation, and they were continuously revised, modified, deleted, and expanded as new codes were developed. (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) As a result, coding was very labor intensive and took almost a complete month of revising, reformatting, and rewriting.

A major challenge of employing provisional coding arose as a result of a preliminary list that was designed to expand as new ideas and innovations were discovered. As a result, I felt that my coding was never completed, but I knew that developmental evaluators had to be comfortable “accepting there is a decision point in the course where the process of improving stops, and the recipe is hard copied.” (Presentation during EdD Seminar, November 23, 2013)

To systematize my coding practices, I utilized an eight steps process (Zhang, Y. & Wildemuth, B. M., 2009). I especially liked this process because it facilitated purposeful opportunities to revise codes. (See Appendix K: Eight Step Process for Preparing Data Findings) (Zhang, Y. & Wildemuth, B. M., 2009).

Step 1: Prepare the Data
Step 2: Define the Unit of the Analysis
Step 3: Develop Categories and Coding Scheme
Step 4: Test Coding Scheme on a Sample of Text
Step 5: Code All the Text
Step 6: Assess Coding Consistency
Step 7: Draw Conclusions from Coded Data

Step 8: Report Methods and Findings.

I needed a method that would allow me to identify the different parts of the whole interview. Fortuitously, Dedoose calculated the following table by organizing the provisional codes by segregating the five interviews and tallying the codes in an item analysis table that quantified the number of excerpts for each code. In addition, each group of excerpts was color-coded to indicate a greater number of tallies. For example, Dedoose generated the following table.

Table 1. Dedoose Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Evaluation: summative, formative, evaluation on self-efficacy</th>
<th>Evaluation: empowering teachers to take ownership of the program</th>
<th>Evaluation: empowering teachers to facilitate their own professional growth</th>
<th>Interpreting the dynamics, learning vs. Knowledge</th>
<th>Learning is a social practice</th>
<th>Learning is continuous and recursive</th>
<th>Research and feedback</th>
<th>Researcher's role as Research Pracitioner</th>
<th>Building Relationships</th>
<th>Social and Cultural Setting</th>
<th>Standardization</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Tri-Level Leadership</th>
<th>School Leadership</th>
<th>District Leadership</th>
<th>State Leadership</th>
<th>Simple solutions for complex problems</th>
<th>Downstream</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marti.story.doc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly.interview1.doc</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly.interview 2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen.interview1.doc</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen.interview 2.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn.interview1.doc</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn. Interview 2.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian.story.doc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In one glance, Dedoose allowed me to compare data from my interviews and my codes. Besides quantifying the number of codes between the first and second interviews, I
was able to identify the frequency of codes within each interview. Although the table only provided tallies, I was able to see definite trends among codes.

It was also important to acknowledge that the Marti and Brian interviews were added after the original set of interviews due to requests from the participants. Although the data was not directly tied to teacher evaluation, I chose to support the participants by including the qualitative data about the emotional penalties that arise from decisions made upstream.

In addition to the frequency of codes, Dedoose accessed the content of each excerpts. I was able to gain more understanding by reading the actual quotes from each tally. For example, when I opened the interview with “Holly”, I was able to read her exact words that were assigned to the code: Evaluation: Summative, Formative, Developmental Evaluation. As a result, Dedoose provided me access to a considerable amount of quantitative data to record trends.
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Dedoose also afforded a wealth of qualitative data that enabled me to delve deeper and seek ways to improve teacher evaluation while accepting “the road of the new education is not an easier one to follow than the old road but a more strenuous and difficult one.” (Dewey, 1938 p. 90) The Dedoose data promoted social and cultural understanding by collating participants’ personal stories, and it promoted inductive analysis techniques that helped me to discover new insights into the processes of evaluation (Patton 2002, p.453) In addition, Dedoose promoted the developmental evaluation process because it supported innovation by tracking my new ideas and reflections. Finally, Dedoose highlighted the fact that my research was not driven by theory, but practical knowledge and daily demands of the job (Jarvis 1999, p.147). It was important for me to believe that I was not researching theory, but developing teacher evaluation improvements and innovations.

**Journals**

Perhaps one of the more interesting experiences in employing qualitative research techniques came as a result of my 2013 journal writing. I'm not sure why I did not pursue journaling at the beginning of my research, but it still took me two months of writing before I realized that journaling was a “reflection-on-action zone” that allowed me to slow down, scrutinize actions, and determine whether my actions were benefitting my efforts to reach my objectives. Thus my journal became a place where I could develop “the ability to identify tacit, unspoken knowledge that is not typically taught.” (Stevens, D., Cooper, J., 2009, p.27)

My original intent of journaling for the 2013 year was not to code the entries for my research. In truth, I started my journals as a means of settling my whirl of thoughts about
my project—thoughts that seemed to change with the trade winds. I knew that I needed my journals to push my research writing by forcing me to draft short memos to myself (Maxwell, 2013) that could eventually be expanded into paragraphs and then dissertation chapters. Besides maintaining my daily writing, I challenged myself to compose enough content that would solicit deeper thinking. As a result, I made sure that every month consisted of fourteen pages of journals. The first two months were coincidental, but the remaining ten months were purposely preset as a standard of practice.

In addition to displaying interview data, Dedoose also organized my 2013 Journals in the same format. The software helped me to analyze my data by clearly connecting journal excerpts and codes.
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Similar to the participant interview data, Dedoose allowed me to compare data from my journals and my codes, while matching the actual participant quotes to the particular codes from each month. The following table highlighted certain themes such as “Reflection”, and “Insights to improving dissertation”.

Table 2. Dedoose Journal Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Developmental Evaluator SOME of the time</th>
<th>Developmental Evaluator ALL of the time</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Importance of Journaling</th>
<th>Insights to improving dissertation</th>
<th>Innovations that occur</th>
<th>Action Research</th>
<th>Significant Social/Family Events</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013 September Journal.DE..docx</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 October Journal.docx</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 November Journal.docx</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 May.Journal.DE..docx</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 March.Journal.DE.docx</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 June.Journal.DE..docx</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 July.Journal.DE..docx</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 January Journal.DE.docx</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 February Journal.DE.docx</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 December Journal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 August.Journal.DE..docx</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 April.Journal.DE..docx</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes most useful to me were “DE (Developmental Evaluation) some of the time”, and “DE all of the time”. I felt that the data gathered under these categories helped to identify my transition from novice, to becoming a skilled developmental evaluator. Based upon the coding, my transition occurred during March, but the more significant data that documented my evolution was not extracted from a number, but described in the quality of my March journals. The following was a coded text excerpt.
Findings

Coding data to generate concepts or variables from interviews was worthwhile. The usefulness of the data was not based on generalized findings, but the fact that the information led me to identifying interesting and innovative themes. There were three approaches to qualitative content analysis that I explored based on the degree of utilizing inductive reasoning. The first was conventional qualitative content analysis in which coding categories were derived directly and inductively from the raw data. The second approach was a summative content analysis that started with the counting of words or manifest content, and then extended to an analysis that included latent meanings and themes. The third approach was directed content analysis in which initial coding started with a theory or relevant research findings in which researchers are immersed in the data and allow themes to emerge. (Zhang, Y. & Wildemuth, B. M., 2009) For my study, I modified the third approach by starting with an initial set of provisional codes that were based on my professional experiences, and then revised them as I coded more text. As I noted earlier, “coding was very labor intensive and took almost a month of work even thought I employed the Dedoose software.” In the end, I felt that I had developed a thoughtful list of themes that were closely allied to the contexts of my research.
As a result, after transcribing my eight interviews, I was able to finalize context rich themes that were developed from the redefined codes. The final codes then established the specific themes of my research.

- Evaluation systems: summative, formative, developmental evaluation
- Evaluation as a tool to empower teachers to improve practices
- Using evaluation systems to measure teaching complexities
- Tracking innovations
- Interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies
- Learning versus knowledge
- Learning as a social experience
- Learning is a continuous and incidental process
- Reflection and feedback
- Research practitioner
- Building relationships
- Social and cultural contexts
- Standardization
- Compliance
- Tri-level leadership
- School leadership
- District leadership
- State leadership
- Using simple solutions for complex problems
- Identifying down stream consequences
When analyzing my journals, I employed the same qualitative content analysis technique by predetermining opening codes prior transcribing. Like the participant interviews, I revised my categories as I coded. An example of coding as I coded was my decision to add, “Significant Social/Family Events” after a couple of months of journaling. I felt that it was important for me to track significant social/family events because I wanted to document how seemingly separate experiences directly impacted my work as a researcher. For example, the attached is an excerpt from a March journal.

The final themes that emerged from my journals were:

- Thinking like a Developmental Evaluator SOME of the time
- Thinking like a Developmental Evaluator ALL of the time
- Leadership for the development evaluator
- Reflection
- Importance of Journaling
- Insights to improving my dissertation
- Tracking innovations that occur
• Action research

• Significant Social/Family Events

While identifying findings for my research, I was not pressed for a specific answer or resolution, nor did I attempt to generate any statistical significance. Instead, I worked towards uncovering patterns, ideas, and categories that were connected to teacher evaluation, and I attempted to document clear descriptions that matched my interpretations. (Patton 2002, p.503-504).

After working with the HIDOE data coaches for eighteen months, I interviewed selected coaches to gather perceptual data about teacher evaluation that was based on a developmental evaluation conceptual framework. Throughout my study, I expressed the belief that teacher evaluation practices have not improved professional practice nor created any sense of efficacy among teachers, and I was interested in hearing the data coaches’ stories about their experiences with evaluation methods. More importantly, I wanted to track their thoughts about effective evaluation practices, and see if there were connections to developmental evaluation. I didn’t feel that it was important to document whether my earlier meetings had impacted the data coaches’ perceptions, or attempt to generalize findings at this stage.

As a result, I reformatted the following Dedoose data to highlight clear descriptions that were connected to eight interesting evaluation themes. I also added additional columns that totaled the number of responses from each participant, I counted the number of categories that were significant for a research practitioner, and offered inductive interpretations that were founded on my professional educational practice.
Table 3. Revised Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Interview:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Interview:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Artifact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Interview:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Interview:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Artifact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Interview:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Interview:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Artifact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Interview:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marti Interview:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme One: Evaluation: Summative, Formative and Developmental Evaluation: As the highest counted theme, the data coaches identified the differences between the types of evaluation that were discussed during our meetings prior to the interviews. During the interviews, the data coaches were able to provide strong statements indicating their understanding of summative and formative evaluations, and how developmental evaluation was different from traditional evaluations. The data coaches' statements reflected their understanding that a different evaluation was needed for complex issues such as evaluating teachers. They didn't have any difficulty in supporting an evaluation
system by collecting data from multiple sources and extending evaluations beyond a timed teacher observation.

Theme Two: Learning versus Knowledge: The data coaches were aware that measuring learning was difficult because of the dynamics of individual growth. During the interviews, the coaches talked about measuring student achievement, and that learning was never summative. Many of the data coaches’ responses showed that learning, like teaching was continuously improved and not meant to be static.

Theme Three: Simple Solutions for Complicated Problems: The data coaches were able to make a strong connection to the limitations of schools initiatives that do not address the complexity. During the interviews, the coaches recognized the problem of routinely purchasing programs to “fix” student who have significant reading problems without connecting these “solutions” to the contexts of the student. The data coaches’ codes made multiple comments that the elimination of their positions was an example of the routine use of simple solutions to fix problems that were complex, but were, nevertheless, construed as simple.

Theme Four: Down Stream Consequences: I thought it was interesting that data coaches commented on down stream consequences almost twice as often during the first interviews because the context of these interviews was very different. The first interview provided a background to their experiences with teacher evaluations, while the second interview was based on an evaluation artifact that they chose to talk about. The coaches were very consistent that current evaluations were stressful procedures that did not improve their teaching performances. The data coaches’ affirmed that beyond be stressed by their past evaluation experiences, a down stream consequence of teacher evaluations
had been that they had not sought to improved their instructional and assessment practices, but required to only follow the evaluation procedures as a compliance activity.

**Theme Five: Documenting the Interactions, Dynamics, and Interdependencies, and Innovations that Occur:** The low number of items in this category surprised me because they were specifically listed to connect to criteria for a Development Evaluation. I thought the few responses indicated that current evaluation practices are driven by formative and summative practices that don't measure growth, creativity, and innovation. The data coaches’ also indicated that they understood that teacher evaluations needed to recognize the plethora of contexts that were connected to learning.

**Theme Six: Learning as a Social Experience:** This category was fascinating to me because it was an emergent code that developed from coding the first round of interviews. I thought that learning occurring in social experiences was very connecting to my work with Professional Learning Communities and the importance of teachers teaching to and learning from their colleagues. The data coaches’ commented on the reality that most of their learning occurred when they talked to each other during formal and informal meetings. They also indicated that current evaluation systems were limited because the discussions were too focused upon predetermined criteria and rubrics used to measure formative and summative assessments.

**Theme Seven: Tri-Level Leadership:** The leadership themes were also emergent categories. I thought the data coaches were very attuned to the importance of the different leadership levels. I purposely separated the tri-levels because as I coded, the coaches were very specific about how the different levels either supported, or did not support teacher evaluation. The coaches remarked that the decisions made at the state level were not
connected with the reality of teaching, while school level leaders were helpful but not fully aware of the teaching contexts and gradations of the observed lessons. The data coaches’ comments specified that they were more concerned about the state rather than the school level leadership.

**Theme Eight: Measuring Teaching Complexities:** I thought the Data Coaches were very clear that they did not feel that teaching evaluations measured teaching effectiveness. The coaches commented on the subjectivity of evaluation and especially the uncertainty of how the criteria were used to create an evaluation score. The data coaches’ shared that evaluation decisions were based on subjective perceptions from administrators who did not understand the complexity or contexts of their lessons.

Besides eliciting findings from the data coaches’ interviews, I coded the additional interviews from Brian and Marti. The interviews were not preplanned to address teacher evaluation, but the data coach participants conferred with each other and told me that their collective voices could be heard more clearly through the additional interviews. When I met with both, I thought that I was going to listen to a catalog of personal concerns, but instead Brian and Marti talked about their worries for the Department. As I coded their interviews, their contexts were different, but their stories matched. Neither spoke about teacher evaluation, other than the fact that they felt marginalized by the state leadership because their positions were eliminating with no clear rationale. Both Brian and Marti concurred that the coaches were not told why, but just that their positions were not being continued for the following year. As a result, the coaches arrived at their own interpretations. Based on their coded responses, they concluded that the state leadership had imprudently eliminated the data coach positions as a simple solution for a bigger
problem that was never disclosed. And as a result, data coaches felt that the were negatively affected by down stream consequences that ranged from a mistrust for the state leadership, to unanticipated family financial burdens because most 12-month data coaches accepted 10-month teaching lines.

In addition to coding my participant interviews, I searched for themes throughout my year of journaling. To show the evolution of my findings, I reformatted the Dedoose data to include columns for the total number of codes and themes. As a result, I found four more significant themes.

**Table 4. Revised Journal Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Journals</th>
<th>DE Some of the Time</th>
<th>DE All of the Time</th>
<th>DE Leadership</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Importance of Journaling</th>
<th>Insights to Dissertation</th>
<th>Innovations that Occur</th>
<th>Action Research</th>
<th>Social/Family Events</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflection: Understandably, a large number of comments were linked to reflection. I would have been interested measuring the number of reflection codes at the beginning of the EdD program because I believe that my reflection skills have monumentally improved in quantity and quality due to my improved understanding of the role of complexity in evaluation. As a result of my experiences of becoming comfortable with complexity, I agreed with Noel Burch’s “Four Stages for Learning Any New Skill”, and I moved among the Four Stages. Early in my career, I was the Unconscious-Incompetent who was unaware that I lacked the skills to resolve complex problems. Like my Legacy Lesson #1 from Chapter I, I consistently incorporated simple solutions such as adding more play equipment to stop the playground fights without resolving the deeper problem of addressing students’ lack of social skills. Prior to the EdD program, I was a Conscious-Incompetent because I didn’t have the range of skills to resolve complex problems. My “incompetency” was not due to a lack of intelligence, but a lack of disposition to reflect, learn, and improve my current knowledge. As a result of the EdD program, I felt that I was moving towards a Conscious-Competent where after much effort and time; I came to appreciate that I couldn’t address most school level complexities. The eventual goal that leaders strive towards is Unconscious-Competent because they do not have to exert tremendous effort and time to resolve issues of complexity, and by achieving this stage, they can also afford themselves the ability to undertake even more complex problems. For example, improving teacher evaluation required the proficiencies of the Unconscious-Competent, or the extended time and resources for the Conscious-Competent.

Insights to Dissertation: The second highest number of coded comments doubled as I drafted more chapters. The exact numbers were not meaningful but the trend was clear
that as I wrote more, I learned more, which validated the importance of reflection and journaling to my growing understanding of developmental evaluation.

**Action Researcher:** The number of entries for the Action Research did not vary significantly throughout the year. The monthly numbers of codes were higher at the end of the year, but I felt that tracking my thoughts and actions as a practitioner researcher was important because I felt that it kept me grounded in a qualitative inquiry approach. My instincts were based on my commitment to adhering to the quantitative methods, and I sought to infuse my research practices with efforts to collect stories about teacher evaluation. As a result, I felt that the practitioner researcher approach gave me important insights into teacher evaluation. The coding validated my belief that evaluation had to be connected to an ongoing improvement process akin to that of a research practitioner who was studying a process to improve his/her teaching skills.

**Innovations that Occur:** Although the number of items in this category was not the largest, I felt that the innovation entries were the most important for my research because they tracked my personal and professional progress towards understanding developmental evaluation. The codes were very significant because they identified new thoughts and ideas that were the basis for developing innovations. (Patton, 2011) The following journal entries describe my early connections developmental evaluation.

In regards to my two thoughts to ponder, I can see how a day like today would definitely dampen my developmental efforts at the current time of 10:45 p.m., I can't think, and more importantly find a desire to reflect. Today was too tough to extend beyond my operational responsibilities and therefore I mostly bounced around in my "react" costume. Unfortunately, many of my days bouncing episodes...because so many decisions have to be made almost non-stop (sort of like Lucille Ball attempting to pack boxes of candies at the end of an assemble line), I don't know how to schedule reflection time at this moment. And by waiting to the end of today...like tonight...is too late. After days like today, I don't have enough brain energy to developmentally evaluate. But to find time in the day, I realize that I must design time versus hoping for a chance to think. Ray McNulty referred to "Success by design, not by chance" about three summers ago at his Model Schools Conference. Reflectively, I can now challenge "model schools" because there are no model schools—just successfully designed schools that address their complexities. Maybe my answer to finding time in the day to reflect and ponder is predicated by purposely scheduling time to talk to smart people.
In my January/February entries, I was beginning to understand that I was learning to embrace developmental evaluation as a means of pursuing innovation in my work and in teacher development. I knew that I had evolved from a conscious-incompetent to a conscious-competent developmental evaluator. And as I learned, I realized that my original intent to teach the Data Coaches about developmental evaluation was weakened by the fact that I was not fluent with it. However, as I had dealt with development evaluation everyday through multiple circumstances, I eventually gained a better understanding of it and its application. As a result, my following journals entries reflected a changed understanding from talking about my new learning to my efforts to infuse it into my daily practices and how developmental evaluation has become ubiquitous in my life.
In conclusion, the Findings laid the foundation for my qualitative content analysis. Beyond simply counting words or generalizing sterile data to generalize interpretations, the findings allowed me to comingle new information with my past professional experiences and pull together a better understanding of developmental evaluation in a much more practical way. However, as a result of listing my findings from both my interviews and my journals, I realized that I had not taught the data coaches about developmental evaluation during our meeting that I had described in my action plan. I initially believed that I had “taught” them about development evaluation but I couldn’t have know enough about it because had not attained the stage of the Conscious-Competent in my understanding of complexity.
Analysis

As a practitioner researcher, my analysis extended far beyond mere descriptive and central tendency data, but also included “attaching significance to what was found, making sense of findings, offering explanation, drawing conclusions, extrapolating lessons, making inferences, considering meaning, and otherwise imposing order on an unruly but surely patterned world.” (Patton 2002, p.480) As a result, my qualitative content analysis helped me work through a sense-making effort that took a volume of qualitative data and attempted to identify consistencies and meanings, (Patton, 2002, p.453). I initially struggled to implement a more structured analysis but there were more than twenty different qualitative research genres from well-established traditions such as ethnography, grounded theory, phenomenology, (Miles et al., 2014). In the end, I selected qualitative content analysis because it supported my conceptual framework and allowed me to pursue what I noticed as developing innovations. I could not employ, therefore, qualitative content analyses that involved a designed process to pack data into categories or themes based on inference and interpretation. Instead, I implemented a qualitative content analysis by employing inductive techniques to dig deep and note new ideas, (Patton, 2002).

Initially, I really struggled to analyze my data because I wanted to backup my analysis with evidence. The inductive process made sense to me, but I had difficulty pushing aside my experimental design mindset, and allowing myself to seek new learning and insights. Even thought I finished coding six months earlier, I struggled to take the first steps of analyzing. Part of my foot-dragging was due to glorified expectations that the analysis would produce profound insight, but I realized that insight was not a bonfire, but a kindled ember that would begin to glow over time. I continued to struggle even after
Hunter repeatedly corrected me, “You are trying a bit too hard to address purely technical issues (the researcher voice) rather than projecting the practitioner voice. I think that you are still a bit oppressed by the traditional five chapter, dissertation monster.”

After accepting that qualitative content analysis was not bound by correct answers and developing innovations that were not forced, I realized that I circled back to my first chapter where I thought that I shared an incredible insight. However, I learned in my data analysis that I had developed new insights that went far beyond my Legacy Lessons that I had considered final. It was obvious that the EdD program had considerably impacted my understanding of evaluation. Prior to being selected for the EdD program, I felt had very confident about my Legacy Lessons that I had learned from my thirty-year career in education. When I talked to my colleagues about the encapsulation of my lessons, I had thought that I spoke from a height that could only be realized by the most experienced practitioner. Like my talk to data coaches about developmental evaluation before I could grasp the complexity of it, I realized that my “Legacy Lessons” were a starting point and that this project had taught me that the developmental evaluation approach is a valuable tool in promoting change in conditions of complexity.

My original Legacy Lessons before being refined by this study. I have now refined my three Legacy Lessons based on what I have learned from my study.

Legacy Lesson 1: Simple solutions are for simple problems and complex solution are for complex problems, but simple solutions cannot resolve complex problems.

Legacy Lesson 2: Good teaching is tracked by the act and process of continuously improving one’s skills.
**Legacy Lesson 3:** It’s about the leader’s steadfast effort to set a direction, and elicit the support of others to agree and move in those directions.

While completing the findings, it was obvious that my beloved Legacy Lessons had become antiquated. The Lessons lost value not because they were less enduring, but they were not complete. The entire three-years of the EdD program has transformed my Legacy Lessons by reconstructing them as “Stories”. Stories are much more inclusive because they include context. Each story consists of a progressive amalgamation of my thirty-year career, my Legacy Lessons, and the EdD cohort experience. And like a good stew, the stories will continue to cook and improve as new innovations are realized and new insights develop.

**Story 1, Development Evaluation:** Perhaps the most important lesson that that I have learned as a result of the EdD program has been to put a stop to simple solutions for complex problems. Throughout my years as a principal and OCISS Director, mediating problems has been my most demanding job. Mediating problems has crossed the full range of scenarios, but the common connection between each conflict is that I was resolving problems that originated from people other than myself. I am certain that if I were able to reinvest the time that I committed for every complaint and focused on connecting with students, I would have been able to form amazing personal connections with every student. Unfortunately since “fixing problems” was generally restricted to the administration building, I was forced to spend over 80% percent of my days in the confines of the Principal’s Office and away from students.

Despite my understanding of how to implement improvement, I realized that only very rarely had complex problems been solved by complex solutions. While working with
teacher evaluations over the past 30-years, I've faithfully implemented the range of typical teacher evaluations. However, I have also noted that three decades of teacher evaluations have not taught me how to support teachers. Even though I've spend untold hours mistakenly easing teachers’ minds about the evaluation process, and as many hours revising my systems to match my misaligned actions, I never could guide teachers to accept that evaluation was not an end, but a process for continuous improvement.

Upon reading Michael Quinn Patton's *Development Evaluation*, I finally came to realize that I have been pushing teachers to “develop” their teaching practices based on summative scores, or in other words “simple solutions”. Obviously, summative scores are one-off measures and not reflective of continuous development. What has been insightful to me is grasping that simple solutions for improving teacher evaluations have not moved teachers forward, but kept them revolving in circles.

I also once believed that the answer for improved practices was framed within formative practices. (Black & Wiliam, 2009) But as I learned more from Patton, formative practices are only steps toward reaching a summative score. Therefore, I understand that I have been telling teachers to improve their practices based on predetermined expectations without any consideration of the influence of context. The collection of experiences verified by my data collection told me that I was making no progress by telling teachers to improve their practices based on evaluations that were limited by summative expectations.

To start my journey toward truly improving teachers’ skills, I had to drop the simple solution attitude and implement a complex solution approach that was based on tracking innovations and improvements. As noted by the data coaches, they were not inspired to improve by attaining an arbitrary summative score. As data coaches shared their stories
from evaluation artifacts during the second interviews, they were self-motived to improve their growth when it was personalized and connected to relevant practice embraced by developmental evaluation that tracked and attempted to make sense of what emerged under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold. (Patton, 2011)

In conclusion, good developmental teacher evaluation can't be based upon any of the current systems such as the Danielson method. Instead, evaluation must be able to handle complexity while promoting teacher innovation and creativity.

**Story 2, Teacher Evaluation:** It is unhelpful merely to assert that summative teacher evaluation scores do not promote professional efficacy. What is needed is more practical advice that will actually support improved performance. Stating that summative teacher evaluation scores do not promote professional efficacy is not insightful. As I worked to address the problems of current teacher evaluation practices, I thought that the answer might be to use developmental evaluation as a means. While talking to many school administrators and teachers, studying Patton’s work, and framing his thoughts within the reality of leading a school, I came to the conclusion that a lot of the responsibility must be held with the principal. However the reality is that there are no alternative approaches to teacher evaluation that are consistent with developmental evaluation.

When I talked to the data coaches about developmental evaluation, their comments were positive about implementing a tool such as the Danielson Framework because of the strong link between multiple observations and criterion-based improving teaching practices. I realized that a major challenge that I faced when addressing teacher evaluation was that my understanding of developmental evaluation was a work in progress. Likewise,
the data coaches only knew what they knew, too. As a result, when I pushed deeper discussions about teacher evaluation, I wasn’t surprised that the discussion centered on the Danielson Framework.

The difficulty that I face with the current teacher evaluation system is not based on introducing new ideas, but on simple compliance with the programmed evaluation rubric. In fact, all of the state’s Danielson trainings are purposely standardized to execute a common certification for all evaluation administrators. I felt that standardization of the evaluation trainings that focused on inter-rater reliability was counter to developmental evaluation practices. Unfortunately, I had almost no choice in changing a standardized system that promoted compliancy.

To change teacher evaluation in the direction of a more developmental approach, I had to remove myself from any quantified teacher’s improvement efforts. I wanted to avoid grades, scores, and rubrics that were summative. And even more troubling to me is that in seeking compliance; we become complicit in a system that encourages mediocrity.

In order to find a different approach, I pushed myself to extend my learning about developmental evaluation. Throughout my career and especially within the EdD program, I have been able to see myself as an active research practitioner. I embraced the idea of practical inquiry because it enabled professionals to seek practical solutions for problems of practice. It’s not a top-down process, but one that emerges from the work of practitioners from the bottom up. It seeks solutions for local problems rather than generic solutions that are imposed by outsiders. Thus, I began to see that action research would be a good model to follow in taking a developmental approach to teacher evaluation.
Throughout my educational career, I have had to continuously update my professional knowledge. Every year offered new learning opportunities where I relied on reading research, talking to colleagues, and practicing my understandings in real classrooms with real students. And as a result, my knowledge was never static but always evolving. I was comfortable with the realization that my teaching practices had to continue to develop based on the new knowledge that I attained in an "unprecedented requirement of adaptability" (Schön 2009, p. 15). I came to agree with Schön that “If it is true that professional practice has at least as much to do with finding the problem as with solving the problem found, it is also true that problem setting is a recognized professional activity.” (2009 p.18)

John Dewey is also clear about the challenges of the research practitioner to purposely and continuously improve his or her professional practice by not simply subscribing to predetermined pathways, but by reflection.

There is no discipline in the world so severe as the discipline of experience subjected to the tests of intelligent development and direction. Hence the only ground I can see for even a temporary reaction against the standards, aims, and methods of the newer education is the failure of educators who professedly adopt them to be faithful to them in practice. As I have emphasized more than once, the road of the new education is not an easier one to follow than the old road but a more strenuous and difficult one. (1938 p. 90)

In conclusion, I have come to a new awareness of how, as a principal, to work developmentally with teachers to support them to improve their teaching. I no longer want
to be in the business of employing teacher evaluation procedures that simply arrive at summative scores that really offer no guidance about how to grow as a professional. My question, then, is: How can I institutionalize a research practitioner process at the school level? Based upon my learning from the interview findings, numerous practitioners’ discussions, and approximately 160 teacher evaluations, I have some definite ideas about how I can accomplish this plan, but my thoughts will never come to fruition in my current OCISS position.

**Story 3, Level of Implementation:** One of the most important lessons that past Superintendent Paul LeMahieu taught me was to “frame the fight”. He didn’t mean that principals had to be combative, but he understood that conflict was inevitable and that “framing” the conflict in a positive direction was a useful strategy. I also learned that “framing the fight” was not meant to be a distant struggle, but an up-close leadership tactic that subscribed to the belief that the best decisions were made in the trenches and not by poring over maps from a distance. Kahneman (2011, p.88) also referenced framing as an effect. He identified how “different ways of presenting the same information often evoked different emotions.” He advised that framing was about how information could be presented differently, and we have to be attuned to contexts to avoid saying things without evoking erroneous emotional response.

Over the years, I have continued to work on my framing skills by learning to understand how social and cultural contexts impact thought and action. The data coaches also talked about their past principals and evaluators who were able to manage the complexity of supervising teachers. The data coaches described the successful principals as hands-on and knowledgeable about the classroom contexts. The coaches also noted that
the administrators who were not engaged and understanding of the complexity of the teachers’ classroom realities were not helpful problem solvers. In my opinion, successful administrators can be compared to military sergeants because they are closer to and have greater immediate impact on the life of enlisted soldiers than higher ranks. A sergeant’s influence is of more consequence to the soldier because she or he understands their daily tasks, and is responsible to model the standards for soldiers to follow, and live up to. Most importantly, sergeants are vital because they perform at the actual level of implementation. They are not distant officers who make decisions far away in camouflaged tents.

The interviews noted many references to tri-level leadership and the connection to state implementation efforts. The interview data indicated a strong relationship between state level leadership and two frequently made comments: simple solutions for complex problems, and down stream consequences. The data coaches understood that at the school level, administrators are called upon to implement the many projects that have been initiated in recent years.

From my OCISS position, I also struggled with the EES. I felt compelled to help my colleagues; yet, in my new position I felt too distant from the action. I was especially torn because I have always supported my colleagues through past trainings (see Appendix C: Professional Development for Principals). And as a past principal I could understand the many challenges that principals were facing, but I felt that I was looking at maps rather than participating in the action.

My work and leadership experiences put me in the position to help statewide initiatives when I was at the school level. In regards to the HIDOE Strategic Plan, teacher evaluation was without question the most complex component of the Effective Educator
System (EES). However, despite many HIDOE efforts to improve the EES implementation, it has been very difficult for principals to implement. The highly publicized principals survey, “The Voice of Hawai’i School Principals”, May 13, 2014. (Galera & et.al., 2014) reported:

Visual 12  Voice of Hawai’i School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>EES implementation of Race to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Top and Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness System (EES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>negatively impacted Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Staff Morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>negatively impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>negatively impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preparing students for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new national test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>negatively impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campus supervision and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monitoring of student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>negatively impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transition to the Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>negatively impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, one of the most interesting understandings that I was able to derive from my research findings, talking to colleagues, and deep reflection about my practices was that I am not helping schools as a member of the OCISS team, as I originally intended. I am no longer a valued member of the fraternity of principals, but more of a bureaucratic manager. I have learned that if I really want to support my colleagues, then I have to be close to the action: more accessible to teachers and in a position where I can actually take a part in understanding the complexities of particular school issues and seeking solutions and implementing them. During my year of writing this dissertation, I have felt that the OCISS directorship was a promotion and an indication that I have attained a higher level of competency. But as my year in this position draws to an end, I have come to the realization that the principalship is the only position where I have the real opportunity to put my ideas about developmental evaluation into practice.
I have never looked on my educational journey as a compliance exercise but as an opportunity to extend my knowledge in ways that have practical consequences. As a result of what I have learned from my three years in the EdD program, I have become committed to learning more about the nature of problems that I have never been able to answer before: the fact that they are complex and that simple solutions so often imposed from the top really make matters worse. But now, I feel that I have traveled far enough and closer to my original commitment to help deal with the complexity of teacher evaluation.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

Prior to engaging in my research project I believed that I was successfully managing the vast array of challenges and complications that emerge from leading a school. I thought I was an effective leader, and that I performed at an exemplary level based on multiple quantitative measurements. My curriculum vita was stellar; I was honored with the National Distinguished Principal, and Island Insurance Foundation, Excellence in School Leadership awards; and my performance evaluations ratings were excellent. But even with the achievements, I continued to struggle with troublesome concerns about teacher evaluation, and how deal with the complexity of the problems that I encountered. However, as a result of completing my research, I realized that earning my EdD has transformed my understanding, and I reevaluated my thirty years of accomplishments, and I began to look upon my thirty years of accomplishments in a new light. But much more significantly, my EdD has renewed my sense of transformation and professional improvement.

What was the personal value of the research?

It was evident that my experiences in working with the data coaches transformed my thinking, professional disposition, and purpose. When I started the EdD program, I thought that submitting a dissertation was my end goal. I now realize that it represented simply the start of my journey along a pioneering path that will take me through yet untraveled professional trails to seek deeper complexities of understanding of teacher evaluation.

My thinking has changed. My three years of study and professional practice in the EdD program has changed the way that I see problems and how I seek remedies. I once believed that every problem was connected to established methods of resolution. When I
had “solved” problems in the past such as a contentious Special Education meeting, I would pull out a preordained procedure from my “bag of tricks” that would lead to a hoped-for outcome. When I was concerned about how the teachers were implementing the Common Core State Standards in their classrooms, I initiated a professional development process that would assure that every teacher received the same standardized training. Over the years, I learned that initiating action was limited to simply applying a predetermined set of procedures.

However, my thinking has changed, and I have learned to deal with complexity in a different manner. Now, I want to examine the context and the rich interplay of forces that shape the problem in unique ways. If I decide that the problem is complex, then I know that I must be careful to avoid simple solutions. For example, if a parent files a complaint that her child is struggling in class, then I need to gather details about the context before meeting the teacher so that I can frame solutions around improving instructional practices. I see issues of teacher evaluation in much the same way. I have changed my thinking from implementing simple solutions that utilize summative scores to determine growth, and instead I see the importance of supporting ongoing improvement and self-efficacy based on developmental evaluation practices much as Patton recommends by “tracking and attempting to make sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity.” (2011, p.7)

My professional disposition has changed. During the EdD program, I always attended “best practices” trainings with the intent of replicating the practices at my school. Even if I struggled to understand the particulars of the process, I still committed to full-fledged efforts to transport the practice to my school for implementation.
I continue to support "best practices", but more importantly I look more closely at context, and avoid feeble practices that simply quantify observations. In fact, I consistently question comparisons of central tendency scores and view rubrics critically. With regard to teacher evaluation, I have changed my professional disposition from simply replicating trainings on teacher observation protocols to one of seeking more complex solutions that account for new learning that "occurs as innovations unfold." (Patton, 2011).

My professional purpose has changed. Because of the EdD program, I understand the strongest access point for system improvement is at the school level. I thought that OCISS was an environment where I could lead systems and manage the quality of initiatives. I found that I was able to administer multiple and very complicated assignments from my OCISS assignment, but I was not able to influence the quality or monitor implementation at the school level.

I continue to believe that strong leadership is the most important factor for school improvement. I still believe that leadership primarily consists of setting directions and influencing members to move in an aligned direction. However, after studying teacher evaluation along developmental lines, I have changed my professional beliefs in regard to my assumption that system wide improvement such as teacher evaluation was contingent upon a strong state office. I still believe that the state office should lead standardized teacher evaluation initiatives such as observation protocols, but I am now aware that only school people can understand the complexities of the contexts of evaluation through an ongoing process of “documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies.” (Patton, 2011)
As a whole, I feel that my study of developmental evaluation has dramatically improved my understanding of teacher evaluation, and I have become increasingly comfortable with the idea of tackling complex problems using a developmental approach. Although teacher evaluation is an incredibly complex process, I have become excited about implementing practitioner inquiry as a means of improving teacher evaluation practices.

**What insights, knowledge, and inspiration were derived from the study?**

As a result of completing my research project, I have learned many important insights that I will eventually learn to apply at the school level. Most importantly, I am committed to developing teacher-based action research procedures to support evaluation protocols.

I believe that I can offer teachers practical and purposeful considerations toward improving teacher evaluation protocols and improving efficacy. Although my thoughts are based on qualitative practices that tackle problems differently from the current quantitative methods, I do not intend to divide practitioners. I believe that there is a solution that involves both current evaluation systems, and qualitative maxims.

For example, utilizing appreciative inquiry to build successful practices versus correcting mistakes and identifying faults are aligned to my efforts to instigate a process where teachers initiate action research through the support of their administrators. I believe that the action research must be led by the teacher and based on contexts and indigenous learning. “Context is important in solving problems of practice and someone with local knowledge of the rich tapestry of social factors that make up the context is someone with local knowledge.” (H. McEwan, personal communication, July 4, 2014). Hunter also shared:
Human life and social and educational problems do not lend themselves to abstract generalizations. Variety is an inescapably part of school life. We need people who have this local knowledge, because without it, we are doomed to applying the same failed methods time and time again to unique problems. (Personal communication, July 4, 2014)

I intend to learn more about how to combine action research and teacher evaluation, but I can’t establish details until I initiate practices that will include processes for teachers to conduct qualitative research using appreciative inquiry methods. Although I cannot provide implementation details, I am moving forward by relying on current school efforts to institutionalize Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) by developing complex solutions for complex problems. Implementing PLCs is not a new concept, however utilizing PLCs to support innovative complex solutions is an interesting proposal. The most difficult challenges for schools are based on composing different mindsets about implementing the Effective Educator System initiatives as described in Graphic 12, (Voice of the Hawai’i School Principals, p.84). I concur with Hunter McEwan’s connection, “I see an important role for the principal in engaging groups of teachers (PLCs) in action research teams dealing with problems of practice such as addressing issues of professional improvement, implementing curriculum innovations, addressing local school initiatives with respect to state-wide reforms such as Common Core” (Personal communication, July 4, 2014).

I also foresee the importance of starting a professional community of school administrators who sanction one vision along an innovative direction that complies with the state strategic plan, while supporting the social and cultural contexts of individual
schools. The purpose of the professional community would be to improve leadership skills by working together to address complex problems with complex solutions. For example, my goal would be for teams of principals to learn how to utilize developmental evaluation practices to eventually override summative teacher ratings. As I have learned from this research, I would advocate for complex solutions that align to developmental evaluation practices such as organizing systems that track teachers’ action research. Instead of relying on an arbitrary classroom observations quantified by mediocre rubrics, I would promote evaluations that extend teachers’ knowledge through professional learning communities and research-based practices.

As I close my research and commence my new journey toward applying my “insights, knowledge and inspiration”, I realize that I have to return to the school level where I can be of most use to the system—a place I can work to understand the complexity of local issues and seek solutions that can be adapted to the unique character of the situation. This requires local knowledge. Prior to entering the EdD program, I held the view that the school principal is vital to initiating change—a leader who might move a school to follow through on complex solutions for very complicated initiatives. My research has deepened my understanding of the role of the principal as such a leader—some one who is uniquely positioned to affect change through their understanding of the local context. As Reed and McEwan state:

It is the constellation of relationships built over time, within the distinctive ever-evolving context, which are reflected in the process-product. These cannot be replicated, nor should we want them to be, because ultimately it is both the uniqueness of the story that the practitioner tells --- its elements of
believability, and resonance with the experience of his/her readers --- that give the work life. (2014, Artistry in Practitioner-Inquiry, Unpublished paper)

Therefore, upon completion of my doctoral studies, I have transferred from my OCISS directorship, to be appointed the Proud Principal of Pearl Ridge Elementary—the school where I started my administrative journey twenty years earlier. I could not be more excited about commencing the complex work of constructing teacher evaluation processes that supports developmental evaluation practices. As I proceed, I will embrace Stephen Toulmin’s quote while developing a local-based teacher evaluation system, ”In practical disciplines, questions of rational adequacy are timely not timeless, concrete not abstract, local not general, particular not universal.” (1992, p.34)
# Appendix A: Professional Learning Team Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotation Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Data Coll Math</th>
<th>Data Coll ELA</th>
<th>Data Team Math</th>
<th>Data Team ELA</th>
<th>Learning Team Math</th>
<th>Learning Team ELA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Aug. 1</td>
<td>Race to the Top (RTTT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Aug. 8</td>
<td>RTTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aug. 15</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Lynne)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Jan)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
<td>K (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aug 22</td>
<td>K (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aug 29</td>
<td>3 (Steve)</td>
<td>5 (Chad)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>2 (Ian)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sept. 5</td>
<td>1 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Lynne)</td>
<td>3 (Ian)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>K (Phyllis)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sept. 12</td>
<td>2 (Lynne)</td>
<td>K (Chad)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sept. 19</td>
<td>5 (Lynne)</td>
<td>3 (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Ian)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Sept. 26</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oct. 10</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Lynne)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Amber)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
<td>K (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oct. 17</td>
<td>K (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/T</td>
<td>Oct. 24</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nov. 7</td>
<td>3 (Steve/Kelin)</td>
<td>6 (Chad)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>2 (Amber)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
<td>1 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Ian/Kelin)</td>
<td>3 (Amber)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>K (Phyllis)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG</td>
<td>Nov. 21</td>
<td>Thanksgiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nov. 28</td>
<td>2 (Ian)</td>
<td>K (Kelin/Chad)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dec. 5</td>
<td>5 (Kelin)</td>
<td>3 (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Amber)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG</td>
<td>Dec. 12</td>
<td>Winter Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Jan. 9</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Jan. 16</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Jan. 23</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan. 30</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Ian)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Amber)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
<td>K (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feb. 6</td>
<td>K (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Feb. 13</td>
<td>3 (Kelin)</td>
<td>5 (Chad)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>2 (Amber)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feb. 20</td>
<td>1 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Ian)</td>
<td>3 (Amber)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>2 (Ian)</td>
<td>K (Kelin)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>Schoolwide Inclusion: Anne Beninghof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>5 (Kelin)</td>
<td>3 (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Amber)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>March 27</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Ian)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Amber)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
<td>K (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 3</td>
<td>K (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>3 (Kelin)</td>
<td>5 (Chad)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>2 (Amber)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>April 17</td>
<td>1 (Steve)</td>
<td>4 (Ian)</td>
<td>3 (Amber)</td>
<td>5 (Steve)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>2 (Liz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>April 24</td>
<td>2 (Ian)</td>
<td>K (Kelin)</td>
<td>1 (Roanne)</td>
<td>4 (Steve)</td>
<td>3 (Liz)</td>
<td>5 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>5 (Kelin)</td>
<td>3 (Chad)</td>
<td>2 (Amber)</td>
<td>K (Roanne)</td>
<td>1 (Phyllis)</td>
<td>4 (Wiene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG</td>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>May Day Preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>RTTT: EES, Gregg Iha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>Celebration, Celebration, Celebration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Context for “Talking Story”

The following content is from the article “Storytelling in Context to... What?” written by Larry Brooks on October 17, 2010

Everything we do in life is informed by context.

Context is one of the greatest, most powerful words in any language.

Life itself is nothing other than context. The only things that exist in a vacuum are floating in outer space.

And even they have context.

Too often our stories end up being described just that way. But it’s avoidable... through a keen awareness and understanding – up to and including mastery – of the contextual forces that hover above the writer’s keyboard.

Context is like oxygen – invisible, essential, and taken for granted. At least until something goes wrong.

Context is like gravity. Ignore it, mishandle it, and you will most likely crack your head open.

Imagine a surgeon doing an operation without context.

You can’t. Because even someone stuck in a car stranded in the desert who has to remove the appendix of a screaming companion has to deal with context... and it isn't pretty.

Nonetheless, as you consider this question you’ll quickly realize that multiple layers of context are in play – the context of the training received in medical school... the context of the nature of the ailment being attended to... the context of the patient’s age, state of health and medical history... even the context of available resources, insurance coverage and whatever is going on in the surgeon’s life that might be a distraction.

Context is what empowers success and derails the unprepared.

Context is a menu of variables taken into account by professionals and too often undervalued or ignored altogether – either through naivety or ignorance – by the neophyte.

So it is with storytelling.

At a recent workshop I asked the group a warm-up question: in what context are you writing your story?

A sea of blank stares spread before me.
Not that upon reflection they didn't have an answer, but rather, their initial take was that they've never thought about storytelling from that perspective.

I’m here to tell you, there is great value in doing so.

The experienced, enlightened writer understands the value of context to their story, and – like that surgeon – they comprehend it on multiple levels. These contextual elements are folded into the mix of story planning and execution, informing the writer’s progress at every turn, twist and plot point.

Context is the stuff of great storytelling. The more of it you see and feel and comprehend, the better writer you will be.

**What is the storyteller’s contextual checklist?**

At the most basic level, the contextual questions a writer must consider look like this:

Do you understand the fundamentals of basic dramatic theory? If so, what is the nature and evolution of the core conflict of your story? It’s inherent tension? The arc of your character? The thematic landscape? The structural architecture?

If not... well, in that case you won’t know what went wrong until someone tells you. And rest assured, they will.

Do you understand the contextual demands of the genre you are writing in? How it differs from other genres, and how it puts a fence around your creative options?

Do you understand the context of the six core competencies of storytelling, to an extent that you cover each base with equal emphasis and have considered the inherent criteria defined under each?

What is the context of your story’s essence – its time and place, its voice, its sub-text, its inherent appeal?

**Every story has context.**

It’s a qualitative issue, a matter of degree and art. If you don’t manage context, it will manage you.

Are you aware of the context in the marketplace that will color your story’s chances of publication? A published writer works under a completely different context than that of a new writer, and a writer jumping genres works under a fresh context from the last project.

Are you keenly sensitive to your own limitations? Your exposure to the nuances of what you are attempting to achieve within your story? Your ability to keep your story on track, to manage the dramatic tension and pace required?
Part of understanding context is finding any answers that you know in your heart are missing from your storytelling palette.

The best answers of all come from understanding the questions.

**These questions are always at hand.**

And yet, rare is the writer that inventories them prior to launch.

I’m not selling pre-draft story planning over organic story development via drafting. At least that isn’t my primary point today.

What I am suggesting is that, however you discover your story, an awareness of the various levels of context that surround you – indeed, that define all that will unfold as you work – is perhaps the most empowering aspect of the storytelling craft.

Like a pilot planning a trip, a surgeon cutting into a patient, a chef gathering ingredients for a feast, or a mother shopping at Costco, success depends on your grasp of context.

Always has, always will.

Because context is always part of the story. In life, and on the page.
Appendix C: Professional Development for Principals

Presentations at HIDOE State and District Conferences

School Leadership: After being recognized as a distinguished principal (2007), I was asked to share my thoughts about the importance of leadership, and how to initiate new school-based programs.

- Leadership Symposium, 2013
- Thinking Maps, La Kaku’i, 2012
- Chaminade University, Leadership for Educational Administrators, 2011
- Thinking Maps Leadership, 2011
- Professional Development & Educational Research Institute, 2010
- Moanalua High School, 2010
- International Center for Leadership in Education, Summer Symposium, 2009
- Leadership Kakela Ka’ike, 2009
- New Principals Academy, 2009

Data Teams: After attending a Doug Reeves training “Leadership and Learning” (2010), the school leadership decided to implement school-wide data teams. As a result, the leadership was asked to share the school’s implementation.

- Central District Principals, 2011
- International Center for Leadership in Education, Model Schools, 2010

Professional Learning Communities: After opening the Mililani ‘Ike Elementary (2003) with Professional Learning Communities, the leadership was asked to share at multiple Professional Development venues.

- Administrator Certificate for Excellence, 2007
- Roosevelt Complex Schools, 2006
- Professional Development & Educational Research Institute, 2006, 2005

Administrator Certificate for Excellence Program: During four summer trainings for school administrators, I was asked to work with a team of principals to provide trainings on various topics.

- School Safety/Opening School, 2011
- Learning Leader, 2010
- Professional Learning Communities, 2008
- Student Supervision, 2006
Standards-Based Reporting: After being selected as one of ten pilot schools for SBR, the school leadership was asked to share best practices with many other school leaders.

- Central District Principals, 2003, 2004, 2005
- HIDOE Educational Leadership Conference, 2005
- Leeward District Principals, 2005
- North Area Learning Team, 2004
Appendix D: Consultancy Project Interview Questions

Data Coach Interview Protocol

Purpose:
To provide the consult group with more information about the work data coaches have been doing in the data team process and formative assessment with schools.

- Identifying strengths and weaknesses in approaches/strategies being used to implement the data team process and formative assessment in schools
- Identifying communication strategies data coaches are using with schools
- Identifying training and collaboration needs among data coaches

Interview Questions (questions are based on formative and data team processes)
1. Who supervises your daily work?

2. Describe the process and/or pattern of communication between your assigned school and your project administrator

3. What are the strengths of the approaches and strategies you have been implementing in your assigned schools?

4. What are some of the issues of implementing the data team process?

5. In your experience what are some of the issues (i.e. challenges) of supporting schools in implementing formative instruction and assessment practices?

6. Over the course of the year, what types of professional development did you receive?

7. What types of opportunities do you have to collaborate with other data coaches for implementing the data team process?

8. Name of school
   - Is the school using the data team process? (y/n)
   
   - Was the data team process previously established? (y/n)
• What has your role as a data coach been within this school?

• Is the data team process used school-wide or within a pilot group?

• If a pilot group, what are the plans for school-wide implementation?

• Is the school leadership knowledgeable in the data team process (y/n)

• Has your experience with this school met your expectation as a data coach? Why/Why not?
Appendix E: Consultancy Project Executive Summary

Executive Summary

In the Fall of 2011, the Hawai‘i Department of Education (HIDOE) submitted a proposal to the University of Hawai‘i’s Education Doctorate Program Coordinator in Fall 2011.

We began our work with the HIDOE Office of Curriculum Instruction and Student Support (OCISS) in December 2011. The proposal requested our consultancy group’s assistance in determining the impact of their Race to the Top projects as well as providing possible suggestions for statewide capacity building with the projects initiatives, including evaluating professional development needs within specific contexts.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provided $4.35 billion for the Race to the Top fund, which includes $4 billion for statewide reform grants. According to the Program’s Executive Summary, the intent of the Race to the Top grant is to reward states that have demonstrated success in raising student achievement and have the best plans to accelerate their reforms in the future (U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

The U.S. Department of Education (U.S.DOE) created three phases of Race to the Top grants. Hawai‘i applied for a Race to the Top grant during the second phase of the competition and was one of twelve applicants awarded a four-year $75 million grant in August 2010.

The Hawai‘i’s Race to the Top plan created twenty-seven projects in the following five assurance areas: a) reform support and building capacity, b) standards and assessments, c) data systems, d) great teachers and leaders, e) zones of school innovation. Two projects, titled Assessment Literacy and Functional Data Analysis and Instructional
Teams, were created to improve instruction in classrooms throughout the state. The goals of the Assessment Literacy and Functional Data Analysis projects are:

1) to increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems that provide teachers, principals and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness; and

2) to support complex areas and schools that are using instructional improvement in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement (Race to the Top Progress Update, 2012, p.1).

We began our work with the project administrator to reach agreements on our scope while considering both meeting the needs of our client, as well as assuring our deliverables were within a realistic range of impact and influence. We determined that our overall goal for our consultancy project was to support the work of the project administrator and data coaches in developing their formative instruction and the data team implementation plan for the HIDOE.

In order to assist both our group and the project administrator in finding ways to assist them with their work, we agreed on guiding questions to assure we could provide the support they needed in moving forward beyond our consultancy. These included:

- Is there a common understanding about the data team process amongst all stakeholders?
- What are the most effective techniques or strategies for implementing data teams at the school level?
• What are the next practices of data teams?
• What are the essential components needed for implementation of formative assessment practices within the data team process at the school level?

We began our work gathering general information about the Race to the Top projects, organizational structures, and expectations for the upcoming year. The project administrator provided our consultancy group with specific contextual information about the Race to the Top grant, the role and nature of the work assigned to the data coaches, and the challenges they were facing at the time.

Our work with the data coaches included our attendance at three data coach meetings, gathering background information via a questionnaire, facilitating a reflective activity at the conclusion of their first year of work, and conducting interviews with selected data coaches. These opportunities provided us the ability to triangulate information from our research and the project administrator.

Within 14 months of being awarded the grant, the U.S.DOE informed the State of Hawai‘i that their Race to the Top grant was placed on high-risk status because of their unsatisfactory performance (Whalen, 2011, p. 3). Ann Whalen, Director of the Policy and Program Implementation Unit of the U.S.DOE, cited results from an on-site program review in June 2011, monthly reports, and a revised scope of work as their reasons for concern about the State of Hawai‘i’s ability to make adequate progress in implementing its approved plans within the grant period.

In July 2012, the Hawai‘i State Board of Education (BOE) unanimously approved an updated BOE/DOE Strategic Plan. The new plan mandated all schools implement data teams, formative instructional practices, and the K-12 construct (K. Matayoshi, personal...
communication, July 19, 2012). The superintendent’s 2012-13 directives immediately changed the scope and focus of the data coaches work accelerating their timeline for statewide implementation.

Due to this directive the project administrator, in collaboration with the data coaches, reorganized their support to complexes and schools statewide. This included narrowing data coach assignments from three coaches to two per school and/or complex. One data coach serves as the lead and the other in a support role. In situations that may require additional support or expertise, all sixteen data coaches could assist a complex or school.

Our commendations include the program administrators and data coaches successful implementation of the first stage of data teams and formative instruction and assessment. They have a strong understanding of the project goal of implementing formative assessment and the data team process. The data coaches have been provided extensive data coach opportunities. The data coaches feel supported by the project administrator.

The implementation of the data team process through formative instruction and assessment requires time and extensive development and support. Understanding the complexity of the project while in this implementation process involves learning by doing and observing. David Snowden and Mary Boone (2007), who advise that when facing complexity probe first, then sense, then respond. Probing is the doing. Sensing is the observing. And responding is the adaptation (Patton, 2011). The ultimate purpose of this Race to the Top project is to provide schools the tools and support needed to build on raising standards in the classroom, which ultimately supports change in the classroom.
We recommend for the HIDOE to take some time to articulate the fundamental goals of the department, including indicators that districts and schools can use to monitor their progress. These goals need to be specific and not visionary. They need to be sure to have the essential elements needed for districts and schools to understand the impacts these goals can have on student improvement in the classroom (Dufour & Marzano, 2011). The HIDOE’s ability to create a culture and environment of “defined autonomy” is needed to establish a common framework of strategies to achieve these articulated goals (Marzano & Walters, 2009). With this focus, the HIDOE at all levels can look at initiatives as they relate to the goals, faculty and staff can view these initiatives and see coherence and purpose. This will ultimately assist the DOE in keeping a sustained focus on limited number of goals that are centered around student achievement (Dufour & Marzano, 2011).

Within the HIDOE the system-wide communication and expectation for this work must be clear and manageable. The communication needs to be given to the teachers, who are at the ground level, doing this work. Their voices should be included in the planning process in order to assure that the scope of the initiative is aligned with the realities of what our schools face daily. Whether it be funding, manpower, student population, etc., realistic expectations need to be made at the state level in order to assure success at the school and classroom level. Patton (2011) reminds us that when “we look at complex systems and their relationships we must keep in mind the interconnections between individual actions, organizational dynamics, and interactions of the cultural and social context” (p. 115). The HIDOE’s ability to probe and sense what is going on and then responding with adaptations, based on complex and school’s needs is essential. These adaptions must be ongoing as there are further interactions and interconnections.
As DuFour & Marzano explain the criticalness of communication, we recommend the HIDOE to consider these in messaging to their faculty about this Race to the Top project.

- Keep the message simple and consistent.
- Demonstrate congruency between the actions of district level leadership and professed priorities.
- Ensure the Hawai`i BOE is aligned and supported of the district goals and priorities.
- Demand that all leadership, no matter the level, speak with one voice.

These recommendations will help to keep the leadership solid in the view of faculty, which is key element to the success of the implementation of the data team process through formative instruction and assessment (DuFour & Marzano, 2011).

Through the creation of an environment that requires reciprocal accountability, the HIDOE can shift the culture of the leadership as teachers are seeing the behavior of the data team process through formative instruction and assessment modeled by their principals and superintendents. The focus of meetings for these leadership groups should be on developing their own PLC. This then shifts meetings into creating a collaborative effort to identify and resolve implementation challenges of the data team process. As principals and superintendents are having these conversations they are able to build their capacity based on what other schools are doing to improve student learning (Dufour & Marzano, 2011).

In building upon the professional development data coaches received in their first year, their focus should now shift to how they could expand their knowledge to schools. How can schools and the instructional leadership, including others outside of principalship, build their understanding of the data team process and formative instruction and
assessment? How can we assure all of this knowledge is impacting teaching and learning within the classroom?

There is also a need for horizontal articulation to align all schools to the ultimate purpose of improving instructional practice in the classroom. The project administrator and data coaches should assist in facilitating these conversations to build state-wide consistency in the area of evidence collection. This too raises additional questions that may help in formulating some next steps for the project administrator and data coaches. What evidence is being collected at the school level to demonstrate this work? How can the Formative Instruction/Data Team Readiness matrix be used to identify needs and next steps for the data coaches?

Upon completing this study, it is evident that the project administrator and the data coaches have successfully completed the first stage of the project. The project administrator and the data coaches have worked conscientiously to develop a thorough understanding of formative assessment and the data team process based on extensive professional development and overt systems of support. The collection of data also indicated that the second stage of the project would require a more extensive research of school-based instructional leadership and sources of evidence to measure formative instructional practices at the classroom level.

And therefore our consultancy would like to extend our gratitude for the project administrator’s and data coaches’ hospitality, flexibility, and most importantly the time to professionally dialogue and reflect over the past twelve months. We have been honored to collaborate with such committed educators who have worked well beyond the scope of this project to advance instructional practices and thus improve student achievement.
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Appendix F: Journal Entry: April 14, 2013

April 14, 2013
Alysse didn’t score well, (0, 4), but played well. She was upset after the match, but I’ll build her up tonight during our talk. She hit well, but reacted too slow.

As for DE, I got my new book, Essentials of Utilization-Focused Evaluation by Patton. I think that I will like the book and it will profoundly affect me like Patton’s DE book. As for my limited time tonight, I will start thinking about my update for Sanjeev that has to be turned in this week, and now I have another presentation that I need to prepare for the HIDOE data coaches...during a week that I’ll be focused on Alysse’s tennis (all day) on Tuesday and Saturday. Maybe as I continue this week’s journaling, I have to start talking about my plans, versus my past reflections. My journals have been sounding like a response or compliance, as opposed to a search for new knowledge or discussion about a path of learning...something to think about because it is apparent after my one-day thought of moving my journaling to the mornings for better thoughts (beginning of this month), I know that I can do much more with my writing.

As for a fleeting DE thought, I was thinking earlier today about my methodology, and I'm wondering if methodology is becoming a “hybrid”... something about equaling DE to a type of case study, action research, and interviews (oral history.) I liked the 30 minutes I heard from Warren Nishimoto, Director of Oral History from yesterday’s Saturday EdD session. I don’t have time to read another book, but I have to learn more about the three. But for some reason, my intuition is asking me to focus only on action research and interviews...maybe because if I am including complexity, then I have to add other factors beyond the subject. Is DE about asking subjects to share their stories. I sort of remember one of the types of DE supports subjects who have marginalized...or, giving a voice to those who were not given one...time for a little research.

1. Rapid feedback for on-going development. Staff needs rapid feedback about how program participants react to the program; staff reflections and learning will be used to make changes.
2. Evaluator participates in program design change discussions to document rationales and identify expected results of those changes, gathering follow-up data to find out what actually happens.
3. Explore new possibilities for cross-scale innovation based on evaluation of a program’s success and lessons learned.
4. Support ongoing development of an effective collaborative response to a complex problem like HIV/AIDS, which involves complex health, family, economic, political,
social, community, and religious interactions; provide feedback to the collaboration about the effects on intervention initiatives and emergent opportunities.
5. Support the community’s efforts at community development not only by providing timely and credible feedback in initiative undertaken and helping them to extract lessons from their experiences, but also by building the community’s capacity to engage in evaluation and think evaluatively.
6. Direct resources where they are most needed; identify gaps; identify and direct support to self-organizing efforts; identify and communicate emergent that relief agencies can respond to quickly before they reach new crisis proportions; stem misinformation to reduce uncertainty and contribute to stability.
7. Track and share innovation about adaptation across the network for learning and ongoing development
8. Feedback about observed systems dynamics and emergent interactions that can support development of the system change process, both deepening understanding of the system and helping those involved respond to what happens at the system level.
9. Advocacy initiative to influence public policy and/or legislation
10. Political campaign messaging.

OMG… After looking over the ten utilization-focused developmental evaluation design examples from Michael Patton, I’ve realized that he has been describing systems, NOT PEOPLE… Now, am I going to be innovative to focus on people (because I’m too panicked to think about adjusting my research, or am I really opening myself to studying something a little different. I’ll share more thoughts tomorrow.
Appendix G: Journal Entry: April 18, 2013

April 18, 2013
Tonight was a second night of supporting Alysse by talking with her for over an hour. I know that she appreciated our talk where I basically supported her growth and validated what she felt that she needed to work on. I think most significant was Alysse telling me that her lose will probably improve her future skills better than winning. She now knows that she has very specific skills that she needs to improve...versus thinking that she’s good enough.

As for my presentation, I think that I have a good message for the HIDOE data coaches tomorrow. Most importantly, I have changed my research question. I took out the fancy verbs like “discover” that would be found in a Grounded Theory research, and only focus on: How can a developmental evaluation be linked to teacher performance?

I also like my research methodology as:
- At this time, I am thinking that I will utilize a qualitative grounded theory founded on narrative research.
- I will incorporate data coaches’ stories to discover how developmental evaluation tracks the complexity of teacher performance.
- I believe incorporating narrative research is important to pinpoint complexity that exists among (not separate of) data coaches.
Appendix H: Developmental Evaluation January 2013 Presentation

Conducting a Development Evaluation among the HIDOE Data Coaches

Steve Nakasato
January 11, 2013

Objectives
- Talk about developmental evaluation
- Share what my research will look like for the following months

Project Scope Spring/Fall 2012
- Clarify the role of the OCIS data coaches in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process in schools as a face to the Top deliverable.
- Define a common understanding of the components of data teams for all stakeholders.
- Define a common understanding of formative instruction/assessment in the data team process for all stakeholders.
- Identify the deliverables of data coaches in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process.
- Identify strengths and develop a plan for internal capacity building within the OCIS data coach team.
- Identify evidence of impact in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process via data coaches.

Commendations
- Successful first stage implementation of data teams and formative instruction and assessment
- Strong understanding of the project goal of implementing formative assessment and the data team process by the data coaches
- Extensive professional development opportunities for data coaches
- Data coaches feel supported by their project administrator

Recommendations
- Improve system-wide communication
- Develop instructional leadership at the school level
- Transfer formative instruction and data team process knowledge to the complex and school level from the data coach
- Implement Stage 2 of data teams and formative instruction and assessment
  - What evidence is being collected at the school level to demonstrate the impact of your work?
  - How are you using the Formative Instruction/Data Team Readiness rubric to identify needs and next steps for the data coaches?

Fixing 21st Century Problems with 21st Century Solutions

113
Literature Review
- Data Team Process
- Formative Instruction and Assessment
- Instructional Leadership
- Professional Learning Communities
- Adult Learning
- Complexity Theory
- Developmental Evaluation

Developmental Evaluation
- Simple, Complicated, and Complex
- It’s not Xs and Os
- It’s not Summative or even Formative... it’s Developmental...

Developmental Evaluation
Developmental evaluation tracks and attempts to make sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold. (Patton, 2011)

Reflective Practice
Reflective Practice is a developmental evaluation method...formal facilitated sessions with those involved in and affected by an initiative to capture their experiences and perspectives; formal data gathering; regular debriefing sessions to capture important patterns that emerge and facilitate creative synergies that allow for new ideas and possibilities to emerge. (Patton 2011)

Developmental Evaluator’s Job
Identify and document initial conditions and monitor what emerges; provide ongoing, timely, and rapid feedback about what is emerging; track incremental actions and decisions that affect the paths taken (and not taken); facilitate regular reflective practice about what is developing, and embed evaluative thinking in the innovative process. (Westley, Zimmerman, Patton, 2006)

Purposes of Development Evaluation
- Ongoing development
- Adapting effective principals to local context
- Developing a rapid response
- Preformative development of a potentially broad-impact, scalable innovation
- Major system change and cross-scale developmental evaluation.
Ten Developmental Evaluations

1. Facilitate regular reflective practice about what is developing.
2. Enhance participant engagement and historical participation in lessons learned. This can provide valuable information about how changes are unfolding and how best to support them.
3. Facilitate regular reflective practice about what is developing.
4. Support ongoing development of effective coaching practice to enhance the effectiveness of the coaching process. This can provide valuable information about how changes are unfolding and how best to support them.
5. Enhance participant engagement and historical participation in lessons learned. This can provide valuable information about how changes are unfolding and how best to support them.
6. Facilitate regular reflective practice about what is developing.
7. Track and share innovation about adaptation across the network for learning and ongoing development.
8. Enhance participant engagement and historical participation in lessons learned. This can provide valuable information about how changes are unfolding and how best to support them.
9. Enhance participant engagement and historical participation in lessons learned. This can provide valuable information about how changes are unfolding and how best to support them.
10. Enhance participant engagement and historical participation in lessons learned. This can provide valuable information about how changes are unfolding and how best to support them.

Project Scope Spring/Fall 2013

- Facilitate regular reflective practice about what is developing.
- Track innovations from HIDOE data coaches that emerge.
- Identify strengths and develop a plan for internal capacity building within the OCIS data coach team.
- Identify evidence of impact in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process via data coaches.

Developmental Evaluation Partners

Those supporting and facilitating the diffusion and dissemination process and members of the diffusion and dissemination network.

Key Development Evaluation Questions

- How are local adopters of the innovation adapting it to fit local circumstances?
- What are the consequences of those adaptations, both intended (achieving desired results) and unintended?
- What is being learned about adapting and further developing the innovation?
- How is the innovation and its impacts changing as it goes to scale?

Timeline for Feedback

Periodic feedback depending on the speed and scope of diffusion and the intensity of the network interactions; the network members and participants should establish feedback timelines. Stay open to unscheduled, emergent feedback as significant findings come in from the evaluation.

Developmental Evaluation Engagement, Design and Methods

Cross-site and cross-scale syntheses of local-level evaluations of adoption and adaptation experiences; social network analysis tracking interactions around the going-to-scale and diffusion processes.
Appendix I: Developmental Evaluation March 2013 Presentation

Conducting a Development Evaluation among the HIDOE Data Coaches: The Research Question

Thoughts from the past, tips for the present & plans for the future

Steve Nakasato
March 8, 2013

Today’s Objectives
Thoughts from the past, tips for the present & plans for the future

- Continue talking about developmental evaluation
- Begin addressing the project’s research question by thinking like a developmental evaluator
- Initiate the collection of data

What happened to the plan?

- What did you hear?
- What have you heard from your schools?
- Was this preventable?
- Why was it not foreseen?

Thoughts from the past, tips for the present & plans for the future

- What did you hear?
- What have you heard from your schools?
- Was this preventable?
- Why was it not foreseen?
Simple, Complicated and Complex

**Simple**: Knowledge and experience tell you what to do...like baking a cake or "best practices"

**Complicated**: Situations are less predictable and producing desired outcomes become less certain:
- Technical Complicated: high uncertainty...like sending a rocket to the moon
- Socially Complicated: high social conflict...like gun laws

**Complex**: High uncertainty and high social conflict "high uncertainty about how to produce a desired result fuels disagreement, and disagreement intensify and expand the parameters of uncertainty...like being a good parent. DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATION HANDLES COMPLEXITY"

---

Thinking like a Developmental Evaluator

Stand and repeat in your head 10 times, "there is no standard practice for every community."

Write it on your arm with your finger, "Simple solutions don’t work for complex problems."

---

Learning

- Individuals learn during the daily process of working and living. This learning is most frequently incidental (Marsick and Watkins, 1990)

---

Learning

- The relationship between practical knowledge and practice is pragmatic. Pragmatism is about discovering what works for each of us; it is not about generalizations
- Theory applied to practice is old practice.
- Practitioners produce their own personal theory as a result of reflecting on their own work situations and learning from their experiences.
**Practice**

- Always subject to change — it is dynamic. Moreover, the theory is individual and subjective, since it is the individual practitioner who has innovated in a uniquely changing practice situation and learned from experiences. Jarvis 1999

**Practice**

Practice is always changing. Individual practitioners are learning and researching how to respond in their changing situations.

- Practice is transitory
- Knowledge about practice cannot be measured.
- Practice is personal and subjective phenomenon to the practitioner.
- Precise events can never be repeated, so each practice situation is unique.
Thinking like a Developmental Evaluator: Seeing beyond the paradigms...

Navigating Conditions of Complexity: Standard practice
Learning: Learning Outcomes
Practice: Practice makes perfect (permanent)

Simple, Complicated and Complex: Real practice
Developmental Evaluation: Developmental Evaluation

Developmental Evaluation

Developmental evaluation tracks and attempts to make sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold. (Patton, 2011)

Types of Developmental Evaluations

1. Rapid feedback: The development process needs feedback on how program participants react to the program, what is working, and what isn’t, so they can be adjusted.
2. Facilitating change: Developmental evaluation helps participants understand complex systems and identify expected results of these changes, rather than waiting to see what actually happens.
3. Capture new paradigms for classroom instruction based on evaluation of a program’s success and lessons learned.
4. Support ongoing development of an effective collaboration response to a complex problem like HIV/AIDS, which involves complex health, family, economic, political, social, community, and religious intersections, provide feedback to the collaboration about the effects on intervention initiatives and emergent opportunities.
5. Support the community’s efforts at community development not only by providing timely and credible feedback in response to stakeholders, but also by building the community’s capacity to engage in evaluation and think evaluatively.
6. Direct resources where they are most needed. Identify gaps, identify and direct support to self-expanding efforts, identify and communicate emerging that urgent agenda can respond to quickly before they reach new crisis proportions, refine and recalibrate to reduce uncertainty and contribute to stability.
7. Track and share innovation about adaptation across the network for learning and ongoing development

Purposes of Development: Evaluation

- Ongoing development
-Adapting effective principals to local context
- Developing a rapid response
- Preformative development of a potentially broad-impact, scalable innovation

Developmental Evaluator’s Job

- Identify and document initial conditions and monitor what emerges
- Provide ongoing, timely, and rapid feedback about what is emerging
- Track incremental actions and decisions that affect the paths taken (and not taken)
- Facilitate regular reflective practice about what is developing and embedded evaluative thinking in the innovative process. (Westley, Zimmerman, Patton, 2006)

Reflective Practice

- Formal facilitated sessions with those involved in and affected by an initiative to capture their experiences and perspectives
- Formal data gathering, documenting, analysis of patterns, and feedback to project administrators
- Regular reflective practice to capture important patterns that are emerging and, interacting together, to facilitate creative synergies that allow for new ideas and possibilities to emerge. (Patton 2011)
Thinking like a Developmental Evaluator

Stand and repeat in your head 10 times: “there is no standard practice for every complexity.”

Tell a friend in two different tones “Learning is continuous and never summative”.

Without talking, make eye contact with a colleague, and switch chairs. Then tell your new elbow partner “practise cannot make perfect.”

Write it on your arm with your finger, “simple solutions don’t work for complex problems”.

Find 2-3 partners and talk about “developmental evaluation tracks and attempts to make sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold.”

Thinking like a Developmental Evaluator: Seeing beyond the paradigms...

Navigating Conditions of Complexity: Standard practice

Learning: Learning Outcomes

Practice: “Practice makes perfect (permanent)”

Simplistic, Complex: Best practices

Developmental Evaluation: Developmental Evaluation

Today’s Objectives
Thoughts from the past, tips for the present & plans for the future

• Continue talking about developmental evaluation

• Begin addressing the project’s research question by thinking like a developmental evaluator

• Initiate the collection of data

Research Question:
What innovations can emerge from conditions of complexity among the HIDOE Data Coaches?

Research Question: Sub-Questions

• How are data coaches adapting innovation among state, complex, and school contexts?

• What are the consequences of those adaptations, both intended (achieving desired results) and unintended?

• What is being learned about adapting and further developing the innovation?

• How does the innovation and its impacts change among state, complex, and school contexts?

Project Scope Spring/Fall 2013

• Facilitate regular reflective practice about what is developing.

• Track innovations from HIDOE data coaches that emerge.

• Identify strengths and develop a plan for internal capacity building within the OGIS data coach team.

• Identify evidence of impact in the implementation of formative instruction/assessment through the data team process via data coaches.
Appendix J: Developmental Evaluation April 2013 Presentation

Conducting a Developmental Evaluation among HIDOE Data Coaches

How can a developmental evaluation be linked to teacher performance?

Today’s Objectives

- Responding to the leading question from 3-8-13
- Continuing to talk about developmental evaluation
- Discussing the Research Question and Methodology

What happened to the plan?

- What did you hear?
- What have you heard from your schools?
- Was this preventable?
- Why was it not foreseen?

Research Question:

- 3-8-13: What innovations can emerge from conditions of complexity among the HIDOE Data Coaches?
- 4-19-13: How can a developmental evaluation be linked to teacher performance?

Qualitative Research

In Natural Settings
- Data collected in the field and sensitive to people and places being studied
- Does not involve sending out instruments, such as surveys
- Gathers up-close information by talking directly to people or observing how they act in a chosen context

Involves Sense-Making / Interpretation
- Examines the meanings people bring to social or human problems
- Brings forth the voices of the participants
- Focuses on multiple perspectives, themes should reflect multiple perspectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlights the Voices of the Participants</td>
<td>Holistic Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Researcher’s job is to bring forth the voices of the participants</td>
<td>• Develops a complex picture of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Often involves giving voice to those who have been silenced</td>
<td>• Uses words not numbers to depict complexity and multiple views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involves narratives or words, not numbers in order to represent their world views</td>
<td>• Paradoxes may develop the most rich data, and metaphors are also useful...how do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants use metaphor to describe their world?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of my research</th>
<th>Purpose of my research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I am studying the thoughts and discussion of HIDDE resource teachers who support the</td>
<td>• The purpose for my study will be to document a developmental evaluation process that can thrive among tri-level complexity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of school initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of my research</th>
<th>Research Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• My research will track and attempt to make sense of what emerges under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfold. (Patton, 2011)</td>
<td>• I will utilize a qualitative narrative research founded on grounded theory. I will incorporate data coaches’ stories to discover how developmental evaluation tracks the complexity of teacher performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I believe incorporating narrative research is important to pinpoint complexity that exists among (not separate of) data coaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K: Process for Preparing Data Findings

8 Step Process to Prepare Data Findings

Step 1: Prepare the Data
Step 2: Define the Unit of the Analysis
Step 3: Develop Categories and Coding Scheme
Step 4: Test Coding Scheme on a Sample of Text
Step 5: Code All the Text
Step 6: Assess Coding Consistency
Step 7: Draw Conclusions from Coded Data

Step 1: Prepare the Data: Qualitative content analysis can be used to analyze various types of data, but generally the data need to be transformed into written text before analysis can start. If the data come from existing texts, the choice of the content must be justified by what you want to know (Patton, 2002).

Step 2: Define the Unit of Analysis: The unit of analysis refers to the basic unit of text to be classified during content analysis. Messages had to be unitized before they can be coded, and differences in the unit definition could affect coding decisions as well as the comparability of outcomes with other similar studies. Thus, assigning a code to a text chunk of any size, as long as that chunk represents a single theme or issue of relevance to my research questions.

Step 3: Develop Categories and a Coding Scheme: Categories and a coding scheme were derived from a developmental evaluation theory based on inquiry. I generated an initial list of coding categories from the theory, and I modified the theory within the course
of the analysis as new categories emerge inductively (Miles & Huberman, 1994). However I did not adopt coding schemes from previous studies had the advantage of supporting the accumulation and comparison of research findings across multiple studies.

In quantitative content analysis, categories need to be mutually exclusive because confounded variables would violate the assumptions of some statistical procedures (Weber, 1990). However, in reality, assigning a particular text to a single category can be very difficult. Qualitative content analysis allows you to assign a unit of text to more than one category simultaneously, and most of my entries were assigned to multiple codes.

Step 4: Test Coding Scheme on a Sample of Text: I didn’t plan to test code, but the qualitative content analysis naturally led to testing and revising because the codes evolved. I did not conduct an assessment of inter-coder agreement, but I did check my codes by asking an EdD candidate to validate a sample of my codes.

Step 5: Code All the Text: During the coding process, I had to complete as many of the codes in a set time because I anticipated that my interpretation of the codes would change over time. In reality, my original set of codes was revised multiple times as I identified entries, however it seemed that I didn’t need to revise as much for journals. I don’t think that I spent more time coding, but I simple could anticipate a broader span of codes prior coding.

Step 6: Assess Your Coding Consistency: After coding the entire data set, I rechecked the consistency of my coding. In reality, I coded all of my interviews and my journals over my Fall Break in October where I sat for almost twelve hours for five days. I know that I made mistakes due to fatigue but I really felt that each code was warranted.
Step 7: Draw Conclusions from the Coded Data: Once I completed my codes, I initially drafted concepts and ideas for my analysis. I avoided noting generalizations, but actual themes. I did have to make inferences based on tracking and attempting to make sense of what emerged under conditions of complexity, documenting and interpreting the dynamics, interactions, and interdependencies that occur as innovations unfolded. (Patton 2011) p. 7 Admittedly, I was most fearful of this step prior to coding, but I felt that I was very success in identifying and recognizing themes.

Step 8: Report Your Methods and Findings: For the study to be replicable, you needed to monitor and report your analytical procedures and processes as completely and truthfully as possible (Patton, 2002).
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