A CASE STUDY OF TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES IN A WALDORF SCHOOL: SEEKING THE VALUE IN EVALUATION

by

Kathleen Brunetta

B.A., University of Western Ontario, 1975

Teacher Certification, University of British Columbia, 1978

Waldorf Teacher Certification, Rudolf Steiner Centre, Toronto, 1985

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Curriculum Studies)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

September 2009

© Kathleen Brunetta 2009

ABSTRACT

This study examines twelve teachers' experiences of evaluation of their own practices and explores these teachers' beliefs about the value of these evaluations in terms of their continuing professional growth. It investigates the purposes and procedures for evaluating teachers and analyzes the results of evaluations in the context of a Waldorf school. Within Waldorf schools, teachers are responsible for identifying standards of good teaching and for implementing evaluation tools for themselves. The accountability measures they designed in this school were intended for educational quality control, to provide direction for continuing professional development, and to provide information that would relate to their continuing employment. The underlying assumptions in conducting these evaluations were that teachers' work could be fruitfully evaluated, that student achievement was affected by teachers' skills, and that teachers could and should continue to develop their skills through ongoing professional study.

Interviews, field notes, focus group conversation, and school documents provided my research data. My central questions addressed evaluation through the participants' experiences and identified the results they distinguished as valuable or not valuable. I interviewed teachers who had been evaluated as well as teachers responsible for overseeing evaluations. Some participants had a dual role and fit both categories. The parameters of this study were limited to one school and to single interviews with the twelve teachers who volunteered to be interviewed.

The data analysis identified four dimensions of teacher evaluation that participants recognized as worthwhile. These were self-evaluation, work with skilled evaluators, positive recognition by peers and others, and support provided for continuing professional development. Most participants found value in the evaluation experiences despite initial feelings of anxiety and fear. Outcomes for most included increased confidence and encouragement resulting from

positive encounters that affected participants' senses of identity and self worth. This study investigates the value of each dimension of this four-part evaluation process for teachers' professional growth and development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii

CHAPTER 1 Introduction 1

1.1 Purpose of Study 1

1.2 Background and Rationale 1

1.3 Research Questions 8

1.4 Researcher's Personal Perspectives and Involvement 9

1.5 Research Context and Methods 11

1.6 Organization of the Chapters 13

CHAPTER 2 Review of Literature 15

2.1 Overview 15

2.2 Purposes of Evaluation: Goals and Players - Why Evaluate Teachers? 17

2.3 Evaluation Criteria and Applications: What, Where, When, Who and How 20

2.4 Evaluation Outcomes: Complications and Considerations of Change 24

CHAPTER 3 Methodology 29

3.1 Research Design 29

3.2 Setting for Research 30
- 3.2.1 Waldorf Education: Overview and History 30
- 3.2.2 Distinguishing Characteristics 34

3.3 Site of Research 42

3.4 Participants 44

3.5 Data Collection Process 45

3.6 Data Analysis 48

3.7 Summary 51

CHAPTER 4 Presenting the Research 53

4.1 Introduction to Key Findings: The Mirror, the Question, and the Community 53

4.2 Data Analysis and Examples 55
- 4.2.1 Purposes, Procedures and Participants 55
- 4.2.2 Value Embedded in Procedures 68
- 4.2.3 Value in Summative and Formative Outcomes 81

4.3 Summary of Key Findings 88

CHAPTER 5 Implications for Practice 92

5.1 Introduction 92

5.2 Conclusions 92

5.3 Aspects of Evaluation Unique to Waldorf Education 93

5.4 Recommendations 95

5.5 Research Limitations 95

5.6 Research Significance: Implications for Future Research 96

5.7 Researcher Reflections 98

5.8 Summary 100

REFERENCES 103

APPENDICES 109

Appendix A: UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Board Certificate of Approval 109

Appendix B: Letter to Agency Requesting Approval to Conduct Research 111

Appendix C: Agency Letter of Approval 113

Appendix D: Letter of First Contact 114

Appendix E: Consent Form for Participants 116

Appendix F: Interview Preparation Questions for Teachers 119

Appendix G: Interview Preparation Questions for School Personnel 120

Appendix H: Focus Group Invitation Letter with Preparation Questions 121

Appendix I: Waldorf School Self Evaluation Guide 122

Appendix J: Waldorf School Teacher Observation Form... 124

Appendix K: Waldorf School Early Childhood Faculty Evaluation Forms 126

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 Participants' Academic and Professional Backgrounds.. 60

TABLE 2 Participants' Evaluation Experiences: Purposes and Procedures 63

TABLE 3 Participants' Formative Evaluation Outcomes 87

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis would not be possible without the help of a number of people who deserve my heartfelt thanks.

To the teachers who were willing to share their evaluation experiences and take time from their demanding responsibilities to participate in these interviews, thank you.

To Diana Hughes and Torin Finser, teacher educators whose work invests greatly in professional development for Waldorf teachers, thank you for the encouragement and support you have invested in me and my work.

To Linda Farr Darling, my thesis advisor, thank you for your time and encouragement, for your expertise, tact, patience, advice, and support. To Tony Clarke, thank you for stepping in at the last minute to join my committee. Your insightful comments were invaluable. And to Anne Phelan who sat in the examiner's role, thank you for your deep interest in this topic and for your positive encouragement of my work.

To John Kettle who kindly read through my drafts with an editor's eye, thank you for your generous gifts of time and expertise.

To Frances Cole who supported the final edits and formatting, your help with these final practical details made the completion of this thesis possible. Thank you.

Without Leslie Andres, I would not have been in this masters program. Thank you for your encouragement, interest, and practical help.

Finally, to my husband Peter and sons John and Andrew, who never doubted I'd finish this thesis and patiently encouraged this journey, thank you for your longstanding and sincere support.

CHAPTER 1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine teacher evaluation practices. In my research, I investigated the purposes, procedures, and results of evaluation from the points of view of evaluated teachers as well as the points of view of those responsible for overseeing evaluations. Participants critiqued their evaluation experiences and considered what was and was not of value for them in both the procedures and the outcomes. In presenting the participants' reflections and opinions of their evaluation experiences, this study examines (a) the intentions that give purpose to conducting evaluations, (b) the criteria and processes involved in evaluation practices, (c) the roles of participants who were involved and (d) the value of the evaluation processes for participants. The addition of a literature review provides an expanded context describing teacher evaluation practices and guides this study's examination of the values, issues, challenges, and limitations of evaluation.

The setting for this research is in a Waldorf school. Waldorf schools operate in an independent jurisdiction and are not beholden to the teacher accountability structures used in public schools. Waldorf schools are divorced from the public school teacher accountability measures and develop their own internal policies and procedures. Conducting this research in a Waldorf school allowed me the opportunity to study evaluation practices developed by teachers for teachers.

1.2 Background and Rationale

My interest in this study arose from my desire to learn if teachers derive value from their participation in evaluation and to understand what, if any, educational changes

result from evaluations on personal and professional levels. My hope is that this research will clarify the intentions for conducting teacher evaluations, identify best practices in evaluation procedures, and reveal what results occur from conducting evaluations. Whether or not teacher evaluation serves teachers' continuing professional development is a primary interest for me.

Various perspectives on teaching and the evaluation of teaching influenced how I formed my research questions and investigation. A look at the historical purposes for teacher evaluation allowed me to take note of the complex issues that relate beliefs about teacher effectiveness with student achievement. The factors of school context, student-teacher relationships, and teachers' personal and professional traits are additional background pieces that gave shape to the structure of this study.

Teaching and learning are complex processes that are difficult to evaluate. The public, including parents, place educational institutions under constant scrutiny. In general, most people know something of schools and teachers from a consumer's role and base judgements of schools, education, and teachers on knowledge and experience derived from having been a student. Parents of school-aged children bring yet another dimension to this as they seek good schools for their children. Added to word of mouth evaluation is the Fraser Report's school rating statistics based on students' high-stakes test results. Teachers are perennially in the public eye, yet little is known of what takes place internally to evaluate teachers' work and support their continuing development.

Clarifying the purposes for evaluation is an essential starting point to developing evaluation criteria and procedures. Peterson (2000) listed six reasons for conducting evaluations: "to protect children, reassure teachers that they are doing good jobs, assure audiences interested in teacher performance, make personnel decisions, inform teacher

educators, and shape further practice" (p.36). Numerous evaluation models designed and applied in the last century have kept these goals in mind.

In their historical overview, describing teacher evaluation in American schools prior to World War II, Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) identified a major issue that remains current for schools. The researchers questioned "how the process can both achieve organizational ends and increase the skills and self-esteem of the teachers" (p. 31). This issue concerns the purpose of teacher evaluation and addresses whether it is a summative or formative process. A summative evaluation provides information for the organizational and administrative function of a school, which is responsible for determining such things as continuing employment, salary, and job restructuring. "Such an appraisal is a final and, by inference, complete statement of a teacher's effectiveness and worth to the system" (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, p. 22). The implication of this high pressure evaluation suggests the use of evaluative tools that measure and summarize a teacher's worth to provide school administration with a specific gauge limited to continuing employment criteria. Given the complexity of teachers' work, it is hard to imagine how such measures provide a complete picture. Formative evaluation, on the other hand, is concerned with the details of teachers' work life and their continuing development. Formative evaluation results direct teachers' growth, change, and ability to continually learn and improve their work. Shinkfield and Stufflebeam indicated that these two types of evaluation may be incompatible, although they provide examples of evaluation models that are both summative and formative in design. Shinkfield and Stufflebeam also suggested that when the reasons for completing a teacher evaluation are clear, the evaluation may more effectively provide the required information.

Just as the purpose of the evaluation needs to be clear, beliefs about teachers'

roles must also be transparent. Underlying teacher evaluation practices is a belief that the quality of the teachers' skills is equated with the quality of student learning: improved teaching results in improved learning. Not all educators agree. Stake (1998) asserted,

> We don't know quality of teaching partly because of the complexity of education even for an individual youngster . . . . Our indicators are feeble. Dick Jaeger has concluded that we mislead ourselves about quality of education by supposing that quality of teaching is more or less equivalent to quality of student performance. (p. 3)

What students learn may not be equivalent to how well or how poorly teachers teach, but students do depend on their teachers to shape and guide their learning opportunities. Making the connection between teaching and learning as a point to promote teacher evaluation, Shinkfield & Stufflebeam (1995) argued that "the quality of learning depends largely on the quality of teaching; teacher evaluation clearly is essential in effective schools" (p. 2). If evaluators expect teacher evaluation to affect the quality of student education, they must question how the evaluation will achieve this (Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990; Stronge, 1997). Linking the quality of teaching to the quality of education needs to direct the shape of evaluation criteria and procedures.

Good teaching has many faces, depending on the context of the learning situation. While good teaching may not necessarily be reflected in "student performance" (Stake, 1998, p.3), especially when connected directly to test results, I am convinced that, when you consider the larger learning context, teachers play a significant role in contributing to student learning. Eisner (2000) said, "Students learn both less and more than what they have been taught" (p. 343). Students learn less and more than is intended, given the scope of the social, emotional, cultural, political, and economic environment in a school and

given their own biographies. Britzman (1991) added to this,

> Students are never simply learners; they arrive in their classrooms already knowledgeable. And this knowledge never merely reflects a reality out there. Rather the knowledge of students always mediates how they understand the work of learning. The fact is, not everything depends on the teacher . . . . (p. 225)

Yet, in any classroom there will be measures of student success that result from good teaching. It is unreasonable to dismiss students' engagement with learning as criteria in teacher evaluation. This is at the heart of teachers' work. How to meaningfully assess the connection between student learning and teacher performance is a challenge for evaluation.

The complexity of the evaluation situation includes teacher, students, and context. Evaluation calls for thoughtful criteria to guide the data collection with evaluators who have the time, skill, and resources to access and discern the details of merit or concern. Britzman (1991) described teaching as " a dialogic movement between the teacher, the students, the curriculum, the knowledge produced in exchange, and the discursive practices that make pedagogy intelligible" (p. 232). Conversations between teachers and evaluators also have the potential to make "pedagogy intelligible" by contributing to the discourse on classroom practices through observation and analysis. Evaluators with strong observation and communication skills could guide a conversation that would allow teachers the opportunity to describe the rationale behind their lesson content and structure. Explaining how they organize lessons and units and what informs their pedagogical decisions and actions could build a more comprehensive picture of the educational context for evaluators. What teachers say of their students' achievements and struggles could become an additional indicator for evaluators to discern teachers' beliefs

and understandings as well the level of self-awareness teachers have of their own classroom practices. The evaluators' role here encourages teachers' self-reflection and demands deep listening, careful observation, and sincere interest. Evaluators need to understand teachers' roles, the complexity of learning and the complexity of the learning environment. Through evaluation that is based on classroom observations, evaluators have the opportunity to build relationship with teachers through discourse that is directly related to classroom experience and teachers' own developing practices. These practices include observing and understanding their students.

Examination of the student-teacher relationship provides the evaluator with additional valuable data about the teacher. Cuban (1993) called the student-teacher relationship the "heart of schooling." He described the personal relationship between the teacher and students as the "base of the power of pedagogy" and said that it is not the content that instructs, but "the informal learning that results from imitating and modeling behaviour" (p.184). The teacher has a mighty responsibility to strive for demonstrating character worthy of students' imitation. Such character includes honesty, kindness, and wise action. When consistent and authentic, these are qualities that earn the trust and affection of a child. Grumet (1995) believed that "children must be surrounded by adults who care about them so they know they are known, recognized and loved." These relationships, she wrote, "help the human make sense of the world and support human identity" (p.19). Evaluators must make credible value judgments that concern the professional relationships teachers have with their students as well as with their teaching practices and the curriculum. How they do this will be of critical importance to the evaluation proceedings.

The qualities of teachers are personal as well as professional. Teachers work out

of themselves, out of who they are, out of their natures and beliefs. Quality of teaching and learning has to do with quality of being, and this is something in continual development. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) acknowledged that "teachers' work is deeply embedded in teachers' lives, in their pasts, in their biographies, in the cultures or traditions of teaching to which they have become committed. Developing the teacher therefore also involves developing the person, developing their life" (p. 33). The quality of teachers' characters, in the broadest and finest terms, influences students' learning. Evaluation criteria and procedures must also consider individuals' professional and personal traits, seeing both what teachers are currently accomplishing as well as teachers' potential for development. I include this comment by Fullan and Hargreaves because the evaluation criteria developed by the teachers in the Waldorf school under study attempts to recognize and give value to the interplay of the personal and professional in teachers' work. This is described further in the following chapters.

Through their development of evaluation practices in Waldorf schools, Swann and Rawson (2000) stated, "Each teacher has an entitlement to be professionally assessed because it is one of the most helpful forms of professional development" (p. 1). Seeing that this happens with good process becomes a school-wide or in the case of Waldorf education, a movement–wide responsibility. By considering the students, the teachers, and the overall culture of the school, an evaluation process is acknowledging more than the individual teacher's work. The evaluation involves the ecology of the learning environment where the parts and the whole are an integrated unit for learning, which is not limited to students alone. Britzman (1991) reiterated this reality: "While individual effort is, of course, a necessary condition in learning to teach, so too are social negotiation, interaction and social dependence" (p. 236). The connections among teacher

effectiveness, student achievement, educational rapport, and institutional support are significant. If teachers are accountable to their profession and to their students and strive to develop, at the very least, an evaluation design should be able to identify teachers' competencies, acknowledge their students' achievements, and consider how the nature of the school environment affects their capacity to work to the best of their abilities. An evaluation should also be able to identify where teachers are incompetent and address their need for development. Swann and Rawson defined evaluation in the following way:

> The word evaluation implies that the value of something is identified and drawn out. This act of making value conscious provides the opportunity for reflection and re-direction. Evaluation is always re-valuing. For this reason evaluation and assessment are crucial to the process of quality development within education. (p.1)

Fitzpatrick, Worthen, and Sanders (1997) defined evaluation as the "identification, clarification and application of defensible criteria to determine value, quality, utility, effectiveness, or significance in relation to those criteria" (p.5). My direction in investigating teacher evaluation practices explores these "defensible criteria", how they determine worth and value, and how the participants respond as a result of completing an evaluation process.

1.3 Research Questions

The research questions I developed for the semi-structured interviews with teachers and the evaluation committee members investigated the value of evaluation by gathering information that focused on (a) the purposes, procedures, and results of teacher evaluations as understood by the participants, based on their experiences, and (b) what value, if any, did participants believe they gained from their evaluations.

Four essential points, identified in the Background and Rationale, provided specific direction for the creation of my research questions: (a) what are the purposes for the evaluations, (b) how are the assessment criteria and procedures developed, (c) what measures are in place to allow evaluators to gain as complete an impression as possible of the learning environment, and (d) what are the follow-up steps that occur as a result of the accumulated evaluative data? Using these points as guides and employing assistance from colleagues and my thesis advisor, (Chapter 2, Data Collection Process), I developed the questions to provide the format for the semi-structured interviews with the participants (see Appendixes F, G, H).

1.4 Researcher's Personal Perspectives and Involvement

The personal perspectives I bring to this study combine teaching experience, magisterial studies, and more recent work in adult education, which includes conducting teacher evaluations. In my early teaching years, I taught for two years in a British Columbia independent school, following a year in an international volunteer teaching position. Following this, I taught in a public middle school in the interior of British Columbia for four years. I completed Waldorf teacher training in 1985 and have been teaching in Waldorf schools since then. In the Waldorf schools my duties expanded to include mentoring teachers, working with student teachers, and teaching courses in a Waldorf teacher education institute. During the past six years, while completing graduate studies, I have been a guest teacher in Waldorf schools and Waldorf teacher education institutes, served on school accreditation teams, and mentored and evaluated teachers.

The course work in graduate studies has been exceptionally valuable. It has offered perspective, insight, and depth to the reflective study I have directed to my own teaching. It has provided deeper understanding about the nature of learning. Many of the

courses have guided and informed my work in teacher education, school development, and teacher evaluation. I have found the teacher evaluation practices in many Waldorf schools unclear and somewhat unstructured. It is an area of ongoing development and one I have an interest in learning more about through continuing experience and study.

Since 2004, I have worked as a teacher evaluator with two hundred teachers in fifty Waldorf schools. When evaluating, my responsibilities have involved the development of evaluation criteria and procedures as well as the implementation of evaluation processes. I find it necessary to keep the purposes for the evaluations clear throughout the whole of the evaluation process. This work often involves engaging a small team of evaluators who work together collaboratively to evaluate teachers. We have designed evaluation preparation activities, including self-evaluation guidelines for teachers, viewed teacher and student documents, participated in classroom observations and conversations with teachers, and written final reports. What happens with the recommendations that result from the evaluations is something I have little information about. I do not know what parts of the evaluation are of continuing value for the teachers or the school. I do not know if change occurs. The feedback loop is missing. This missing piece is what gives personal impetus to this research project. I would like to know what occurs out of the evaluations and who or what is served. In particular, I would like to know if the participants see evaluation serving them and if so, how it does this.

Preparing for this study required that I examine my own beliefs and expectations about teacher evaluation. I see the need for both summative and formative evaluations and agree with Shinkfield and Stufflebeam's (1995) suggestion that the intentions for conducting evaluations may require the development of different procedures. Much, but not all, of the teacher evaluation work I have been involved in is structured to be

formative. School administrators, however, may use the information summarized in the evaluation documents to inform their summative evaluation results. How the school uses the information in the evaluation reports to determine teachers' continuing employment has been beyond the jurisdiction of my contracted work.

I chose to conduct the research in this particular Waldorf school for a number of reasons. It was a large school and offered three faculties that encompassed a broad spectrum of experienced teachers to work with. The school had existing evaluation procedures in place, and these were under review at the time of my research. Therefore, my study might offer direct and immediate use to the development of their teacher evaluation procedures. My familiarity with Waldorf educational practices allowed me ease to improvise when conversations moved beyond the prepared guideline. As well, I felt I had a good understanding of Waldorf teachers' roles and responsibilities and a reasonable understanding of the school's institutional infrastructure.

I tried to be attentive to personal bias that could interfere with the data collected and with the subsequent analysis and reporting. My time on site in the role of researcher, observer, and interviewer was as an outsider, yet my Waldorf education experiences and beliefs, to a certain extent, guided what I looked for and what I saw as important. Readers will find my voice describing and interpreting this case study, while making an effort to reduce personal opinion so it does not interfere with the integrity of the research design and findings. Within the limited scope of this paper's investigation of one school's model of teacher evaluation practices, I hope the study will be of some value to others involved in structuring, developing, and implementing teacher evaluation practices.

1.5 Research Context and Methods

In Waldorf schools, the board of directors, school administrators, and teachers

each have their areas of specific expertise and jurisdiction but also work collaboratively to govern the school and make administrative and pedagogical decisions. As a self-directed college, teachers have the task of identifying accountability standards for good teaching and taking responsibility for ensuring that teachers meet these standards. The teachers develop and implement evaluative measures themselves.

In the setting for this research, the teachers developed similar but adjustable evaluation approaches for various situations. For example, the evaluations for first year teachers with probationary contracts were different from those for tenured teachers. In most cases, the evaluation procedures included teachers' self-evaluations, collegial comments, and evaluators' reports based on classroom observations. In all cases, evaluators observed in the classrooms and had discussions with the teachers they observed. Reviewing the evaluation results and following through with evaluation recommendations was the responsibility of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC), a small group of teachers mandated by the school faculty and the board of directors to oversee this work.

I collected research data for this study through three methods. The largest source of data came from interviews with 11 teachers and the 12th teacher who joined the focus group discussion. I met once with each teacher individually in a semi-structured interview that lasted between 40 and 60 minutes. I recorded the interviews. The teacher participants represented the three faculties in the school: early childhood, elementary, and high school. The second source of data came from a focus group discussion I set up with four teachers and one administrator. We met together for 90 minutes to discuss the school's teacher evaluations practices and outcomes. Three of these teachers were members of the FDC. They had been evaluated, were active as evaluators, and were

responsible for overseeing the school's evaluation practices. I facilitated this conversation and recorded the session. The third source of data came from the school's teacher evaluation policies and procedures documents and the internally developed forms that the school used to guide evaluations.

My interpretive strategies recognized that the meaning I constructed and described was from the perspectives of the research participants who spoke out of their personal experiences. The paradigm was heuristic and empirical given that the evidence was derived from the teachers' interpretations of their experiences. The very evaluation practices I was investigating were developed through trial and error with the need for continuing review and development, as was taking place at the time of this study. All collected data were context-dependent in that I used the inductive method of comparison to analyze the information. My conclusions were based on the common themes that emerged out of the subjects' descriptions of their experiences. I added a further level of comparison by considering the collected data against literature. The literature extended the meaning I derived through a data analysis that used categorical aggregation and naturalistic generalizations. Understanding emerged through the repeated collect, analyze, and interpret strategy, building knowledge that integrated the research findings (Cresswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996). These procedures will be described in detail as the thesis proceeds.

1.6 Organization of the Chapters

There are five chapters in this thesis. The first chapter provides an introduction to the purposes for this investigation. The Background and Rationale includes references to the literature that guides this study and helped frame the interview questions. I explain my personal interest in this project and my background in evaluation and in Waldorf

education. A description of the research context and methods concludes Chapter 1.

Chapter 2 reviews literature that sets teacher evaluation in an historical and larger context. It explores and extends meaning with regard to evaluation themes. The literature guides thought about the relevance of evaluation for participants and the school community. It considers the potential for and challenges involved in bringing about personal and institutional change in education.

Chapter 3 describes the bounded case setting and the research design. I provide an overview of Waldorf education and the roles and responsibilities of Waldorf teachers. I describe the specific setting of this research site, and briefly introduce the participants. A description follows of how I collected and analyzed the data. The chapter concludes with reflective considerations based on my experience as a researcher.

The fourth chapter presents the research in three sections. The first section analyzes the school's evaluation design and gives the first level analysis of the teachers' backgrounds and their evaluation experiences. The second section identifies common evaluation themes and analyzes the value in each theme, as identified and described through the teachers' reflections on their evaluation experiences. The final section considers evaluation outcomes in terms of the differing aspects of formative and summative evaluation intentions.

The final chapter presents the results and conclusions I derived from this study. I describe the significance and limitations of this research and include suggestions for further research in the area of teacher evaluation.

CHAPTER 2 Review of Literature

The selection of literature in this chapter is a sampling from accounts and research related to the field of teacher evaluation. The issues and concerns about teacher evaluation I describe represent thinking from educational practitioners involved in the fields of teacher education and educational development. Their research guides this case study by providing insights into the complexities of the still developing field of teacher evaluation.

2.1 Overview

In 2004, the British Columbia College of Teachers developed *Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct of Educators in British Columbia* in order to outline accountability measures to judge teacher proficiency. In 2007, an action-centred teaching group at the University of British Columbia asked the College to withdraw the document and redevelop the standards to more accurately reflect good teaching. The teaching group was concerned that the document reduced teaching to an ends-based practice and did not adequately recognise the complexities of the human exchanges involved in teaching. Describing teaching as a profession where applied knowledge is contextual, the group said, "Teachers exercising practical judgement must be willing to modify both their ends and means as they understand the particulars of the relationships and context" (Coulter, D., Coulter, D., Daniel, M., Decker, E., Essex, P., McKiney, J., et al., 2007, p. 8). This statement touches on core issues that confront the development of effective evaluation practices. Understanding what good teaching is in practice, in specific contexts, and developing criteria and procedures to fairly assess teacher quality are complex tasks. There is also an assumption that evaluating teachers

will provide a measure of accountability.

When the U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, "the movement toward increased accountability in education and a close scrutiny of its intentions and outcomes became a matter of national importance" (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995, p. 23). Responses to this study resulted in school reforms effecting program development and increased accountability standards such as high-stakes tests for students and evaluation procedures for teachers (Danielson, 2001; Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). Schools with ends-based approaches to education are deeply invested in these practices and place great value on measurable educational results but underestimate the value of the processes and diverse contexts involved in teaching and learning. Coulter et al. (2007) acknowledged this in their request for a standards document that would "foster debate and reflection about good teaching, rather than stating minimal requirements to be monitored" (p. 9). The studies about teaching standards and educational accountability conducted since 1983 bear witness to the ongoing debate that considers what good teaching is and how it can be evaluated. Many studies reference theoretical views elaborating evaluation benefits and limitations and practical accounts describing teacher development, evaluation purposes, procedures, and outcomes (Britzman 1991, 1998; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Cochran-Smith & Lytle 1993; Cole & Knowles 2000; Coulter et al. 2007; Danielson 2001; Danielson & McGreal 2000; Delandshere 1994; Eisner 1994; Fitzpatrick, Worthen & Sanders 1997; Guskey 1995; Hargreaves 2003; Hargreaves & Fullan 1992; Hubball, Clarke & Beach 2004; Millman & Darling-Hammond 1990; Peterson 2000; Scharwz & Alberts 1998; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam 1995; Shulman 1987a, 1987b; Spitz 2001; Stake 1998; Stiggins 1986; Stronge 1997, 2002; Wise,

Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1984). Indeed, the quantity of literature on the topic of teacher quality, teacher education, professional development, and evaluation is so rich, I managed to digest a few appetizers, glance at the enticing entrée selections, and if a dessert menu exists, it is still to be discovered or perhaps, developed. One such area I became aware of only upon submission of this thesis is the field of self-study research in teacher education. Inclusion of literature from educators such as John Lochran, Gary Hoban, Tom Russell, Alicia Crowe and others could have supported the direction of this study.

The following review of literature touches on relevant themes regarding issues that continue to surround teacher evaluation purposes, criteria, and procedures, giving consideration to participant roles and evaluation outcomes.

2.2 Purposes of Evaluation: Goals and Players - Why Evaluate Teachers?

School reform did not initially consider that improving the quality of teaching was important for effecting educational development (Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Stronge, 1997). This seems a remarkable oversight, given the current climate that strongly identifies teachers with educational quality and student learning outcomes. Stronge's comment, "Regardless of how well an educational program may be designed, the program is only as effective as the people who implement and support it," (p. 1) indicates a shift in attitude about the value of teachers. Making the connection between the quality of education and the quality of teaching influenced changes in teacher evaluation purposes and procedures. Researchers and educators identified teachers' continuing professional development as a worthwhile investment to support learners' needs and educational change (Danielson, 2001; Guskey, 1995;

Hargreaves, 2003; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990; Schwarz & Alberts, 998; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Stronge, 1997).

While teachers' roles as valued players in the educational context have become clearer, the purposes and procedures for teacher evaluation have not. Danielson (2001) stated that evaluation purposes combine "the requirements of quality assurance and professional development . . . to recognize cultivate and develop good teaching" (p.13). These purposes are similar to but also differ from Millman & Darling-Hammond's (1990) statement that educational "initiatives rely on teacher evaluation for . . . selection, training, improvement and advancement" (p. 17). Stronge (1997) made no reference to quality assurance or to teacher selection when he quoted Stufflebeam, who said the purpose of evaluation is "not to prove but to improve" (p. 6). These statements are reflections of the continuing tensions that exist between competing purposes in summative and formative evaluation designs.

Formative evaluation purposes and procedures are intended to improve and support teachers' development. When applied for summative purposes, evaluation provides information to assure teacher competence for continuing employment against whatever criteria evaluators use for this measure (Fitzpatrick, Worthen, & Sanders, 1997; Peterson, 2000; Shinkfield & Stuffelbeam, 1995; Stronge, 1997). Stiggins (1990) criticised summative-based purposes in evaluation calling them a "narrow definition of good teaching with judgements based on limited observations" (p. 570). He advocated separating summative and formative evaluation, whose purposes he said, "are incompatible" (p. 570). Others acknowledged these concerns, but this has not led so much to separating evaluation purposes as to integrating multiple evaluation purposes within the school context. Stronge (1997) argued that "multiple purposes of evaluation

can be met successfully in one design . . . when the conception of teacher evaluation ties evaluation not only to teacher improvement but to school improvement" (p. 4). In Stronge's statement that "individual and institutional goals are intertwined," he advocated that "teacher evaluation can and should be considered a vital part of the total improvement/restructuring efforts in education" (p.3). With the goal of sustaining and developing educational quality through assuring teacher quality, evaluation as a means to support progress accounts for not only the connection between quality teaching and quality education but the mutually interdependent relationship that exists for teachers with the quality of their educational environment (Britzman, 1991; Danielson, 2001; Delandshere, 1994; Eisner, 2000; Guskey, 1995; Hargreaves, 2003; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Hubball, Clarke & Beach, 2004; Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990; Peterson, 2000; Schwarz & Alberts, 1998; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Stronge, 1997).

A further tension in teacher evaluation, which I refer to in this study's Background and Rationale, occurs when evaluators expect proof of teacher performance in the specific results of advanced student achievement. Stiggins (1990) described this ends-based expectation. The purpose of evaluation, he believed, "is to result in improved student learning through supporting teachers' development needs with formative evaluation" (p. 570). These and other results may occur from evaluation but to limit formative support to these ends and assume it will improve teacher quality that will result in improved student learning is problematic. Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) wrote,

> The trouble with teacher evaluation is that teaching itself is a highly complicated process. No one knows precisely what ideal role a teacher should perform to affect excellent student learning, not even when the context of a classroom is specified. (p. 9)

Similar to teaching, evaluation is not merely “an end in itself” (Stronge 1997, p. 18). Britzman (1991) furthered these points with the defining statement, “Teaching is fundamentally a dialogic relation, characterized by mutual dependency, social interactions and engagement, and attention to the multiple exigencies of the unknown and the unknowable” (p. 237). The processes of learning Britzman referred to suggest the need for evaluation applications that gather wide-ranging and diverse data and employ the kind of practical judgement Coulter et al. (2007) described: one where evaluators take the diversity of the educational context into account.

2.3 Evaluation Criteria and Applications: What, Where, When, Who and How

Coulter et al. (2007) acknowledged the “tensions in conceptions of teaching and in deciding what counts as good teaching” and the need to understand the difference between “teaching as attaining pre-determined ends or as finding the ends in context” (p.3). They emphasized that there is a difference between the kind of learning that is predetermined and the kind of learning that “cannot be predetermined in advance, but must be discovered in particular relationships, contexts, and situations” (p. 4). The challenge for evaluation is to develop criteria that recognize that “distinctive forms of practice require different forms of judgement, with unique components” (p. 5). A considerable amount of literature describes the nature of teaching that can guide the development of evaluation criteria. Shulman (1987b) for example, characterized teaching as something learned in practice where it is a lively, varied activity based on understanding the learner and the dynamics of age specific learning. Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005) described teachers’ “deep content knowledge, sophisticated pedagogical strategies, rich knowledge of culture and human learning, and positive beliefs about the

capacity of all children to learn academic content" (p. 100). When it comes to evaluating teachers however, too often the criteria and applications are not inclusive, diverse, or adaptable (Danielson & McGreal, 2001; Guskey, 1995; Schwarz & Alberts, 1998; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). Including evaluative criteria that measure educational value in relationships, contexts and situations, such as Coulter et al. referred to, remains a challenge in evaluation designs.

Teacher evaluations have often taken place in "negative environments with low levels of trust". Evaluations have been "an activity done to teachers" rather than one including teachers (Danielson, 2001, pp. 14-15). Shinkfield & Stuffelbeam (1995) referred to the widely endorsed set of guiding principles put forward by the Personnel Evaluation Standards National Joint Committee. These principles gave evaluation "credibility," ensured "protection from corrupt practices," and identified "four basic evaluation principles: propriety, utility, feasibility, accuracy" (p. 3). School principals applied these principles as an administrative task, observing teachers, writing reports, and conducting follow-up conferences (Danielson, p. 14). Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) provided numerous examples of evaluation designs that are formative, summative, and a mixture of both. In each of these examples, teachers remained subjects of a hierarchical structure. Financial constraints have further restricted the time needed for completing the evaluations and limited the development of and access to professional development opportunities. With this history, it is not a surprise that teachers continue to regard evaluation with disdain and distrust.

Hubball, Clarke, and Beach (2004) described evaluation practices that keep "metacognition as a central construct underlying authentic assessment" (p. 87). Defining metacognition as "learning how to learn" (p. 88), their guiding principles considerably

extended those developed by the National Joint Committee. Hubball, Clarke, and Beach acknowledged teachers as members affected by and effecting what occurs in their learning community. Their model identified adult learners who participate as co-creators of the evaluation design and implementation. In this way, "assessment becomes an integral part of learning" (p. 94). The researchers encouraged "faculty members to be actively engaged in the process" (p. 91) of designing the evaluation objectives, criteria, and strategies. Hubball, Clarke, and Beach provided carefully planned and differentiated evaluation approaches, taking into account the whole evaluation procedure from beginning to end, with goals that linked individual and school responsibilities. While the model was meant to serve the unique situation of evaluation in a university or college setting, their methods and intentions translate into applications for other teacher evaluation and professional development settings.

Danielson (2001), Guskey (1995), Hargreaves (2003), and Schwarz and Alberts (1998) also provided examples of evaluation designs that invite teachers to be participants in the design and implementation. Danielson encouraged evaluation models that "place teachers in more active and professional roles" (p. 14). Danielson suggested "systems of teacher evaluation [that] use a differentiated approach" (p. 13) for novice and experienced teachers. In Danielson's designs, experienced and tenured teachers "engage in self-directed professional growth activities . . . that permit the opportunity for professional development through which teachers can extend their practice" (pp. 13-14). Guskey described similar adaptive practices that he called "highly contextualized" (p. 329) and Hargreaves promoted a "collaborative culture" (p. 164) with teachers working together as a "professional learning community" (p. 164). These researchers all saw the potential to embed teacher learning and development opportunities within evaluation

procedures, similar to Hubball, Clarke, and Beach's (2004) model.

Many educators encourage self-reflective practice as a valuable tool for teacher development and support its use in teacher evaluation (Britzman, 1998; Cole & Knowles, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 1985; Danielson, 2001; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Hargreaves, 2003; Palmer, 1998; Peterson, 2000; Schwarz & Alberts, 1998). Danielson and McGreal wrote that teachers learn more from reflections of their teaching experiences than from the actual teaching. Cole and Knowles as well as Palmer encouraged the use of journals as a self-education tool for teachers. Britzman (1991) advocated self-study as a means to be free from the "dynamics of cultural reproduction" (p. 233). Some designs employ self-evaluation as the starting point for discussion with an evaluator (Danielson, 2001 Guskey, 2002; Spitz, 2001; Swann & Rawson, 2000). In the case of Hubball, Clarke, and Beach (2004), faculty explored "their own (and others') learning styles" (p. 90). Danielson said, "We promote reflection by dialogue with others. Others may see aspects of our teaching of which we are unaware" (p. 15). These evaluation innovations suggest practices that address some of the challenges teacher evaluation presents by including teachers in the design by incorporating self-reflective practices and valuing colleagues' contributions in evaluation observations and conversations.

With regard to the evaluator's role, Fitzpatrick, Worthen, and Sanders (1997) described the "expertise-oriented approach" as the "oldest and most widely used" form of evaluation (p. 119). The term *expert* refers to a person with a high degree of knowledge and skill in a particular field. How the expert uses, communicates, and applies this expertise is the crux of expertise-oriented evaluation. Fitzpatrick, Worthen, and Sanders acknowledged concerns. For Danielson (2001), the "professional conversation" (p. 15) as

she called it, is critical with “evaluators [who] are trained to recognize the different aspects of teaching identified in the system as evaluative criteria, and [where] teachers have the opportunity to clarify misconceptions on the part of the evaluator” (p. 14). Danielson encouraged the use of portfolios to expand what observers miss seeing in the classroom (p. 14). Eisner described a “connoisseurship” approach that extends the defining qualities of experts. Connoisseurs are “aware of the complexities in real-world settings and possess refined perceptual capabilities.” They have “knowledge of what to look for . . . gained through a backlog of previous relevant experience (as quoted in Fitzpatrick, Worthen, & Sanders, p. 128). The evaluators’ experiences, training, and communication skills, are significant factors in teacher evaluation implementation, as are the evaluation criteria, the participants’ roles, and the follow-through evaluation procedures that are intended to support teachers’ formative development.

2.4 Evaluation Outcomes: Complications and Considerations of Change

These discourses on evaluation purposes, criteria, and applications are intricately connected with educational institutional cultures and contexts. How teachers and evaluators understand and conduct evaluations is not only dependent on beliefs and knowledge about teaching and learning but also dependent on educational policies and practical implementation factors. For example, school management and budget allocations will affect teacher evaluation procedures. A consideration about how educational change occurs, individually and institutionally, becomes a factor with regard to evaluation outcomes. For formative evaluation recommendations to have value, teachers have to believe in their own capacities for change and feel that such development is warranted.

Fullan (1993) believed, “Change is a journey not a blueprint,” which involves

risk-taking and uncertainty (p. 21). Describing change as a process of discovery, Fullan suggested "teachers learn to treat knowledge as something they construct, test, and explore, rather than as something they absorb and accumulate" (as quoted in Evans, 1996, p. 78). This approach invites teachers to accommodate rather than assimilate change by applying innovations in context. Analyzing, constructing, and implementing change are processes and provide the possibilities for the development of new capacities in participants through their involvement in all of these activities. When Fullan (2001) said, "Changes in behaviour precede rather than follow changes in belief," (p. 92) he affirmed the processes of learning that teachers are involved in alone and in a community where they learn from one another. In a similar manner, Hargreaves (2003) characterized teaching as a "learning profession for teachers" that requires teamwork, inquiry, and continuous learning (p. 170). Hargreaves believed that teachers need a certain amount of autonomy within the school organization for change to be effective and warned, "Professional learning communities do not flourish in standardized systems that severely restrict teachers' discretion for decision-making and self-initiated change" (p. 170). Schwarz and Alberts (1998) concurred that "authentic change cannot be predetermined from the top-down" (p. 153). Like Hargreaves, they were critical of the "management-oriented view of school innovation" (p. 153) and suggested that greater value lies in teacher directed change.

Teachers, however, do not work in isolation and factors in educational development concern how the parts and the whole interrelate. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) described "forms of association" and "patterns of relationship" (p. 233) among teachers, administrators, and parents that can influence a collegially supportive environment. When the parts of a school culture are unaware of each other's needs, they

cannot offer support. Evaluation can inform the institution of its members' needs and direct the development of educational support measures tailored for the specific situation. Fullan (1993) painted a helpful picture of how the layers of school community, through mutual purpose, awareness, and communication, provide a third space, where teachers and students engage the support they need. He described how with "consensus from above, pressure from below, things happen" (p. 37). This picture included "interaction among implementers [that] serves to integrate both pressure and support" (Fullan, 2001, p. 91). Fullan described his beliefs in directives for change:

> Teachers must not only want to implement a change, they must feel that they can achieve it. They need to see change as not only appropriate for students and as promising better learning but also as something practical that they and their school can manage. To be practical, changes must not only address important perceived needs, be focused and clear, and seem to be of manageable scope and complexity; they must also come with useful how-to-do-it measures. (quoted in Evans, 1996, p. 85)

Such motives encourage participation in evaluation and in the development of potentially valuable formative support measures.

The kind of management support professional learning communities require is specific to their contexts. Fullan (1993) suggested, "One starts with oneself, but by working actively to create learning organizations, both the individual and the group benefit" (p. 41). The changes an evaluator recommends may address a specific issue or need but because layers of relationships exist in educational cultures, efforts undertaken by individuals have the potential to impact others and the educational institution. "The goal is to get into the habit of experiencing educational change processes as an

overlapping series of dynamically complex phenomena" (p. 21) involving both individual and group development. Hargreaves (2003) described a collaborative approach where

> success depends on continuing support from outside the school, compatibility with external reform imperatives, strong support in terms of instructional materials and leadership development, and a staff with sufficient levels of knowledge, competence and skill to share with their colleagues. (p. 172)

When formative evaluation procedures identify where change and development are needed and recognize the ecology of the learning environment, there is a possibility for professional development support that will address continuing teacher education. It will, by necessity, require generating support from the larger educational community.

Fullan (2005) defined an approach to professional development where "capacity building involves developing the collective ability - dispositions, skills, knowledge, motivation and resources – to act together to bring about positive change" (p. 4). Even when teachers are able to provide a structure of engagement, support, and accountability for one another, the dynamics of their educational community's internal and external structures still affect them. The relationships, contexts, and situations remain relevant for evaluation outcome applications. Fullan (2001) suggested that the "culture or climate of a school can shape an individual's psychological state for better or for worse" (p. 84). How the institution of a school collectively works together affects teachers' moral, confidence, and willingness to participate in educational change.

Teachers learn by doing and will make errors in the process. The tolerance and support within an educational community will be a critical factor in teachers' willingness to participate in taking the risks required for making change personally and professionally. Evans (1996) looked for success through error and suggested, "To

succeed at change, people must be free to fail at it, to explore experiment, err, and try again without penalty" (p. 85). Evaluation outcomes at their most useful may simply provide teachers with the opportunity to share their experiences with colleagues and through this learn from and with one another's successes, efforts, and mistakes. As Britzman (1991) noted,

> Subjectivity is both our conceptual orderings of things and the deep investments summoned by such orderings. It organizes an individual's ideas about what it means to recognize oneself as a person, a student, a teacher, and so forth, and arranges strategies for the realization of these multiple identities. (p. 57)

Evaluation, similar to teaching, involves human exchanges. Coulter et al's (2007) scrutiny of teaching standards applies to evaluation practices. In evaluation, applied knowledge is contextual and requires practical judgement that will modify the ends and means as evaluators understand the particulars of the relationships. It is possible then for evaluation to be conducted in the service of improvement and change not just ratings and assessment.

CHAPTER 3 Methodology

3.1 Research Design

I structured my research as a case study bound by three factors: (a) the practices under study, (b) the setting for the research, and (c) the time allowed completing the data collection. I designed the study to be exploratory and descriptive, researching teacher evaluation to understand its value from the point of view of the participants. With no known published information about Waldorf teachers' experiences with teacher evaluation, this study contributes to the literature on this topic.

Participants were a purposeful sampling as they represented teachers from each of the three faculties in one school, as well as the committee members who were teachers responsible for overseeing the evaluations. This sampling allowed for the possibility of a variety of evaluation experiences and perspectives. My role as observer, interviewer, and researcher allowed me to examine the subjective realities of the research participants in order to understand their experiences, explain the evaluation practices, and discover meaning in the given context.

The data I collected for this study are of a qualitative nature, designed to focus the study on the value of the participants' experiences. The focus group discussion and all interviews took place in the same educational setting.

I undertook the study with the assurance of anonymity for the school and the interview subjects. I asked participants to read the letters of informed consent (see Appendix E) and sign them before their interviews, indicating their voluntary agreement to participate in the study. All participants signed the consent forms.

I obtained approval for this project from both the UBC Behavioural Ethics Review Board (see Appendix A) and the school where the research took place (see

Appendix C) prior to the commencement of the study.

3.2 Setting for Research

In order to situate the context of this research, I provide a brief account of Waldorf education as a prologue to the description of the research site. I intend this explanation of Waldorf education's history and some of its distinguishing educational characteristics to provide an overview of the ontological and epistemological commitments unique to this system of education and what it means for teachers to work in this system. I hope this will assist the reader's understanding of the school's evaluation design, the teachers' reflective comments about their evaluation experiences, and the roles, responsibilities, and intentions that shape Waldorf teachers' attitudes to their work. In particular, I hope it will illuminate the particular relevance Waldorf education gives to teachers' self-study and continuing self-development.

3.2.1 Waldorf Education: Overview and History

Waldorf education is based on the research and theory of human development that comes out of the work of the Austrian philosopher, scientist, and educator, Rudolf Steiner (1861-1925). It is a holistic and child-centered education with curriculum and teaching methods developed to be specifically age appropriate and suited to the stages of children's development as characterized in Steiner's theories. Waldorf teaching methods are inquiry-based for the learner and integrate artistic and experiential activities as a means to learning. The term *holistic* is something of a catchword and requires definition to have meaning in this context.

Miller (1999) characterized "four basic principles" of holistic education: (a) The human being is a complex existential entity made up of many different layers of meaning, (b) holistic educators recognize the stages of a child's development, (c) holistic educators

should not take spirituality as an utterly mystical or otherworldly spirituality, and (d) holistic educators should not reduce holistic education to any single technique (pp.193-196). Miller's definition applies to Waldorf education in that Waldorf teachers work with a spiritual-scientific view of human development that identifies distinct, age-related educational and emotional needs that unfold in definable stages. Examples of this are described further in the next sections. Lessons include different forms of representation. Waldorf teachers' understanding of how students learn is similar to what Eisner (1994) described as "cognitive pluralism" where students' "multiple aptitudes and diverse ways of knowing" (p. 83) are part of what guides how teachers develop lessons. The integrated artistic practices are meant to direct learning experiences that will stimulate the students' senses, enrich their imaginations, cultivate their feeling lives, and engage their intellects. Waldorf teachers claim that, "[b]y engaging the whole child in the learning process, the heart and hands as well as the head, they find that children become more involved and enthusiastic about learning" (Easton, 1997, p. 87).

Waldorf teachers claim student motivation and engagement increases when the content and teaching methods are appropriate to stages of development, including what teachers identify as stages of soul-spiritual development. These particular terms are specific in Waldorf pedagogy. Steiner characterizes soul-capacities as those involving cognition, emotion, visualization, and aspects of intention. Teachers aim to develop their lesson content to be soul-nourishing. Narratives are one vehicle to introduce content knowledge with metaphor-rich stories that engage the younger child's imagination. Biography and observable phenomena are introduced to stimulate and enrich an older child's learning experience. There is a strong value given to working with imagination which is understood in this system to be a capacity that when it matures, will support

independent thinking (Schmitt-Stegmann, 1997).

Waldorf teaching applies layers of learning approaches with experiences that are meant to provide

> equal emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge, the practice of skills, the fostering of creative ability, the stimulation of the imagination, the nurturing of feelings of empathy and understanding, the importance of social responsibility, and the value of moral principles. (Nicholson, 2000, p. 585)

To work in this way, teachers employ an artistic, moral, and academic rigor that involves continuing study and self-development. Waldorf teachers "view their own self-development as one of the most fundamental aspects of their qualifications as teachers" (Easton, 1997, p. 89). They work with the curriculum and methods of educating both as co-creators and practitioners. In practical application, the Waldorf curriculum and teaching methods continually undergo development and modification. In addition, teachers identify with the values inherent to Waldorf education. These include the ideals of social justice and social renewal that Steiner initiated in the first Waldorf school, founded in Stuttgart, Germany in 1919.

In 1919, Emil Molt, the owner of the Waldorf Astoria cigarette factory in Stuttgart, was concerned that the social life in Europe, following the end of World War I, was deteriorating. He asked Rudolf Steiner to speak to the factory workers about his ideas for social renewal. Factory workers met these lectures with enthusiasm, and Molt decided to establish a school for the workers' children. He asked Dr. Steiner to be the school's director. Steiner agreed to help as long as the new school observed four conditions: (a) It must accept children from all social, economic, racial, and religious backgrounds; (b) it must be autonomous, free of economic and state control; (c) it must

be co-educational, and (d) it must include a curriculum up to grade 12. Steiner based the education in his research approach, the science of spirit, or anthroposophy (Tautz, 1982).

Steiner (1970) said the purpose of education was “to develop free human beings who are able of themselves to impart purpose and direction to their lives” (p.73). He believed adults could participate in cultural renewal if they were educated to have balanced capacities through a liberal, scientific, artistic, and practical schooling that would instil knowledge in the context of human values. The idea was not to teach an ideology, but to teach so individuals would be inwardly free and the whole person, body, soul, and spirit could function with self-directed purpose (Uhrmacher, 1995). In order to teach with these ideals, teachers were challenged in their continuing self-development to liberate their own thinking and behaviour.

During the 1920s the Stuttgart school grew and was followed by the establishment of several other German schools as well as schools in Switzerland, Holland, England, and New York City. The European schools were forced to close during the rise to power of the Nazi government but reopened after World War II (Barnes, 1991). Ninety years later, there are over 1000 Waldorf schools in more than 50 countries around the world. Of the approximately 200 Waldorf schools in North America, 25 are in Canada (European Council for Steiner Waldorf Education, n.d.). The schools remain non-secular and non-denominational, but they are not all free of state control. In British Columbia and Alberta, educational legislation requires compulsory testing for students, and Waldorf schools comply as part of meeting requirements to be eligible for independent school funding. In some cases, this involves adjusting curriculum and learning outcomes to concur with provincial standards. All Waldorf schools rely on fees for operation, a factor that limits accessibility to all students. Fees vary from school to school as do Waldorf teachers’

salaries and benefits.

3.2.2 Distinguishing Characteristics

Waldorf schools are distinguished by how they are governed, their pedagogical philosophy, teaching methods, and their teachers' commitment to continuing self-development, which includes meditative practices.

3.2.2.1 School Governance

The faculty in a Waldorf school work together as a college of teachers with decision-making responsibilities for the running of their school. They share and rotate leadership positions and participate in all levels of school governance. A teacher's job description will include administration duties as well as teaching assignments. These duties vary and could, for example, require serving on the board of directors, chairing one of the faculties, or serving on committees. Weekly faculty meetings include business, artistic activity, child study, and pedagogical study. Most teachers are involved in some level of independent or collaborative research that will be part of the study portion of their meetings. Palmer (1998) described this kind collegial activity when writing about the practice of building community and spiritual wholeness in schools to support "educators who are willing to seek a transformed way of being in the world . . . a way of working illumined by spirit and infused with soul" (p. 15). Waldorf teachers are invested in developing healthy social and collegial habits as part of sustaining a healthy work culture. Their work involves personal and professional development through collaborative leadership, teaching responsibilities, and continuing study (Finser, 2001).

3.2.2.2 Pedagogical Philosophy and Teaching Methods

There are five main points to consider in Waldorf schools' pedagogical philosophy and educational practices: (a) roles and responsibilities of the teachers, (b)

holistic, artistic teaching methods, (c) working with Steiner's philosophy of human development, (d) working with the curriculum, and (e) the importance of the child-teacher relationship.

In mature Waldorf schools that offer a full curriculum up to grade 12, the body of teachers includes the early childhood teachers, subject specialist teachers, class teachers (for grades one to eight), high school teachers, and remedial curative teachers. Subject specialists teach multi-grade level programs in curricular areas such as foreign languages, music (orchestra, band, choir), advanced arts and crafts (woodwork, sculpture, weaving, book binding, graphic arts, metalwork), computer skills, gardening, physical education, and eurythmy (an artistic movement program unique to Waldorf schools). Class teachers are responsible for core academics and all other aspects of managing a class, such as parent communication, monitoring student progress, organizing outings and trips, class plays, and class-related events. Ideally, a class teacher begins in grade one with his or her class and remains through the elementary and middle school years to grade eight graduation, looping with the same group of children each year (Finser, 1994).

A distinguishing feature of Waldorf education is the morning lesson, a two-hour uninterrupted academic class, taught by the class teacher in three to five week blocks of study on based on one curricular theme such as mathematics or history or science. This method allows class teachers to cover subjects in depth, in a variety of ways, enlivened with an art- and experience-based approach. Where possible, class teachers and subject specialists integrate the curriculum and the theme of the morning lesson appears in subtle ways in other activities (Schwartz, 1999). For example, the study of medieval history in the grade six morning lessons might include the grade six class hosting a Medieval Fair with games organized by the physical education teacher and a recorder ensemble learnt in

music. Once a class has intensely explored a topic, a new morning lesson block begins. High school teachers work in their specific fields of academic specialization and employ the morning lesson block system of instruction as well. They share responsibility for high school programming and administration, which extends to such things as community service, international exchanges, extra-curricular activities, and academic counselling.

Rather than use textbooks and workbooks with a prescribed lesson format, teachers develop the content and lesson structure by referencing many resources to first learn about the subject they will teach. The summaries they create out of this referencing become a direct, personal delivery designed to suit their students. Teachers follow curriculum indications and learning outcome expectations but use self-created lesson plans and teaching materials. The students' activities in classes vary depending on the subject but include stories, songs, verses, movement games, histories, labs, demonstrations, and investigations. Learning is inquiry-based for the teacher and the student (Finser, 1994). Students use books and resources available to them from their school library and classrooms on a regular basis, but teachers delay and sometimes omit the use of textbook- and workbook-directed learning. Teachers use textbooks for some classes in the middle and high school grades at their discretion. The same applies to learning aids such as calculators and computers, which students use in middle and senior grades when the teachers feel they will be useful. Students create morning lesson books similar to a journal or portfolio, combining artistic and academic accounts with illustrations, practice exercises, and various written texts to record the content of their studies. Projects and independent assignments become a regular part of middle and high school students' study (Schwartz, 1999).

Steiner's pedagogical philosophy described the human being having a threefold

nature of body, soul, and spirit. Within this threefold nature, Steiner's view of human development involved four distinct stages of maturing characterized with specific emergent capacities and attributes. First, the physical body strengthens and matures to a point at which the child is ready for school, at around age seven. Following this, up to the age of 14, the body of formative life forces matures. In the third stage, from 14-21, the developing sentient, intellectual consciousness matures. Finally, the individuality or ego-being is born into the human's evolving capacities. Steiner saw these aspects of human development as distinct but interconnected stages, which develop in an expected time frame but do not develop uniformly. Waldorf teachers take each developmental period into account in the child's education, bringing curriculum content and learning approaches suitable to each stage (Schmitt-Stegmann, 1997).

The early childhood teachers, for example, work with the children in the first seven-year period when physical growth and physiological systems are strengthening. The children learn about the world through their senses, through physical activity, and through imitating what they see and hear. They play and work, learning through direct experience and imaginative activity. Most of the learning takes place in an unconscious manner during these early years. The nursery and kindergarten surroundings are warm and aesthetically beautiful, giving the children an experience of goodness and beauty to imitate. The children see their teachers caring for this environment and are invited to work alongside. The program includes outdoor and indoor play. The teachers structure a well organized week with specific activities for each day, which include cooking, cleaning, projects, puppet shows, dramatized stories, festival celebrations, songs, and circle games. Teachers encourage imaginative play with simple objects. Teachers use rhythm, routine, and repetition as cornerstones in the creation of a safe and secure place

where the children are engaged in purposeful learning. The early childhood teachers appeal to the children's feeling and willing capacities (Almon, 1992).

In the second seven-year period, when the children's formative life forces are maturing, teachers view them to be living strongly in their feelings, while their intellects are only beginning to develop. Teachers describe children in this period as pictorial, imaginative, and dramatic. Children have more stamina, strength, and agility now and are slowly growing more conscious of themselves and the world around them. Learning is inquiry-based and integrates skill and capacity development with activities that require imagination, direct phenomenological experience, and skill practice. The subject specialists and class teachers work out of authority that provides guidance (Schwartz, 1999). By providing the leadership children need at this stage in life, teachers earn the children's trust and confidence. Most children see the care and preparation their teachers bring to creative lessons, designed to be meaningful for them. The bond of affection and respect that grows between the students and their teachers is critical in these years (Finser, 1994).

In high school, abstract intellectual thinking begins to mature. This is the third stage where the development of sentient and intellectual consciousness occurs. This is a time of powerful feelings, increasing intellectual capacity, searching for truth, and taking risks, as the students gain a fuller sense of themselves and the world around them. Teachers continue to meet the students with personal caring and interest but now teachers do so through the mastery they have as authorities in their subject fields. High school teachers support the inner searching behind their students' questions. It is the teacher's task to help the students develop independent thinking and moral judgement (Steiner, 1981, 1982).

The fourth developmental phase in Steiner's theory involves what he characterizes as ego maturity. The ego maturity stage requires that the physical, life force, and sentient stages have completed their maturation. Steiner characterized the ego as having a higher soul capacity wherein deeper awareness and responsibility are born (Steiner, 1996a, 1996b).

The Waldorf curriculum coincides with the developmental stages described above. It is a broad curriculum, inclusive of the "panorama of human history, literature, science, technology, mathematics, art and music" (Koetzch, 2007, p.1). Some elective choices exist for high school students but, for the most part, every student "sings, plays musical instruments, paints, draws, sculpts, learns artistic movement, writes and recites poetry, acts in plays, knits, sews, works with wood, metal and clay and works in the garden" (Koetzch, p. 1). All Waldorf students study arts and handcrafts as an integral part of their development. Likewise, all students study mathematics, science, literature, history, and foreign languages. A specialized program of learning where students either choose not to take some subjects or are directed by their teachers into specialized learning does not occur before high school and even then, the curriculum remains broadly based.

Class teachers gain knowledge and insight about their students from working with the same group from year to year. This allows for deep caring to develop as well as an understanding of children's individual learning styles and needs. Class teachers share and develop this knowledge of the children with the larger faculty of teachers in a variety of ways. Every spring, for example, the early childhood teachers present the biographies of the kindergarten children who will be entering grade one to the whole faculty. The same happens for the grade eight students moving into high school. Subject specialist teachers, who work with all the classes, offer broad perspectives on individual children in the

weekly faculty child studies (Finser, 1994). Noddings (2003) spoke in support of the idea of "long-term multi-year relationships to develop care, trust, and respect among teachers and students" (p. 64). This quality of long-term relationships between both teachers and their students and teachers and the parents of their students, is a hallmark of Waldorf education.

Waldorf teachers know their students well and establish relationships of depth with them and with their families as a result of the multi-year teaching system. Teaching the same children with a new curriculum each year, requires that teachers be flexible and take up rigorous learning themselves. They must observe their students carefully to see what the children require from them at the different stages of their lives. Steiner (1996a) wrote,

> Each life period requires a corresponding influence. In the first, it is a model to imitate; in the second an authority to emulate; the third requires rules of conduct, principles and axioms. The teacher is of utmost significance for the young person at this time – the personality that will guide students' eagerness for learning and their desire for independence in the right direction. (p.62)

In Steiner's (1996b) collection of lectures for the first teacher training course, he wrote, "What we know is not what truly educates, but who we are; this is what awakens within children the human beings toward which they are struggling to grow, struggling to become" (p. 20). He continued,

> For the teacher, three qualities are essential if the relationship with the child is to be alive and in the true sense, educational. The first is imagination, which transforms the intellectual content of one's teaching into a language of experience that speaks directly to the child's soul; the second is courage for the truth of world

realities; and the third is a feeling of responsibility toward what is truly human in the children entrusted to our care. (p. 21)

Steiner put forward the expectation that a Waldorf teacher will always work towards imagination, truth, and responsibility. As a result, Waldorf teachers work with a variety of reflective, meditative, and artistic activities in their continuing study.

Besides their individual preparations and regular faculty meetings, being part of a national and international educational movement includes attending regional, national, and international teachers' conferences and professional development courses, which provide professional development support. This tie links Waldorf schools to the educational themes and research occurring worldwide. Eisner (1994) described the teacher as someone "growing and evolving, a practitioner of ideals, involved in continual professional development" (p. 103). This is true of Waldorf teachers who are meant to bring continuing educational research to their professions, along with a deep interest in and caring for their students.

There are 15 Waldorf teacher education institutes in North America and Mexico offering full- and part-time programs. Canada has two Waldorf teacher education programs and Mexico has one. Two of the institutes in the United States offer state certification and a Master's degree option specializing in Waldorf education. All the institutes offer summer professional development courses and teachers regularly attend these. There are generally more positions available in Waldorf schools than teachers to fill the vacancies (Association of Waldorf Schools of North America, 2008). The schools choose the best candidates available but because there are not enough candidates for all the positions, schools find themselves on occasion having to hire teachers who are still completing their Waldorf teacher education or who have yet to begin the training. The

schools attempt to provide their teachers with support and continuing education through a variety of professional development strategies including mentoring.

This brief overview of Waldorf education contextualizes the practices and expectations teachers in this system work out of. This description provides a template to understand what evaluators are looking for when evaluating these teachers.

3.3 Site of Research

The Waldorf school where this research took place was located near the regional boundary of a large city in an area that experienced enormous urban growth since the school first moved to the site 40 years ago. The school building, a unique multi-storied structure, was designed by an architect who worked together with Waldorf teachers to create its intentional construction. It was set back from the street, accessible by road or walkway passing through a wooded, park-like area. In 1990, the school had added an arts and sports wing to the existing school building. The new wing included a living machine (built for biological wastewater treatment) that operated in a large greenhouse and also provided an adjacent arm occupied by a Waldorf Teacher Education Institute and a bookstore. The campus was situated on 26 acres and had large green areas, sports fields, forested play areas along a ravine, a biodynamic garden, and a small farm for curricular studies.

The school was incorporated in 1968. It was independent and co-educational with educational programs for children beginning in the nursery and concluding in grade 12. The provincial Ministry of Education, the Association of Waldorf Schools of North America, and the Canadian Educational Standards Institute had granted the school full accreditation in 1999 and then again in 2007. Interestingly, the accreditations did not include criteria that scrutinized the school's teacher evaluation procedures.

At the time of this study in the autumn of 2007, 370 students were enrolled: 70 in early childhood programs, 200 in grades one to eight, 100 in the high school. There were an additional 45 families in the parent and tot program. At the time of this study, the school employed 30 full-time and 23 part-time teachers, 8 full-time and 2 part-time administrative staff, and 2 full-time plant managers.

This site was particularly convenient for conducting my research because I was going to be in the area for four weeks, teaching on campus at the Waldorf Teacher Education Institute. This allowed me the time I needed to collect the data. I needed a school whose teachers were not those for whom I had been an evaluator, and I needed a school, as mentioned earlier, that had an established practice for evaluating their teachers.

I undertook a number of administrative procedures to enable this research design. The first step involved contacting the school's faculty chair who provided approval to conduct the research on the school campus. The second step involved inviting interview participants to volunteer to take part in this study. A third step required finding space in the school to complete the interviews. The school generously allowed me the use of their interview room to record the sessions with participants. This small room was acoustically suited for recording, private, and comfortable with examples of students' artwork displayed on walls and shelves. On five occasions, when it was unavailable, interviews took place in rooms that happened to be free at the time. These were the science lab, a kindergarten room, a gym office, and the school library. The focus group discussion occurred in a larger meeting room in the teacher education wing.

The school administration and teachers kindly supported this research in numerous ways. Participants willingly gave time from their busy days for interviews. Administration welcomed me to reserve rooms for the interviews. The Faculty

Development Committee (FDC) provided me with the evaluation documents I needed to study and then copy. The faculty and staff took time for conversations and warmly welcomed me into their school community.

3.4 Participants

All participants met three criteria: (a) They were current employees of the school, (b) they had at some point undergone formal evaluations, and (c) they were willing to reflect on and share their evaluation experiences. Some participants met the additional criteria of being the teachers who were overseeing the school's teacher evaluations by serving on the Faculty Development Committee. Initially, I intended to solicit interview participants through a Letter of First Contact (see Appendix D) sent to the chair of each faculty section in September. This letter asked the chair to inform teachers of this project and invite those who met the criteria to participate. When I contacted two of the faculty chairs in August, they suggested waiting until I was on campus in October to personally introduce the research and directly invite teachers to participate. The faculty chairs felt teachers would be too busy in September to consider this research project. I followed the suggestions of the faculty chairs and in October, when I was onsite, I described the research project to teachers and sought interview participants.

The FDC gave me a list of all the teachers who had completed evaluations so I would know who met the criteria for participation. I identified a cross section of teachers from this list, which would represent the different faculties in the school, and began making direct contact with teachers to invite their participation. Everyone I asked expressed interest and agreed to be involved in the project. I spoke with every participant individually to ensure they understood the ethical issues outlined in the Consent Form (see Appendix E) and invited questions of clarification before they signed it. I offered to

speak to teachers and administrators about the project at any time should they wish further information. The school administrator and chair of the FDC followed suit and met with me to discuss this project further.

I interviewed 11 teachers – 20% of the school's teaching faculty. There were three early childhood teachers, two class teachers, three high school teachers, and three subject specialist teachers. Four of these teachers joined the focus group discussion with a fifth person, a former teacher who, at the time, served the school in a full-time administrative role. I scheduled the individual interview with the administrator a number of times. The administrator cancelled these scheduled interviews due to unexpected administrative and personal responsibilities. As a result, the administrator's participation was limited to the focus group discussion. Three of the four teachers in the focus group were currently members of the FDC. (See Table 1, Chapter 3 for a description of the participants' academic and professional qualifications and years of Waldorf teaching experience.)

3.5 Data Collection Process

I designed the interview questions with help from my thesis advisor and two colleagues, who were both Waldorf teachers and teacher educators. They reviewed and critiqued my interview question drafts, pointing out that I had too many questions, some of which were leading. The questions were not well organized and the opening section requested personal information that seemed unrelated to the research. These responses helped me think more carefully about the information I needed from the participants.

When I completed the third draft of the interview questions, one colleague participated in a pre-test interview to help me practice using the tape recorder as well as practice interviewing. This exercise made me aware that my questions should be brief and structured to elicit the maximum responses from participants. I practiced listening

carefully to guide the next questions and took care not to interrupt the interviewee. I also practiced asking for clarification or repeated what I heard the interviewee say to ensure accuracy. I made notes during the mock interview to see if I could do this without distraction. The whole exercise was helpful in a number of ways. I learnt that an acoustic buffer under the tape recorder improved the recorded sound. I also simplified the questions one more time (see Appendices F and G) and from listening to myself on the pre-test recording, became conscious of some speech habits I should alter when interviewing. For example, I slowed my speech and stopped interjecting short words of acknowledgement such as, "I see," and "Uh-huh." Of most importance, this exercise heightened my awareness to avoid asking leading questions.

All participants received the preparation questions (see Appendices F and G) prior to the interviews in order to become familiar with the topics we would discuss and to begin reviewing and reflecting on their evaluation experiences. Each participant, with the exception of one, was interviewed once. I scheduled the interviews to take place during the school days when the teachers had non-instructional or preparation classes that were at least 45 minutes in length. While I allotted 45 minutes for each interview, a number of teachers had extra time and we met for an hour (see below). I had to reschedule three interviews when teachers could not make the original date, and one interview, with the teacher-administrator, never took place. I completed four interviews in the first week and seven the second. This allowed time in the third week for participants to listen to and edit their recorded interviews if they wished. None of the teachers took their tape to listen to their interview.

I listened to the interviews, began transcribing and reviewed and expanded my notes. This helped me identify where I needed to seek clarification or further information.

I did not record the occasions when I met with teachers a second time to clarify aspects of their interviews as these meetings took place whenever I could find the teachers and were often brief encounters. I took careful notes of these interactions.

I designed the focus group questions (see Appendix H) in the third week, arranged the time and place for this meeting, and invited participants to attend for an hour-long meeting. The focus group met in the fourth week. This session was the most challenging to organize because it was difficult to find one time when all five participants were free. As a result, I scheduled an evening session following the faculty meeting that all teacher teachers attend weekly. While I had asked the focus group to meet for one hour, the real length of this session extended to almost two hours. I taped the first ninety minutes of this session and with their permission, took notes of the comments that continued as teachers carried their discussion further.

Of the 11 participants I interviewed, four were currently on the FDC and two others had previously served on this committee. These participants extended their interview time to 60 minutes, so they could speak about both their personal evaluation experiences and their involvement in designing and overseeing the school's evaluation procedures. My prepared questions (see Appendices F and G) helped guide the second part of these discussions and kept the interviews semi-structured and open-ended. We stayed on topic during the interviews and the teachers generally commented on finding the discussions interesting.

The participants were timely, prepared, and animated in the sessions. Each interview was unique. Most participants had reviewed and considered the questions and four of the teachers made notes prior to the interview. The participants all seemed at ease with the process and spoke candidly and reflectively. The focus group discussion was a

valuable sounding board where the participants asked questions of one another, shared information and concerns, and made suggestions directed to their school's teacher evaluation practices.

The chair of the FDC provided copies of some of the school's evaluation documents for me to study (see Appendices I-K). These were working drafts in review and development. I was given access to read further documents describing their evaluation policies. This information allowed me to see where and how the school's intended procedures were realized in the teachers' reflected experiences.

Before leaving the school, I personally thanked the participants and gave each one a small gift and thank you card. When thanking the participants, I reiterated how I would store and use the data and described again how I would publish and share the results of the research.

3.6 Data Analysis

The analysis fell into three steps. The first step involved organizing and reviewing all the data. I listened to the recorded interviews once while on site and partially transcribed sections that fell into initial common categories and possible themes. I reread the first set of transcriptions along with my field notes and the schools' documents and then listened to the recordings a second time and transcribed further sections. As I transcribed and sorted the data into categories, several common themes emerged. The list included the purposes for evaluations, the varying results of evaluations, the qualities of the evaluator, the role of parents and students, the necessity for follow-through, the attitude of participants, and the positive and negatives aspects of evaluation.

In the second step, I reviewed the transcriptions and notes again, focusing the data by looking at it through the lens of the thesis questions. This enabled me to sort and

organize the responses into two different kinds of information categories: (a) teachers' professional and academic backgrounds and (b) purposes of the evaluations and the procedures involved. I analyzed the transcripts again with the school's evaluation documents to see if there was consistency in aims and methods. Two additional categories emerged: (a) the positives and (b) the negatives of the teachers' evaluation experiences. I shared the results of this work with the participants to test for validity. The four participants who replied verified the validity of this analysis from their points of view.

I worked with the two categories (positives and negatives) and coded responses according to frequency, relevance to the thesis topic, and depth of the response. Six themes emerged, three from each of the two categories. At this point, I looked very carefully at the emerging themes to see if I might be biasing the interpretations. I tried to find three different sets of data that would authenticate or refute each theme. Using color-coding and highlighting this time, the frequent recurrence of the themes confirmed three significant practices that gave value to the teacher evaluations and three significant practices that undermined the value of teacher evaluations.

The three aspects of the evaluations that teachers identified as offering them the greatest value were self-evaluations, sessions with evaluators, and implementation of professional development supports. The positive outcomes teachers identified included increased confidence and self-worth, support to take courses, a change in work load, and valuable teaching suggestions. The negative practices that caused teachers concerns were indirect collegial comments, the length of time evaluators took to complete the process, and inconsistency in evaluation procedures and follow-through. The resulting outcomes from these experiences included feelings of frustration, insecurity, and disappointment. In

reflecting on what was and was not of value for them in the process, participants identified the strengths and weaknesses in their school's evaluation practices. This helped organize the participants' suggestions for improved evaluation practices. It also helped identify, categorize, and analyze evaluation outcomes and results

In the third step, by default due to work responsibilities, I returned to the research after some time had passed and reviewed the data again. My intent was to discern as clearly as possible what participants identified as valuable evaluation outcomes. I was also looking for comments that might indicate if the participants thought the evaluations resulted in change at personal, professional, or institutional levels. This third review largely confirmed themes that had emerged earlier. They fit into a summative-based evaluation result category and included transitions from probationary to tenured status, support for internal job changes, adjustments in teaching assignments, and identification of the need for or desire to participate in professional development courses. The formative evaluation results were more complicated to identify, measure, and categorize and are a limitation of this study. Having only a single interview with each participant, did not provide enough data to more fully analyze these developing themes. For example, when teachers' commented that when they implemented evaluators' practical teaching insights and suggestions, they saw immediate, improved student responses. Did this lead to lasting change for either the students or the teacher? Another category emerged where participants described feelings of increased self-esteem and confidence. Teachers felt that the evaluation acknowledged and affirmed them, changing their perceived sense of identity. Encounter as a catalyst for change or self-development emerged as another possible theme. This would have been interesting to investigate further.

In Chapter 4, I present the analysis of the research through the common themes

apparent within the teachers' comments. Where each point is made, the accompanying quotes are a selection common to the majority of participants. The emergent themes, when considered within the context of the literature review, expand and relate to descriptions of current thought about professional development, faculty learning communities, and cultural institutional change. Some of the developments described in current evaluation practices validate procedures used by the teachers in this case study. The limitations of this study become more apparent and are described in the conclusions in Chapter 5.

3.7 Summary

My goal in this chapter has been to outline the case study design and methods for this research project and preview some of the research outcomes. The introductions to Waldorf education, the participants, and the research site provide detail that I believe is significant to this study. It is challenging to write a comprehensive summary of Waldorf education and identify which aspects need to be included in such a description. The amount of literature on this topic is immense. I am grateful to the Waldorf educators whose descriptions of Waldorf education's history and current practices in North America helped me construct the summary. Writing about Waldorf education caused me to question and identify distinguishing aspects of Waldorf teaching. It is not the objective of this project to explore this topic, but I found this task provided me with some perspective and distance from my own beliefs and judgments about Waldorf teaching. I hope this has strengthened my ability to describe the research participants' experiences more accurately.

Describing the data collection and analysis sections made me keenly aware of the tension this study created for me as I tried to remain an observer of the evaluation

practices under study. I had to remember that I was not investigating my practices but rather those developed by the teachers involved in this research. It was challenging to separate my own experiences as an evaluator from those described by the research participants, and I found myself continually checking, rechecking, and adjusting facts for accuracy in the reported details. The interest generated by hearing the teachers' accounts of their evaluations helped me define my role more clearly as separate from their collegial one. I am aware that my complementary roles as researcher, evaluator, and teacher are ethical underpinnings, requiring vigilant self–reflection to keep checks and balances in place and to enable critical perspective to be brought to bear on the practices under investigation.

Three points of note about the research process became clearer in writing this chapter:

1. The pre-test work with colleagues to develop the preparation questions was valuable and worth the effort, even though it felt perfunctory at the time. The questions helped the teachers prepare for the interviews and kept the interviews on track.

2. Regarding participants' post-interview involvement, were I to do this again, I would provide participants with complete transcripts or recorded copies of their interviews to review for accuracy and meaning.

3. Lastly, I worked too much in isolation rather than in collaboration in this project and believe the effort I made to guard against my own biases would have been lessened if I had worked with a co-researcher. As well, I missed the kind of dialogue and richness of thought that occurs when working together with a colleague in a study such as this.

CHAPTER 4 Presenting the Research

4.1 Introduction to Key Findings: The Mirror, the Question, and the Community

The key findings in this research presentation are foreshadowed by four teachers' voices that follow. Each of the points made is discussed further in the context of this chapter. With regard to the management of their evaluations, the most consistent concerns reflected by almost every participant were poignantly expressed by one, who said,

> I was disappointed. I was willing to go through this but lost confidence because I saw inconsistencies in how the process carried through. The structure was faulty. There wasn't enough thought into why we were doing this and how it could support teachers' work. I expected more. I wanted more in-depth looking at me, a mirror process of looking at me, the way we look at our students. I don't feel I was seen.

The comment spoke to the teacher's willingness to take up an evaluation that held the promise of support, and highlighted the need for clear, consistent evaluation purposes and procedures. The comment also hinted at the personal investments teachers make in their teaching and the care they give to their work. This theme was suggested further in the comments of the next three teachers who touched on the intimate and dual nature of teaching that is personal and professional, private, and public.

> Teaching is the second most private thing you can do behind closed doors. It's a scary thing. We all have a blind side. Evaluation gives you better sight, insight to your own self. I wanted someone to elicit from me what I was doing so I could see my own work more deeply.

This teacher's desire for greater self-awareness introduced a second key finding about evaluation that acknowledged the value of self-study for teachers' development, which in this situation, included the hope that the conversation with the evaluator would support such development.

The evaluator's role was significant for all participants. A comment echoed by many was indicated in the next two teachers' statements:

> This is about human encounter, about trust. In our first conversation, all was positive, there was nothing controversial. The evaluator was laying a foundation for a deeper conversation the next day. She questioned why I do what I do out of real interest. We explored my questions and hers. I felt seen.

Participants were grateful when evaluators brought the combined skills of deep listening, insightful questioning, interest and careful observation into their work. Participants questioned what skills and responsibilities are required of an evaluator and noted the value of a good evaluator. The positive impact possible through what was recognized as good evaluation process was described in this last comment which acknowledged the potential value evaluation can affect for teachers' senses of self-esteem. This participant said,

> I gained confidence, inspiration, and ideas about teaching. In the conversation, I felt affirmed by what the evaluator reflected back to me about my teaching. He asked such good questions. It gave me self-direction.

This statement noted the value of being affirmed and reflected similar themes reflected by the others, all who valued continuing professional development in their work.

This research presentation relies on the teachers' voices to reveal what they value from their evaluation experiences. The first section examines who the participants were,

what exactly they experienced, and why they were being evaluated. The second section reveals value imbedded in evaluation practices, keeping in mind that participants were the architects and implementers of their own evaluation model. The third section analyzes the summative and formative results participants identified as valuable outcomes. In the conclusion, the final themes that emerged connect evaluation with the role the larger learning community plays in teacher development and educational change. I briefly explore the impact the larger community has on teachers' personal and institutional identities and relate that larger community to the initial inquiries that question whether teachers' skills can be evaluated and what role professional development contributes to educational quality.

In each section, the emergent themes inform and shape the next ones. I interpret them at each stage to disclose and extend relevant meaning. An analysis seeking to discern the value in evaluation practices concludes each section.

The participants' voices are not differentiated. While I recognize this may pose difficulty for readers, this choice is deliberate for a couple of reasons. Firstly, the Waldorf community in Canada is small and informed readers might identify participants. To keep subjects' identities confidential, the individuals' comments that are included, speak to common themes rather than speaking out of character. In doing this, I was able to distance myself from participants and look for commonalities without what for me could have been distracting portraiture. In making this conscious choice, I have tried to include participants' comments in ways that are clearly presented for readers.

4.2 Data Analysis and Examples

4.2.1 Purposes, Procedures and Participants

Examining the school's evaluation documents allowed me the opportunity to

compare written intentions and procedural descriptions to actual implementation in practice. Knowing something about the participants' academic and professional histories provided a context for adaptations evaluators applied to individual situations. Asking participants to reflect on their experiences offered insight to where they found worth in some practices and problems with others.

4.2.1.1 The School's Teacher Evaluation Design: Purposes and Procedures

At the time of this study, the school's teacher evaluation practices were under review by the Faculty Development Committee. The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) was a four-member group, mandated by the faculty to oversee the school's teacher evaluations. The mandate involved developing evaluation policies and procedures and having them approved by the Human Resources Committee of the school's board of directors. Each faculty in the school chose one member to sit on this committee for a term of three or more years. FDC members were full-time, experienced teachers with authority to oversee and implement teacher evaluation procedures. When evaluation recommendations involved changes to teachers' job descriptions, termination of employment, or spending beyond the allocated budgets in the Professional Development Fund, other members of the school's infrastructure such as the human resources officer and the school administrator became involved. While teacher evaluations proceeded within confidential boundaries, the committee provided reports of their work to sectional faculty chairs, the full faculty, which is compromised of all the teachers, and the board of directors.

The purposes for conducting teacher evaluations were not explicitly stated in the school's documents. The documents implied rather than stated the intention to support teachers' continuing professional development as an evaluation outcome. Teachers

articulated greater purpose for evaluation than what was stated in the documents. The school's evaluation policy indicated the FDC's duty to adjust or extend teacher evaluation measures to suit specific situations. In general, the procedures required that teachers complete a lengthy self-evaluation and be observed teaching. One exception included procedures for new teachers under probationary review. In addition to evaluation, the FDC assigned first year teachers a mentor. The mentor, a senior teacher, and the FDC monitored first year teachers. In a teacher's second year, they followed standard evaluation procedures. The second exception occurred with class teachers, whose job required teaching a new age group and new curriculum each year. These teachers underwent an evaluation of critical significance in the fourth grade to examine their ability to continue into middle school teaching. It was unclear if the FDC evaluated part-time teachers or if the evaluations were designed for only full-time teachers.

Three self-evaluation guidelines existed: (a) one for early childhood teachers, (b) another for probationary teachers, and (c) a third format for all other teachers (see Appendix I). The guidelines involved four areas of self-reflection: (a) preparing and planning, (b) implementing teaching practices, (c) implementing classroom management strategies, and (d) monitoring and recording students' progress. The early childhood teachers' guidelines had additional categories. Observation and conversation guidelines directed evaluators to the different categories of teachers (see Appendix J). In practice this meant evaluators had separate guidelines for early childhood teachers and teachers on probation, but used the same observation guidelines for subject specialist teachers, class teachers, and high school teachers.

The guidelines for observation included the following headings: Content of Lessons; Lesson Form and Discipline; Teacher-Student Relationships; Academic, Artistic

and Pedagogical Standards; Colleagueship; and Parent Relations. Observation guidelines required that teachers be observed by a minimum of two evaluators, one chosen by the teacher and the other(s) chosen by the FDC. The procedures did not specify whether the evaluators needed to be internal or external to the school's faculty. Guidelines asked evaluators to make a minimum of two classroom visits each, conduct pre- and post-evaluation meetings with the teacher, and submit a written report to the FDC. Evaluator guidelines also referenced viewing student work and teacher portfolios (documents such as lesson plans, student assessment rubrics, parent communications, and preparation materials).

The FDC also invited written collegial comments on a volunteer basis where colleagues could comment anonymously "to identify key strengths and achievements as well as areas needing growth and support" in their fellow teacher. The FDC shredded these forms after summarizing any common themes that emerged from the collegial comments. This summary was added to the teacher's concluding evaluation wrap-up. High school advisors had an additional category that included parent comments. Two elementary teachers indicated they personally solicited parent comments to include in their evaluations.

The FDC summarized the evaluation results in writing and met with the teacher to review the process and discuss evaluation recommendations. The appropriate faculty chair, who managed a budget allowance from the Professional Development Fund, was then tasked with directing funds to support the recommendations indicated for the teacher.

Evaluation guidelines put forward the expectation that evaluations were completed within the school year, with the exception of probationary teachers, whose

evaluations were to be completed in a school term. Evaluation guidelines recommended that teacher evaluations occur every four to five years, and more often if the FDC considered it necessary.

The evaluation procedures indicated that accountability for the school's educational program content and delivery was a mutual responsibility of individual teachers and the larger faculty. The significant time and resources invested in teacher evaluation and support for professional development were an action based on this collective responsibility. When required, the FDC could make summative-based recommendations from the same procedures but these evaluations were largely formative evaluation as indicated through the emphasis given to supporting teachers' professional development.

The FDC ensured that every teacher created a Personal Annual Learning Plan. The FDC paired teachers with a colleague to work on these plans and the two teachers met monthly to discuss and support each other's progress. The teachers shared themes from these personal learning plans with the FDC and faculty chairs, which then provided study direction for the whole faculty.

4.2.1.2 Participants' Academic and Professional Backgrounds

The interviews began with participants describing their academic and professional experiences. They described their qualifications prior to becoming Waldorf teachers, their teaching experience, their current professional development activities, and how they acquired Waldorf teacher education. Participants indicated the length of time they taught in other schools, the length of time they taught in this school, and the number of times the FDC had evaluated them (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 Participants' Academic and Professional Backgrounds

Waldorf Teacher Education	Taught Elsewhere	Current Pro Dev Activity	# Years Teaching Here	Education	# Times Evaluated
Institute	Yes	Yes	6	BA, BEd MA pending	1
In house	Yes	Yes	6	Bsc, BEd	2
In house	Yes	Yes	8	BMEd, MEd, MMEd	1
Institute PT	Yes	Yes	12	College	1
Institute PT	Yes	Yes	13	BA	2
Institute	Yes	Yes	17	RN	2
In House	Yes	Yes	17	HBA, BEd	2
Institute	Yes	Yes	18	HBA, BEd	2
Institute	Yes	Yes	20	High School	2
Institute PT	Yes	Yes	23	BA, BEd	3
In house	Yes	Yes	25	Bsc, BEd	3

4.2.1.3 Analysis of Participants' Profiles

All of these participants had contract experience teaching in public or other independent schools before becoming Waldorf teachers. All were currently involved in some kind of professional study. For example, some teachers were taking courses through the Waldorf Teacher Education Institute, one was enrolled part-time in graduate school, and another was involved in an action research study. All were tenured teachers with teaching experience in this school ranging from 6-25 years. The FDC had evaluated all of them: three teachers had undergone one evaluation, six teachers had undergone two evaluations, and two teachers had undergone three evaluations. The frequency of evaluations averaged one in every eight years. Part of the reason for the infrequency of evaluations had to do with some teachers' previous part-time teaching status. The FDC did not evaluate these teachers until they became full-time. As well, seven of the participants were currently involved in an evaluation process and some of the teachers entered the school when there were no evaluation practices in place.

All participants but one completed post-secondary education. One teacher had a nursing degree and another had a college diploma. Of the eight teachers with Bachelor degrees, five also had Bachelor of Education degrees and one teacher had Master degrees in Education and Music Education. The participants obtained Waldorf teacher training in a variety of ways. Prior to beginning teaching at this school, only four of the teachers completed Waldorf teacher education. Waldorf Teacher Education Institutes complete an accreditation process similar to that which the schools undergo. Three of the Institutes in the United States are work with state colleges and grant state education degrees with a specialization in Waldorf education.

Three teachers started teaching without completing Waldorf teacher education

and were supported by the school to complete their training through part-time Waldorf teacher education programs (referenced as Institute PT in Table 1). Four others underwent in-service training through specialized programs designed for them. The in-service training involved course work while teaching under the guidance of colleagues and teacher educators.

4.2.1.4 Participants' Evaluation Experiences

The participants' accounts, (see Table 2) described the purposes and procedures involved in their evaluations. The purposes included completing terms of probation, changing jobs internally, going through evaluation as a standard procedure, and, in two cases, teachers requested an evaluation. All participants completed self-evaluations and all received a summary of collegial comments (referenced as Faculty Input in Table 2).

Interactions with evaluators varied considerably. The types of conversations and feedback varied considerably before, during, and after the evaluations. In the Evaluator section, the words, One, Two, Three, indicate the number of evaluators that the FDC assigned to observe the teacher. The numbers 2x, 4x, 5x, and 6x indicate the total number of times evaluators observed the teacher. The chart also indicates whether the evaluators were internal faculty members or external to the faculty. With the first teacher on the chart, for example, two evaluators, one internal and one external, observed for a total of two observations, that is, each evaluator made only one classroom visit each.

Time refers to the timing of the whole process from the initial preparations to participant receiving the final summary and evaluation recommendations. The final section, FDC, refers to the Faculty Development Committee's management of the evaluation, including how they guided the process, how they communicated, and how they followed-through with summary documents and final meetings.

TABLE 2 Participants' Evaluation Experiences: Purposes and Procedures

Evaluation Purpose	Self-Eval Complete	Faculty Input	Evaluator	Meetings with Evaluator	Written Report	Time	FDC
Probation Procedure	Yes	Okay	Two 2x Internal External	Good	Good	Too Long	Good Follow Through
Probation Procedure	Yes*	Okay	Three 5x Internal	Good	Good	Too Long	Good Doc
Internal Job Change	Yes	Okay	Two 2x Internal External	Helpful	Oral Reports Only	Too Long	Good Follow Through
Internal Job Change	Yes*	Not Helpful	Two 6x Internal	Helpful*	Too Slow	Too Long	Good Follow Through
Internal Job Change	Yes*	Okay	One 2x Internal	Good*	Did not see it	Okay	Good Follow Through
1.Requested Evaluation 2.Int. Job Change	Yes	Not Helpful	Two 4x Internal External	Judgmental Good*	Too Slow Good	Too Long Okay	Need Better Doc
Requested Evaluation	Yes	Not Helpful	Two 2x Internal External	Good*	No Report	Too Long	Need Better Doc
Standard Procedure	Yes*	Helpful	Two 2x Internal External	Helpful	Good	Too Long	Okay
Standard Procedure	Yes*	Not Helpful	Two 2x Internal	Good	Did not see it	Too Long	No Talk or Doc
Standard Procedure	Yes	Not Helpful	One 2x External	Most Helpful*	Did not see it	Too Long	No Talk or Doc
Standard Procedure	Yes*	Not Helpful	Two 6x Internal	Most Helpful*	Valuable	Okay	No Talk or Doc

* The asterisk symbol indicates the process was one of exceptional significance for the participant.

4.2.1.5 Analysis of Participants' Evaluation Experiences

Table 2 represents twelve evaluation experiences. A number of participants with multi-evaluation experiences made reference to more than one evaluation, but only one person described and compared more than one evaluation in detail.

All of the evaluations had a formative purpose, with half including summative intentions linked to either tenure or internal job changes. The FDC used the same structure and the same evaluation occasion to acquire the information they needed to make decisions affecting teachers' job status and professional development needs.

All teachers completed a self-evaluation and all spoke about the value of the self-evaluation process. They described engaging in meaningful reflective activity through following the self-evaluation guidelines. As indicated by the asterisk symbol, six participants indicated the self-evaluation as a process that had exceptional value for them.

One participant indicated that the comments from colleagues were valuable. Four participants felt these comments had some value and six participants did not find the faculty input helpful.

Eight teachers had two evaluators, one teacher had three evaluators, and two teachers had one evaluator. In five cases, the evaluators made one observation each and in the other six, the evaluators made at least two observations. Teachers who found the work with the evaluators particularly valuable described some of the qualities they appreciated. The evaluators who made careful observations without making judgments and asked insightful questions based on sincere interest and then listened deeply to the teachers provided significant encounters where teachers felt their own self reflective skills were enhanced. They commented on feeling these conversations offered insight to their own teaching practices. They felt encouraged by this. They appreciated when

evaluators had significant teaching experience themselves and understood the dynamics of the classroom. All teachers had meetings with their evaluator(s). It was unfortunate that in some cases due to lack of time and in others, due to lack of procedural clarity, only half of the teachers received a copy of the evaluation report or the FDC's summary report.

There was one situation of dissatisfaction with an evaluator where the teacher felt the evaluator did not observe well and was judgmental. Otherwise, participants described the meetings with evaluators as valuable and helpful, with some indicating this aspect of the evaluation as an area of great worth. Six qualified the conversation with the evaluator in this category.

Participants' experiences with evaluators' reports reflected inconsistency in process. Five indicated they did not receive a report. Of the six who received written reports, two felt it was of little value because the time lapse was so great between when they were observed and when they received the document. One noted discrepancy between the written report and the verbal report. Of the three who felt the document was valuable, one described it as most valuable.

Two teachers felt the timing of their whole evaluation process was acceptable. The other nine participants found that it took too long for the FDC to complete the process. In three instances participants said it took more than a school year for the FDC to complete their evaluations.

Half of the teachers indicated satisfaction with the FDC's work. They described a good follow-through and a good summary document. With the other half, two teachers felt the final document needed to be more thorough, and three teachers indicated they did not receive a summary document or have a final meeting.

4.2.1.6 Summary of Section One

Two participants shared history about the development of evaluation in the early years of the school. They had been personally involved in identifying the need for teacher evaluations and designed the first steps in the process. One said,

> We saw a need for evaluation, for accountability. The intention was for the process to be clean, transparent, supportive, and well-organized.

The other added,

> It was designed to improve the teachers' work by meeting clear expectations. It was designed to be affirming.

A current member of the FDC expanded these purposes stating,

> Teacher evaluations are conducted to have current information about our teachers. We evaluate to help teachers personally assess where they are and give them tools to improve. The evaluations are also an accountability measure for the school. We need to be watching the quality of the education so it can be the best it can be, to help teachers do their best. Evaluations help build an accurate picture of teachers' work and this helps us allocate resources of support where they're needed. Evaluations offer opportunities for renewal, conversation, and new connections for colleagues to access outside resources.

All participants felt the evaluations were important and identified specific areas of worth in the process. Half of the participants felt the reasons for conducting the evaluations needed to be clearer. All participants reflected critically on some of the methods. Every participant questioned aspects of the process that seemed unclear or missing, and all had suggestions for improving practices to make the evaluations more valuable to them. Every participant experienced aspects they did not like and two

participants expressed disappointment with the process and results.

> The evaluation was a negative experience. I asked for this process to seek discernment about a situation. A whole year passed before it was dealt with. The evaluator came twice. We had a long conversation the second morning. The written summary was submitted a month later. A long time passed before the interview with the Faculty Development Committee. By then, much happened between the parts of the evaluation process. The concluding written summary and conversation did not jive. If the timing had been better, there could have been resolution. I felt heard in the committee meeting but the committee didn't realise the depth of the distress. I felt treated unfairly. The structure wasn't professional.

With regard to achieving intended aims, participants described successful transitions from probationary to tenured status, receiving support while changing jobs internally, and benefiting from professional development activity beyond what the evaluation experience itself offered. With the exception of two instances, teachers felt affirmed by their evaluation experiences and expressed gratitude to the school for making the evaluations possible. All participants felt the school saw their worth as teachers and that providing evaluations was a way of making an investment in them and their work.

> I felt insecure about my teaching. The evaluation made me feel better about my work. The strengths in my teaching were affirmed, and I got help in areas where I needed to improve. I got great tips from my observers. The things I felt I needed to work on were reflected back to me. These were things I knew, but having the evaluator see this too, confirmed my own perceptions. I feel more confident in myself.

There were inconsistencies when comparing the school's intended evaluation

procedures with the participants' experiences. Only one evaluator, rather than two, observed some participants, and the evaluators did not always complete two classroom visits. Evaluators did not always complete reports. Evaluators wrote some reports long after the observations occurred. There was a lack of clarity about whether or not teachers should receive a copy of these reports. Follow-through did not always occur and, in some cases, it happened too late to be of value.

> I was disappointed. I wanted input for my teaching across the grades particularly with the younger children. This would have been helpful . . . . Colleagues' comments weren't helpful. I didn't know what to do with anonymous comments that didn't seem to have anything to do with my teaching.

Participants found value in the self-evaluations, in their encounters with evaluators, and in the support provided to participate in professional development courses. The collegial comments, aspects of timing, and inconsistency in procedures and follow-through were problematic. Administrative challenges described by the FDC are described in detail later in the study. These include dealing with situations of teacher incompetence that could lead to dismissal and generally overseeing the extent of the school's teacher evaluations, something that demands a huge amount of administrative time.

4.2.2 Value Embedded in Procedures

The analysis of strengths and weaknesses I identified in the evaluation purposes and procedures guides the next level of examination, where participants identified value gained from experiences with specific procedures. Completing self-reflective activity, working with skilled evaluators, experiencing clear purpose and communication in the evaluation procedures, and receiving support for recommendation implementations

received high value recognition. Participants said that poor timing, faulty process, poor management, and a lack of depth and clear purpose diminished the value of their evaluation experiences. Where participants' identified positive change resulting from evaluation experiences (self-evaluation and evaluators' contributions), they suggested that positive value was embedded in the procedures themselves. Reflections on less-valued and problematic procedures involving collegial comments and evaluation management challenges resulted in suggestions for improved practices, which bore witness to participants' feelings of responsibility to guide development in the school's evaluation design.

I chose participants' quotes that reflect and articulate the common themes that emerged. Where more than a third of the participants concurred in their responses about the value of an evaluation practice, I chose quotes that represented belief, with noted exceptions.

4.2.2.1 Analysis of the Value of Self-evaluation

Participants gave particular value to self-reflective activity that engaged them in deep observation and examination of their teaching and their students. Here, greater self-knowledge and strengthened observation skills became companions to self-directed professional development. In the following quotes, the participants used the terms *observer* and *evaluator* interchangeably. One said:

> I took the self-evaluation seriously. I got a lot out of the guided questions. It made me think about the elements of a lesson and deepen my observations of the children.

Another added:

> It's an extensive look at oneself, at one's weaknesses and strengths, biography,

> and experience. I can see that my challenges can be opportunities to become a better teacher if I work with them, but I have to be aware of them as a starting point.

I assumed the self-evaluations were shared as part of the evaluation process and was surprised when participants questioned who should read the self-evaluation documents and how they could be better applied in the evaluation context.

> Who is the written self-evaluation for? Who reads it? It never seemed to be discussed. Did the evaluator read it? Should the evaluator read it?

When this issue came up in the interview, I learned that the teachers' self-evaluations were usually only read by the FDC and that some teachers felt this was appropriate while others wanted to share this work with the evaluators.

> It's good that the Faculty Development Committee reads this. It's a delicate document. An enormous amount of trust is needed for the teachers to write and share this. It's not a public document, but it could be useful to the conversation with the observers if they could read it too.

Finally, participants suggested the need for advanced self-evaluation guidelines tailored for different kinds of teachers and situations, such as subject specialists and repeat evaluations.

> The form needs to be developed to be more specific for high school and subject specialist teachers and changed a bit for repeat evaluations. Maybe the first self-evaluation will be useful the second time around if it's reread and expanded.

The self-evaluation stood on its own merit as a valued professional practice. Participants indicated reflection was a regular activity but described this particular exercise as more rigorous and more valuable than daily reflections. Their suggestions to

develop additional guidelines specific to teachers' individual circumstances extended the possibility of this activity's potential worth. The option to share self-evaluations with evaluators might take this activity out of the purely personal realm, inviting observers' reflections, and possibly extending the value of this exercise.

4.2.2.2 Analysis of the Value of the Evaluators

All participants recognised the skills they valued in a good evaluator even though a few were dissatisfied with the evaluators they had worked with. Participants described the qualities they appreciated in evaluators such as teaching experience and curriculum expertise.

> I really enjoyed working with the external evaluator. He was a peer in both academic field and teaching experience. He offered a fresh perspective and gave some good insights into my teaching.

When evaluators' strengths included communicating with tact, interest, careful listening, and thoughtful questioning, participants found the encounter had immediate and long lasting value. A participant reflected:

> This was a valuable human encounter. She made an effort to be human with me. I felt affirmed. She questioned why I do what I do out of a true curiosity, not out of disagreement. We explored my questions and hers as to how I could take steps to deepen my meditative life with working with children. She shared her struggles and solutions and we dealt on a human level. It increased my professionalism.

Another noted:

> There was no feeling of judgement. The suggestions made in the conversations after the observations were most valuable. They were suggestions to help make me a better teacher.

Participants preferred more than one evaluator and thought each evaluator should observe at least two lessons.

> Observers should each observe at least two lessons and have conversations after each observation. It's best if one of the observers is a peer and the other is external. The conversations after the observations are the most valuable part. They reinforced my work. We talked about the students and the observer had really helpful insights.

Most participants were grateful to have both internal and external evaluators and emphasized the value of the conversations and timely feedback:

> It was valuable to have both an internal and an external evaluator. The external evaluator offered new ideas, fresh insights. The internal evaluators are helpful because they know the students and the school. Internal evaluators understand the dynamic of the class that an outsider evaluator doesn't know. The Faculty Development Committee finds the external evaluator. They look for someone who knows the subject, has experience, someone who's a good match.

A number of participants noted challenges when working with an internal evaluator. One said, "It takes a lot of honest conversation to step out of the habit of collegial relations." Some felt an internal evaluator, who is also a colleague, could not be effective because, "people know one another too well and might be uncomfortable sharing critical comments." Another participant recognised the struggle a colleague might have to observe without prejudice. She said, "The person observing is supposed to do this without judging. It's hard to be impartial." Participants expressed concerns that internal evaluators did not have adequate time, because their teaching demands competed with their evaluation duties. One teacher made the case for multiple classroom observations:

“The evaluation happens in everyday life. The observer may not see the best lesson. It’s difficult for this to be acceptable.”

A second set of reflections about peer or internal evaluators recognized value gained from the activity. One teacher who had acted as an internal evaluator recognised deepened collegial relations had resulted. Another, from the perspective of being the evaluator, said observing colleagues was inspiring:

> From the point of view of one who served as an evaluator, we all have lots to learn. It was exciting for me to observe teachers. They bring new ideas. We’re both enriched from the exchange. This is true peer evaluation. It’s joyful and energy giving.

Participants made practical suggestions for supporting internal evaluation such as offering adequate substitution so internal evaluators could have adequate time away from their teaching duties to complete the evaluation. Another suggestion was to develop workshops for internal evaluators so they could learn evaluation skills. Two participants spoke about the need for evaluation training. One said:

> How can the observer work in a non-judgmental way? Evaluators need training and experience. They need to know how to have the conversation, what to look for, how to record.

The other commented:

> I believe an effective evaluator provides a mirror for the teachers to see a truer, deeper reflection of themselves and their teaching. Good questions help. It’s skill to be able to do this.

Participants wondered if evaluators saw enough students’ work and made a strong case for the use of portfolios:

> Currently we aren't really gathering enough information on all aspects of our teachers so part of it is dependent upon self-evaluations. We do a pretty good job of going into the classroom and seeing the dynamics in the classroom of how the teachers work with the children. Some things we don't go into depth on are we don't see how the teacher keeps records and marks and gives feedback. We don't see the quality of the children's work. We don't see their student reports or the dynamics of their parent meetings or their communication with parents. We don't look at issues of timeliness on an ongoing basis, how they relate to other faculty members and administrators, very specific things. We depend on generalised matter. I think we need more specific information.

With regard to timelines and the value of receiving written reports, participants suggested the need for immediacy. One said, "The report has to be written within two weeks otherwise the momentum is lost." Another added that, "The observer's comments were valuable. Quick feedback reduced anxiety."

A participant echoed a common theme about feeling anxious when evaluators were in the classroom. He said, "Many teachers feel nervous and defensive about their teaching and find being observed difficult." The anxiety lessened after teachers met with their evaluators. One teacher described feelings of acute anxiety about being evaluated. She was surprised when the conversation with her evaluator was so easy and said she looked forward to her next evaluation. Her comments described how experience with evaluation can change teachers' attitudes about being evaluated. She said, "Having more than one evaluator offers a fuller perspective. I would like an external evaluator next time." She suggested, "We need to look at and change our attitudes and beliefs about evaluation." Someone else, noting the same attitude, said, "We could have more visitors

in our classes, then there wouldn't be so much tension around being observed."

Experience with good evaluation practices changed teachers' attitudes about being evaluated. Many described feeling validated and encouraged by the evaluators they worked with. They looked forward to the next evaluation. These kinds of encounters were valuable and spoke to the need for good evaluation processes that include skilled evaluators. However, nervousness and self-consciousness may always be an element in evaluations as one teacher noted,

> It is human nature to be more sensitive when you know you're being evaluated. There's a little sensitivity that happens and it's easy to step into a defensive place, a place where you defend and go into excuses. It's difficult because you're teaching and being evaluated in the midst of a not perfect situation. It's not a textbook situation. It's everyday life and you have no guarantee of what the class will do. If you do have a class where there are issues and you are really dealing with them, you may be caught in that moment, and it may not be the perfect lesson and then to let that be the sample lesson for evaluation is a disappointment.

This would apply to not only to evaluations for Waldorf educators but for teachers in all institutions.

Eisner's connoisseurship approach (as quoted in Fitzpatrick, Worthen, & Sanders, 1997, p. 128) comes to mind when listening to participants describe good evaluators. I suggest that participants are building connoisseurship within their faculty learning community through these evaluation practices. When observing one another and conversing about their teaching, through the applied and developing skills that many mention particularly unquantifiable deep listening and questioning, they are educating one another. The attitudes they bring into evaluation are supportive. They are looking for

ways to strengthen their practices. The learning taking place here is of value to the evaluator as well as to the teacher being evaluated, and it occurs during the encounters based on observations and conversations where participants are training themselves to take up a quality of self –study through shared practice.

4.2.2.3 Analysis of the Value of Collegial Comments

The contrast between the highly regarded values of the direct contact teachers had with their evaluators was remarkably different from the evaluation component that included the colleagues' anonymous comments. Only one participant found value from colleagues' comments in this form, four said it had some value, and six participants stated that this evaluative feedback was not helpful. One participant's comment summarizes why collegial comments in this form were not useful:

> This was negative. The comments aren't made out of observing my teaching. It was unsettling. The comments are anonymous. What am I supposed to do with this? It's personal venting, unprofessional, not a fair way to evaluate a colleague. There's too much invitation to be negative and critical. The questions are vague. It was hurtful, not objective. It's important to have colleagues meet face to face. It lacks clarity as to the purpose of this. We need to find a better way to do this.

Of interest, no one suggested eliminating this part of the evaluation procedure. Instead, participants suggested clarifying the purpose for the collegial comments, developing more specific guidelines, and requested mediation if the FDC identified critical conflict. One participant said,

> Meet colleagues face to face. Colleagues' comments should be signed. If a colleague's comment is contentious or negative, it indicates a poor working relationship. The committee should note this and refer these colleagues for

mediation.

The FDC indicated that they do facilitate such mediation.

These reflections implied colleagues' comments were desired and relevant, particularly if they were based on observations related to their fellow teachers' professional work. The fact that the comments were anonymous appeared to be an issue. The Collegial Comments Guide invited comment on personal and professional conduct and did not specify verification through observation. One participant said,

> We have been discussing in the faculty that conflict situations that come up with students or colleagues are important not to run from or be afraid of but to let them stay their course and pursue the kernel, the reason of the problem, rather than avoiding the person or not speaking to the conflict because of the fact that there are reasons for this and they're part of moving forward. I'm aware of some of my problems and have been able to work through things and be helped in my development but it takes a lot of honest conversation. It takes really stepping outside of the norm of the collegial atmosphere. We also have different levels of development as human beings and we have different ages and very different biographies and coming into appreciation of that is necessary.

Discerning whether this type of collegial comment belongs in a teacher evaluation is a point of study. This aspect of the evaluation process requires clarification and development.

4.2.2.4 Analysis of the Value of Evaluation Management

When recommendations were implemented associated with a clear process and in a timely manner, participants acknowledged value. One noted:

> The written document was handed in by the end of the week, typed, and easy to

> read. The follow-up with the committee was timely and it all felt finished. The evaluator gave a copy of the report to the committee. The committee gave me my copy. The whole process was given a good amount of time. It felt professional. I got good feedback and good recognition. I appreciated the confidentiality . . . . I was supported by the school financially, and the courses I got to take were valuable.

A second participant concurred:

> I got support out of the evaluation. Another teacher took up some of the lessons. My teaching responsibilities were lightened. This was helpful.

Recommendation implementation hampered by insufficient funds or lack of follow-through resulted in the participants expressing frustration and disappointment. One teacher noted that lack of support left him feeling insecure and wondering if the school valued the educational program he offered.

> Financial support for professional development recommendations was denied. Continued training was denied. I continue to request support hoping the funds will be available for the continuing training at some point. I wonder if there is prejudice against my program or me? Are the financial resources for professional development adequate?

Some participants suggested poor follow-through resulted from an unreasonable workload in the FDC or complications involving cumbersome internal communications. Participants' experiences indicated inconsistency in follow-through and overall management:

> The evaluation process has developed over the years and is tighter and more detailed now. There's a conscious awareness that following up on

> recommendations is necessary. The intention to follow up is good but, realistically, it isn't effective. The committee's overloaded, the budget's limited, the communication with the faculty chair is slow, and we don't have clear priority outlines for allocating the money in our account.

Participants' suggestions for improving evaluation follow-through practices included the desire for clear, consistent communication, both verbal and written with specific recommendations that represent fair distribution of professional development resources.

> The communication from the committee included a short letter of four sentences saying all has gone well. I experienced this as unsatisfactory. Provide a more complete summary letter at the end of the evaluation and meet with the teacher after the summary letter is read so the teacher can make comments and sign it.

When the evaluation procedures included involvement with the larger educational infrastructure, the systems were slow, cumbersome, and inconsistent. The value in the evaluation proceedings for participants was dependent, at this point, on how the FDC managed the larger context.

Two participants found the timing of the evaluations acceptable and seven felt the timing was adequate. Others felt the whole process took too long to complete. All participants made suggestions for improvements such as an evaluation timeline, clear process communication, and procedural consistency. Participant suggestions indicated the level of investment they were willing to make in what they considered a worthwhile practice.

All but three participants questioned whether the task of managing teacher evaluations had outgrown the capabilities of a faculty-mandated committee:

> Time and timeliness are big problems. It’s easy for the process to be derailed. The intent is to complete the concluding letter in one month and the whole process within the school year. It’s never fast enough. We need a timeline.
>
> The Faculty Development Committee members are all full time teachers. They’re busy and it takes a lot of time to manage a complete evaluation process. I feel this is an important part of our work. Perhaps we should create a full-time role for someone to do this. We need better follow-up and implementation of the recommendations. It’s too much work for the committee. It’s hard to monitor the follow-up.

Despite the significant management concerns, participants wished to see evaluations continue. They connected the value of evaluations with meaningful personal and professional development for themselves, translating into educational benefit for their students. Expanding the evaluation procedures would increase the committee’s already extensive mandate, yet participants’ suggestions included expanding evaluative criteria. For example, many wondered if the FDC should include parent and, in some cases, student comments in the evaluations.

> One of the things I’ve struggled with is that I’ve wished members of the committee would be at arms length from the actual evaluations, but what tends to happen is that the members of the committee get involved in doing the evaluations. Then I feel that this compromises our objectivity. It’s a person-power issue and somewhat of a financial issue but more a person-power issue. We don’t have enough people internally who can complete all these teacher evaluations.
>
> And the other problem is how to fit in the conversations in the framework of everybody’s schedules, how to get the committee together so we can preview the

> information, and then how to find time so that all the members of that committee and the individual being evaluated can meet. That's very challenging.

Participant comments indicated that managing the school's evaluations was a large, involved task. The expectations on the FDC were extensive and demanding. The evaluation management issues participants identified did not suggest committee members were incompetent but rather that they had an unmanageable workload.

4.2.2.5 Summary of Section Two

It was evident that the self-evaluation, the engagement with evaluators, and some recommendation implementations had immediate valuable impact. It was equally evident that the overall management of the evaluations required further development. In this setting, where teachers were responsible for developing and implementing these procedures through a mandated committee, it was not clear how the changes would be accomplished without extended administrative support. Is it the responsibility of the FDC alone to adjust evaluation procedures? The magnitude of the FDC's responsibilities suggested simplifying rather than expanding the evaluation processes. The struggle the FDC had to oversee the whole process in a timely and consistent manner compromised the value of their evaluation practices. Faulty process undermined and devalued participants' investment and trust in the evaluation.

4.2.3 Value in Summative and Formative Outcomes

This final section examines where and how participants recognized evaluation outcomes that serve the educational institution as well as personal and professional development. The multiple purposes for evaluation integrated in this school's design resulted in formative as well as summative outcomes. From an institutional point of view, the summative evaluation outcomes addressed continuing employment, internal job

changes, tenured status, and specific directives for teachers' continuing professional development. Participants acknowledged this dual role and the tensions of combined purposes in evaluation. Participants' comments reflected this in the following statements where one said:

> Evaluation is linked to continuing employment for teachers with probationary contracts. Teachers on probation are evaluated in the first and last terms of their first year. The evaluation reports influence whether they become permanent full-time teachers.

Another said:

> Evaluation provides formative information. We want to know how teachers are doing, how they see themselves, and how the evaluator sees them. We need to know what support they need for their continuing professional development. Evaluation is a means to gain help.

Of the twelve participants involved in this study, two transitioned from probationary to tenured status, four participants described successful internal job changes, and all participants said they benefited from some kind of professional development. I inferred from these examples that the summative evaluation outcomes served the institution's educational accountability responsibilities. This purpose for conducting the evaluations was clear and acceptable standards of teacher performance resulted in continuing employment.

The most straight forward formative-based evaluation outcomes related directly to improved teaching practices, such as the acquisition of new knowledge and skills. Seven participants spoke about subsequent meaningful coursework they felt enhanced their teaching practices. As described in Chapter 4 under the section, The School's Teacher

Evaluation Design: Purpose and Procedures, funds for continuing professional development and further training were allocated to teachers resulting from recommendations made in their evaluations. For three of these participants, evaluation led to further training that resulted in a shift to more satisfying jobs internally. Evaluation also meant these teachers were able to fill positions needed in the school's educational programs. One teacher spoke of results that led to a sabbatical year of meaningful study and personal renewal. Another described the professional value gained from taking courses, which allowed expanded colleagueship through meeting teachers from many different schools. Participants also acknowledged the value of immediately applicable evaluator comments that improved students' educational results.

Other formative results were not so easy to identify and describe. For example, participants described evaluation outcomes that resulted in increased self-confidence, better self-reflective practices, and awareness of personal strengths and weaknesses. These results did not clearly identify an ends-based outcome; they implied results that influenced teachers' continuing, forming developments. These results were speculative and probable rather than definitive outcomes. These results acknowledged that teachers were learners and developed their skills through continuing practice, both alone and together. A participant said:

> As colleagues we know each other on the outside of the classroom but when someone has seen us work in the classroom, they know us in a different way. So then in the meetings there's a different understanding that's developed. In this work, the more we understand each other, the more we can support each other in the good and the bad. That level of trust from one colleague to another can only happen when you feel secure enough. I think that's where the real issue is that

comes through evaluation. It's security, feeling secure in your own work and your own self. This doesn't have a feeling of judgement or examination. It is a colleagueship to help one another.

> I was thinking about this with an example from one of my classes. I describe Tibetan Buddhists. They have an art of debate where they're trying to work with their thoughts and their ideas. Part of their practice is to let someone begin a discussion and put out their thought about an idea and then they challenge it and slap their hands and say, "No, there's something false about that," when the logic is not clear, when the thought is not of clarity. They do this to help the other one to move together in their [*sic*] development through their [*sic*] thought, and it is done with the depth of love for that person. But to be in that place where we can take that kind of work and to see it in that perspective, we have to do our work to be there, and the motive has to be right on both sides.

The personal results participants said were valuable included greater self-worth and greater sense of purpose in their work. Evaluation affirmed most participants. They mentioned feeling less isolated, less defensive, less self-critical, more secure, and more willing to expand new applications in their teaching. These personal results extended and blended into those that had direct connection to specific professional development. In some cases, collegial bonds deepened. Participants spoke of wanting to take courses and wanting to collaborate in research-based study with colleagues. A number of participants felt they saw improvements in their classroom practices, in their rapport with students, and in students' achievement. Some felt confident to step into greater roles of responsibility and leadership, and some mentioned feeling more confident when speaking with parents and colleagues.

A pattern emerged regarding human encounters. The reflection that resulted from these interactions influenced formative outcomes. The participants were all teachers and were all invested in educational development whether in the role of evaluator or evaluated teacher. Many spoke out of their dual roles having been in both positions. This evaluation design involved participants in self-study and educational study through investigating one another's practices. One said:

> The more we understand one another, the more we can support one another. That level of trust from one colleague to another can only happen when we truly see the others' vulnerability.

Another added:

> Why do we fear evaluation? Where is the fear from? It's human nature to feel fear. In this case we might be seen as less than. We see it as examination where fault must be found. We need to move through the fear of judgement and develop a level of trust. We're all on the same side. This is more than a Faculty Development Committee task.

A sense of connection to being a builder of institutional identity emerged. Palmer (1998) commented on this value of encounter with self, other, and "the subject" when he said,

> As we gather around the subject in the community of truth, it is not only we who correct each other's attempts at knowing, rejecting blurry observations and false interpretations. The subject itself corrects us, resisting our false framings with the strength of its own identity, refusing to be reduced to our self-certain ways of naming its otherness. (p.106)

In such cases, significant effort is applied to learning together. Participants described

making considerable personal and institutional investments in these evaluation practices, which in some cases, motivated or catalyzed personal, professional, and institutional development. They were, as Britzman (1991) described, making “pedagogy intelligible” (p. 232).

Participants’ comments included three categories of encounter experiences: (a) Through self-evaluation, they identified personal attributes; (b) through contact with the evaluators, participants encountered a reflection of themselves and their work; and (c) through contact with their larger educational community, participants’ encountered a reflection of their valued role as educators.

Through these levels of encounters with oneself and one’s practices, with others, and with the larger educational culture of the school, participants’ formed identity, based in practice and in recognition of practice. We hear this in language when someone describes *what* they do as *who they are*. They say, “I am a teacher,” rather than, “I teach.” These forming identities were part of relationships and human encounters that played out in classrooms, playgrounds, the faculty room, with parents, and in all functions where the educational community invited exchange.

Table 3 makes an effort to categorize how participants’ acknowledged this kind of identity-based result from their evaluation experiences. I describe these as encounter-based results. The table uses excerpts from participant’s comments to build the common theme categories.

TABLE 3 Participants' Formative Evaluation Outcomes

Encounter with self	Encounter with others	Encounter with the institution
• Trust myself more. • Have confidence in myself. • Know myself better. • Know strengths and weaknesses. • Know what to work on. • Have a better sense of my own responsibilities. • Gained skill to use self-reflective practices more effectively. • More aware of what I'm doing and why it's important. • Am a better teacher. • Deepened my understanding of the pedagogy. • Made positive changes in my work.	• Trust myself more now. • Gained confidence. • Feel more secure about my work. • Feel less doubt and inadequacy. • Feel validated. • Feel affirmed. • Feel recognised. • Feel greater sense of self-worth. • Feel like an equal. • Feel better understood. • Can ask for help more easily. • Know where my teaching is competent and where I need to improve. • Feel my struggles and strengths were seen. • Have a better sense of self-direction. • Got suggestions that help me teach better. • My teaching improved. • Met peers for collaborative study went to conferences. • Gained insight into my students.	• Grateful for continuing training and support. • Grateful for the recognition. • I was worth investing in; I must be worth it! • Gave me confidence to take up more responsibilities. • Helped me take initiative for program development. • Feel like a valued member of this community; I am known now. • This was very affirming. • Can represent the school with more confidence. • My spirit of commitment is strengthened. • School made improvements to my workspace. • Able to ask for help, to admit problems. • School adjusted my workload. School gave me support. • Feel a sense belonging, am part of the colleagueship. • I have a significant role here with my students and with the school community. • Feel valued. • Feel trusted. • Feel important to the school. • Joined faculty study group. • Feel more secure, more valued, know if I need help, it's there for me.

4.2.3.1 Summary of Section Three

The summative evaluation results that led to continuing employment were straightforward. Participants expressed satisfaction with these outcomes. Formative outcomes leading to professional development support measures had discernable and satisfying results for teachers when the FDC applied them with good management. The formative aspects that affected teachers' confidence and self-esteem, the encounter categories, were challenging to measure. These formative aspects (see Table 3) positively affected a participant's sense of self-worth. In turn, this self-worth encouraged motivation and deepened a sense of identity related to educational practice and connection with the educational institution. Participants described increased confidence, greater self-knowledge, an ability to trust their own judgement, and feelings of encouragement about their teaching. The evaluation process affirmed them.

Encounters with the institution, represented by the FDC's management of the evaluations, allowed participants to feel a sense of self-worth and increased value to the school in many, but not all, cases. Many participants identified themselves more deeply with the cultural educational practices by becoming more involved in the life of the school, by stepping into leadership positions, or by assuming greater responsibilities. The schools' identity developed or took shape by the activity of its teachers. The ecology of the whole-school environment, when active in this way, was interdependent with one part affecting every other.

4.3 Summary of Key Findings

What teachers found valuable in and from their evaluation experiences had much to do with clear evaluation intentions and well-managed procedures, which included combined personal, professional, and institutional efforts. This school's evaluation

system believed that teacher evaluation was linked to continued teacher learning and both were essential practices. Evaluators and teachers generally understood the purposes for conducting evaluations: quality control measures leading to continuing employment and support for teachers' continuing development, which resulted in valuable learning experiences for both teachers and their students. A second level of purpose addressed accountability assurance for teachers and other stakeholders interested in the school's quality of education. The evaluation procedures were somewhat traditional, and teachers identified valuable professional development activity embedded in self-evaluation, in work with skilled evaluators, and in continuing study.

Most participants acknowledged that some level of discomfort or tension resulted from being evaluated. This was an unpleasant factor. They felt fearful, vulnerable, and wanted assurance that the process would be trustworthy. Most participants agreed evaluations were important and could be helpful when the procedures were clear and well-managed. Their desire for evaluations to continue with improved procedures was unanimous and evident in their reflective comments, criticisms, and suggestions for improved practices. However obvious the management challenges, most participants acknowledged value gained from the encounter categories where affirmation strengthened feelings of self-worth. Participants' statements reflected how the increased confidence they gained through their evaluations motivated them to address professional development. Evaluations changed how participants saw themselves and their role in the learning community. I specifically included participants' reflections about anonymous collegial comments because these comments were strikingly different from the value participants identified in direct interactions. The evaluation procedures had value as professional development activity. With the exception of indirect collegial comments, the

faculty learning community appeared to strengthen through teachers' direct involvement in observing and speaking with one another.

In this school, where teachers generated the evaluation design and implementations themselves, they expected to gain value from participating in evaluation and from the resulting recommendations. I found it interesting that some participants requested evaluation and that most anticipated value from the proceedings. Despite the anxiety many felt about the FDC conducting an evaluation, the evaluations had meaning and were taken seriously. Teachers described the critical importance of self-development and continued learning in their profession and regarded evaluation as a means for this to continue through collegial and institutional support. Participants expressed great value in gaining insight to themselves and their teaching. Participants highly valued self–knowledge.

A large amount of responsibility rested on the evaluators, who reported their observations and represented a definitive statement about teachers' quality. External mentors contracted by the FDC were largely experienced teachers or teacher educators whose evaluation experience was learned in the field through trial and error. Internal, peer evaluators did not have training per se but again, tended to be experienced teachers who were learning how to evaluate mainly through their evaluation experiences. That this evaluation design relied heavily on management that was a mandated duty for a small group of teachers was problematic and suggested the need for additional administrative support. Suggestions for evaluator training, adequate time for procedures, and adequate resources to implement recommendations suggested the need for additional financial support.

I was not privy to evaluation results that made reference to serious teacher

incompetence that would result in termination. None of the participants engaged in this study were in this category. The FDC described their process of providing a summary of evaluation results for a mandated team responsible for the school's human resource management. This information would be a contributing factor in a process that could lead to teacher dismissal. The FDC's mandate did not include the responsibility to hire or fire teachers nor did this responsibility fall to any evaluator.

The relevance of encounter as a catalyst for self-esteem and identity building was important, given the number of times participants mentioned it. The limited scope of this study did not include adequate data to fully explore this theme. The data did not indicate what the lasting affects of evaluations for teachers were or what specifically affected student learning or lasting educational change.

CHAPTER 5 Implications for Practice

5.1 Introduction

The focus for this study was teachers' reflections on their evaluation experiences. I wanted to understand whether or not evaluation serves teachers' continuing professional development and if so, understand what held value in the teacher evaluation practices for participants. Participants acknowledged definite value resulting from some aspects of evaluation procedures. In summarizing these aspects, I am aware that the point of conclusion feels more like an entry to begin further explorations. The summary of research conclusions, recommendations, limitations, significance, and implications for further practice follows, along with my reflection on some of the unique aspects of evaluation practices in a Waldorf school setting.

5.2 Conclusions

Teachers identify evaluation as a valued practice. They invest themselves in their evaluations and want the experience to be worth their while. They want depth and clarity in the purposes, procedures, and outcomes. They identify value gained through increased self-knowledge and insight about themselves, their students, teaching, and learning. Teachers value highly skilled evaluators who offer practical and reflective insight about teaching and support the self-development process. When an evaluation assures teachers that they are doing a good job, teachers feel validated. Likewise, teachers are also validated when the areas they sense need development are noted by an evaluator. Teachers value the direction and support they receive for continuing study and the summative evaluation results that confirm continuing employment. Some teachers also value the sense of community that develops among those who follow through with

building collaborative practices out of their evaluation encounters. Effective timeliness in the management of the whole proceedings makes a significant difference to how participants' discern value from their evaluations.

I recognize many of Peterson's (2000) purposes for evaluation in these results. He said evaluation should "protect children, reassure teachers that they are doing a good job, assure audiences interested in teacher performance, make personnel decisions, inform teacher educators, and shape further practice" (p. 36). One missing piece in this study is identifying the link between evaluation and teacher education.

5.3 Aspects of Evaluation Unique to Waldorf Education

A comparative study to know whether Waldorf teachers are evaluated on different grounds than public school teachers was not part of this study and while there may be similarities, the evaluation criteria included refers specifically to Waldorf teachers' educational practices (see Appendix J). Waldorf teachers include, as standard practice, self-reflective activity, collegial study, working with artistic practices, meditative activity, child study, and teaching methods that address capacity building educational goals for students. These have to do with learning how to learn in addition to specific skill acquisition. Class teachers who loop with the same class for eight years and learn new curriculum each year call for another evaluative approach unique to Waldorf educators. The evaluative criteria reference some of these practices.

Waldorf teachers' unique ways of approaching curriculum content and delivery necessitate specific questions that are different from those asked of teachers in non-Waldorf settings. The question, "How does anthroposophy inform your work?" (see Appendix J) is one example. This indicates a research application for all practices. The emphasis on self-development and continuing professional development are integral to

Waldorf teachers' practices. Evaluation that offers formative value is in line with Waldorf educators' pedagogical practices.

The lack of self-confidence and self-worth some teachers reveal may result from the high ideals Waldorf teachers work out of. Some of their goals, such as teaching to the child's future potential, involve teaching for results teachers may never see. Their teaching emphasizes the process of learning, and evaluators try to observe how teachers are translating such things as self-evaluation, child study, artistic practice, and meditation into their creative teaching practices. As a result, Waldorf teachers welcome the reflections experienced evaluators offer them and greatly appreciate recognition and affirmation (see Table 3).

Some of the current evaluation practices I described in the Review of Literature are practices used in this schools' evaluation design. One such practice includes teachers as participants in developing the criteria and methods for their evaluation model. Other such practices involve this school's use of differentiated evaluation applications for varied situations. Recognition that the larger school context and complexity of relationships are factors in evaluation is acknowledged. This school values the process of learning as well as completed educational results, reflected in students' achievements. Evaluators use portfolios in order to access additional information. For Waldorf teachers, the skilled evaluator is particularly valuable as one who could offer insight, objective observation, and support for self-awareness and self-development.

In some instances, the evaluator appears more in a senior mentor role than an evaluator. There is need to differentiate the roles of mentor and evaluator. These roles can easily blur in a process where people are growing through a relationship. The tension is to be too sympathetic resulting in the loss of a critical edge.

5.4 Recommendations

The valuable evaluation purposes, procedures, and outcomes that participants identified are best practices. My main recommendation is to continue to develop and implement these practices. The practical improvements participants suggest such as evaluator training and adding advanced self-evaluation criteria are sensible. The biggest concerns are the management issues. The need here is for some kind of additional administrative support to oversee the whole process and ensure consistency and timeliness. Perhaps additional outcomes will involve further professional development activity with action research and teacher educators.

5.5 Research Limitations

The scope of my questions exceeded the limited sampling in this study. Only 20% of one school's faculty were involved through a single interview. The study was also limited to an independent school where teachers had strong roles and responsibilities in guiding their own professional development and evaluation practices. The evaluation practices were context specific, developed by and for the teachers at this school and may have limited transferability to other settings for different participants. This limitation, however, does provide a case study example where teachers were participants and developers of these practices and where they identified value within such activities. I hope that readers will find useful content in this study and apply aspects to their own settings.

I recognize that I assumed a personal bias throughout this study. I assumed without question that teachers value professional development activity and that professional development activity is valuable. This is not something I question. Further, I

did not scrutinize the valued professional development activities participants make reference to when they mention continuing courses of study. Further, given my own experience evaluating teachers, the tension for me in this study includes the investigation of my own practices through the participants' experiences with evaluators and evaluation procedures. I am really asking whether evaluation is providing continuing education for teachers and if it serves educational development within the school community. I did not gather adequate data to discover this. As well, it was never clear how effective evaluation was in situations where teacher incompetence was an issue.

I would have liked this study to indicate where there could be links with evaluation outcomes and teacher education programs. Because I scrutinized participants' reflections about their experiences with the evaluation practices, rather than the recommendations for continuing courses of study, I do not know what the courses of study were. I assume such courses could be or are offered in teacher education programs. Knowing more about teachers' specific interests in continuing study, which could lead to educational program development, is the next direction for my ongoing research.

With only one interview per participant, the data collection was not extensive. I did not have access to archival records to see how the FDC conducted previous evaluations and how the FDC followed through on recommendations. I did not have an opportunity to directly observe an evaluation in process. The limited data shaped and reduced the outcomes of this study.

5.6 Research Significance: Implications for Future Research

This study may provide valuable information to support the school's continuing evaluation procedure development. The study may encourage teachers to be more involved in working with their school's evaluation developments. This research may

specifically serve Waldorf teachers' professional development. This research certainly acknowledges how a Waldorf school invests valued resources in their teachers' development.

For other Waldorf schools and any school involved in evaluation development, this research generates relevant knowledge about teacher evaluation that will inform Waldorf schools of the issues, concerns, and values involved in developing and implementing teacher evaluation practices with regard to the purposes, procedures, and outcomes. This research considers ways that schools can develop evaluation practices. I hope that any school working with evaluation will find this study of value.

I hope this study will be of use to other schools by clarifying the value of conducting teacher evaluations and promoting improved teacher evaluation practices. This includes recognizing the importance of educational support practices arranged by and implemented for teachers as a result of evaluation recommendations.

Further study could investigate program development for training evaluators. What would a comparative study of evaluation practices in a public and Waldorf school reveal? What are the lasting results for teachers from their evaluation experiences? What change, if any, occurs in the educational institution as a result of teacher evaluations? Further study could investigate where there might be an intersection between teacher education and teacher evaluation. What kind of continuing education courses are of value to teachers? Do teacher evaluation results indicate areas where teacher education programs need to develop?

An underlying premise of inquiry-based teacher education is that teachers are not only consumers of knowledge but also "architects of study and generators of knowledge" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993, pp.1-2). Such an approach in teacher evaluation and

teacher education has the potential to be transformational for teachers. I return to an earlier statement cited in Chapter 1, Background and Rationale, by Waldorf teacher educators, Swann and Rawson (2000). They advocate for evaluation as a teacher's right, arguing that it is a "helpful form of professional development" (p.1). I repeat their statement that,

> The word evaluation implies that the value of something is identified and drawn out. This act of making value conscious provides the opportunity for reflection and re-direction. Evaluation is always re-valuing. For this reason evaluation and assessment are crucial to the process of quality development within education. (p. 1)

There are commonalities with this approach and some of the innovative work teacher educators describe in the Review of Literature, where, like in this case study, teacher evaluation is linked with professional development activity, evaluation becomes in itself an opportunity for professional growth.

5.7 Researcher Reflections

Participants' comments about their evaluation experiences enabled me to evaluate my own practices and better understand my strengths and my development needs as an evaluator. I am motivated to explore ideas for evaluation development. I would like assurance that what I am doing is supporting teachers, students, and their schools. I would like to develop means for those evaluated to evaluate the evaluator. I continue to see value in these practices and would like to better understand the ways change happens. I heard participants describe aspects of change beginning with understanding attitudes and values through good communication, and successful interactions that build trust.

The work with the participants was interesting. I appreciated their involvement

and ensured the data collected was confidential and not available for others' use. I believe participants' identities are protected within this research design. I gathered and analyzed the data before summarizing it in the thesis format. I attempted to write accurately with detailed description representing the data based on participants' perspectives. I tried to be aware of my assumptions, values, and beliefs so my interpretation would not be biased and would justly reflect the participants' truths. I believe this work validates the participants' experiences and hope it will generally serve teachers' interests in their continuing involvement with evaluation.

It has been interesting to evaluate teachers after conducting the research. I have felt more aware of what participants might be experiencing. Most specifically, I have been looking at recommendation implementation practices and the various kinds of follow-up activities that can occur after the evaluation is completed.

I am moved and inspired by the commitment, enthusiasm, personal striving, responsibility, collegiality, and love of children's learning that I met in the participants. They reminded me, however, of a danger that comes about when schools place too many expectations on teachers.

In a recent conversation with my mechanic, a fellow who is learning English, knowing I am a teacher, he asked for my opinion, as a "demigod", about a school issue. I took a moment to enjoy the delight I would have sharing this bit of news about my esteemed status and godly powers with my husband, but this exchange stuck with me and niggled at something. Britzman (1991) described cultural myths associated with teachers: the teacher is an expert, everything depends on the teacher; and the teacher is self-made (p. 223). These illusions about teachers do elevate the mere human to a lofty status and for Waldorf teachers, immersed in an educational culture with high ideals and enormous

expectations, I couldn't help but think of the painful fall from grace that can occur when one's mere mortality becomes apparent. Britzman continued that the "self-made, autonomous, expert teacher" (p. 237) becomes a role lived in practice and isolates teachers into positions where they over rely on themselves and reproduce the myth of the teacher as demigod. The omnipotent teacher in such a position is responsible for all that goes right and all that goes wrong (Britzman 1991). Too often the result of this pushes the teacher into becoming a demagogue, an emotive dictator, controlling children and demanding compliance as a survival tactic. I suspect demagogue, is the word my mechanic really meant to use.

The educational context for the pedagogue as opposed to the demigod is where "teaching is fundamentally a dialogic relation, characterized by mutual dependency, social interactions and engagement and attention to the multiple exigencies of the unknown and unknowable" (Britzman, 1991, p. 237). Here the teacher's identity shifts from that of an all-knowing being to one of inquirer, learner, researcher, and observer (p.241). The social organ in evaluation where teaching is seen, shared, and studied, to a certain extent, counteracts the tendency for teachers to become isolated in illusionary omnipotence. The encounters, or "dialogic relation . . . mutual dependency [and] social interactions" (p. 273) of learning through evaluation processes become a faculty practice that support the role of teacher as inquirer and learner and hopefully counters the too easy possibility of falling into the demigod trap.

5.8 Summary

When considering who is accountable for quality outcome in the educational process, I suggest it is the whole community of teachers, administrators, students, and parents. Having teachers participate in the development of evaluation criteria, procedures,

and implementation seems to be a valuable practice. When teachers are invested in the development and application of evaluation purposes, procedures, and outcome implementations, evaluation becomes part of the process of their own professional development. Evaluation in this light is not something done to teachers, but something they create mutually out of their own senses of collective responsibility for professional development. When teachers are directly involved in the change process, they can more easily and effectively implement new practices and new ideas.

Evaluation has value providing accountability information and guiding the potential for teacher development, educational improvement and enhanced student learning.

Participants appreciated the value the school placed on their continuing development. To this point, an adequate budget is needed for costs that include evaluator services, administrative time, and course fees for teachers' continuing study. Professional development can take many forms. Schools can tailor professional development to the individual's needs. I was impressed to learn that some professional development recommendations at the school in this study included therapeutic art and other health measures such as massage.

I would like to see all evaluations offer teachers deeper self-study opportunities. Self-study raises the professional profile and educational standards working from the grassroots situation of classroom practices. While change and development often begins with individual effort, this change most often does not occur in isolation but is catalyzed through processes. Herein is where the encounter-based values identified by participants need to be recognized. Through self-evaluation teachers realized personal attributes, through contact with the evaluators, participants encountered a reflection of themselves

and their work, and through contact with their larger educational community, participants' encountered a reflection of their valued role as educators.

While each part of the four part evaluation structure studied in this paper did not have equal merit for teachers, each part attempted to provide a valuable mirror to enhance deeper self-knowledge. The self-evaluation, the evaluator's discussions, the collegial comments, and the final review with the FDC all had potential value for personal and professional growth embedded in the procedures themselves. An astute evaluator who could ask significant questions created the venue for what Danielson (2001) called the "professional conversation" (p. 15). The faculty learning community that Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) described where "forms of association" and "patterns of relationship" (p. 223) among teachers, administrators, and parents influence a collegially supportive environment are real possibilities to support the learning community, of which the teacher is one part. The value in evaluation is meant in this context to address and support teachers' striving and continuing development.

Evaluation can be more than something done to someone, more than a measure of accountability that influences remuneration and status. It can be about making pedagogy intelligible within a dialogic relationship. In order for this to happen, participants must be interested in examining their practices, and be able to trust in the management and timeliness of the process.

REFERENCES

Almon, J. (1992). Educating for creative thinking: The Waldorf approach. *Revision,* 15(2), 71-78.

Barnes, H. (1991). Learning that grows with the learner: An introduction to Waldorf education. *Educational Leadership,* 49(2), 52-54.

British Columbia College of Teachers. (2004). *Standards for the Education, Competence and Professional Conduct of Educators in British Columbia* (2nd ed.). Retrieved November 20, 2007 from: http://www.bcct.ca/documents/AboutUs/standards?edu_stds.PDF.

Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Britzman, D. P. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership,* 55 (5), 6-11.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993) *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69-102). Washington, DC: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (2000). *Researching teaching: Exploring teacher development through reflexive inquiry.* Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Connelly, F. M., Clandinin, D. J. (1985) Personal practical knowledge and the modes of knowing: relevance for teaching and learning. In E. Eisner (Ed.), *Learning and*

teaching the ways of knowing (pp. 174-98). National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coulter, D., Coulter, Dianne., Daniel, M., Decker, E., Essex, P., McKinney, J., et. al. (2007). A question of judgement: A response to standards for the education, competence and professional conduct of educators in British Columbia. *Educational Insights*, 11(3), 1-11.

Cresswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design, choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership/ February.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 12-15.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Delandshere, G. (1994). The assessment of teachers in the United States. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 1(1), 95-114.

Easton, F. (1997). Educating the whole child, “head, heart, and hands”: From the Waldorf experience. *Theory into Practice,* 36(2), 87-94.

Eisner, E. (1994). *The educational imagination* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. (2000). Those who ignore the past . . . : 12 “easy” lessons for the next millennium. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 23(2), 343-357.

European Council for Steiner Waldorf Education. (n.d.). Retrieved July 13, 2007 from: http://www.steinerwaldorfeurope.org/

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change.* New York: Wiley.

Finser, T. (1994). *School as a journey.* New York: Anthroposophic Press.

Finser, T. (2001). *School renewal*. Great Barrington: Anthroposophic Press.

Fitzpatrick, J.L., Worthen, B.R., & Sanders, J.R. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. (2nd ed.). Don Mills, ON: Longman.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces*. London: Falmer.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Grumet, M. (1995). What are the basics and are we teaching them? In J. Kincheloe & S. Steinberg (Eds.) *Thirteen questions: Reframing education's conversation* (2nd ed.,pp. 15-21). New York: Peter Lang.

Guskey, T. H. (2003). Results-oriented professional development. In A. Ornstein, L. Behar-Horenstein & E. Pajak. (Eds.). *Contemporary issues in curriculum* (3rd ed., pp. 321-329). New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (Eds.). (1992). *Understanding teacher development.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hubball, H., Clarke, A., & Beach, A.L. (2004). Assessing faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 97, pp. 87-100.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews, an introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miller, R. (1999). Holisitic education for an emerging culture. In S. Glazer (Ed.), *The heart of learning: Spirituality in education* (pp.189-201). New York: Jeremy P.

Tarcher/Putnam.

Millman, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.). (1990). *The new handbook of teacher evaluation, assessing elementary and secondary school teachers.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nicholson, D. W. (2000). Layers of experience: Forms of representation in a Waldorf school classroom. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 32(4), 575-587.

Noddings, N. (2003). Teaching themes of care. In A. Ornstein, L. Behar-Horenstein & E. Pajak. *Contemporary issues in curriculum* (3rd ed., pp. 59-65). New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Schmitt-Stegmann, A. (1997). *Child development and curriculum in Waldorf education.* US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 415 990, PS 026 174)

Schwartz, E. (1999). *Millennial child: Transforming education in the twenty-first century.* Great Barrington, MA: Anthroposophic Press.

Schwarz, G., & Alberts, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Teacher lore and professional development for school reform.* Westport: Bergin & Garvey.

Shinkfield, A.J., & Stufflebeam, D.L. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice.* Norwell, Massachusetts: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Shulman, L.S. (1987a). Assessment for teaching: an initiative for the profession. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 69(1), 38-44.

Shulman, L.S. (1987b). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the reform. *Harvard*

Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Spitz, F. (2001). Through the looking glass: Teacher evaluation through self-reflection. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 5(18), 1-9.

Stake, R. (1998). *Evaluation of teachers in higher education.* Retrieved November 17, 2007 from: University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Centre for Research in Applied Measurement and Evaluation, University of Alberta, AB, Canada, Research Report NO. CRAE 98-01, November, 1998. http://www.education.ualberta.ca/educ/psych/crame/files/rr98_01Stake.PDF.

Steiner, R. (1970). *Education as an art.* (M. & E. Tapp, Trans.). New York: Steiner Books. (Original work published in 1921)

Steiner, R. (1981). *The renewal of education.* (R. Everett. Trans.). U.K.: Steiner Schools Fellowship Publications. (Original work published 1920)

Steiner, R. (1982). *The kingdom of childhood.* (H. Fox Trans.). London: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published 1924)

Steiner, R. (1996a). *The education of the child.* (G. & M. Adams Trans.). Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press. (Original work published in 1927)

Steiner, R. (1996b). *The foundations of human experience.* (R. F. Lathe & N. P. Whittaker, Trans.). New York: Anthroposophic Press. (Original work published in 1919)

Stiggins, R. J. (1986). In R. W. Houston (Ed.). (1990). *Handbook of research on teacher education.* USA: Macmillan Publishing.

Stronge, J.H. (Ed.). (1997). *Evaluating teaching, a guide to current thinking and best practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association for

Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Swann, J., & Rawson, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Guidelines for teacher assessment*. Forest Row, Sussex: Steiner Schools Fellowship Publications.

Tautz, J. (1982). *The founding of the first Waldorf school*. Spring Valley, NY: Council of the Pedagogical Society in North America.

Uhrmacher, P. B. (1995). Uncommon schooling: A historical look at Rudolf Steiner, anthroposophy, and Waldorf education. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 25(4), 381-406.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M., & Bernstein, H. (1984). *Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Board Certificate of Approval

The University of British Columbia
Office of Research Services
Behavioural Research Ethics Board
Suite 102, 6190 Agronomy Road, Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z3

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL - MINIMAL RISK

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	INSTITUTION / DEPARTMENT:	UBC BREB NUMBER:
Linda Farr Darling	UBC/Education/Curriculum Studies	H07-01718

INSTITUTION(S) WHERE RESEARCH WILL BE CARRIED OUT:

Institution	Site
UBC	Point Grey Site

Other locations where the research will be conducted:
Toronto Waldorf School, Thornhill, Ontario. Approval pending.

CO-INVESTIGATOR(S):
N/A

SPONSORING AGENCIES:
N/A

PROJECT TITLE:
A Case Study of Teacher Evaluation Practices in a Waldorf School

CERTIFICATE EXPIRY DATE: August 13, 2008

DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN THIS APPROVAL:	DATE APPROVED:
	August 13, 2007

Document Name	Version	Date
Protocol:		
Thesis Proposal Case Study Waldorf Teacher Evaluation	July 13, 2007	July 13, 2007
Consent Forms:		
Consent Form Waldorf Participants	Version: July 13, 2007	July 13, 2007
Questionnaire, Questionnaire Cover Letter, Tests:		
Interview Preparation Questions for Teachers	N/A	July 13, 2007
Interview Preparation Questions for School Administrators	N/A	July 13, 2007
Letter of Initial Contact:		
Request seeking approval to conduct research at TWS	Version: July 13, 2007	July 13, 2007
Initial contact letter to recruit subjects	Version: July 13, 2007	July 13, 2007
Other Documents:		
Agency Approval Letter July 31, 2007	July 31, 2007	July 31, 2007

The application for ethical review and the document(s) listed above have been reviewed and the procedures were found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.

Approval is issued on behalf of the Behavioural Research Ethics Board and signed electronically by one of the following:

Dr. Peter Suedfeld, Chair
Dr. Jim Rupert, Associate Chair
Dr. Arminee Kazanjian, Associate Chair
Dr. M. Judith Lynam, Associate Chair
Dr. Laurie Ford, Associate Chair

Appendix B: Letter to Agency Requesting Approval to Conduct Research

Department of Curriculum Studies
Faculty of Education
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4

July 13, 2007

Principal Investigator: Dr. Linda Farr-Darling
Telephone (604) 822 093
Email linda.darling@ubc.ca
Co-Investigator: Kathleen Brunetta
Telephone (604) 264 1525
Email knetta@telus.net

Toronto Waldorf School
9100 Bathurst Street #1
Thornhill, ON. L4J 8C7
Attn. Todd Royer, Faculty Chair

Dear Mr. Todd Royer,
This is a letter introducing myself and the research I am conducting for the purposes of completing the requirements of a Master of Arts degree at the University of British Columbia and is a formal request for approval to conduct this research in the form of interviews and one focus group discussion on the site of the Toronto Waldorf School during the weeks of October 15 to November 9, 2007 with Toronto Waldorf School teachers and administrators who meet the criteria for participation and freely give their consent to participate.
This research project is investigating teacher evaluation practices and the results of teacher evaluations as conducted in a Waldorf School. It intends to generate relevant knowledge that could lead to improved educational support for practicing Waldorf teachers and clarify the value of conducting teacher evaluations. The Toronto Waldorf School is an established independent school, the oldest and largest of its kind in Canada. It offers full and accredited programs from early childhood education to high school graduation and provides an excellent venue to conduct this research with an outstanding faculty and administration. This request includes permission to read your teacher evaluation policies and procedures documents and include any parts of these texts in the thesis document if applicable.
The consent form for participants and the interview/focus group preparation document are attached for you to read. These documents describe the details of this research project including the invitation to subjects willing to participate in one forty-minute audio taped interview and/or one hour long audio taped focus group discussion. The University of British Columbia Behavioural Research Ethics Board (BREB) is currently reviewing my application to ensure ethical conduct for research involving human subjects. They require that I obtain and submit a copy of a letter from you granting approval for me to conduct this research at your school with your teachers and administrators.

Should approval be provided from you and from the UBC Behavioural Ethics Research Board I would like to send a letter of introduction, description of research and invitation to participate to the faculty chairs and/or administrators of the early childhood, lower school and high school faculties in early September. I will include a request that they inform teachers of this research invitation and distribute the consent form and interview preparation document to those teachers and administrators who meet the participation criteria, should they be interested in participating and willingly give their free and informed consent. If you have questions about the study, please contact my Research Supervisor, Dr. Linda Farr Darling who is acting as Principal Investigator.
This research will require the use of one room that provides adequate acoustic support to conduct not more than fourteen interviews and one focus group discussion. Scheduling the times to use this space would be at your convenience.
Please call or e-mail me if you would like to discuss this request. I will phone you within one week to ensure you have received this letter and the accompanying attachments and to provide further information if it is required.
Thank you for your time and consideration.
Sincerely,

Kathleen Brunetta
M.A. Graduate Student
University of British Columbia

Appendix C: Agency Letter of Approval

Toronto Waldorf School
9100 Bathurst Street #1
Thornhill Ontario L4J 8C7

Kathleen Brunetta
Department of Curriculum Studies
Faculty of Education
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4

July 31, 2007

Dear Ms. Brunetta,

I have read your proposal for conducting research on evaluation procedures at our school. This is a very valuable research objective and we are pleased to participate. We are willing to grant permission for this work and will accommodate your requests for space to interview with our staff.
Please contact us once your project is cleared and we will make contact with the appropriate people.
Sincerely,

Todd Royer
Faculty Chair
Toronto Waldorf School

Cc. Dr. Linda Farr-Darling

Appendix D: Letter of First Contact

Department of Curriculum Studies
Faculty of Education
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4

September 10, 2007

Principal Investigator: Dr. Linda Farr-Darling
Telephone (604) 822 093
Email linda.darling@ubc.ca
Co-Investigator: Kathleen Brunetta
Telephone (604) 264 1525
Email knetta@telus.net

Toronto Waldorf School
9100 Bathurst Street #1
Thornhill, ON. L4J 8C7
Attn. Faculty Chairs and/or Administrators of the Early Childhood Faculty, the Lower School Faculty and the High School Faculty of the Toronto Waldorf School

Dear Teachers and Administrators,
This is a letter to introduce myself and the research I am conducting for the purposes of completing the requirements of a Master of Arts degree at the University of British Columbia. I wish to invite teachers and administrators who meet the participation criteria to participate in this research project.
This research project is investigating teacher evaluation practices and the results of teacher evaluations conducted at the Toronto Waldorf School. It intends to generate relevant knowledge that could lead to improved educational support for practicing Waldorf teachers and clarification of the value of conducting teacher evaluations.
Involvement includes audio taped interviews with individuals and one focus group discussion with teachers and administrators on the campus of the Toronto Waldorf School during the weeks of October 15 to November 9, 2007. Over this one-month period, participants' total involvement will include up to three hours including time to read the consent form, prepare for the interview, complete the audio taped interview and/or focus group discussion and then listen to the tape to assure accuracy and edit comments if necessary.
The consent form for participants and the interview/focus group preparation document are attached for you to read and to distribute to teachers and administrators. These documents describe the details of this research project including ethical and confidentiality standards. Participants can be assured that all data collected will remain confidential and participants' identities will remain confidential. Names of individuals and institutions will not appear in any written documents about the project. Results of this research will be given to the school and made accessible to all who want to review the study whether they participated or not. If you have any questions about the study, you may contact my Research Supervisor, Dr. Linda Farr Darling, who is acting as Principal Investigator.
Would you inform your faculty of this research invitation and distribute the consent form

and interview preparation document to those teachers and administrators who meet the participation criteria, are interested in participating and are willing to give their free and informed consent? Participants must be fully competent adults over the age of nineteen, currently employed at the Toronto Waldorf School who have participated in teacher evaluation at the Toronto Waldorf School with an evaluator other than this researcher. Teachers and administrators who have never participated in teacher evaluations or whose employment currently relies on an evaluation in progress will not be eligible to participate in this study.

Those wishing to participate should confirm this me within the week by e-mail or telephone. Anyone may contact me directly to discuss the details of this research further if there are questions. I will collect signed consent forms directly from subject participants when I arrive on your campus the week of October 15, 2007.

Please e-mail or phone me if you wish to speak about this research project. I will phone you within one week to ensure you have received this letter of request and the accompanying attachments and to provide further information if it is required.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Brunetta
M.A. Graduate Student
University of British Columbia

Department of Curriculum Studies
Faculty of Education
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4

Consent Form for Participants
Research Project: Teacher Development Through Evaluation A Case Study of Teacher Evaluation Practices in a Waldorf School

Principal Investigator: Dr. Linda Farr-Darling, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, Department of Curriculum Studies, University of British Columbia, Telephone (604) 822 9093, email: linda.darling@ubc.ca
Co-Investigator: Kathleen Brunetta, M.A. Graduate Student, Faculty of Education, Department of Curriculum Studies, University of British Columbia, Telephone (604) 264 1525, email: knetta@telus.net.
This research is being conducted for the purposes of completing the requirements of a Master of Arts degree and will be part of a thesis, a published document.
Purpose: The purpose of this project is to investigate teacher evaluation practices and the results of teacher evaluations conducted through a case study situated in the Toronto Waldorf School. This research will explore Waldorf teachers' and administrators' experiences with teacher evaluations on this campus.
Procedures:
You are invited to take part in this research project if you are currently an employee of the Toronto Waldorf School over the age of nineteen and have participated in teacher evaluations in the role of teacher or administrator. Participants who completed an evaluation conducted by the co investigator, who have never been involved in an evaluation or whose current employment status is conditional upon an evaluation in progress are not eligible to participate.
Your participation in the project will include:
1. Preparing for the forty minute semi structured audio taped interview and/or the hour long audio taped focus group discussion;
2. Participation in a single individual interview with the researcher and/or participation in the focus group discussion facilitated by the researcher;
3. Listening to the taped interview for accuracy and clarity and to make additional comments if wanted.

Participants' involvement includes a total of three hours unless a participant is involved in both an interview and the focus group discussion in which case the amount of time required to participate will total five or six hours.
Focus group participants will include four teachers and two administrators and

will be selected by the researcher from the list of participants based on the participants' experience, willingness and availability.
The interview sessions and focus group discussion will take place on the Toronto Waldorf School campus during the weeks of October 15 – November 9, 2007 in a reserved, private room scheduled at a time convenient for participants. As often as possible these interviews will take place during school hours. Times to review your taped interview will be scheduled in the same manner. The researcher will be available to support participants to prepare for the interview using the interview/focus group preparation document if they wish. Otherwise, participants are requested to review and reflect on this document privately.
Data from interviews, the focus group discussion and from the researcher's field notes will be used to complete the researcher's master's thesis, scholarly papers, professional presentations and the researcher's own development as an educator. Participation in this project is entirely voluntary and participants may withdraw at any time without harm.

Potential Benefits:

This research design intends to generate relevant knowledge that could lead to improved educational support for Waldorf teachers through investigating current teacher evaluation practices. This research is meant to serve Waldorf teachers' professional development and acknowledge how Waldorf schools are investing resources in their teachers' development.
It is hoped that this research will highlight the benefits of teacher evaluation and reveal evaluation practices that require review and development. It is hope this research will promote improved teacher evaluation practices and clarifies the value of conducting teacher evaluations.
Findings will be shared with all participants. Upon completion of the thesis a copy will be given to the school to be accessible to all who want to review the study.

Confidentiality:

In agreeing to participate be assured that:

1. All data collected will remain confidential with the listed researchers through the following procedures:

- Your name will not appear in any written documents about this project
- All subjects' identities will be kept strictly confidential. Pseudonyms will be used for both persons and institutions.
- Collected data will not be available for use by others.
- All documents and audiotapes will be identified only by code number and kept in a locked filing cabinet accessible only by the researchers. Electronic data will be stored on the researcher's personal computer protected by password. Confidential data will not be collected or exchanged via e-mail.
- You may review the audiotapes and the collected data that pertains to you at any time.

2. You may refuse to participate at any time, without prejudice.
3. At any stage of your involvement, you may request clarification on any issue regarding this project. This project will not involve a risk of any kind.
4. All focus group participants are encouraged to refrain from disclosing the contents of the discussion outside of the focus group; however, the

researcher cannot control what other participants do with the information discussed.

Contact for information about the study:
If you have any questions or desire further information about this study, please contact either the Principal Investigator, Dr. Linda Farr-Darling at 604-822-9093 or by e-mail at linda.darling@ubc.ca or the Co-Investigator, Kathleen Brunetta, at 604-264-1525, or by email at knetta@telus.net.
Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects:
If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598 or if long distance e-mail to RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.
Consent:
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time.
Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form and agree to participate in this study being conducted by Kathleen Brunetta on your school campus from October 15 to November 9, 2007 through an audio taped interview and/or audio taped focus group discussion.
Please make yourself a copy of this form for your own records.

Participant Signature   Date

Printed Name of the Participant

Please give this signed consent form to Kathleen Brunetta.

Appendix F: Interview Preparation Questions for Teachers

Interview Preparation Questionnaire for Teachers who completed an evaluation:

Thank you for reading through this to prepare for the interview conversation about your experience with evaluation.
Please provide a little information about yourself and your evaluation experience:
Waldorf Teacher Education: Y/N Program ___________________Grad Year_______
Waldorf Teaching Experience: # of years______ Full Time _______Part Time
Current Teaching Assignment: Class teaching (Grades)
Specialist teaching (Subject)
High School teaching (Discipline/s)
Other teaching:
Education: BA / BSC / MA / MED / PhD Other:

1. Why were you involved in an evaluation process?
2. Describe the evaluation procedures:
3. In what ways has the evaluation supported your work?
4. Comment on the level of communication both written and verbal with the evaluator(s) and your school's follow-through support:
5. How could the evaluation process be improved?

Additional Questions:

Did you find one aspect or another of the evaluation process more or less valuable?
Comment on the role the evaluator played.
Is the time devoted to the process adequate?
How was the evaluation recommendations implemented?

Appendix G: Interview Preparation Questions for School Personnel

Interview Preparation Questions for School Personnel who arrange teacher evaluations and/or follow through with evaluation recommendation implementation:

Thank you for preparing for the interview about evaluation practices:
Please provide a little information about your work.
What is your responsibility with regard to teacher support practices in your school including teacher evaluation?
Describe your school's teacher evaluation practices.
Describe your school's professional development expectations and support provided for teachers.

---

1. Why are you conducting teacher evaluations?
2. What value has there been and to whom, in conducting teacher evaluations?
3. What administrative challenges, if any, are there in order to complete teacher evaluations?
4. How could the evaluation procedures be improved?
5. Have teacher evaluations in any way influenced school policy changes or any other kinds of developments?

Appendix H: Focus Group Invitation Letter with Preparation Questions

From Kathy Brunetta
Re. teacher evaluation focus group discussion

October 31, 2007

Dear Teachers
Thank you for participating in an interview to discuss your experience with teacher evaluation. The second step in data gathering involves a focus group conversation with a small group to explore this topic further. This conversation will be forty-five minutes in length and will focus on questions similar to those covered in the interview.
If you are available and interested in participating in a further conversation about this topic, this time with a small group of your colleagues, please indicate from the list below, the times when you are available and willing to join this discussion.

Sunday Nov 4, 3 pm	Monday Nov 5 11:00 - 11:50	Tuesday Nov 6 11:00- 11:45
4 pm	1:15 - 2:00	1:15 - 2:00
7 pm	2:00 - 2:45	2:50 - 3: 35
	5:30 – 6:15	3:45 - 4: 15

Other time suggestions:

Focus Group questions for discussion:
1. What is your responsibility with regard to teacher support practices in your school including teacher evaluation?
2. What is the purpose for conducting teacher evaluations?
3. How have teacher evaluations been helpful? What provides the greatest value?
4. What are the greatest challenges in working with teacher evaluations?
5. How have you followed-up with implementing evaluation recommendations made for your teachers and school? Describe challenges and successes:
6. How could the current evaluation procedures be improved?
Please suggest other questions you think would be of value in this discussion.

Appendix I: Waldorf School Self Evaluation Guide

Toronto Waldorf School

FACULTY SELF-EVALUATION GUIDELINES

This portion of the evaluation process offers each individual the opportunity to reflect on their work and the guiding principles which support them. Our goal is to document pertinent information to supplement the observations and reports which will be submitted by observers during the evaluation process. Please complete each category. Point form is acceptable. You may opt to use one of the computers at school and e-mail the finished document to Faculty Development or write it long-hand. If you have additional comments, please fell free to attach them.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

a) Please list any further training, courses or qualifications subsequent to those mentioned in your resume.

b) For our records, please confirm your starting date with TWS and include any changes in status, e.g. part-time to full-time or vice versa.

c) Please list the administrative duties with which you have been involved in the past three years and comment on how you feel regarding the balance between these and teaching.

2. TEACHING PREPARATION AND PLANNING

a) How do you approach the preparation for your lessons? Do you spend time in the summer? Are you able to make use of your spares for preparation?

b) How do you determine when adjustments need to be made in you plan?

c) Identify subjects you feel are your strength and those with which you struggle.

d) Please elaborate in what ways you are working to strengthen your identified weak areas. Are there ways TWS could assist you?

3. IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHING

a) Give some examples of how you fell you have achieved artistic presentations in your lessons.

b) Describe how you work with rhythm in your lessons.

c) Outline the ways in which you use the children’s sleep to support your lessons.

d) Give some example of how you make curriculum decisions. Do you feel you are successful at meeting your curriculum goals?

e) What resources do you most commonly use for content of your lessons?

4. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

a) Explain how you plan lessons to ensure a healthy balance of thinking, willing and feeling.

b) How do you deal with transitions in your lessons?

c) If applicable describe your approach to story time.

d) Describe how you create a learning environment.

e) Outline ways in which you instil a caring and respectful attitude in the students for the materials and equipment in your classroom.

5. PROGRESS OF STUDENTS

a) How do you keep aware of each student's progress? Please include comments regarding skills, psychosocial and physical development.

b) What is your approach to report writing? Do you receive parent feedback?

c) How do you deal with students who are disruptive, inattentive, learning disabled?

d) Try to characterise your relationship with your students. Do you spend time with them in a social context outside of class time?

6. RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS

a) How do you keep parents informed of the progress of their child and the class as a whole?

b) Outline how you prepare for parent interviews.

c) In general, describe your relationship with parents.

7. RELATIONSHIP WITH COLLEAGUES

a) Assess your success in collegial relationships at TWS.

b) Identify any problems you have working in a group and describe how you resolve interpersonal conflicts.

Appendix J: Waldorf School Teacher Observation Form

TORONTO WALDORF SCHOOL TEACHER OBSERVATION GUIDE

Dear _______________________ ,

The Faculty Development Committee is evaluating ______________________

and requests that you observe lessons during the weeks of _______________as

a support in the evaluation. Please visit the following classes:

Please consult with __________________________ of the Faculty Development Committee for questions or funding.

Observation
Please record here your actual in-class observations.

1. Room
   a) state, decoration, temperature, lighting,
   b) posture of students, students mood
   c) lesson beginning on time?
   d) welcome, entrance, eye contact

2. Content of Lesson
   a) appropriate for age?
   b) challenges the students?
   c) clarity of presentation?
   d) enthusiasm in presentation?
   e) responsiveness of students?
   f) is there a sense of the whole?
   g) artistry in presentation?

3. Form and Discipline
   a) Does the form allow students to receive the content?
   b) Describe the teacher's authority and presence before the class.
   c) Outline the teacher's response to individual disciplinary problems and/or difficult situations if any presented themselves.
   d) Describe the evidence of a threefold balance of head, heart and limbs in the lesson.
   e) Describe the beginnings and endings and the transitions within the class.

4. Teacher/Student Relationship
   a) Does the lesson allow breathing?
   b) Do you observe warmth in the exchanges with

students?
c) Detail some student – student interaction.
d) Do you see the promotion of positive social interaction within the class?
e) Is the teacher available to the students for individual help, conversation, etc.?

5. Academic, Artistic and Pedagogical Standards
   a) Is the class as a whole working hard, performing at grade level, eager to acquire new knowledge
   b) Does the teacher promote high academic standards?
   c) Describe the quality of book work or assignments.
   d) Does the teacher follow through on homework, corrections, assignments returned in a timely way?
   e) Describe the quality of the artistic work as demonstrated in blackboard drawings, painting, singing, recorder playing, etc.
   f) Does the teacher delve into the curriculum and thoroughly prepare the lessons?

6. Parent Relations
   a) regular documented parent conferences?
   b) accessibility?
   c) able to communicate goals and share progress of students?

7. Colleagueship
   a) is the teacher easy to work with?
   b) communicates effectively?
   c) willing to help others?
   d) involvement in non-teaching activities ?
   e) promote goodwill and fellowship among colleagues?
   f) can take advice?

8. Relationship to Anthroposophy
   a) Does the teacher appear to work out of Anthroposophical principles?
   b) participates actively in faculty study?
   c) willing to ask questions and hear other's opinions?

Signature of Observer:

Signature of Teacher: Date:

Appendix K: Waldorf School Early Childhood Faculty Evaluation Forms

Early Childhood Faculty Self-Evaluation

1. Start date of employment at TWS and position at that time.

2. List courses of studies you have undertaken since you were hired which pertain to your work and/or courses in the last five years.

3. A healthy life force is integral to the Early Childhood Teacher. Describe how you maintain this in your life.

4. Describe your responsibilities in detail-please note expectations for the day and week, include the rhythm of the program. Do you generally feel prepared and organized for your tasks? Are there any obstacles or challenges in completing your work in a timely way? How do you involve the children in your work? Describe how child development plays a role in this. Please give some specific examples.

5. Describe how you prepare for festivals, birthdays, parents evenings etc.

6. Organization of space- Describe how you set up the room and manage supplies (toys, craft materials etc.) How do you address safety concerns for children working in the classroom?

7. Describe your interactions with the children individually, in small groups, with the whole group.

8. Discipline style-describe how you handle difficulties with children. Include an example of a situation you feel went well. Include an example of a situation that did not go well and what you learned from it.

9. Relationship with co-teacher-when do you meet? Are your roles clear? How are disagreements or differences of opinion resolved?

10. Outline the pedagogical principles you use when deciding on a story or circle theme. How do you manage children who will not participate?

11.Relationship with Parents- how are these relationships established? Outline the schedule you use for Parent Evenings and the range of topics covered. Do you feel they are successful? Describe how you prepare for Teacher/Parents Interviews for intake and for January. How do you communicate with parents if there are difficulties? Are you accessible to them?

12. Relationship with Colleagues-describe how you feel about your relationship with other ECF members, colleagues from other faculties.

13. Additional Responsibilities-list any other activities you do in support of the school. Please articulate your contributions to Open Houses or other outreach efforts, conferences, courses, committee work.
14. Concerns and/or goals- articulate issues which you feel need to be addressed to enrich either the working relationship or your professional development and steps you wish to take to address them.

15. Strengths-summarize the successes and gifts you have discovered in yourself while working at TWS.

Early Childhood Faculty Self Reflection
Probation: Lead Teaching Positions

1. Describe the position are you in at this time.

2. Comment on the pedagogical principles you use when planning your program

3. How do you carry festivals and birthdays?

4. Describe your interactions with the children: individually and in groups. How do you handle difficult situations? Give an example. Describe a rewarding interaction.

5. Comment on your relationships with parents

6. Comment on your relationships with colleagues

7. What do you find challenging in your work?

8. What have been your successes and what gifts do you bring?