

LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

The Effect of Utilizing Danielson Framework for Teaching on Teachers'
Perceptions of Effective Teaching

By

Usama Shehab

A Thesis Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master
of Arts in Education

School of Arts and Sciences

May 2019

THESIS APPROVAL FORM

Student Name: Usama Shehab I.D. #: 200402630

Thesis Title: The effect of ^{utilizing} Danielson Framework ^{for teaching} on teachers' perceptions of effective teaching

Program: Master of Arts

Department: Education

School: Arts and Sciences

The undersigned certify that they have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis and approved it in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of:

Master of Arts in the major of Education

Thesis Advisor's Name: Dr. Mona Nabhani

Signature:  Date: 15 / 05 / 2019
Day Month Year

Committee Member's Name: Dr. Rima Bahous

Signature:  Date: 15 / 05 / 2019
Day Month Year

Committee Member's Name: Dr. Mona C. Majdalani

Signature:  Date: 15 / 05 / 2019
Day Month Year



THESIS COPYRIGHT RELEASE FORM

LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY NON-EXCLUSIVE DISTRIBUTION LICENSE

By signing and submitting this license, you (the author(s) or copyright owner) grants the Lebanese American University (LAU) the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate (as defined below), and/or distribute your submission (including the abstract) worldwide in print and electronic formats and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video. You agree that LAU may, without changing the content, translate the submission to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation. You also agree that LAU may keep more than one copy of this submission for purposes of security, backup and preservation. You represent that the submission is your original work, and that you have the right to grant the rights contained in this license. You also represent that your submission does not, to the best of your knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright. If the submission contains material for which you do not hold copyright, you represent that you have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner to grant LAU the rights required by this license, and that such third-party owned material is clearly identified and acknowledged within the text or content of the submission. IF THE SUBMISSION IS BASED UPON WORK THAT HAS BEEN SPONSORED OR SUPPORTED BY AN AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION OTHER THAN LAU, YOU REPRESENT THAT YOU HAVE FULFILLED ANY RIGHT OF REVIEW OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS REQUIRED BY SUCH CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT. LAU will clearly identify your name(s) as the author(s) or owner(s) of the submission, and will not make any alteration, other than as allowed by this license, to your submission.

Name: Usama Mohamad Shehab

Date: 15 / 05 / 2019
Day Month Year



PLAGIARISM POLICY COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

I certify that:

1. I have read and understood LAU's Plagiarism Policy.
2. I understand that failure to comply with this Policy can lead to academic and disciplinary actions against me.
3. This work is substantially my own, and to the extent that any part of this work is not my own I have indicated that by acknowledging its sources.

Name: Usama Mohamad Shehab

Signature

Date: 15 / 05 / 2019

Day Month Year

Dedication Page

To my beloved wife and children

Acknowledgement

This project would not have been possible without the support of many people. Many thanks to my advisor, Dr. Mona Nabhani, for her inspiration, positive reinforcement, guidance, and assistance. Also thanks to my committee members, Dr. Rima Bahous, and Dr. Mona Majdalani, for their insightful provisions.

And finally, thanks to my wife, parents, and numerous friends who endured this long process with me, always offering support and love.

The Effect of Utilizing Danielson Framework for Teaching on Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Teaching

Usama Shehab

ABSTRACT

Inconsistent definitions of effective teachers and teaching among teachers and diverse classroom observation tools that supervisors of instructions use can have a negative impact on the instructional supervision process. The goal of this study was to address such issues by examining teachers' perceptions of effective teaching behaviors and qualities before and after implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching at a school in Beirut. The purpose was to create common understanding of the concepts of effective teachers and teaching among school stakeholders. The study addressed two research questions: (a) What are the perceptions of teachers regarding the qualities and behaviors of effective teachers before implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching? (b) How did these perceptions differ after implementing Danielson's framework? A mixed-methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies in a triangulation design was followed using a survey and a focus group interview respectively. A purposive sample of forty-one teachers (N=41) completed the survey, and seven teachers (N=7) participated in a focus group interview. Quantitative data results showed that the familiarity with Danielson's framework generated more agreement among the participants on the elements of effective teaching as compared to the data before implementation. Qualitative data results revealed a shared understanding of the importance of having good classroom

management and planning for instruction as elements of good teaching. Other themes emerged such as engaging students in the learning process and having professional responsibilities, but the participants showed less shared agreement on the importance of these. However, after implementing the framework, the qualitative and quantitative findings were more aligned: the theme, “engaging students in the learning process”, gained significance, and agreement increased among teachers on the importance of the four domains of Danielson’s framework for effective teaching. The findings of this study were compatible with the literature to a great extent. This study is the first to examine the effect of implementing Danielson’s framework on teachers’ perceptions of effective teaching in Lebanon. Further research to replicate and expand the findings of this study is recommended. Implications for practice include recommendations for school principals to develop a shared understanding of the qualities of effective teachers through implementing Danielson’s framework for professional development.

Keywords: Effective teachers and teaching, Teachers’ perceptions, Danielson Framework for Teaching.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One	1
Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.4 Questions	3
1.5 Significance of the study	4
1.6 Operational Definitions of Terms.....	4
1.7 Organization of the study	5
Chapter Two	7
Literature Review	7
2.1 The Danielson Framework for Teaching.....	7
2.2 Theoretical Framework	9
2.3 Teacher Effectiveness.....	9
2.4 Teachers’ Perceptions of Teacher Evaluations.....	11
2.5 The Importance of a Clear Common Framework for Evaluation	14
2.6 Summary	15
Chapter Three	16
Methodology	16
3.1 Research design	16
3.2 Research Site and Sample Selection.....	17
3.3 Instruments	18
3.4 Procedure.....	21
3.5 Validity and Reliability	23
3.6 Data Analysis	24
3.7 Ethics	26
Chapter Four	28
Results	28
4.1 Quantitative Results	28
4.1.1 Demographic information.....	28
4.1.2 Addressing the Research Questions.....	29
4.2 Qualitative Results	33

4.2.1 Addressing the Research Questions.....	34
4.2.1.1 Qualitative Results before Implementing the Framework.....	35
4.2.1.2 Qualitative Results after Implementing the Framework.....	41
4.3 Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Results.....	48
Chapter Five	51
5.1 Discussions.....	51
5.2 Implications for Practice	54
5.3 Limitations.....	55
5.4 Recommendations for Practice.....	55
5.5 Recommendations for Future Research	56
5.6 Conclusion.....	57
References	58
Appendices	61
Appendix A.....	61
Appendix B.....	67
Appendix C.....	68
Appendix D	69
Appendix E	71
Appendix F	73
Appendix G	74

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Overview of the used Instruments and their objectives</i>	21
Table 2. <i>Descriptive Statistics of the Participants</i>	28
Table 3. <i>Descriptive Statistics of the Survey before Implementing the Framework</i> ...	69
Table 4. <i>Descriptive Statistics of the Four Domains before Implementing the Framework</i>	30
Table 5. <i>Descriptive Statistics of the Survey after Implementing the Framework</i>	71
Table 6. <i>Descriptive Statistics of the Four Domains after Implementing the Framework</i>	31
Table 7. <i>Paired Tests Statistics</i>	32
Table 8. <i>Characteristics of an effective teacher</i>	35
Table 9. <i>Setting goals</i>	37
Table 10. <i>Designing coherent instructions</i>	38
Table 11. <i>Cultivating respect and rapport</i>	39
Table 12. <i>Engaging students in learning</i>	40
Table 13. <i>Characteristics of an effective teacher</i>	41
Table 14. <i>Setting goals</i>	43
Table 15. <i>Designing coherent instruction</i>	44
Table 16. <i>Cultivating respect and rapport</i>	45
Table 17. <i>Engaging students</i>	46

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Can subject coordinators, department heads, and principals as instructional leaders identify effective teachers when they observe them? This is a current challenge facing those responsible for conducting teacher evaluations, especially when applying checklists that are not well designed to evaluate teachers' effectiveness. A lack of well-designed performance evaluations could be a barrier in creating opportunities for conversations between teachers and administrators about effective practices, and it could be a barrier on how these teachers learn new information about their performance, develop new skills, or change their behavior in a lasting manner during the evaluation process (Taylor & Tyler, 2012).

In most schools, subject coordinators or school principals evaluate teachers by using multiple data sources in determining performance levels. These sources may include formal and informal classroom observation tools based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and students' and parents' surveys ("Race to the Top Executive Summary", 2012, p. 19).

However, traditional systems of teacher evaluation are often ineffective because they rely on evaluative criteria that are outmoded, usually in the form of checklists, and they fail to differentiate between the experience and expertise of novice and veteran teachers (Danielson, 2010). According to Danielson (2010), the administrators and teachers participating in a two-year pilot program in Chicago Public Schools indicated that a consistent definition of good teaching, opportunities

to engage in meaningful conversations about teaching, and a focus on what really matters in good teaching are absent in traditional systems.

Moreover, judges from a variety of backgrounds ranging from school administrators to adults with no formal connection to education, and no matter how experienced, had low ability to identify successful teachers when using either intuitive judgment or an observational instrument not supported by research evidence (Strong, Gargani, & Hacifazlioglu, 2011). According to Strong et al. (2011), judgment of teacher effectiveness with its four distinct categories, student engagement, teaching strategies, teacher characteristics, and subject matter knowledge, may be biased because a shared common understanding of what is considered effective teaching is limited and is based on false assumptions that current observational tools may not control for these biases in an adequate manner.

Therefore, schools need well-designed evaluation systems that are clear, provide useful feedback, and address the quality of classroom instruction to evaluate teacher effectiveness and promote a shared understanding of what is considered effective teaching.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

As a principal of a Lebanese school located in Beirut, I am aware of the absence of a clearly defined and shared understanding of the characteristics of effective teaching among teachers, which may be due to a lack of a comprehensive evaluation system in this school where some departments use checklists and others subjective evaluations. This is causing inconsistencies among those responsible for conducting teacher evaluations to decide on professional development and improvement practices. Hence, there is a need for well-designed and well-implemented aligned evaluation systems since these have the potential to generate

teaching effectiveness by helping teachers and school leaders develop a common understanding of effective teaching and of the expectations for their performance (Coggsall, Rasmussen, Colton, Milton, and Jacques, 2012)

1.3 Purpose of the Study

Very little research has been conducted to examine whether reforms in teacher evaluations, like the Danielson Framework for Teaching, have influenced teachers' perceptions or beliefs about effective teaching (Moss, 2015). So, the purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions of effective teaching behaviors and qualities before and after implementing Danielson's framework as a new comprehensive standards-based evaluation system for the ultimate purpose of promoting a shared understanding of effective teaching.

These behaviors and qualities are exhibited in the daily work of teachers and include the ability of teachers to plan and implement instruction, provide a positive learning environment, and show professionalism (Stronge, 2002).

1.4 Questions

The following research questions were addressed in the study:

- 1) What are the perceptions of teachers regarding the qualities and behaviors of effective teachers before implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching?
- 2) How did these perceptions differ after implementing Danielson's framework?

1.5 Significance of the study

The significance of this study is that it promotes a common understanding of what is considered effective teaching among teachers, coordinators, and the principal. The results of this study can help instructional leaders make informed decisions concerning effective instructional practices, guide teachers to improve their skills, and devote limited professional development resources to components with the greatest potential for improving teaching effectiveness. Limited research exists on teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of Danielson's framework, and more research is needed to know how this evaluation program might affect teacher effort, classroom practices, and effectiveness (Taylor & Tyler, 2012). Hence, my study could add to this needed research especially that no such research has been conducted in Lebanon.

1.6 Operational Definitions of Terms

There are some terms that are important to this study. As such, they are operationally defined.

Danielson's Framework for Teaching: A framework for supervising and evaluating teachers (Danielson, 2013).

Danielson's four domains: The professional practice and responsibilities divisions in Danielson's Framework for Teaching: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibility. These domains are further divided into components and elements of instruction (Danielson, 2013).

Effective teachers: Teachers that bring a combination of personal abilities, content and professional knowledge, and pedagogical skills to students' learning experiences (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997).

Good teaching: “Is not only the teaching that occurs in the classroom but also the behind-the-scenes work of planning and other professional work, such as communicating with families and participating in a professional community. For each component of good teaching, the framework includes four levels of performance -- unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished -- that describe the degrees of teacher expertise in that component” (Danielson, 2011).

Perception: “A mental image based on observations of actual behavior data or upon preconceived data gathered from prior knowledge or experience” (Merriam-Webster Online, n.d.).

Teacher evaluation system: A system designed for continuous improvement of instruction from frequent evaluations of teachers that meaningfully differentiates performance through multiple measures such as observations, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys. The system must provide clear, timely, and useful feedback that identifies needs, guides professional development, and informs personnel decisions (Race to the Top Executive Summary, 2012, p. 19).

1.7 Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five main chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the research study, provides a background of the problem, the statement of the problem, and the purpose and significance of the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature related to Danielson Framework for Teaching, teacher effectiveness, and teachers’ perceptions of teacher evaluation. Chapter 3 addresses the methodology used in the study focusing on the design, population, and instrumentation. Chapter 4 focuses on the quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures and analysis of

the data. Finally, Chapter 5 provides a discussion, conclusion, limitations, and recommendations for additional research studies.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

This chapter presents a review of the literature on the effect of utilizing the Danielson Framework for Teaching on teachers' perceptions of effective teaching. The literature includes an overview of Danielson's framework, a review of what constitutes effective teaching, the impact of perceptions on teachers' effectiveness, teachers' perceptions of teacher evaluations, and the importance of having a clear and shared understanding of a structured framework. It also includes the theoretical framework in which my study findings will be grounded later on.

2.1 The Danielson Framework for Teaching

The Danielson Framework for Teaching is a standards-based comprehensive model which has standards that clearly describe excellent teaching, promote a shared conception of effective teaching, and differentiate levels of effectiveness. Moreover, Danielson's framework describes teaching excellence in all of its aspects and complexity and provides high but achievable goals for teacher practice (Coggshall et al., 2012).

The framework encompasses four domains, Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities (Danielson, 2013). Within each of these four domains, Danielson describes a series of components that further articulate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to demonstrate competence in the classroom.

Danielson's framework is a seminal work on supervision and evaluation. Marzano, Frontier, and Livingston (2011), in their book *Effective Supervision*, gave

an overview of the history of evaluations including Charlotte Danielson's work in 1996 *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* which was updated later in 2007. The standards of this framework act as a reference for any new evaluation regarding supervision and evaluation due to their level of specificity (Marzano et al., 2011).

This framework has three main objectives. First, it seeks to honor the complexity of teaching. Second, it provides a common language for stakeholders to talk about instruction with a shared understanding of effective practice. Third, it provides a structure for reflection and self-assessment on professional practice (Danielson, 1996). According to her, a structured and comprehensive framework is useful in identifying the sources of difficulty and the aspects of teaching that need attention, and therefore it guides in improvement efforts. With such a framework, participants can conduct conversations about where to focus these efforts within the context of shared understandings (Danielson, 1996). Danielson also stressed that the model is grounded in research and that it is flexible enough to be used across all levels and disciplines.

These objectives are aligned to a certain extent with what Milanowski and Kimball (2003) found about standards-based teacher evaluation systems. They showed that these evaluation systems promoted a common conception of good teaching and acted as a performance competency measure useful to identify how to improve instruction, affect teacher selection and retention, and guide teachers to enhance their skills. Odden (2004) confirmed the reliability and validity of the standards-based evaluation instruments that were developed by Danielson and others.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The research-based set of elements of the Danielson Framework for Teaching is rooted in a constructivist view of teaching and learning as developed by Dewey, Piaget, and Vygotsky (Danielson, 2007). Constructivism emphasizes the active role of learners in building their own understanding through their experiences and interactions (Slavin, 2014). This constructivist view is apparent in Danielson's framework. For example: Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) of Danielson's framework is reflected in Dewey's emphasis on the importance of teacher planning and teacher organization; Domain 3 (Instruction), which focuses on reflective questioning techniques, is based on Dewey's concept of reflective activity (Olson, 2015).

Constructivism also forms the basis of this study which examines the effect of utilizing Danielson's framework on teachers' perceptions of effective teaching. The methodological approach used in this study is constructivist in the way teachers create a new shared understanding of effective teaching by building on previous knowledge and experiences, reflecting on their practice, and conducting professional conversations about effective teaching.

2.3 Teacher Effectiveness

The research on defining teacher effectiveness is extensive. Although there are some common elements that are shared among several studies such as promoting a positive orderly learning environment and engaging students in the acquisition of knowledge and skills, the definition is not conclusive in the examined research. Some

identified factors (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2006); others focused on skills (Jahangiri & Mucciolo, 2008); whereas Danielson (2007) set skills.

According to Creemers and Kyriakides (2006), eight teacher effectiveness factors describe the teacher's instructional role and are found to be directly related to student outcomes. These factors include orienting students toward the task goals and objectives, presenting the materials to students in a structured manner, involving students in classroom discussions where teachers ask probing questions with varying levels of difficulties, teaching students how to use problem solving strategies by modelling these thinking strategies and problem solving steps, and providing application opportunities which emphasize immediate exercise of topics taught during the lesson. Other factors are assessment, management of time, maximizing task engagement time for optimal achievement, and contribution in creating and maintaining an orderly learning environment.

Moreover, Jahangiri and Mucciolo (2008), studied effective teachers' personal characteristics and found that they promote a positive learning environment, demonstrate classroom management and organizational skills, and contribute to students' acquisition of knowledge and skills by using techniques associated with learning.

However, the qualities of effective teaching are evident in the performance standards of Danielson where she differentiates between effective teachers and highly effective teachers. Danielson (2007) described effective (proficient) teachers as individuals that clearly understand and implement the concepts underlying the 22 components, thoroughly know their content, know their students and the curriculum. They have a wide range of strategies and activities, and a notable understanding of

classroom dynamics, have mastered teaching while working to enhance their practice, and serve as resources to other teachers as they participate in professional conversations.

2.4 Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher Evaluations

Understanding teachers' perceptions and experiences of teacher evaluation systems has potential to improve teacher classroom practices when the evaluation system is supported by the teachers (Mielke & Frontier, 2012). Studies about teachers' perceptions of teacher evaluations showed contradictory results. Some studies indicated that teachers believe that evaluations do not have any effect on teaching practices and are used to identify ineffective teachers. Other studies showed that teachers see that evaluations improve teaching practices and raise the standards of teaching and learning.

There may be a negative climate surrounding evaluation with a prevailing teachers' perceptions that the real purpose of evaluation is for supervisors to find fault (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). However, even when the climate is positive, judgments are based on specific evidence, and the teacher's role is passive and does not expect to learn from the evaluation process. The researchers also indicated that many believe that because of the lack of feedback from school leaders, evaluations do nothing to help teachers improve their teaching practices.

On a similar note, Teacher Evaluation 2.0 (2010), which is a project that critiques current evaluation systems, structures, and practices, found that most teachers believe that evaluations rate all teachers about the same, and that the primary purpose of evaluation is to remove a small number of incompetent teachers. The report on this project also indicated that many evaluation tools are seen by teachers as

subjective, and most tools do not differentiate between effective and ineffective instruction, making evaluation meaningless to many teachers. However, in a study to examine teachers' perceptions concerning their school's evaluation practices two years after implementing Danielson's framework, Moss (2015) gathered data, through semi-structured interviews with fifteen teachers from one New Jersey high school, and showed that teachers responded very positively to the components of the framework; and they felt that the standards were understandable and credible, reflected good teaching, defined all expectations, and helped improve professional conversations about practice with their supervisors. The teachers saw the framework as a means to not only identify what changes were necessary, but also to give them a guide to change and improve their practice.

Similar findings by Ladd (2016), who examined teachers' perceptions of the evaluation system in six districts in New Jersey after implementing Danielson's framework, showed that most teachers perceived that it enhances performance, provides teachers with meaningful feedback, and is essential to raising the standards of teaching and learning.

Likewise, in a qualitative study in one Rocky Mountain school district, Donahue and Vogel (2018) examined teachers' perceptions of the impact of an evaluation system on daily classroom instructional practices. The findings of this study showed that evaluation systems could positively affect these practices. However, specific aspects of the evaluation system such as evaluator training, continuous feedback, modeling, the evaluation rubric, personal integrity, and self-reflections were critical to this positive change in the daily teacher practices.

Olson (2015) and Sweeley (2004) also addressed teacher perceptions on Danielson's (2013) framework. Sweeley (2004) developed a Likert-style survey

instrument, the Framework for Teaching Survey (Appendix A), for a quantitative study on teacher's attitudes towards Danielson's (1996) four domains in a Pennsylvania school district utilizing Danielson's (1996) framework. Olson (2015) studied "award-winning" teachers' perceptions on the importance of the elements in Danielson's framework. These teachers were "state teachers of the year from throughout the United States from the past 6 years" (Olson, 2015). Using the same instrument (Framework for Teaching Survey), he quantitatively examined the extent teachers agreed that each of the domains and elements of the framework impacted teacher effectiveness.

Both studies concluded that teachers agreed that the components in Danielson's framework were effective in teaching, but that not each component had the same level of importance. For instance, teachers in the two studies rated the components of Domain 3, Instruction, as more important than Domain 2, Classroom Environment, followed by Domain 1, Planning and Preparation, and Domain 4, Professional Responsibilities, but the results differed on which of the 76 elements within the four domains most impacted teacher effectiveness. Moreover, the results of both studies revealed that teachers that were familiar with Danielson's framework generated more positive attitudes and greater agreement toward this evaluation system compared to those who did not have previous knowledge about it (Olson, 2015; Sweeley, 2004).

According to both researchers, Danielson's framework can be used to accurately evaluate teachers and develop teachers' effectiveness by placing emphasis on those significant elements. In doing so, teachers may have the opportunity to focus on what truly matters to improve their effectiveness of teaching (Olson, 2015; Sweeley, 2004).

To further understand teacher's perceptions of how the Danielson's framework affects teaching, White (2017) conducted a mixed-methods study in a small school located in Chicago, where 81 teachers completed a questionnaire and 7 teachers conducted a focus group interview. The qualitative lens of her research focused on understanding the qualities of an effective teaching as perceived by teachers evaluated by Danielson's' framework and rated as highly effective. The results of her study showed that teachers perceived the excellent teacher as the one who plans thoroughly, differentiates instruction, and builds relationships with students that foster their engagement in learning.

2.5 The Importance of a Clear Common Framework for Evaluation

A structured framework with a clear description of effective teaching behaviors and practices that are shared by teachers can serve several purposes. According to Danielson (2007), such a framework helps teachers learn from one another by offering them a "means of communicating about excellence" especially because teaching is a complex profession and requires a language of practice like many other professions. Moreover, a clear description of levels of performance in the framework enables teachers to conduct self-assessment and reflection on practice which enhances their performance (Danielson, 2007). Used in this way, this framework can focus "teachers' collaborative efforts to identify and implement specific research-based instructional strategies and behaviors" (Mielke & Frontier, 2012).

2.6 Summary

The above chapter presented a review of the literature on teacher evaluation systems, such as the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Most studies on teacher effectiveness share a common purpose, namely, specifying processes or instructional practices that may lead to student learning and other positive classroom and student outcomes, though there is no consensus on one definition. Hence, a common understanding of teacher effectiveness can be brought about by utilizing an evaluation system like the Danielson Framework for Teaching.

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1 Research design

The overall purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions of effective teaching behaviors and qualities before and after implementing Danielson's framework as a new comprehensive standards-based evaluation system. Moreover, this study was designed to address the following research questions: (a) What are the perceptions of teachers regarding the qualities and behaviors of effective teachers before implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching? (b) How did these perceptions differ after implementing Danielson's framework?

To address these research questions, I used a mixed-methods approach combining both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2011), mixed-methods research involves the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study which provides a more complete understanding of research problems than does the use of either approach alone. Creswell (2003) also explained that using quantitative data alongside qualitative data provide researchers with a structured format that also allows for inquiry.

The present mixed-methods study is a triangulation design which means that based on both quantitative and qualitative data are collected at the same time (Fraenkel et al., 2011). Fraenkel et al. explain that in the triangulation design, the researcher uses both methods to study the same phenomenon to determine if the two converge upon a single understanding of the research problem being investigated.

For my study, the qualitative methodology was used to address the two research questions. According to Creswell (2003), qualitative research typically deals with a small purposely-chosen group of participants who can provide a “rich description” of the phenomenon. In this study, the phenomenon was inconsistencies in understanding of the characteristics of effective teaching. Semi-structured interview questions provided responses by the participants in a focus group session. These were analyzed thematically to explore the patterns across the four domains of Danielson’s framework (Domain 1: Planning and Preparation, Domain 2: Classroom Environment, Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities).

Moreover, the quantitative methodology was also used where participants responded to a questionnaire that was developed and adapted from Danielson’s four domain areas of effective teaching. This process was performed before implementing Danielson’s framework in training teachers and another time after implementing the framework to compare the effect of having this framework on teachers’ perceptions of effective teaching practices.

3.2 Research Site and Sample Selection

The site of the study was a bilingual high school located in Beirut that serves around 1000 students and has a dedicated professional staff of 80 full-time teachers and 40 part-time teachers. The school provides a rigorous academic program to its students who constantly show outstanding academic achievements in the Lebanese official examinations. The teachers’ evaluation system used for this school varied from one department to another with the majority of departments using evaluation checklists and others using subjective evaluations.

For the qualitative part, a purposive sample consisting of seven full-time teachers with at least five years of teaching experience in the selected high school (from the following departments: Math, English, French, and Science) were interviewed using semi-structured interviews within a focus group. According to Fraenkel et al. (2011), qualitative researchers typically use purposive sampling, “wherein researchers intentionally select participants who are informed about or have experience with the central concept(s) being investigated and can provide a considerable amount of detailed, in-depth information that large-size samples would not”. Hence, interviewing teachers from several different content areas with a minimum of five years of teaching experience, would provide me with varied insights because they had been evaluated by different supervisors and/or different evaluation systems.

As for the quantitative part, researchers typically want to choose individuals who are representative of a larger population so that results can be generalized to that population (Fraenkel et al., 2011). Generally, random sampling strategies are preferred, but often this is not possible, especially in educational settings. Thus “convenience, systematic, or purposive samples” must be used, with “replication suggested and encouraged” (Fraenkel et al., 2011, p. 562). Sample sizes are usually much larger than in qualitative studies. Thus, a convenience sample of 41 full-time teachers, who teach their subjects in English or have a good command of the English language, in the selected school, responded to a questionnaire of 74 items eight of which are demographic.

3.3 Instruments

Three instruments were used in this study.

- 1) Charlotte Danielson: The Framework for Teaching (2013 Edition) (see Appendix C).

This framework is made up of four domains that focus on all areas of teaching (Domain 1: Planning and Preparation, Domain 2: Classroom Environment, Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities). Each domain has several components and elements that can be used by the observer to collect evidence about a specific practice.

- 2) Framework for Teaching Survey (see Appendix A)

This survey instrument was used in a study by Sweeley (2004), who had written and developed it from Danielson's (1996) framework with her dissertation advisor, to examine teacher's attitudes towards Danielson's framework. This instrument was also used in other studies such as Olson (2015) to examine teachers' perspectives on effective teaching elements in Danielson's framework. The results of this instrument were statistically analyzed by Sweeley (2004) and Olson (2015) and were found to be valid and reliable. I have used Sweeley's survey, without any modifications, after having her permission (see Appendix F).

Sweeley's survey used a Likert scale that included five choices: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and do not understand. It had sixty-six questions and eight background questions concerning years of teaching experience, years in current position, teaching assignment, grade level taught, gender, subject(s) taught, level of education, and familiarity with Danielson's model.

I used this survey to determine quantitatively the extent of shared understanding of effective teaching among teachers and to gain a better insight into what teachers consider important in terms of effective teaching and learning.

3) Focus Group Interview Questions (see Appendix B)

This instrument has five semi-structured interview questions that were used to investigate the perceptions of teachers regarding the behaviors and practices of effective teachers before and after implementing Danielson's framework. The focus group interview was conducted with a purposeful sample of seven teachers from the high school. A focus group interview, is an interview with a group of people who have in depth knowledge of a topic and share their views during this group discussion (Merriam and Tisdell, 2015).

These interview questions were developed by White (2017), and I used them after gaining her permission (see Appendix G). In her interview protocol, the researcher used a semi-structured interview with a purposeful sample of seven teachers from the various sectors in a school district located in the southern suburbs of Chicago, Illinois. The interview focused on five critical questions relevant to understanding teacher effectiveness. These five questions were aligned with Danielson's framework domains.

The only modification I made to this instrument was in using the term "effective teacher" instead of "excellent teacher" in the first question. I think that such modification would not affect the quality and type of gathered information, but is more aligned with the concept of effectiveness examined in my study.

Table 1 provides an overview of the instruments that were used to answer the two research questions and the objective of each instrument.

Table 1. *Overview of the used Instruments and their objectives*

Research questions	Instruments	Objectives
What are the perceptions of teachers regarding the qualities and behaviors of effective teachers before implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching?	Survey (Q1, Q2)	To determine quantitatively the extent of shared understanding of teachers' effectiveness among teachers and to gain a better understanding of what teachers consider important in terms of effective teaching.
Q2) How did these perceptions differ after implementing the framework?	Interview questions (Q1, Q2)	To examine change in teachers' perceptions of effective teaching and possible shared concepts, and the possible effects of implementing Danielson's framework on these perceptions.

3.4 Procedure

The steps used in this study are the following:

1) During the second trimester of the school year 2018/2019, and before implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching, 41 full-time teachers, in the selected school, completed a survey (see appendix A) to identify their understanding of effective teaching.

The teachers were given the survey at a regular faculty meeting, and the purpose statement and directions of the survey were read aloud in order to maintain consistency and control for bias or researcher influence. All the teachers completed the survey with 100% return rate.

2) After that, I conducted a one-hour focus group interview with seven full-time teachers each having at least five years of teaching experience in the selected high school (from the following departments: Math, English, French, and Science) to understand the perceptions of these teachers concerning effective teaching.

3) During the second trimester of the same school year, I implemented the framework developed by Danielson (2013) and used a variety of approaches to training teachers and observers (coordinators), including whole group activities, video training, and workshops about the framework.

In this process, I followed the steps recommended by Danielson (2010) in training the teachers and coordinators in the high school. These steps can be summarized as follows:

- Teachers and coordinators “familiarize themselves with the structure of Danielson’s framework”.
- Teachers and coordinators “learn how to recognize the sources of evidence” for each component and element.

- Coordinators “learn how to interpret the evidence against the rubrics” for each component's levels of performance.
 - Coordinators “learn how to calibrate their judgments” against those of their colleague.
- 4) By the end of the second trimester, I conducted the same survey and interviews with the same sample of teachers that were selected before implementing the framework. The purpose of this process was to collect quantitative and qualitative data that enabled me to study the effect of this framework on the perceptions of teachers.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

To ensure the validity of the research, the used instruments must measure what they are supposed to measure. As for the reliability, the instruments must show consistency of measurements. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2015), “validity and reliability are concerns that can be approached through careful attention to a study’s conceptualization and the way in which the data are collected, analyzed, and interpreted, and the way in which the findings are presented.” (p. 210). To elaborate, validity and reliability can be achieved by obtaining data from several sources or methods, spending adequate time collecting data, checking the validity of data interpretations with the respondents, showing detailed procedures, presenting accurate results, and discussing the finding critically without bias (Merriam& Tisdell, 2015).

The interview questions (see Appendix B) are adaptations of the instrument used by White (2017) who used the principle of triangulation (Mixed-methods approach) to ensure validity of the interview questions. Add to this, after the

interview was transcribed, I gave all the participants an opportunity to review the transcripts and verify whether the interview was accurately transcribed. This member-check is used by researchers to ensure validity in the data (Creswell, 2003). As for The Framework for Teaching Survey (see Appendix A), Sweeley (2004) ensured validity and reliability of her survey by directly taking and modifying the survey questions from the elements within Danielson's component areas, as she explained in her study.

This mixed methods design relied on multiple sources of evidence (semi-structured interviews and survey questions), with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion. I also used the principle of triangulation as a powerful way to demonstrate validity. Moreover, according to Baxter and Jack (2008), the use of more than one source of data collection enhances the credibility of the study. In this study I used three.

3.6 Data Analysis

The qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed separately then integrated to see how they both converge to a single understanding of the effect of the framework on the perceptions of teachers concerning effective teaching practices and behaviors. According to Fraenkel et al. (2011), in a triangulation design, quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously and are given equal priority, but the data may be analyzed together or separately.

Qualitatively, I used focus group interviews to answer both research questions. A focus group is a method of collecting data in a qualitative research; it is an interview with a group of people who have in depth knowledge of a topic (Merriam and Tisdell, 2015). In their book, they also referred to Hennink (2014) who

explains the importance of using a focus group: “Perhaps the most unique characteristic of focus group research is the interactive discussion through which data are generated, which leads to a different type of data not accessible through individual interviews. During the group discussion, participants share their views, hear the views of others, and perhaps refine their own views in light of what they have heard” (pp. 2–3). Hence, I found this method appropriate for collecting data from the interactions of teachers.

After collecting data, I used inductive analysis of data, meaning that key themes were emerging from teachers’ specific responses to answer both research questions. According to Creswell (2003), inductive analysis is employed to identify common themes through a repetitive process of thoroughly examining the data and fitting together particular aspects. My analysis of data began by compiling and organizing the interview data in tables to discover meaningful patterns and develop themes from the interview responses.

For the survey questions, I used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to descriptively analyze numerical data and to represent the significance of relationships between variables related to both research questions. Numerical codes were assigned to serve as identifiers when filtering data. Measures of central tendency, such as the mean, were examined for each one of the 66 items of the questionnaire before and after implementing the framework. However, only the means of the four domains (as four sets of items) and the entire framework (as one set of items) were compared with each other and analyzed. Paired-Samples t-tests were conducted to see whether there were significant differences between the means of the entire framework (as one set) before and after implementation.

Findings from both sources of data (quantitative and qualitative) were then integrated to reveal areas of convergence and areas in which the data showed discrepant findings before and after implementing Danielson's framework. Specifically, I compared the themes that emerged inductively from teachers' interview responses with the quantitative ratings assigned by teachers on the importance of the elements of the framework. Teachers' responses also served to explain what factors might have influenced the ratings as illustrated in the discussion chapter.

3.7 Ethics

This research attended to the main ethical aspects of education and was submitted for approval by the Lebanese American University, Institutional Review Board (IRB) before being conducted.

As a school principal, I didn't need any permission to gain access to the school and collect data for my research, but I informed the General Director of the Institution, and she granted me a written consent. Moreover, I took the permission of all the teachers who accepted to participate in the research study after informing them about the educational purpose of the study. The teachers also were guaranteed that the results would neither affect their careers nor have any risks on them because these results would remain anonymous and confidential and only I could have access to the records. After the transcription of the interviews, each teacher received a copy to read for accuracy.

Moreover, I sought the permission to use and adapt all the utilized instruments in my research study from the developers of these instruments.

This chapter presented the methodology of the study, participants and sampling methods, instrumentation, the validity and reliability of the study, and ethical considerations. The next chapter presents the quantitative and qualitative findings of this study.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study was to explore teachers' perceptions of effective teaching behaviors and qualities before and after implementing Danielson's framework as a new comprehensive standards-based evaluation system.

A mixed-methods approach combining both quantitative and qualitative methodologies in a triangulation design was followed using a survey and a focus group interview respectively. Each one conducted before and after implementing Danielson's framework. This section presents the results from each method separately followed by a summary of the findings.

4.1 Quantitative Results

4.1.1 Demographic information

The data for the participants are presented in table 2.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics of the Participants*

Characteristic	N (41)	%
Gender		
Male	1	2.44
Female	40	97.56
Highest level of Education		
Diploma	9	21.95
Bachelor's Degree	17	41.46
Master's Degree	8	19.51
Doctoral degree	0	0
Other/not specified	7	17.07
Current Status as an Educator		0
Teacher	41	100
Administrator	0	0
Other position in education	0	0

Teaching Assignment		
Preschool	11	26.83
Elementary	15	36.59
Intermediate	8	19.51
High School	7	17.07
Familiar with Danielson framework (Before implementation)		
Yes	0	0
No	41	100
Familiar with Danielson framework (After implementation)		
Yes	41	100
No	0	0

Forty participants were females (97.6%) and only one male (2.4%). This extreme difference in gender is due to the fact that the study was conducted with full time tenured teachers only and it excluded the part-timers. In this school, almost all full-time teachers teach at the preschool, elementary and intermediate levels and are found to be females. On the other hand, most of the male teachers are in the secondary level but are also part-timers. Table 2 shows that 17.07% of participants are high school teachers whereas the remaining 82.93 % are preschool, elementary and intermediate teachers. As to the highest level of education, table 2 shows that the majority of these participants have a Bachelor degree (41.5%).

4.1.2 Results Addressing the Research Questions

The research questions were answered quantitatively through the analysis of data using SPSS. The domain areas and the questions were coded as such: Q indicated the question number, and D indicated the domain number. Moreover, the codes used for the teachers' level of agreement are: 4-Strongly Agree, 3-Agree, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree, and 0-Don't Understand.

To answer the first research question, descriptive statistics were calculated to find the mean for each of the 66 questions asked in this survey as shown in table 3 (see Appendix D) and table 4.

Table 4. *Descriptive Statistics of the Four Domains before Implementing the Framework*

Descriptive Statistics	
	Mean
Planning and Preparation	3.2659
Classroom Environment	3.3268
Instruction	3.4211
Professional Responsibilities	3.2043
Total average	3.3045

As shown in table 3, the results ranged between $M = 2.24$ and $M = 3.80$ and referring to table 4, the mean of all the questions is $M=3.30$. This indicates that on average the teachers agreed on the importance of all the elements of the framework. These elements are related to planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. As summarized in Table 4, teachers agreed that Domain 3 (Instruction) is the most important domain for effective teaching with the highest mean importance rating $M= 3.42$, followed by Domain 2 (Classroom Environment), Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation), and lastly, Domain 4 (Professional responsibilities). Moreover, out of the 66 questions teachers strongly agreed that question 37 (Teacher’s spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to student’s age and interests) is the most important element for effective teaching with an average of $M= 3.80$ as shown in table 3.

To answer the second question, descriptive statistics were calculated again to find the mean for each of the 66 questions asked in this survey after implanting

Danielson’s framework at the selected school. The results are shown in tables 5 (see Appendix E) and 6.

Table 6. *Descriptive Statistics of the Four Domains after Implementing the Framework*

Descriptive Statistics	
	Mean
Planning and Preparation	3.6049
Classroom Environment	3.6065
Instruction	3.6325
Professional Responsibilities	3.4543
Total Average	3.5745

As shown in table 5, these results ranged between $M = 2.85$ and $M = 3.85$ and referring to table 6, the mean of all the questions increased to $M=3.57$. This indicates that on average teachers’ agreement on the importance of all the elements of the framework has increased. As summarized in Table 6, teachers also agreed, after implementing the framework, that Domain 3 (Instruction) is the most important domain for effective teaching with the highest mean importance rating $M= 3.63$, followed by Domain 2 (Classroom Environment), Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation), and lastly, Domain 4 (Professional responsibilities). Moreover, out of the 66 questions teachers again strongly agreed that question 37 (Teacher’s spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to student’s age and interests) is the most important element for effective teaching with 0.05 increase in the mean importance rating to become $M= 3.85$. This indicates that their agreement on this element has also increased after implementing the framework.

To see if this increase is statistically significant, a Paired-Samples t-test was performed to compare the means of the entire framework before implementing the framework and after implementing it. The results are presented in table 7 below:

Table 7. Paired Tests Statistics

		Paired Samples Test							
		Paired Differences			95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre - Post	-.27495	.22101	.02720	-.32928	-.22062	-10.107	65	.0000000
6									

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre implementation	3.3001	66	.31275	.03850
	Post implementation	3.5750	66	.19592	.02412

Paired Samples Correlations				
		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pre implement & Post implement	66	.713	.000

These results indicated that the increase in the mean scores of the entire survey after implementing the framework had a statistically significant difference yielding p-values < .05 compared to the mean scores before implementing the framework. This suggested that familiarity with Danielson’s framework generated more agreement on the importance of the elements of the framework for effective teaching, and this increase in agreement is statistically significant. Hence, teachers strongly believed that the elements of the framework are characteristics of effective teaching.

4.2 Qualitative Results

For the qualitative part, the results were based on the focus group interview responses, before and after implementing Danielson's framework, with seven full-time teachers. The two focus group interviews were conducted with the teachers at the school library and took around one hour each. Teachers' responses were digitally recorded after having their approval. Next, I transcribed the audio recordings of these interviews, obtained approval as to their accuracy, and then analyzed them inductively, meaning that key themes were emerging from teachers' specific responses to answer the research questions. According to Creswell (2003), inductive analysis is employed to identify common themes through a repetitive process of thoroughly examining the data and fitting together particular aspects. The interviews addressed teachers' perceptions of effective teaching. Consequently, several common themes emerged from the analysis of the interviews:

The emerged common themes before implementation:

- 1) The importance of the relationship between the teachers and the students, good classroom management, and planning for instruction
- 2) The Lebanese national curriculum.
- 3) Alignment between activities and goals, and the importance of students' prior knowledge and abilities in planning.
- 4) Mutual respect between teachers and students, encouragement, caring, firmness, having clear rules, and not ignoring disrespectful behaviors
- 5) The use of varied types of activities to generate students' enthusiasm and engagement and the utilization of the different teaching strategies.

The emerged common themes after implementation:

- 1) Engaging students in the learning process, planning and preparation, knowing the students well, and being aware of the four domains of Danielson's framework.
- 2) Lebanese national curriculum and using goals that can be assessed.
- 3) The alignment of activities with the objectives and the use of materials and assessment.
- 4) Modeling respectful behavior. In addition, firm and clear expectations, being proud of students' work, teaching moral lessons, and rejecting disrespectful behaviors.
- 5) Interesting and challenging activities about real life problems and experiences.

4.2.1 Addressing the Research Questions

The responses of the participants were analyzed thematically to explore the shared understanding of the characteristics of an effective teacher before and after implementing Danielson's framework. The findings of the thematic analysis are described in this section and are organized by the five questions.

1. What do you believe are the characteristics of an effective teacher?
2. How do you determine the goals you set for your students?
3. How do you design coherent instruction to ensure that your students meet learning goals?
4. What do you do to cultivate respect and rapport with and among your students?
5. What activities do you design to engage students in learning?

According to White (2017), these questions are aligned with the Danielson domains and components of professional practice 1c (Setting Instructional Outcomes), 1e (Designing Coherent Instruction), 2a (Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport), and 3c (Engaging Students in Learning).

The responses of the participants are used to answer both research questions:

- 1) What are the perceptions of teachers regarding the qualities and behaviors of effective teachers before implementing Danielson Framework for Teaching?
- 2) How did these perceptions differ after implementing Danielson’s framework?

Extracts form teachers’ responses are presented in table formats and are anonymized by using fictional acronyms (K, M, MA, J, B, T, and H).

4.2.1.1 Qualitative Results before Implementing the Framework

Question 1: What do you believe are the characteristics of an effective teacher?

Table 8. *Characteristics of an effective teacher*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
K	Have very good management of the classroom
	Have the knowledge and the skills
	Efficient use of material
	Good command of the English language
	Know the capabilities of her students and cater differences
	Use the best method for each student to learn
	Establish a very good relationship with students

	The students should be willing to learn, motivated, happy and interested
	Professional development might help in enhancing our skills
J	Must master different methods in teaching
	Deals with different age groups in different ways
	Requires multi methods of assessment
	Classroom management
H	With experience, you know how to deal better with the difficulties
M	Has to be in a good relationship with her students
	To be well organized
	Know exactly what she is doing according to a plan
T	Well-planned which helps in classroom management
	The relationship between the teachers and the students is very important
	Organization
MA	Planning
	Classroom management
B	Have to be organized
	Experience is very important

As shown in Table 8, more than one participant agreed on the importance of the relationship between the teachers and the students to have good classroom management, and on planning for instruction. On the other hand, other themes emerged during the discussions and are considered important but by different participants. These themes included teaching experience, multiple methods of

assessments, knowledge of content, teaching skills, different teaching methods, dealing with different age groups in different ways, students' motivation and interest, and professional development.

Question 2: How do you determine the goals you set for your students?

Table 9. *Setting goals*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
J	I refer to the standards set by the Lebanese Center for Educational Research and Development (CERD) to prepare students to the official exams
	I refer to the books set by the government
	According to society
T	Mostly, our assessments and teaching methods are restricted by these objectives [standards set by the Lebanese Center for Educational Research and Development (CERD)]
MA	Depending on the curriculum.
	Depending on what students know
H	I relate everything to real life
B	Setting objectives that are related to real life experiments
M	I depend on teachers' guide which has a variety of resources
	adapt objectives to fit the Lebanese society and culture
K	We follow the goals that are set by the curriculum
	I cannot say that I follow CERD

Table 9 showed that most participants discussed setting goals as they relate to the Lebanese national curriculum, teachers' guides, and other curricula that are adapted to best fit students' backgrounds and the Lebanese society and culture.

Question 3: How do you design coherent instruction to ensure that your students meet learning goals?

Table 10. *Designing coherent instructions*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
J	make sure that the activities meet the goals
	take into consideration the different abilities of students, and their background
	what they (students) know and what they have to know
	Plan for ongoing assessment
	take into consideration blooms' taxonomy
M	Setting questions that vary... from the easiest to the hardest
T	we have to think about the different learners and their different abilities ... give them different kinds of activities and different strategies to approach each one of them.
K	we do the different activities or play the different games

The responses of teachers presented in table (10) indicated that several varied themes emerged from these responses about designing coherent instruction. These themes were alignment between activities and goals, and the importance of students' prior knowledge, abilities and background in planning. Additional themes were the

importance of using varied questions, different activities, different teaching strategies and ongoing assessments.

Question 4: What do you do to cultivate respect and rapport with and among your students?

Table 11. *Cultivating respect and rapport*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
H	First respect them [students] in order to gain their respect back
B	You have to be respectful... should always say: please, and excuse me in order for students to learn to use these words with each other and with the teacher
K	Students have to be aware of the rules
	Use praising, encouragement, rewards and punishment (educational and constructive)
	Caring but firm
M	Having good manners, being courteous and following the rules are part of everyday lessons
T	You have to be very firm
	I respect you [student], show me that respect in return
	They [students] have to feel that you care about them
J	Not to ignore disrespectful incidents or they will become part of students' culture in the classroom

Table 11 showed that the presence of mutual respect between teachers and students, encouragement, caring, firmness, having clear rules, and not ignoring disrespectful behaviors were commonly shared themes to cultivate respect and rapport with and among students.

Question 5: What activities do you design to engage students in learning?

Table 12. *Engaging students in learning*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
J	I introduce real-life activities... at high thinking level... challenging activities
B	Activities that students love... interesting activities
M	Audiovisual activities, art stuff
	Group work
	Research
MA	Relate to real life problems... give examples
H	Hands on activities
K	Using technology
T	I depend on presentations ... to make them look for information ... and they explain their own ideas and the students ask them questions... active learning

As shown in table 12, the themes that were agreed on in this question were mainly the use of varied types of activities to generate students' enthusiasm and engagement such as real-life problems, projects, presentations and the utilization of

the different teaching strategies such as classroom discussions, and collaborative group work.

In the following section, I present qualitative interview results after implementing the framework followed by comparing these with interview results before the implementation.

4.2.1.2 Qualitative Results after Implementing the Framework

Question 1: *What do you believe are the characteristics of an effective teacher?*

Table 13. *Characteristics of an effective teacher*

Participants	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
J	Engaging students in the learning process.
	Planning
	Implementation... sometimes I start with examples to reach generalizations... active lecturing using questions
K	Succeeds in engaging the students
	Her classroom management is fine
	Her activities are timely
	Planning is well structured
	Use differentiated instruction and cater differences
	Know the different learning styles
	Getting the useful resources and materials
H	Know the content well
	Demonstrate flexibility towards the students

	Use different teaching strategies such as, lecturing, student-centered approaches, and teacher-centered approaches.... brainstorming
M	Should be aware of the four domains... and apply all the components... which are needed to be an effective teacher
MA	Should know her students and their interests
T	Have and use different skills
	Know their [students'] different abilities
	Able to be creative
	Use effective strategies effectively to engage all students in the learning process.... discussions
B	All [four] domains are essential to be an effective teacher
	Know your students well
	Organized
	Have the lesson plan, and to always be prepared.

Table 13 showed that the most commonly suggested themes were engaging students in the learning process, planning and preparation, and knowing the students well. Other themes were also suggested such as knowing and using different teaching strategies, being organized, knowing the content well, knowing students' interests, and classroom management. Moreover, two participants shared the importance of being aware of the four domains of Danielson's framework to be effective.

Hence, teachers' responses to question one about the characteristics of an effective teacher, revealed that familiarity with Danielson's framework promoted the shared concept of engaging students in the learning process, which became more

significant in their discussions. Additionally, teachers' suggestion that the four domains of the framework are essential for effective teaching emerged as a new theme in this discussion.

Question 2: How do you determine the goals you set for your students?

Table 14. *Setting goals*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
T	Follow our curriculum and the standards of the Lebanese official exam
	Students' social abilities
	These goals can be assessed
J	The curriculum and the CERD official standards
	The learning environment
	Age groups
	The use of STEM approach
H	Lebanese official standards
	Assessment of goals

The responses to this question, as presented in table 14, showed that the most prominent theme about setting goals was related to the Lebanese national curriculum, which was also suggested before implementing the framework, followed by using goals that can be assessed. Other less agreed upon themes were again also discussed, such as taking students' age, abilities, and background into consideration when setting these goals.

Hence, Danielson’s framework had almost no effect on teacher’s perceptions on how to determine the goals they set for their students.

Question 3. How do you design coherent instruction to ensure that your students meet learning goals?

Table 15. *Designing coherent instruction*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
T	Activities should be aligned with the objectives
	The lesson should be structured
	[consider when planning] students abilities
	[consider when planning] time management
B	The activities we might include should be aligned
J	[alignment is also related to] materials used and assessment
K	Move smoothly from one point to the other
	Time is also important
H	Organized [lesson]
M	Clear instructions

Based on the excerpts phrases shown in table 15, the main theme that dominated this discussion was the alignment of activities with the objectives. Other participants added to this alignment the use of materials and assessment. Other themes were also suggested such as time management, organized lessons, clear instructions, students’ abilities, and smooth transition from point to the other. On the

other hand, teachers' responses to this question, before implementing the framework, revealed various responses without showing a shared understanding of how to design coherent instruction.

Hence, familiarity with Danielson's framework developed a common and shared understanding of the ways to design coherent instruction, which centered on the alignment of objectives with the activities and having structured lessons.

Question 4: What do you do to cultivate respect and rapport with and among your students?

Table 16. *Cultivating respect and rapport*

Participant	Quotation
K	Model respectful behavior
	Praise them [students]
	They have to know the rules about what is acceptable and what is not acceptable
	If they misbehave then we can take appropriate procedures
T	Should have firm and clear expectations
H	Showing them [students] how proud she is of what they are doing
J	Focus on the interactions between the students
MA	Do activities in class to show them that respect is important
	Don't accept the behavior of students if they behave in a manner that is not respectful
M	Include moral lessons...as we teach

Participants shared the importance of modeling respectful behavior to cultivate respect and rapport as indicated in table 16. In addition, firm and clear expectations, being proud of students' work, teaching moral lessons, and rejecting disrespectful behaviors were other themes mentioned during the discussion. These themes were also emphasized in teachers' responses before implementing the framework. Hence, familiarity with Danielson's framework did not reveal new concepts or develop the shared understanding of existing ones.

Question 5: What activities do you design to engage students in learning?

Table 17. *Engaging students*

Participant	Excerpt phrases from the focus group interview responses
M	Know what they [students] are interested in
	Using technology
	Challenging [activities]
	Use the three fields: Art, music, and drama in my English classes
H	Relating everything we take to real objects and experiences
	Give higher level objectives
J	They will be lost if the lesson is not structured
	Use activities that students like
B	In science we include... math, technology... lab activities
AM	They will not be engaged if they already know what you are explaining
	If we are not challenging them, they will not be motivated
K	Manipulative(s), hands on activities, and games

	Students will start being distracted if you are not well structured... well prepared
T	Put the objectives on the board
	A variety of activities
	[Students are] engaged in activities that they relate to their daily lives

Comparable to the results presented in table 12, table 17 showed that almost all teachers shared the idea that interesting and challenging activities about real life problems and experiences are critical to engaging students in learning.

However, less shared themes were newly incorporated in the discussion by the various teachers relative to engaging students, such as structured lessons, writing objectives before instruction, well prepared teachers, and good classroom management. These themes were previously mentioned as part of effective teaching characteristics before and after implementing the framework.

Hence, the framework did not change teachers' perceptions on how to engage students in the learning process.

Overall, implementing Danielson's framework had a general positive effect on teachers' perceptions on effective teaching. When describing the characteristics of effective teaching, the familiarity with the framework promoted the shared concept of engaging students in the learning process, and teachers suggested that the four domains of the framework are essential for effective teaching. Moreover, familiarity with Danielson's framework developed a shared understanding of the ways to design coherent instruction, which centered on the alignment of objectives with the activities

and having structured lessons. However, Danielson's framework did not change teacher's perceptions on how to determine the goals they set for their students, how to cultivate respect and rapport with and among students, and how to engage students in learning.

4.3 Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Results

This chapter presented a descriptive statistical analysis of the quantitative data collected from the survey and analysis of the qualitative information obtained from the focus group interviews. These results were obtained before and after implementing Danielson's framework and were used to address the two research questions of the study. Findings of this study, based on the quantitative and qualitative data, showed that the Danielson Framework for Teaching enhanced the shared agreement among teachers on the importance of the framework for effective teaching, specifically engaging students in the learning process.

Before implementing the framework, the findings of the quantitative research, obtained from forty-one participants (N=41), indicated that there was a general agreement on the importance of the elements of the framework for effective teaching. Teachers agreed that Domain 3 (Instruction) is the most important domain for effective teaching with the highest mean importance rating, followed by Domain 2 (Classroom Environment), Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation), and lastly, Domain 4 (Professional responsibilities). On the other hand, the qualitative analysis of the interview questions, conducted with seven experienced teachers (N=7), revealed variable results concerning the emerged themes. For instance, a shared understanding of the qualities and behaviors of effective teachers was generally centered around the

importance of having good classroom management, and planning for instruction. The participants suggested other themes related to these qualities and behaviors, but showed a lesser degree of shared agreement on their importance. These themes were related to instruction, such as engaging students in the learning process, and professional responsibilities. Add to this, participants agreed on following the Lebanese national curriculum when setting goals, showed a shared understanding of the behaviors to cultivate respect and rapport, and the ways students can be engaged in the learning process, However, they did not show a common understanding of how to design coherent instruction.

These findings revealed that the shared themes “good classroom management”, and “planning for instruction” were supported by the quantitative outcomes of the survey, which showed high teacher ratings on domains one (Planning and Preparation) and two (Classroom Environment). Moreover, teachers did not emphasize the importance of professional responsibilities in their discussions, which was also supported quantitatively since Domain four (Professional responsibilities) showed the lowest average score. However, “engaging students in the learning process”, though teachers explicitly and clearly explained how to do it, was not a significantly noticeable shared theme in their responses. This result was not supported quantitatively since domain three (Instruction), which is centered on engaging students in the learning process, showed the highest average score.

After implementing the framework, the quantitative findings showed that teachers’ agreement on the importance of all the elements of the framework had increased without any change in the ratings order. This increase is statistically significant as proved by the results of the Paired-Samples t-test. These results supported to a great extent the qualitative findings about the qualities and behaviors

of effective teachers, which showed a noticeable shared agreement among teachers on engaging students in the learning process, followed by planning and preparation, knowing students well, and good classroom management. Two participants also shared the importance of all four domains of Danielson's framework. Moreover, teachers developed a common understanding of how to design coherent instruction by suggesting and showing agreement on "the alignment of activities with the objectives". As for setting goals, "following the Lebanese national curriculum" remained the most common shared theme among participants. Add to this, teachers' responses revealed almost similar shared understanding of how to cultivate respect and rapport among and with students, and how to engage students in the learning process compared to their responses before implementing the framework.

The next chapter presents interpretations of findings, limitations of the study, recommendations for action, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter Five

5.1 Discussions

This chapter discusses the major findings of this research by comparing them with findings in the reviewed relevant literature. It presents the theoretical and practical implications of the study, assumptions, limitations, recommendations for action, recommendations for further studies and a conclusion.

The purpose of this study was to explore teachers' perceptions of effective teaching behaviors and qualities before and after implementing Danielson's framework as a new comprehensive standards-based evaluation system.

The results are aligned with the literature in many ways. First, the quantitative analysis of the survey showed that the Danielson Framework for Teaching has significantly increased teachers' perceptions on the importance of the elements for effective teaching. These findings were similar to those found by Sweeley (2004) in her study using the same instrument (Appendix A) in a Pennsylvania school district. She showed that teachers agreed that the 22 components within Danielson's four domains were effective in teaching, and found that "Instruction" was rated the highest followed by "Classroom Environment", "Planning and Preparation", and "Professional Responsibilities". Moreover, the results of her study also revealed that familiarity with the Danielson's framework generated more positive attitudes toward this evaluation system. In a similar manner, Olson (2015) used the instrument developed by Sweeley (2004) to determine which of the 4 domains of Danielson's framework are viewed by teachers as having the highest impact on effective teaching. He found that teachers agreed on the importance of the four domains for effective teaching ranked in the same order of domain importance as found by Sweeley (2004).

So, teachers believed that all the domains of Danielson's framework were helpful for effective teaching and this framework could be used in all classrooms regardless of context (Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008).

Second, the qualitative findings of this study revealed that implementing the Danielson's framework resulted in a noticeable focus on the importance of engaging students in the learning process, which is the centerpiece of this framework (Danielson, 2007), and a shared understanding of the ways to design coherent instruction. These are aligned with Coggshall et al.'s (2012) findings that well-designed and well-implemented aligned evaluation systems have the potential to help teachers and school leaders develop a common understanding of effective teaching and delineate the expectations for their performance. These findings are also in harmony with those in another study conducted by Moss (2015) where he showed that Danielson's framework helped improve professional conversations among teachers and served as a guide to change and improve their practice. However, the lack of shared understanding about designing coherent instruction revealed in this study among the teachers of this Lebanese high school, calls for a revision of the currently used lesson plans and a common purposeful design of new lesson plans in this school.

Not surprisingly, the qualitative analysis of the focus group interview responses revealed that teachers in this Lebanese school emphasized, before and after implementing the framework, the importance of following the Lebanese national curriculum when setting goals. This can be seen in many Lebanese private schools which choose to follow the Lebanese national curriculum, though they can choose not to do so (Bahous, Nabhani, & Cochran, 2011). This can be explained by the fact

that Lebanese students in these schools have to sit for national official examinations which limits their choices of selection.

Also, teachers' responses to the interview questions, before and after implementing the framework, revealed a common understanding and shared agreement among them on the importance of having good classroom management and planning based on students' abilities and background. Such results were similar to those indicated by White (2017), who developed the qualitative instrument used in this study. She found that, using the Danielson Framework for Teaching as a tool for measuring teacher effectiveness, teachers perceived the excellent teacher as the one who plans thoroughly for instruction, differentiates learning for students and builds relationships that foster student engagement. This is consistent with the body of research that focuses on the significance of the relationship between teachers and students in quality teaching (Marzano, 2003), and on the importance of effective planning and preparation in making better decisions in the classroom and greater gains in student learning (Marzano, 2012).

The constructivist view was apparent in this study in more than one aspect. First, the emphasis of teachers' responses to the interview questions on students' active engagement, after implementing the framework, is indicative of the constructivist views of Bruner (1986) and Vygotsky (1978) about student engagement in the learning process. Second, the strong agreement on the importance of domain 3 (Instruction) which is based on reflective questioning techniques, before implementing the framework (M= 3.42) and after implementing it (M=3.63), is indicative of Dewey's (1938) concept of reflective practice. Third, teachers' positive attitude toward Domain 1 (planning and preparation), before implementing the framework (M= 3.2) and after implementing it (M= 3.60) reflects Dewey's (1938)

emphasis on the importance of teacher planning and teacher organization. Finally, the development of the shared understanding of the characteristics of effective teaching among teachers, and the conduction of professional conversations about effective teaching throughout the implementation phase, emphasizes the importance of the active role of learners in building their own understanding through their experiences and interactions, which is the basis of constructivism (Slavin, 2014).

5.2 Implications for Practice

Understanding teachers' perceptions concerning teaching effectiveness helps instructional leaders make informed decisions about instructional improvement practices and guide teachers to improve their skills. A well-developed evaluation system has the potential to improve teacher classroom practices when it is supported by the teachers (Mielke & Frontier, 2012). As a result, this study will reinforce that the Danielson Framework for Teaching is an effective tool to measure effective teaching and learning and to promote a common language of effective teaching and learning among teachers.

Furthermore, findings of this study indicated that the Danielson's Framework for Teaching can accurately identify areas that need improvement, so that school principals can make informed decisions related to professional development. For instance, the lack of a shared understanding about designing coherent instruction and the low rating scores of professional responsibilities revealed in this study, call for a professional development plan that focuses on Component 1e (designing coherent instruction) and on Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities).

Moreover, according to Taylor and Tyler (2012), limited research exists on teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the Danielson Framework, and more research is needed to know how this evaluation program might affect teacher effort,

classroom practices, and effectiveness. Hence, my study could add to this needed research especially that no such research is conducted in Lebanon and the region.

5.3 Limitations

The sample size of this study was small and bounded by one Lebanese school. Therefore, the generalizations from this study are limited to the population from which this sample was taken. Forty-one teachers (N=41) completed the survey, and seven teachers (N=7) were interviewed in the focus group. The survey and the interview were both conducted before and after implementing Danielson's framework. The purpose statement and directions of the survey and the interview were read aloud in order to maintain consistency and control for bias or researcher influence. However, the researcher is the current principal of the school, so the respondents may have answered in a way they felt they were expected to. Add to this, the same questions were asked before and after the implementation of the framework, which familiarized the teachers with the questions.

Moreover, the duration of implementation of the framework in this school was less than one year at the time of conducting the study, so teachers and subject coordinators had basic knowledge of this framework and were still learning about it; however, in other studies (Sweeley, 2004; Olson, 2015; Moss, 2015; Doerr, 2012), the research was conducted after at least two years of implementation.

5.4 Recommendations for Practice

This study focused on the problem of how to identify the behaviors and qualities of effective teachers which is causing inconsistencies among those

responsible for conducting teacher evaluations to decide on professional development and improvement practices. This problem is caused by the absence of a common understanding of effective teaching (Strong et al., 2011) which may be due to the lack of a well-developed comprehensive evaluation system.

Based on the research findings of this study, the following recommendations for practice are suggested for school principals:

1. Use this study and other related studies to show teachers that the Danielson's framework is perceived to be an effective tool for teacher evaluations.
2. Focus on the key elements of the Danielson Framework for Teaching when evaluating teachers, thereby improving evaluation accuracy, and planning for teacher professional development programs accordingly to increase teacher effectiveness.
3. Encourage and provide opportunities for communication among and between teachers concerning their common understanding of the indicators of teacher effectiveness based on the key elements of the Danielson Framework for Teaching.

5.5 Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations for future research are presented:

1. Further research should explore students' perceptions of effective teaching as compared to teachers.
2. Future research should explore the effect of implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching on the extent of shared understanding of effective teaching between teachers and evaluators (coordinators).

3. Future research should replicate the study after two years of implementing the Danielson Framework for Teaching and explore the effect of this framework over time rather than the pre/post implementation effect.

5.6 Conclusion

As a conclusion, the quantitative and the qualitative findings of this study were compatible with the literature to a great extent. The results showed that familiarity with Danielson's framework generated more agreement on the importance of the framework for effective teaching among the participants, specifically engaging students in the learning process, when compared to the findings before implementing the framework.

Moreover, according to Taylor and Tyler (2012), limited research exists on teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the Danielson Framework. As a result, this study can be used to focus attention on the key elements of the framework when evaluating teachers and for deciding on teacher professional development programs.

Finally, the findings of this study revealed the strong commitment and dedication of the teachers to the teaching profession in general and to their students in specific.

References

- Bahous, R., M. Nabhani, and J. Cochran. 2011. "Lebanon: Democracy Based in Religion." In *Democracy in the Middle East: The Impact of Religion and Education*, edited by J. Cochran, 135–154. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Baxter, P., and Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Coggsall, J. G., Rasmussen, C., Colton, A., Milton, J., and Jacques, C. (2012). Generating Teaching Effectiveness: The Role of Job-Embedded Professional Learning in Teacher Evaluation. Research & Policy Brief. *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality*.
- Creemers, B. P., and Kyriakides, L. (2006). Critical analysis of the current approaches to modelling educational effectiveness: The importance of establishing a dynamic model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(3), 347-366.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practices: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C., and McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Ascd.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2010). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational leadership*, 68(4), 35-39.
- Danielson, C. (2013). The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument, 2013 Instructionally Focused Edition. Retrieved January, 17, 2017. heframeteach.htm
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Doerr, S. E. (2012). *Charlotte Danielson's theory of teacher evaluations: A quantitative study of teachers' perceptions on the four domains*. Capella University.

- Donahue, E., & Vogel, L. R. (2018). Teacher Perceptions of the Impact of an Evaluation System on Classroom Instructional Practices. *Journal of School Leadership, 28*(1), 31-55.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., and Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
- Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: A Research Synthesis. *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality*.
- Hennink, M. M. (2014). *Focus group discussions*. New York: Oxford
- Merriam, Sharan B. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (p. 308). Wiley. Kindle Edition.
- Jahangiri, L., and Mucciolo, T. W. (2008). Characteristics of effective classroom teachers as identified by students and professionals: a qualitative study. *Journal of Dental Education, 72*(4), 484-493.
- Ladd, S. (2016). *An examination of teachers' perceptions of teacher evaluation in New Jersey school systems*.
- Maniglia, R. J. (2017). *A mixed methods approach: Reaching a common understanding of the rating of teacher effectiveness and its perceived impact on student learning among New Jersey High School teachers and administrators using the Stronge Teacher Effectiveness Performance Evaluation System*. Drexel University.
- Marzano, R. J. & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1). 6-13. Retrieved March 14, 2010 from the Education Research Complete database.
- Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., and Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Ascd.
- Marzano, R. J. (2012). Teacher evaluation: What's fair? What's effective? *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 14-19.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mielke, P., and Frontier, T. (2012). Keeping improvement in mind. *Educational leadership, 70*(3), 10-13.
- Moss, J. T. (2015). *The Danielson model of teacher evaluation: Exploring teacher perceptions concerning its value in shaping and improving instructional practice*.

- Odden, A. (2004). Lessons learned about standards-based teacher evaluation systems. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(4), 126-137.
- Olson, D. J. (2015). *Exemplary teachers' perspectives on effective teaching elements in Danielson's Framework for Teaching*.
- Race to the Top Executive Summary (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/rtted-executive-summary.pdf>
- Slavin, R. E. (2014). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice* (10th ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson.
- Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sweeley, T. M. (2004). *Teachers' attitudes towards Charlotte Danielson's four domains of teacher evaluation*.
- Taylor, E. S., and Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *The American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628-3651. doi:10.1257/aer.102.7.3628.
- Teacher Evaluation 2.0. (2010). The New Teacher Project. New York: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.tntp.org/files/Teacher-Evaluation-Oct10F.pdf>
- Strong, M., Gargani, J., and Hacifazlıoğlu, Ö. (2011). Do we know a successful teacher when we see one? Experiments in the identification of effective teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 367-382. doi:10.1177/0022487110390221.
- White, C. (2017). *Exploring teacher effectiveness as measured by the Danielson Framework for Teaching and student achievement outcomes: Pursuing an understanding of leading students to excellence-PULSE Study*.
- Williams, R. E. (2010). *Administrator and teacher perceptions of the qualities of effective teachers*.
- Wright, S. P., Horn, S. P., and Sanders, W. L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 57-67. Retrieved March 3, 2010 from the Education Research Complete database.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Framework for Teaching Survey

The purpose of this survey is to gain a better understanding of what teachers consider important in terms of effective teaching and learning. The results will be analyzed collectively and individual responses will be held confidential and anonymous.

Directions are as follows.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree that the following elements are important to effective teaching and learning. If you do not understand the meaning of the statement, please indicate by circling the DU response.

To indicate your responses to the survey questions, please circle one of the choices.

Strongly Agree (SA) Agree (A) Disagree (DA) Strongly Disagree (SD) Don't Understand (DU)

Survey Questions:

1. Teacher displays a solid content knowledge.
2. Teacher's plans reflect an understanding among relationships and concepts taught.
3. Pedagogical practices reflect current research.
4. Teacher displays an understanding of developmental characteristics of students.
5. Teacher displays solid understanding of different learning styles.
6. Teacher displays knowledge of students' skills and knowledge.

7. Teacher displays knowledge of students' interests or cultural heritage.
8. Student goals are valuable in their level of expectation.
9. Most goals are clear and permit viable methods of assessments.
10. Goals are suitable for most students in the class.
11. Goals reflect several different types of learning opportunities.
12. Teacher is aware of all resources available throughout the school or district.
13. Teacher is aware of how to gain access, for students, to school and district resources.
14. Learning activities are suitable for students and instructional goals.
15. Materials and resources support instructional goals and engage students.
16. Instructional groups are varied and appropriate.
17. Lessons and units have clearly defined structure that activities are organized around.
18. The teacher's instructional goals are assessed through his/her proposed lesson plan.
19. Assessment criteria and standards are clear and are communicated to students.
20. Teacher uses assessment results to plan for individuals and groups of students.
21. Teacher-student interactions are friendly, demonstrate general warmth, caring and respect, and are appropriate to developmental and cultural norms of students.
22. Student interactions with teacher are generally polite and respectful.

23. Teacher conveys genuine enthusiasm for the subject, and students demonstrate commitment to its value.
24. Students accept teacher insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.
25. Instructional goals, activities, interactions, and classroom environment convey high expectations for achievement.
26. Tasks for groups are organized and students are engaged.
27. Transitions occur smoothly.
28. Routines for handling supplies occur smoothly.
29. Efficient systems for performing non-instructional duties are in place.
30. Volunteers and paraprofessionals are productively engaged during class.
31. Standards of conduct are clear to all students.
32. Teacher is alert to student behavior.
33. Teacher response to misbehavior is appropriate and respectful of the student's dignity.
34. The classroom is safe and the furniture is a resource for learning activities.
35. Teacher uses physical resources skillfully, and all learning is equally accessible to all students.
36. Teacher directions and procedures are clear to students and contain an appropriate level of detail.

37. Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to students' age and interests.
38. Teacher's questions are of high quality and adequate time is available for students to respond.
39. Classroom interaction represents true discussion, with teacher stepping, when appropriate, to the side.
40. Teacher successfully engages all students in the discussion.
41. Representation of content is appropriate and links well with students' knowledge.
42. Activities and assignments are appropriate to students and are engaging.
43. Instructional groups are productive and appropriate.
44. Instructional materials and resources are suitable to instructional goals.
45. Lessons have clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized.
46. Teacher feedback to students is of high quality.
47. Feedback to students is provided in a timely manner.
48. Teacher is able to make an adjustment to a lesson, and the adjustment occurs smoothly.
49. Teacher accommodates students' questions or interests.
50. Teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning.
51. Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its goal.

52. Teacher is able to make specific suggestions on how a lesson might be improved.
53. Teacher's system of maintaining information on student completion of assignments is effective.
54. Teacher's system for maintaining information on student progress in learning is effective.
55. Teacher's system for maintaining information on non-instructional information is effective.
56. Teacher provides frequent information to parents about the instructional program.
57. Teacher communicates with parents about students' progress on a regular basis.
58. Teacher's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.
59. Teacher's relationship with colleagues is cooperative and supportive.
60. Teacher volunteers to participate in school events making a substantial contribution.
61. Teacher volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution. 62. Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.
63. Teacher participates actively in assisting other educators.
64. Teacher is moderately active in serving student needs.
65. Teacher works within a particular team or department to ensure that students receive a fair opportunity to succeed.

66. Teacher maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision-making.

Please provide the following information about yourself.

Years of Teaching Experience _____

Years in Current Position _____

Current Teaching Assignment: Please check all that apply.

Elementary_____

Middle School_____

High School _____

Grade Level(s) You Currently Teach: Circle all that apply.

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
12

Gender: Male_____ Female_____

Subject(s) You Teach_____

Highest Level of Education: _____

Are you familiar with Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching? Yes _ No _

Thank you for participating in this survey.

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Appendix B: Research Participant Questions

1. What do you believe are the characteristics of an effective teacher?
2. How do you determine the goals you set for your students?
3. How do you design coherent instruction to ensure that your students meet learning goals?
4. What do you do to cultivate respect and rapport with and among your students?
5. What activities do you design to engage students in learning?

Appendix C

Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013)

<p>Domain 1 Planning and Preparation</p>	<p>Domain 2 The Classroom Environment</p>
<p><i>Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy</i> <i>Demonstrating knowledge of students</i> <i>Setting instructional outcomes</i> <i>Demonstrating knowledge of resources</i> <i>Designing coherent instruction</i> <i>Designing student assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Creating an environment of respect and rapport</i> <i>Establishing a culture for learning</i> <i>Managing classroom procedures</i> <i>Managing student behavior</i> <i>Organizing physical space</i></p>
<p>Domain 3 Instruction</p>	<p>Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities</p>
<p><i>Communicating with students</i> <i>Using questioning and discussion techniques</i> <i>Engaging student in learning</i> <i>Using assessment in instruction</i> <i>Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness</i></p>	<p><i>Reflecting on teaching</i> <i>Maintaining accurate records</i> <i>Communicating with families</i> <i>Participating in a professional community</i> <i>Growing and developing professionally</i> <i>Showing professionalism</i></p>

Appendix D

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics of the Survey before Implementing the Framework*

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
D1Q1	41	3.00	4.00	3.7073	.46065
D1Q2	41	.00	4.00	3.3902	.91864
D1Q3	41	.00	4.00	2.7317	1.16242
D1Q4	41	.00	4.00	3.5366	.74490
D1Q5	41	3.00	4.00	3.6341	.48765
D1Q6	41	.00	4.00	3.5366	.77774
D1Q7	41	2.00	4.00	3.1707	.58747
D1Q8	41	.00	4.00	2.7561	1.15716
D1Q9	41	.00	4.00	3.0244	1.06037
D1Q10	41	2.00	4.00	3.1220	.64012
D1Q11	41	3.00	4.00	3.5122	.50606
D1Q12	41	.00	4.00	3.2683	.80698
D1Q13	41	.00	4.00	3.0732	1.12673
D1Q14	41	.00	4.00	3.5122	.92526
D1Q15	41	3.00	4.00	3.7561	.43477
D1Q16	41	.00	4.00	3.0976	.96966
D1Q17	41	.00	4.00	3.0976	.94353
D1Q18	41	.00	4.00	3.2439	.91598
D1Q19	41	.00	4.00	2.8780	1.26876
D1Q20	41	.00	4.00	3.2683	.89511
D2Q21	41	.00	4.00	3.5122	.74572
D2Q22	41	.00	4.00	3.6829	.72246
D2Q23	41	.00	4.00	3.3659	.91532
D2Q24	41	.00	4.00	3.1463	.79250
D2Q25	41	.00	4.00	3.5366	.80925
D2Q26	41	1.00	4.00	3.4146	.63149
D2Q27	41	2.00	4.00	3.3415	.52961
D2Q28	41	.00	4.00	3.0488	.99878
D2Q29	41	.00	4.00	2.2439	1.39249
D2Q30	41	.00	4.00	2.7073	1.14551
D2Q31	41	.00	4.00	3.2683	.97530
D2Q32	41	3.00	4.00	3.7073	.46065
D2Q33	41	3.00	4.00	3.7073	.46065
D2Q34	41	2.00	4.00	3.6829	.56741
D2Q35	41	2.00	4.00	3.5366	.59572

D3Q36	41	2.00	4.00	3.6341	.53647
D3Q37	41	3.00	4.00	3.8049	.40122
D3Q38	41	2.00	4.00	3.4390	.59367
D3Q39	41	3.00	4.00	3.5366	.50485
D3Q40	41	2.00	4.00	3.3902	.54213
D3Q41	41	.00	4.00	3.3902	.77065
D3Q42	41	2.00	4.00	3.5122	.55326
D3Q43	41	.00	4.00	2.9756	.79018
D3Q44	41	.00	4.00	3.2927	.78243
D3Q45	41	2.00	4.00	3.3902	.54213
D3Q46	41	.00	4.00	3.4146	.80547
D3Q47	41	.00	4.00	3.1220	1.07692
D3Q48	41	.00	4.00	3.3659	.85896
D3Q49	41	3.00	4.00	3.3902	.49386
D3Q50	41	2.00	4.00	3.6585	.52961
D4Q51	41	3.00	4.00	3.5366	.50485
D4Q52	41	.00	4.00	3.3171	.84968
D4Q53	41	.00	4.00	3.0244	.90796
D4Q54	41	.00	4.00	3.2927	.74980
D4Q55	41	.00	4.00	2.4146	1.32241
D4Q56	41	2.00	4.00	3.0732	.56525
D4Q57	41	2.00	4.00	3.2927	.67985
D4Q58	41	2.00	4.00	2.8537	.65425
D4Q59	41	2.00	4.00	3.4878	.55326
D4Q60	41	.00	4.00	3.0000	.74162
D4Q61	41	.00	4.00	3.0732	.72077
D4Q62	41	.00	4.00	3.4146	.94804
D4Q63	41	2.00	4.00	3.1951	.60081
D4Q64	41	2.00	4.00	3.3659	.53647
D4Q65	41	3.00	4.00	3.5610	.50243
D4Q66	41	.00	4.00	3.3659	.94223
Valid N (listwise)	41				

Appendix E


Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics of the Survey after Implementing the Framework*

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
D1Q1	41	3.00	4.00	3.7073	.46065
D1Q2	41	3.00	4.00	3.7561	.43477
D1Q3	41	2.00	4.00	3.3659	.58121
D1Q4	41	3.00	4.00	3.7317	.44857
D1Q5	41	3.00	4.00	3.8293	.38095
D1Q6	41	3.00	4.00	3.7561	.43477
D1Q7	41	2.00	4.00	3.4390	.63438
D1Q8	41	2.00	4.00	3.5610	.59367
D1Q9	41	2.00	4.00	3.6829	.52149
D1Q10	41	2.00	4.00	3.6585	.52961
D1Q11	41	2.00	4.00	3.6098	.54213
D1Q12	41	3.00	4.00	3.5366	.50485
D1Q13	41	2.00	4.00	3.4878	.55326
D1Q14	41	3.00	4.00	3.7317	.44857
D1Q15	41	3.00	4.00	3.7805	.41906
D1Q16	41	.00	4.00	3.3902	.91864
D1Q17	41	3.00	4.00	3.6098	.49386
D1Q18	41	2.00	4.00	3.4878	.67535
D1Q19	41	2.00	4.00	3.5854	.54661
D1Q20	41	2.00	4.00	3.3902	.62762
D2Q21	41	2.00	4.00	3.6585	.52961
D2Q22	41	3.00	4.00	3.8780	.33129
D2Q23	41	3.00	4.00	3.7317	.44857
D2Q24	41	2.00	4.00	3.6585	.57488
D2Q25	41	3.00	4.00	3.5854	.49878
D2Q26	41	3.00	4.00	3.6829	.47112
D2Q27	41	.00	4.00	3.5366	.74490
D2Q28	41	3.00	4.00	3.6098	.49386
D2Q29	41	.00	4.00	3.1707	1.02231
D2Q30	41	.00	4.00	2.8537	1.25620
D2Q31	41	2.00	4.00	3.5854	.54661
D2Q32	41	3.00	4.00	3.8049	.40122
D2Q33	41	3.00	4.00	3.8293	.38095
D2Q34	41	2.00	4.00	3.7317	.50122
D2Q35	41	3.00	4.00	3.7805	.41906

D3Q36	41	3.00	4.00	3.6585	.48009
D3Q37	41	3.00	4.00	3.8537	.35784
D3Q38	41	3.00	4.00	3.8049	.40122
D3Q39	41	3.00	4.00	3.5854	.49878
D3Q40	41	3.00	4.00	3.7073	.46065
D3Q41	41	3.00	4.00	3.7073	.46065
D3Q42	41	3.00	4.00	3.5854	.49878
D3Q43	41	3.00	4.00	3.5366	.50485
D3Q44	41	3.00	4.00	3.6098	.49386
D3Q45	41	3.00	4.00	3.6585	.48009
D3Q46	41	.00	4.00	3.6829	.72246
D3Q47	41	3.00	4.00	3.5610	.50243
D3Q48	41	3.00	4.00	3.5366	.50485
D3Q49	41	3.00	4.00	3.4634	.50485
D3Q50	41	3.00	4.00	3.5366	.50485
D4Q51	41	2.00	4.00	3.5610	.54994
D4Q52	41	2.00	4.00	3.4878	.55326
D4Q53	41	2.00	4.00	3.4634	.55216
D4Q54	41	3.00	4.00	3.5854	.49878
D4Q55	41	.00	4.00	3.1220	1.05345
D4Q56	41	.00	4.00	3.1707	.86320
D4Q57	41	3.00	4.00	3.6585	.48009
D4Q58	41	.00	4.00	3.0732	.84824
D4Q59	41	.00	4.00	3.6098	.73750
D4Q60	41	2.00	4.00	3.5854	.54661
D4Q61	41	.00	4.00	3.4390	.77617
D4Q62	41	.00	4.00	3.5366	.74490
D4Q63	41	3.00	4.00	3.5854	.49878
D4Q64	41	2.00	4.00	3.4878	.63726
D4Q65	41	3.00	4.00	3.7317	.44857
D4Q66	41	.00	4.00	3.1707	1.28262
Valid N	41				

Appendix F

Permission to Use the Survey Instrument

 Tina Kane <tkane@mnsd.org>
Tue 22/01/2019 22:20
Usama Shehab ✉

Hello Usama,
I am happy to grant you permission and wish you the best of luck. Kindly, let me know if you require me to sign any documentation for your records.
Tina Sweeley Kane

From: Usama Shehab <usama.shehab@lau.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2019 3:17 PM
To: Tina Kane <tkane@mnsd.org>
Subject: Permission to use survey

Dear Dr. Tina M. Sweeley,

I am writing to request permission to use the survey you created in 2004, entitled the Framework for Teaching Survey. I am planning to use the survey to collect data for my thesis at the Lebanese American University (Department of Education) entitled " The Effect of Utilizing Danielson Framework for Teaching on Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Teaching".

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you need any additional information.

Sincerely yours,

Usama Shehab
MA Student
Department of Education

Appendix G

Permission to Use the Interview Instrument



Caletha White <cwhite@sd163.com>

Wed 23/01/2019 01:29

Usama Shehab ✕



Hello Usama

You are welcome to use the research questions. Best of luck to you with your thesis.

Caletha H. White, Ed. D.
Superintendent Designate
Park Forest-Chicago Heights SD 163
(708)668-9404

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 22, 2019, at 2:59 PM, Usama Shehab <usama.shehab@lau.edu> wrote:

Dear Dr. Caletha White,

I am writing to request permission to use the research participant questions you created and used in 2017, in your study entitled "Exploring Teacher Effectiveness As Measured By The Danielson Framework For Teaching and Student Achievement Outcomes: Pursuing An Understanding of Leading Students to Excellence PULSE Study". I am planning to use the interview questions to collect data for my thesis at the Lebanese American University (Department of Education) entitled " The Effect of Utilizing Danielson Framework for Teaching on Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Teaching".

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you need any additional information.