

**The Relationship Between Students' Academic Achievement and Teachers' Perceptions of
Administrative TEAM Feedback at Select Elementary Schools**

Charity L. Roberts

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of

Education

Education Department

School of Sciences and Education

Milligan University, Tennessee

2021

Doctoral Committee:

Dr. Patrick Kariuki

Dr. Mark Dula

Dr. Angela Hilton-Prillhart

@2021

Charity Roberts

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. Student subpopulations and teachers' years of experience were also examined. Participants in this study were randomly selected students from grades 3, 4, and 5 that completed the TNReady state assessment in the 2018-2019 school year. All participants were from eleven elementary schools in a single school district in Tennessee. Teacher perceptions data were collected using an online survey distributed to approximately 300 teachers resulting in a 36% return rate with 109 respondents. The survey consisted of 24 survey questions that used a four-point Likert scale. Data were analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficient. The results indicated no significant correlation with teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback for: student mathematics achievement scores ($r = .007, p = .941$), student English Language Arts Achievement scores ($r = .016, p = .86$), low-income student mathematics achievement scores ($r = .01, p = .920$), low-income student English Language Arts Achievement scores ($r = .062, p = .523$), and students with disabilities mathematics achievement scores ($r = .016, p = .871$). A significant, very weak negative relationship was found between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students with disabilities English Language Arts achievement scores ($r = -.199, p = .039$). Two conclusions were inferred: 1) Feedback is a complex process that impacts student learning through a layering of actions and practices; 2) Feedback should be used to examine equitable practices. Future research should examine the quantity and quality of administrative feedback to teachers during the pandemic closures. The focus could be on feedback loops between administrators, classroom teachers, and special education teachers.

Keywords: Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), TNReady, Administrative Feedback, Students with Disabilities, Low-Income, Academic Achievement, Teacher Perceptions

Milligan University Dissertation Defense Approval Form

Candidate Name Charity Roberts

Date of Defense 4-20-2021

Dissertation Title The Relationship Between Students' Academic Achievement and Teachers' Perceptions of Administrative Team Feedback

Final Approval of Dissertation Defense

A signature below indicates committee members agree with the following:

- 1) Agreement the dissertation meets with the committee's approval.
- 2) Agreement the oral defense of the dissertation was successful.

Patrice n. Karunkin
Dissertation Chair Signature

4/20/21
Date

M. Durb
Dissertation Committee Member Signature

4/22/21
Date

Angela Hinton-Piehnert
Dissertation Committee Member Signature

04/26/2021
Date

Other Required Signatures

Patrice n. Karunkin
Ed. D. Research Director Signature

4/20/21
Date

Angela Hinton-Piehnert
Area Chair of Education Signature

04/26/2021
Date

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my parents Larry and Helen Roberts. Thank you for your unconditional love, teaching me to pray with fervor, and to always give wholeheartedly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my appreciation to my dissertation committee. Dr. Patrick Kariuki's time, encouragement, and support were crucial to finishing this project. Dr. Angela Hilton-Prillhart and Dr. Mark Dula supported this research through timely feedback. Next, I would like to express special thanks to Dr. David Timbs for continuously asking why and challenging me to refine my practice, to Dr. Cory Gardenhour for seeing potential and helping me build stamina, and to Dr. Tausha Clay for always encouraging me to push forward. My Milligan cohort has been a safety net and second family. They picked me up and dusted me off many times. I can't imagine this journey without them. I am grateful for the support of my children. Tuesday Dowell continuously held me accountable and inspired me with her determination and spunk. Kenny Dowell's prayers were fervent. I want to say thank you to the Jesus Girls. This special group of women prayed without ceasing, mapped scripture, and supported discernment. I want to acknowledge Todd Biggs for his encouraging words and faith. I want to express gratitude to my school family. I love each member of this special community and wholeheartedly thank them for their support. Finally, I wanted to express my gratitude to my mother, Helen Roberts. She showed me how to lean into God throughout every bump in the road.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	9
Definitions.....	10
Assumptions	11
Scope and Delimitations	11
Limitations.....	11
Study and Organization.....	11
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Background	13
Administrative Feedback	16
Perceptions.....	23
Conclusion.....	29

3.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	31
	Introduction.....	31
	Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	31
	Population and Sample.....	33
	Instrument.....	37
	Data Collection and Procedures.....	37
	Data Analysis.....	38
	Summary.....	39
4.	DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS.....	40
	Introduction.....	40
	Demographic Data.....	40
	Findings.....	41
	Summary.....	49
5.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS...51	
	Summary of Findings.....	51
	Discussion of Findings.....	52
	Limitations of the Study.....	58
	Conclusion.....	58
	Recommendations for Practices.....	59
	Recommendations for Future Research.....	61
	REFERENCES.....	63
	APPENDICES.....	74
	APPENDIX A Survey.....	75

Lists of Tables

Tables	Page
1. Student Ethnicity of Select School District.....	34
2. Student Demographics in Select School District.....	34
3. TNReady Performance Levels	36
4. Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Mathematics Scores	41
5. Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Low- Income Student Mathematics Scores	42
6. Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students with disabilities Mathematics Scores.....	43
7. Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students English Language Arts Scores.....	44
8. Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Low- Income Students English Language Arts Scores.....	45
9. Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and students with Disabilities English Language Arts Scores.....	46
10. Correlation Coefficient of Teachers with more than Five Years of Experience Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students Mathematics Scores.....	48
11. Correlation Coefficient of Teachers with more than Five Years of Experience Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students English Language Arts Scores	49

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background of the Study

Feedback as a useful tool for elevating teaching and learning is supported across educational research (Hattie, 2012; Wiśniewski et al., 2020). Meta-analysis of 196 studies with almost 7,000 effect sizes produced a dramatic increase to the reported effect size for feedback on learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). With an effect size of .75, feedback is commonly incorporated as part of formal and informal teacher evaluation models (Hattie, 2012, 267; Putnam, H., 2018). Hattie cites disconnect within feedback loops, "While feedback is among the most powerful moderators of learning, its effects are among the most variable" (p.129). One factor that influences feedback effectiveness is teacher perceptions; transference of evaluation feedback to classroom practices is directly linked to teacher perceptions (Joyce & Showers, 1983; Tuma et al., 2018). Jamshidian et al. (2019) indicate that teacher perceptions of administrative feedback influences the effectiveness of transference to instructional practices and student learning. Administrators must generate authentic dialogue that results in actionable feedback (Leiva et al., 2016).

Existing research examines the relationship between feedback transference and instructional shifts; further, the research explores the effects of teacher perceptions on transference (Ripley, 2016; Tuma et al., 2018; Horne, 2012; Leiva et al., 2016). A gap in research exists between teacher perceptions of feedback and connections to student achievement. The examination of the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative feedback and student achievement is the focus of this study.

Tennessee's use of report cards for districts and individual schools brings the use of accountability measures based on student achievement to center stage. Understanding the relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) feedback provides insight into how gains can be maintained overtime and achievement gaps can be narrowed. The TEAM evaluation model is recognized nationally as a pioneering model that supports teacher growth at a rapid and high rate; the TEAM model requires that all teachers have 1-8 formal observations annually and receive administrative feedback during pre and post-observation conferences (Putnam et al., 2018). The TEAM model's repetitive use of administrative feedback is an indication that Tennessee has placed a large premium on feedback as a strategy for increasing student achievement. Examining the relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback provides insight into the effectiveness of Tennessee's investment in the evaluation system.

Jamshidian et al. (2019) focused on teacher perceptions about evaluators and concluded that their perceptions impacted the effectiveness of feedback from evaluations. We can make an inference that the relationship between administrators and teachers influences the implementation of feedback. Jamshidian et al.'s (2019) study was conducted at the university level; however, its conclusions can be applied to all education evaluation levels. For feedback to be meaningful and actionable, a culture of trust must be established. Building relationships and developing a culture that promotes growth and learning are paramount to the effectiveness of feedback. Without relationships between administrators and teachers, feedback is perceived as arbitrary. Teachers' perceptions about the usefulness of feedback directly impacts their willingness and ability to utilize strategies and pedagogical theories to support student

achievement. Lemov (2015) indicates that teachers must evaluate, problem-solve and adapt ideologies, along with tools to achieve the specific goal of increasing student achievement. As with many similar studies, the focus thus far is on establishing teachers' perceptions and the influence those perceptions have on instructional practices.

Kane et al. (2012) examined relationships between teacher observation scores and student achievement; teachers with higher evaluation scores had students with high achievement outcomes. A pattern of evaluation components' reliability was established throughout this research, resulting in the conclusion that there is a clear relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student outcomes. Examining this conclusion alongside Jamshidian et al.'s (2019) observations about teacher perceptions leads us to the need for exploration of the relationship that exists between students' achievement and teacher perceptions regarding the use of administrative feedback.

The motivating factor for administrative feedback to teachers is to impact student learning outcomes. Principals in Illinois indicated a lack of time to collaborate with teachers during the evaluation process effectively (Lavigne & Chamberlain, 2016). Lavigne and Chamberlain (2016) describe the need for policy makers to design policies that consider the amount of responsibility administrators have and work to protect administrative time spent on educator professional development. The ability to prioritize and manage resources is a vital characteristic that should be supported among administrators and educators to ensure the most useful feedback strategies are used to leverage evaluation data.

Digging deeper into utilizing evaluation as a means for accountability leads to the disaggregation of strategies used in evaluation processes to leverage growth and capacity building at the grassroots instruction level. Goodwin, Cameron, and Hein (2015) list 66 best

practices of influential leaders. Woven throughout these practices is the use of continuous authentic dialog that focuses on the needs, expectations, and data associated with practitioner capacity building to support student achievement. It can be inferred from their extensive review of research that feedback is a pivotal instrument for moving the needle when developing educator capacity and furthering student achievement. Bradley (2015) indicates useful feedback is constructive, provides encouragement, and includes teacher input. Teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of administrative feedback are directly related to administrators' ability to build rapport and impact culture. Bradley indicates teachers need to experience constructive feedback in the context of connection and established relationships.

Kane, et al. (2012) state, "Ultimately, the goal is to use classroom observations to help teachers improve student outcomes. A classroom observation system that bears no relationship to student outcomes will be of little help in doing so" (p.6). For evaluations to impact student achievement, teachers must perceive the process as being useful. Each component of teacher evaluation models should contribute to student achievement by building teacher capacity for effective instruction. Hattie (2012) states, "Teachers' beliefs and commitments are the greatest influence on student achievement over which we can have some control" (p.25).

Administrative feedback is utilized twice in the Tennessee TEAM model. The repetition of this component indicates that there is an expectation that administrative feedback is being leveraged to improve teachers' individual competencies to support student achievement.

Tennessee Department of Education (2018b) requires that TEAM evaluators complete training and pass a rigorous certification test; failure to maintain certification is considered a grievous offense. Evaluators receive in-depth training on how to engage with educators using high-quality feedback. Tennessee Department of Education (2013) states, "Participants

(evaluators) will: prepare to implement an accurate, fair, credible, rigorous, and transparent evaluation... conducting effective post-conferences... utilizing... meaningful and actionable feedback for educators" (6). Emphasis on actionable, useful feedback is referenced throughout the TEAM model. It includes modeling, scripts, exemplars, and clear expectations that all evaluators are required to participate in collaborative pre and post evaluation conferences with teachers using effective feedback (Tennessee Department of Education, 2018b). The feedback loop in Tennessee's TEAM model is reciprocal in that feedback is given in two directions. Administrators and teachers give and receive feedback from each other as part of the TEAM model. Administrators are evaluated based on their ability to provide and receive feedback (Tennessee, n.d.c). TEAM's intentional focus on feedback partnered with Tennessee's rigorous certification process leads to the inference that all TEAM evaluators have a well-developed understanding of useful feedback. Principals that are certified to perform evaluations are expected to give high-quality feedback.

Teachers' perceptions regarding the usefulness of feedback are important because it determines the effectiveness of administrative feedback. Evaluation feedback must be perceived as useful for educators to be motivated to incorporate it in ways that lead to improved practices (Tuma, et al. 2018). Tuma, et al. (2018) state, "Paying attention to teachers' perceptions of the feedback they receive... to evaluate their performance is critical for understanding how schools and districts can successfully translate evaluation and feedback into improved teaching practices" (p.2). The incorporation of staff input further highlights the importance of teacher perceptions as part of administrators' evaluation composite scores (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.c). Tennessee places a high premium on both feedback and teachers' perceptions. When teachers perceive feedback as useful, it will impact instructional practices and student outcomes.

This research included comparisons of disaggregated student sub-populations. The examination of subgroup populations is a way to address inequities that exist within current educational settings. Gregg (2019) states, "Equity is defined as the improvement of underperforming student groups...one way to help inform interventions is by having an interpretable and useful equity measure... currently, this equity measure is based on comparisons of subgroup performance at the school and the state-level." The Tennessee Department of Education (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.a) includes disaggregated data for low-income students and students with special needs as a way to determine the effectiveness of districts and schools to support traditionally underserved populations. The use of subgroup populations to better understand the relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback will provide insight into the impact of leader feedback on student outcomes.

Statement of Problem

Merriam and Tisdale (2016) state, "What we see depends on our angle of response" (p.245). Because teacher perceptions are highly personal and impact classroom instruction there is a clear need to improve our understanding of the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and student achievement (Tuma et al., 2018). 2018 Tennessee Educator Survey indicates that 72% of teachers believe evaluation processes improved their personal instructional practices; 69% believe that evaluation processes increase student learning (Putnam et al., 2018). Putnam, et al. state, "53% of teachers surveyed believe that the feedback received from evaluators was focused more on helping teachers improve, rather than making judgments about performance" (p.20). An inference can be made that most teachers believe that a connection exists between administrative feedback and student learning.

In general, a focus on student achievement to determine teacher effectiveness is common among United States education systems. Student achievement measured through standardized, benchmark, and norm-referenced assessments, along with administrator evaluation of teachers' performance, are critical components used to formulate teachers' composite effect scores (Dodson, 2017). We know very little about the relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative feedback (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016). One would expect that student achievement would increase when teachers' perceptions about administrative TEAM feedback are positive, but we do not know this. This research is essential, so that this topic can be examined to determine if a relationship exists between student achievement on state standardized assessments and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. The independent variable is teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. The dependent variable is student achievement scores. It includes comparisons of teacher perception scores with composite mathematics and English Language Arts scores and comparison of achievement scores using student subpopulations and teachers' years of experience.

Feedback is widely accepted and implemented as an evaluation tool within teacher evaluation models. The lens through which teachers receive feedback determines the impact of feedback on instructional practices. Positively perceived feedback is more likely to impact instructional practices and student achievement (Tuma et al. 2019). Negative perceptions regarding feedback results in a lack of transference and may promote stagnant mindsets that can impede and even stunt growth (Bridges & Bridges, 2016; Joyce & Showers, 1983; Scott, 2017).

Administrators must ground feedback in research-based best practices that reflect a clear understanding of the context for which feedback is being received. Brown (2018) indicates that viewing feedback through the receiver's lens, in this case, the teacher, is crucial to establishing authenticity and ultimately transference. Understanding the relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of feedback will provide a foundational understanding of how to better leverage feedback practices to increase student learning.

Research Questions

1. Is there a relationship between students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
2. Is there a relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
3. Is there a relationship between students' with disabilities achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
4. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
5. Is there a relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

6. Is there a relationship between students' with disabilities achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
7. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
8. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
9. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
10. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback on student achievement in a rural school district in East Tennessee. The State of Tennessee has placed a great deal of emphasis on accountability through student achievement and the TEAM model. A rural East Tennessee school district has mirrored this emphasis throughout its strategic plan (2020). District goals are developed based on student achievement scores across mathematics and English Language Arts. Measurement of these goals leans heavily on administrators collaborating with teachers through TEAM generated feedback

(Strategic Plan, 2020). By studying teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback in relationship with student achievement, this study may provide beneficial insight into any link between teacher evaluation practices and student achievement. This study is intended to make a positive contribution to research regarding educator evaluation tools, particularly feedback, used to increase educator effectiveness. This exploration into perceptions of instructional shifts, framed in the context of administrative feedback, has the potential to increase the effectiveness of administrative feedback. Transference of feedback into instructional practices may be increased when teachers and principals understand the impact that perceptions of feedback have on student learning. Essentially there is a need to know if, to what degree, and in which direction teacher perceptions of feedback correlate with student achievement.

Definitions

The following terms are specific to this study. Terms are defined to ensure standardization through the research. Definitions were developed by the researcher unless accompanied by citations.

Administrative Feedback: In this study, administrative feedback is provided to teachers by the administration based on evaluation observations to grow and refine teachers' instructional skills.

Low income: The State of Tennessee criteria determines Low-income status for free and reduced lunch (TNReady, n.d.).

Students with disability: In this study, students with disabilities are defined by the State of Tennessee as students with Individual Education Plans (TNReady, n.d.).

TEAM: Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model is a state-level evaluation model used for accountability.

Assumptions

This study assumes that all Tennessee Teachers receive feedback during the state-mandated evaluation system. Additionally, the study assumes that all enrolled students in Tennessee schools in grades 3, 4, and 5 completed state-mandated standardized assessments during the 2018-2019 school year.

Scope and Delimitations

Participants of this study consist of randomly selected students in grades 3, 4, 5 who completed the TNReady assessments for mathematics and English Language Arts in the 2018-2019 school year.

Participants also include teachers from the Sullivan County Department of Education (SCDE). The sample will consist of all teachers that taught mathematics and English Language Arts in grades K-5. Eleven schools serve K-5 students with around 300 teachers (Great Schools, n.d.).

A delimitation of this research is the use of data from only grades 3, 4, and 5. These grades were chosen over others because they reflect foundational learning.

Limitations

Limitations of this research include the use of archival data. Errors may have occurred when these data were collected; this research will not check for errors. A second limitation is that not all teachers will complete the survey. Ideally, all teachers would respond.

Study and Organization

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the effectiveness of and emphasis on administrative feedback, the importance of teacher perceptions, and student achievement and feedback as accountability measures. It also discusses the statement of the

problem, the purpose of the study, and the significance of the research. Additionally, an instruction to definitions of terms, delimitations, and limitations of the study is provided. Chapter 2 provides a literature review relating the history of feedback as a tool for professional development and refinement of skills. Chapter 2 also describes current research and the impact of teacher perceptions in relationship to instructional practices. It describes the contexts, cultures and organizational relationships that shape teacher perceptions. The chapter concludes with a description of accountability through student achievement scores and evaluation reforms. Chapter 3 outlines research design, ethical considerations, and methodology. Chapter 4 delivers the results of the study. Chapter 5 consists of discussion regarding findings and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Background

Student achievement is the ultimate goal of education. Education reform has generated a focus on developing teacher capacity as a way to increase student achievement. Berman and McLaughlin (1978) used a federal lens to describe teacher characteristics and administrative leadership's impact on change initiatives. They concluded that authentic dialogue at the local level is needed to generate efficiency and increase student achievement (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Joyce and Showers (1983) described a shift of evaluation models from rating scales to feedback processes. Instructional leadership administrators and classroom teacher's hierarchy has been analyzed and labeled continuously over three decades (Edmonds, 1979; Hitt & Tucker, 2016; Murphy & Hallinger, 1984). Murphy and Hallinger (2016) analyzed 56 empirical studies across three decades and identified five domains including 28 practices for a unified leadership framework. Woven throughout this and similar frameworks is a call for school administrators to influence outcomes through culture, collaboration, and dialogic feedback (Murphy and Hallinger, 2016; Hitt & Tucker, 2016). Despite these findings across multiple decades, education reform throughout the aughts focused on accountability through value-added and achievement scores. These measures were used to reward and sanction local education agencies and educators. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 brought a season of high stakes accountability to public schools; standardized testing and teacher qualifications were large accountability components (Berberick et al., 2016; Patrick & Mantzicopoulos, 2016). NCLB's focus on qualifications increased the number of teachers with higher degrees; however, it's one size fits all did little to make professional development meaningful (Dee & Jacob, 2010). Under

NCLB, low-income elementary students showed more growth in the area of mathematics, but overall outcomes were negligible in most areas and nonexistent in reading (Dee & Jacob, 2010). When evaluation tools are aligned with desired goals, content, and contexts, they impact student learning (Huijgen et al., 2017). NCLB had good intentions but did not integrate authenticity at the local level and failed to incorporate evaluation tools to impact teachers' classroom instructional practices.

NCLB was later replaced by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). ESSA was grounded in the ideology that the federal government and state governments should partner to maximize flexibility and innovation in education reform; Tennessee was one of the first states to implement ESSA reforms by adopting rigorous standards and the TEAM model (Executive Office of the President, 2015). The TEAM model has been ranked among the most successful evaluation models in the United States (Putman et al., 2018). Tennessee's evaluation model along with three other states incorporated seven core principles identified by the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). Tennessee further emphasized observational and administrative feedback and related professional development by basing 50% of teacher composite scores on these core principles (Putman et al., 2018). The use of multiple measures that include observations and feedback is essential because it gives a holistic picture of how teachers implement instruction (Cantrell & Kane, 2013; Patrick & Mantzicopoulos, 2016; Van Der Lans et al., 2018). Martinez et al. (2016) indicated that multiple measures stabilized evaluation systems to ensure that teacher ratings were not manipulated; standardized protocols across multiple measures levels the playing field. Feedback is woven throughout the core principles of effective evaluation models. The use of observational feedback allows administrators to

accurately evaluate and support teacher effectiveness across contexts, including non-tested grades (Patrick & Mantzicopoulos, 2016).

Steinberg and Kraft (2017) used data from the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study, the Framework for Teaching (FFT), Value Added Models (VAM) and the Tripod student survey; they examined the relationship between changes to weighted performance measures and teacher evaluation ratings. Steinberg and Kraft (2017) found that district to district changes of weighted evaluation components impacted teacher rating scores. Norm referenced and criterion referenced measures demonstrated different distribution patterns (Steinberg & Kraft, 2017). Steinberg & Kraft (2017) concluded that state and local influence on assigned component weights produced variation among teacher proficiency ratings (Steinberg & Kraft, 2017). A weight shift of less than 5% may double the number of proficient ratings (Steinberg & Kraft, 2017). Their research looked at rating scores for tested and non-tested teachers, because of states' common practice of using student achievement data as part of all teachers' composite scores (Steinberg & Kraft, 2017). It can be inferred that local influence on teacher evaluation models' implementation generates differences across districts in the number of teachers identified as proficient. The use of multiple measures works to standardize evaluation processes and provide a more accurate representation of teacher performance.

Tennessee's reform of teacher evaluations highlighted the importance of teacher capacity building across skill sets. In addition to the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System's (TVAAS) statistical analysis of student growth, educators are now measured by administrators using nineteen, classroom level indicators (Davis, et al. 2016). Research indicates positive movement in student achievement in relationship to the TEAM model. Davis et al (2016)

reported that teachers with high TVAAS growth scores were more likely to have high TEAM observation scores.

Feedback is integrated throughout the TEAM model. Administrative TEAM feedback is given to teachers twice as part of each observation. The number of annual observations required by TEAM varies according to composite teacher scores; teachers with a composite score of 5 are observed once, a composite score of 4 requires two observations, and composite scores of 3 or below require four annual observations (Tennessee Department of Education, 2018). Patrick and Mantzicopoulos (2016) identified a high validity of observation models across research settings. Tennessee teachers receive administrative TEAM feedback between 2 to 8 times annually. Tennessee has placed a high premium on administrative feedback as a tool for increasing teacher capacity to promote student growth. The effectiveness of feedback is supported by research.

Administrative Feedback

Jug et al. (2019) defined feedback as, "The delivery of information...meant to improve performance" (p.244). Feedback and evaluation are closely related but not interchangeable. Their fundamental purposes clearly distinguish them. Evaluations are based on past performance and feedback actively happens during or immediately after an observation (Jug, et al., 2019). Useful feedback should be explicitly labeled and requires mindful consideration of the environment and participants (Jug, et. al., 2019; Bradley, 2015). Engaged feedback requires participants to actively employ dialogue that leans into vulnerability to establish authenticity and promote change (Brown, 2018). Administrators in particular set the stage for teachers' perceptions; open communication in the form of feedback cycles ensures that administrators are approachable and allows staff to feel that their voices are being heard (Gordon-Phan, 2019).

Feedback is essential because it is an instrumental component of developing professional competency (Jug, et al., 2019). Hargreaves and O'Connor (2018) examined the use of inquiry and feedback to increase instructional effectiveness; they determined that collaborative professional development was crucial to the success of capacity building. A recommendation was made to establish clearly stated feedback expectations that incorporate collective professionalism and rigor (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018). This echoes earlier findings from Hattie and Timperley (2007) that feedback must be contextualized through collaborative dialogue between stakeholders to be useful. Alignment and quality of administrative feedback during teacher post conferencing impact student achievement (Davis et al., 2016; Little, 2019). Keller et al. (2016) warned that non-dialogic feedback might be perceived as contrived and produce a sense of disenfranchisement among teachers. The TEAM model's incorporation of pre- and post- conferencing reflects this practice. Conferencing sets the stage for feedback dialogue between administrators and teachers.

Often feedback is presented as a monolog in which an individual receives critique with the expectation that corrections will ensue. Ajjawi and Boud (2018) conducted research using iterative coding and interpretive feedback dialogue to analyze the impact of feedback on student performance. They concluded that cognitive, social and structural characteristics were interwoven across the feedback process; feedback was identified as a critical strategy for sustainable growth (Ajjawi & Boud, 2018). Their research challenged those in authority to juxtapose time dedicated to the generation of low, impact critique with feedback conversations that enhance recipients' ability to interpret, engage and impact tasks beyond the present (Ajjawi & Boud, 2018). Feedback dialogue is closely aligned with organizational culture and is a relational venture. Engagement through a dialogic process should focus on goals beyond the

current feedback loop; having defined roles in feedback loops promotes bridging of feedback and classroom practices (Ellis & Loughland, 2017). Feedback is most powerful when it is delivered in a learning context where the application is readily available (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Hall & Simeral, 2008).

Having a voice is crucial to the conversation. Hughes et al. (2014) used a profiling tool to examine feedback between higher education professors and students; they recommended ipsative, contextualized dialogue to generate effective feedback. Feedback dialogue that results in choices builds on the framework that feedback is not a product but a process in which participants are vested. Hughes et al. (2014) stated, "Guidance on feedback heralds a shift from viewing feedback as a product that is given to students to viewing feedback as a process in which students play an active role" (p.3). Their research was conducted at the collegiate level, but their findings are relevant to this project because they identified the context needed for effective feedback. Participants that have ownership in the choices produced through collaborative dialogue are vested in the feedback process. This generalization can be used to support the development of teacher ownership in the feedback process. Teacher ownership is valuable because it supports the transference of feedback to classroom practices. The transference rate is zero when it is passive: dialogue must be collaborative and constructive to be impactful (Joyce & Showers, 1983; Hirsch, 2017). Hughes et al. (2014) identified pre and post conferencing as supporting longitudinal change, practice, and growth. Hall and Simeral, (2008) indicated, "When the sharing of feedback becomes a constant part of the administrator - teacher relationship and develops into an accepted, repeated pattern of interactions, then the teacher can begin to expect it and apply it immediately" (p.141). Gordon-Phan (2019) identified active feedback communications as a key practice of successful administrators. The use of repetitive feedback

dialogue is mirrored in the TEAM evaluation model. Timely pre- and post- conferencing are tools for generating unbridled critical feedback and reflective capacity building (Hall & Simeral, 2008).

Joyce and Showers (1981) explored teacher transference of instructional skills through the lens of coaching; they found that teachers needed support beyond skill acquisition to ensure that skills were improved and transferred to the classroom setting. The use of collaborative feedback loops supports full transference and future skill development. Joyce and Showers (1983) suggest using, "A collaborative approach to teacher development, involving continuous training and study of both the academic substance and the craft of teaching" [abstract]. The TEAM model tasks administrators with providing transferable feedback. Transference is synonymous with the application. Feedback plays a pivotal role in teacher evaluations; however, it must be transferred to classroom practices before impacting student learning.

To better understand why feedback is or is not transferred to classroom practices, it is important to examine teachers and administrators' perceptions. Perceptions are formed based on individuals' experiences. Hirsch (2017) explored feedback through the lenses of evaluators and recipients; he described this filter as, "The deep-seated, highly distinct set of prior assumptions, beliefs, and predispositions they have formed over their lifetimes. This shield acts like a cognitive compass that guides and directs their review process" (p.15). Feedback in an organizational context can be viewed as a gift, administrators want it to be adroitly delivered and well-received (Scott, 2017).

Feedback is a continuous process that manifests itself in every human interaction (Jug, et al. 2019). It can range from facial expressions to direct statements. Feedback recipients must decide what to do with the feedback they are receiving (King et al., 2018). King et al. (2018)

conceptualize feedback in the context of intervention. Their research included a feedback survey of college students. Four dimensions of feedback were identified as impacting participants' ability to apply corrective feedback: utility, retention, sensitivity and confidentiality (King, et al., 2018). This finding can be used to generalize across contexts. Utility and retention link directly to the importance of contextualizing feedback so that there are opportunities for application and retention of developing skills. Motivation matters with feedback because it impacts the relationship between delivery and application. Sensitivity and confidentiality indicators center around professional relationships and contexts. Individuals are more likely to act on suggestions for improvement when it is delivered with authenticity (Hirsch, 2017). Authenticity and specificity are crucial for opening feedback conversations; they ensure that feedback is non-threatening while clearly defining cultural expectations (Ellis & Loughland, 2017; Jug et al., 2019; King, et. al., 2018).

Buttram & Farley-Ripple's (2016) research examined administrators' roles as instructional leaders through a holistic approach that included interviews, observations and a teacher survey. They concluded that high expectations in isolation are ineffective; they generate dysfunctional organizational environments (Buttram & Farley-Ripple, 2016). As with expectations, feedback is not useful when presented in isolation (Hitt & Tucker, 2016). A clear relationship between regular formative feedback and delineated expectations is needed to make the most of administrative feedback. Hitt and Tucker (2016) stated, "Active involvement requires that leaders not only participate in discussions but also have influence on the vertical and horizontal alignment ... included here are regular classroom observations and timely provision of feedback to teachers along with clear expectations of specific teacher practices" (p.557). Impactful administrators assiduously engage in feedback conversations; active feedback dialogue between

invested administrators and teachers is the most effective way to impact student learning (Ajjawi & Boud, 2018; Buttram & Farley-Ripple, 2016; Hirsch, 2017). Hall & Simeral (2008) focused on building teacher capacity through administrative partnerships. Feedback should be constant, timely, and based on teachers' strengths in the context of professional learning (Hall & Simeral, 2008).

As with all aspects of life, experience is an essential indicator of how well individuals deliver and receive feedback. Effective administrators should be experts at providing meaningful feedback that focuses on instructional practices grounded in rigorous standards (Papay, 2012). Levia et al. (2016) conducted a longitudinal study of principals' classroom observation and feedback practices. They found that with experience principals shifted feedback from content to interactions and provided descriptive feedback instead of evaluative feedback (Levia et al., 2016). Blazar and Kraft (2015) examined differences in coaching feedback to teachers. They found that feedback related to instructional practices positively impacted learning and managerial feedback negatively impacted learning (Blazar & Kraft, 2015). Vander Der Lans et al. (2018) indicated that classroom management could be effectively supported through various tools; focusing administrative feedback on instructional quality was instrumental to developing teacher capacity. Managerial aspects of classroom instruction are frames that set the stage for learning but do not necessarily push student achievement forward. Administrative feedback should focus on building instructional practices. A correlation exists between these studies. As experience is gained, feedback is better aligned with content and instructional practices; feedback becomes richer and more impactful. Papay (2012) indicates that robust evaluation systems must be resource-intensive and support evaluators' training in the area of feedback to ensure that feedback is differentiated and actionable. Sineck (2017) stated, "Being told only what

we are good at reduces our ability to grow...Real learning happens when things go wrong or when we screw up. what we should all want is a balance of feedback" (p.299). The type of feedback delivered has a clear impact on teacher instructional practices and student outcomes.

Teacher expertise and development also impacts the reception of feedback. Fuller (1969) described the development of teacher perceptions through the format of phases of concern: self, tasks, and impact on learning. As teachers gain experience, their ability to interpret, modify, accept and/or reject feedback is refined (Fuller, 1969; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kulhavy, 1977; Van Der Lans et al., 2018). Teachers transition from managerial concerns to instructional effectiveness as they gain experience. It is important to note here that feedback perceptions begin to fork between givers and receivers about the quality and quantity of feedback. Givers report a large quantity of feedback, while receivers report insufficient feedback (Gutierrez, 2018; Jug et al., 2019). Balancing the amount and quality of the feedback are areas that require training for both administrators and teachers. Sineck (2017) challenged givers and receivers of feedback to embrace listening skills, provide time to process feedback, and allow for different perspectives. There is great value in allowing time for teachers to wrestle with and digest feedback (Brown, 2018; Scott, 2017).

Gutierrez's (2018) qualitative study examined the impact of administrative feedback on teacher self-efficacy. Teachers indicated that feedback was impactful when it was specific, longitudinal, and delivered through the lens of emotional intelligence (Gutierrez, 2018). Feedback should be explicitly identified to ensure that teachers understand there is an expectation of interpretation (Jug et al., 2019). The ability to judge the quality of feedback relies mostly on experience, contextualization and emotional intelligence; administrators should use established examples, modulate the quantity of feedback based on priority, and ensure that

feedback is personally actionable to solicit positive reception (Jug et al., 2019). Van Der Lans et al. (2018) examined 32 effective teaching strategies in the context of teacher development phases; they concluded that a stage-wise development does exist in the building of educators' instructional capacity. Most interestingly, this research indicated that development across stages could be simultaneous (Van Der Lans et al., 2018). A mismatch between administrators and teachers' experience can produce ineffective feedback dialogue due to discrepancies in expectations (Gutierrez, 2018; Van Der Lans et al., 2018). The trustworthiness of feedback is the basis for teacher interpretation. Bridges and Bridges stated that individuals should "Regard it as valuable information and reflect on it. Feedback may be biased and you do not have to swallow it whole. But check it for important half-truths" (p.120). Teachers require more than praise; they need to engage in constructive dialogue that promotes self-efficacy. To positively impact teacher growth, principals must frame negative feedback in contexts that display emotional intelligence; effective feedback refines the practice not the person (Gutierrez, 2018). An explicit plan for the use of feedback and other professional development tools should be in place; this allows teachers to develop across the phases of concern (Gutierrez, 2018; Van Der Lans et al., 2018).

Perceptions

Perceptions of feedback are strongly related to personal motivation (Shenninger & Murray, 2018; Scott, 2017; Brown, 2018). Shenninger and Murray indicated, "If educators understand and value why... they are more intrinsically motivated to embrace it, which results in sustainability and ultimately leads to transformation" (p.39). Shenninger and Murray (2018) explored innovative leadership practices through case studies of districts and schools. Their work identified many practices in antiquated schools; they called for a shift in instructional paradigms; additionally, they discussed an imperative need to challenge educator beliefs and mindsets

(Shenninger & Murray, 2018). Perceptions have the potential to make or break instructional shifts. In the world of feedback, perception is crucial to generating organizational beliefs and group efficacy (Brown, 2018). Many studies have centered on stakeholder perceptions, specifically regarding accountability and feedback practices.

The New Teacher Project (TNTP) (2015) conducted a two-year study of more than 10,000 teachers and 500 school leaders. 80% of surveyed teachers perceived themselves as highly effective. Only 47% indicated that they had weaknesses; among teachers rated as ineffective, 62% self-reported that their instructional practices supported learning at a high level (The New Teacher Project, 2015). Formal evaluation ratings reinforced these perceptions. 77% of teachers with four or more years of experience and 95% of all teachers in this study had administrative ratings of meeting expectations or higher on formal evaluations (The New Teacher Project, 2015). Those with lower ratings felt strongly that their ratings were inaccurate (The New Teacher Project, 2015). A similar conclusion was observed by Keller et al.'s (2016) review of empirical research; they found that teachers' perceptions did not coincide with the cognitive evaluation of instructional practices. Half of the teachers surveyed by TNTP believed that professional development had a lasting impact on classroom instruction and about one-third agreed that professional evaluations improved teacher practices (The New Teacher Project, 2015). TNTP's (2015) research indicated a disconnect between teacher perceptions, administrative ratings and student achievement. TNTP (2015) cited various relevant conclusions; ultimately, teacher motivation, sense of urgency, and change to instructional practices are directly linked to teachers' perceptions of administrators' ability to evaluate and facilitate meaningful capacity building. Keller et al. (2016) explored a holistic view of teacher enthusiasm which included passion, intrinsic value, experience, and enjoyment. They found that teachers'

perceptions of competence and goal values influenced their instructional behaviors and thus impacted student achievement. Teacher perceptions can stop innovation when they are not an accurate depiction of reality or propel instructional effectiveness when framed by appropriate supports, interpretations, and expectations.

Kraft and Gilmour (2016) conducted a longitudinal study that examined discrepancies between teacher evaluation ratings and evaluators' perceptions of teacher effectiveness distribution. Evaluators, on average, estimated that 27% of teachers in their schools were performing at below proficient; this was surprising because it quadrupled the actual percentage of teachers rated below proficient (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016). The mismatch between perception and reality indicated that teacher ratings were being inflated. Kraft and Gilmour (2016) indicated that rate-inflated scores were more likely to occur in states that used three or fewer indicators. Kraft and Gilmour speak directly to feedback in their conclusions. Principals are often hesitant to provide honest feedback when it is not part of schools' everyday culture and expectations; additionally, time and perseverance were areas of concern (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016). Kraft and Gilmour (2016) quoted administrators, "When you have an unsatisfactory teacher, it takes much time to observe that teacher, to give true honest to goodness feedback" (p.241). Goldring et al.'s (2015) mixed methods research indicated observational feedback resonated with administrators despite being time-consuming. Feedback was valued because of its specificity and transparency; administrators felt that observations were particularly helpful in guiding human resource decisions (Goldring et al., 2016). Research clearly shows that perceptions affect the transference of feedback across contextual settings (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Joyce & Showers, 1981).

Bryant (2012) concentrated on Tennessee administrator perceptions of the TEAM model; qualitative survey results indicated that administrators perceived the TEAM model as a useful

and appropriate tool for building teacher instructional capacity. Factors that influenced administrators' perceptions were observation data, collaborative instruction conversations, and clearly defined expectations (Bryant, 2012). An inference can be made that the TEAM model's use of feedback contributes to positive administrative perceptions. Bryant's (2012) research adds to our understanding of relationships between perceptions and evaluation models.

Horne (2012) explored teachers' perceptions of instructional coaching. Horne's research consisted of survey data from 536, K-12 teachers; 129 of those teachers had five or fewer years of experience (Horne, 2012). Teacher perceptions supported instructional coaching; this was found across all respondents and subpopulations (Horne, 2012). Among their conclusions was a sense that teachers needed to have more voice in the development of instructional coaching mechanisms. They suggested that teachers did not feel vested in the instructional coaching process, that coaches should not be direct supervisors, and that a need existed for relationship building to prime participants in feedback dialogue positively (Horne, 2012). This project parallels Horne's work because it examines teachers' perspectives of administrative TEAM feedback. The TEAM model directly tasks administrators with instructional coaching/leadership (Putnam et al., 2018; Tennessee Department of Education, 2018). The current project differs because it seeks to look closely at the impact of teacher perceptions by comparing them with student achievement.

Heil and Berg (2017) conducted a mixed-methods project to examine pre-service teachers' perceptions of the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). EdTPA is Tennessee's latest reform for teacher certification; requirements include multiple measures similar to the TEAM model (Heil and Berg, 2017; Tennessee Department of Education, 2018a). EdTPA differs from TEAM in that pre-service teachers submit video recordings of previously

taught lessons; recordings are rated by an unknown evaluator (Heil & Berg, 2017). Both negative and positive aspects were identified. Participants indicated that edTPA's linear process was beneficial because it provided teacher candidates with full instructional planning, implementation and assessment (Heil & Berg, 2017). Negative aspects included external administration and a lack of feedback and support; participants felt that the snapshot of their teaching practices was not adequately measured by the standardized format of edTPA (Heil & Berg, 2017). Similar perceptions are echoed by practicing teachers.

Moran (2015) explored connections between teachers' perceptions and instructional decisions. Four categories of teachers were identified under the umbrella of teacher perceptions: teachers who perceived evaluation as valuable, internalized it, and changed instructional practices, teachers who felt forced to change due to fear of repercussions and did find some benefit from the model, teachers that did not believe in the model and only changed instruction on the surface level, and teachers who did not believe in the model and refused to change (Moran, 2015). Observation data's subjectivity was a recurring concern among participants; teachers felt that the further away from the classroom an observer was the less accurate their classroom instruction interpretations became. Moran (2015) states, "When teachers are given appropriate autonomy, they are happier, more devoted to their profession and have greater stake in student outcomes" (p.106). While a clear connection between teacher perceptions and instructional practice change is shown, a gap still exists between teachers' perceptions and student achievement.

Jiang et al. (2015) examined Chicago teachers' perceptions of administrative evaluation feedback through the lens of fairness and usefulness. Qualitative and quantitative measures were used to assess several indicators including instructional leadership, trust among feedback givers

and receivers, teacher voice, and instructional support quality. (Jiang et al., 2015). 65% of teachers felt that the evaluation process relied too heavily on student achievement; while, 71% of teachers felt that observations were accurate representations of their teaching (Jiang et al., 2015). Jiang et al. (2015) suggested that the historical application of observations made teachers more open to this type of evaluation; based on its sense of familiarity, they suggested pairing observations with collaborative feedback to drive positive teacher perceptions. They discussed at length the critical role that administrators play in feedback loops. Jiang et al. (2015) stated, "Principal instructional leadership and principal-teacher trust are highly correlated with teachers' perception of evaluation and feedback" (p.114). Jiang et al.'s work focused mainly on teachers' perceptions of feedback and the use of student achievement scores as an accountability indicator. It did not seek to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions and student achievement. The current project seeks to fill this gap by comparing teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback with student achievement scores.

Berberick et al. (2016) conducted surveys of how principals evaluated music teachers and music teachers' perceptions of evaluations. Principals indicated that music teachers were evaluated using the same criteria as teachers in tested grades (Berberick et al., 2016). Teachers indicated that they did not feel administrators had the expertise needed to provide meaningful feedback; additionally, a disconnect was identified between principals' and teachers' perceptions regarding which evaluation indicators were most important (Berberick et al., 2016). As seen in Heil and Berg's (2017) research, teachers felt that the evaluation model's standardized nature forfeited authenticity. Cohen and Goldhaber (2016) stated, "Research has demonstrated that raters struggle to keep multiple dimensions of quality in mind during observations and that content-specific aspects of instruction are especially cognitively demanding and subject to rater

biases" (p. 382). Berberick et al.'s (2016) research is relevant to the current project because it includes teacher perceptions from non-tested classrooms. Tennessee holds all K-5 teachers accountable for grades 3, 4, and 5 achievement scores (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016). Perceptions of non-tested teachers contribute to the holistic education of students. Berberick et al.'s (2016) work provides insight into perceptions and evaluation processes; it does not examine the relationship between perceptions and student achievement.

Koedel et al. (2017) examined teacher perceptions through the lens of job satisfaction. They used factorial analysis to determine the impact of the TEAM model on teachers' job satisfaction. The higher the evaluation rating the higher teachers' job satisfaction; likewise, lower evaluation ratings corresponded with lower job satisfaction (Koedel et al., 2017). Overall, receiving higher and lower ratings increased and decreased teacher job satisfaction by a mean score of 0.08 to 0.09 standard deviations (Koedel et al., 2017). This research suggests a causal relationship between teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and evaluation ratings. Koedel et al. (2017) established connections between perceptions and evaluation ratings.

Conclusion

The federal government sought to increase student achievement through a variety of accountability measures. Research indicated that impactful reforms needed to occur at the local level where change could be accessed quickly through application (Berman and Mclaughlin, 1978; Hitt & Tucker, 2016; Joyce & Showers, 1981, 1983). The incentives of ESSA brought Tennessee to the forefront of innovative reforms. Tennessee's implementation of the TEAM model incorporated the repetitive use of observational, administrative feedback as a vehicle for impacting student achievement by improving teachers' instructional effectiveness (Executive Office of the President, 2015; Patrick & Mantzicopoulos, 2016; Putman et al., 2018; Steinberg &

Kraft, 2017). Administrators play a crucial role in feedback loops; they influence the feedback process through their ability to contextualize the delivery of feedback and build safe environments that promote collaborative dialogue (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018; Hattie & Timperley, 2008; Jug et al., 2019). Multiple sources have identified feedback as an instructional best practice in the contexts of classrooms and evaluations (Bradley, 2015; Brown, 2018; Hattie & Timperley, 2008; Jug et al., 2019). Many sources have defined the context and dialogue needed to deliver and receive useful feedback (Ajjawi & Boud, 2018; Buttram & Farley-Ripple, 2016; Hitt & Tucker, 2016; King et al., 2018). Teacher perceptions greatly influence the effectiveness of administrative TEAM feedback. In particular the transference of administrative feedback into classroom practices is dependent on teachers' interpretation of feedback (Gutierrez, 2018; Hirsch, 2017; Moran, 2015). Recent research examined relationships between administrator perceptions, teacher perceptions, effectiveness ratings, and evaluation models, specifically the TEAM model (Berberick et al., 2016; Bryant, 2012, Jiang et al., 2015; Keller et al., 2016; Koedel et al., 2017; Kraft & Gilmour, 2016; Moran, 2015; Shenninger & Murray, 2018; The New Teacher Project, 2015). Little is known about the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and student achievement scores.

Chapter 3

Research Design and Methods

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. The independent variable was teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. The dependent variable was student achievement scores. This research study compared teacher perception scores with composite mathematics and English Language Arts scores along with comparisons of achievement scores using student subpopulations and teachers' years of experience.

Chapter three addresses the methods used to complete this study. The methods include research questions and null hypotheses, population and sample, instruments, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Ten research questions guided the analysis of data for this study:

1. Is there a relationship between students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
2. Is there a relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
3. Is there a relationship between students with disabilities achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

4. Is there a relationship between students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
5. Is there a relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
6. Is there a relationship between students' with disabilities achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
7. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
8. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
9. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?
10. Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

Population and Sample

The population for this study came from eleven elementary schools in the selected district where this study was conducted. The demographics of the selected school district are displayed in Tables 1 and 2

In the 2018-2019 school year, Tennessee students in grades 3, 4, and 5 completed the TNReady standardized test in English Language Arts and Mathematics. The purpose of these standardized tests was to measure student achievement as a percentage of students' final grades, to evaluate teacher effectiveness, and serve as a component of TVAAS scores. Administrative TEAM feedback and achievement scores from grades 3, 4, and 5 are components of all elementary teacher evaluations in Tennessee. All English Language Arts and mathematics teachers in the eleven elementary schools of the select district were invited to complete the Teacher Perceptions of Administrative TEAM Feedback survey.

Archived student data were used for this study. This research focused on achievement at the elementary level; random selections of English Language Arts and mathematics achievement scores from grades 3, 4, and 5 were utilized. Random selections of students with disabilities and low-income students' mathematics and English Language Arts achievement scores were identified. All teachers with more than five years of experience were included. All individual identifying information was removed from the data. Random numbers were assigned to each participant's scores. The student achievement data and teacher perceptions data were both from eleven elementary schools in the selected district where this study was conducted.

Table 1

Student Ethnicity in Select School District

Ethnicity	Percent
White	94.6
Hispanic	2.1%
Multiracial	1.9%
African American	.07%
Asian	.4%
Native American	.1%
Pacific Islander	.1%

Table 2

Student Demographics in Select School District

Demographic	Percent
Low-Income	49%
Disabilities	21%
Male	51%
Female	49%

Instrument

Survey

Description. The Teacher Perceptions of Administrative TEAM Feedback survey consisted of 27 items. Item one was a yes or no question used to determine whether the subject met the criteria for this study. Item two was a demographic question that identified teacher experience as being 0-5 years or 5+ years. Items 3-27 used a four choice Likert-type format strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Likert-type items are single statements commonly used in social science research as a way to measure combinations of cognition, attitude, feeling, and action (Joshi et al., 2015; Likert, 1932).

Administration. An invitation to complete the Teacher Perceptions of Administrative TEAM Feedback survey was emailed by the central office technology coordinator for the selected school district to all teachers in the district. The email body and attached cover letter contained informed consent and a description of the survey. As an incentive, teachers that fully completed the survey had the opportunity to enter a random drawing of a \$50 Amazon gift card. The survey was administered as a Google form and required approximately 10 minutes to complete. Responses were collected for two weeks.

Scoring. Scored survey items consisted of 21 positively worded items and 4 negatively worded items. Items 15, 18, 21, and 27 were negatively worded and reverse coded to ensure that values indicated the same type of response across all items. An example of a positively stated item is administrative feedback increased my content knowledge to better support student growth. An example of a negatively worded item is administrative TEAM feedback has not increased my effectiveness as a teacher. Suárez-Alvarez et al. (2018) indicated that reverse coding is a strategy used to avoid bias and is grounded in the assumption that strongly agree and

strongly disagree are equivalent. Respondents' scores for each item were totaled to create a composite score.

TNReady

Description. TNReady English Language Arts and mathematics assessments are part of the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP). TNReady is a standards-based assessment that is unique to Tennessee, is administered across grades 3-12, and is used to measure student achievement. The Department of Education (TDOE) classified subgroup populations of low-income students and students with disabilities in accordance with federal and state guidelines.

Administration. Archived 2018-2019 scores for grades 3, 4, and 5 were utilized in this study. The local education agency administered these assessments in accordance with state regulations.

Scoring. The TDOE collected, scored, analyzed, returned, and archived data. The TDOE used score ranges to identify four levels of student performance: mastered, on-track, approaching, and below. Performance levels and score ranges are displayed in Table 3. Students' composite scores represent an average from across domains for each content area.

Table 3

TNReady Performance Levels

Performance Level	Score Range
Mastered	351-400
On Track	301-350
Approaching	251-300
Below	200-250

Reliability and Validity

The Teachers Perceptions of Administrative TEAM Feedback survey was adapted from Ripley's (2016) teacher perceptions instrument. Ripley (2016) administered the original survey to two pilot groups and teachers in grades Pre-K through 12 to enhance the validity of the survey; adjustments were made based on feedback from the pilot groups. Survey items were adapted to reflect the focus of current research. Louangrath and Sutanapong (2018) indicated that items with four choices between two extremes provide an accurate depiction of perceptions.

Standards based assessments are considered reliable when procedural and internal consistency exists in the delivery and interpretation of test scores (McClarty et al., 2013). TDOE has utilized TCAP assessments since 1988; TNReady assessments have very precise guidelines for development and administration (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.b). McClarty et al. (2013) indicated that validity is established when cut scores are based on careful alignment and interpretation of assessment, performance, and criteria. TNReady performance ranges are established and continuously recalibrated by Tennessee educators as part TDOE guidelines (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.b).

Data Collection and Procedures

Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at Milligan University. Before data were collected, permission to conduct the study was obtained from the director of schools for the selected school district. February 2021 invitation to complete the Teacher Perceptions of Administrative TEAM Feedback survey and informed consent were emailed to all teachers by the district technology supervisor. Survey responses were collected for a two week period. Participant responses were totaled to generate composite scores. During January and February 2021, permission to access archived 2018-2019 student data was requested

and granted. Pearson correlation coefficient statistical test was used to compare teacher perception composite scores and student achievement scores. All survey responses and student data were stored electronically in a password protected file.

Data Analysis

All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 27th edition.

The following research questions guided the analysis of data:

1. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.
2. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.
3. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between students' with disabilities achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.
4. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback
5. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

6. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between students' with disabilities achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.
7. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.
8. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.
9. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.
10. A Pearson correlation coefficient test was used to examine the relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

All data were analyzed at a significance level of .05. Analysis results for all questions are included in chapter 4.

Summary

Chapter 3 contained the methodology used in this quantitative study. Following a short introduction, the research questions with null hypotheses, population, and sample were explained. This chapter also included a description of the instruments used in this study along with data analysis and collection processes.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis and Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between elementary student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. The study hypothesizes that a relationship exists between student achievement and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. Analysis of data reveals the relationship between teacher perceptions and mathematics, English Language Arts, and other subsets. In this chapter, data were analyzed to answer ten research questions. These data were collected from 109 elementary teachers and a random selection of English Language Arts and mathematics achievement scores from grades 3, 4, and 5. The analysis and findings are presented in this chapter.

Demographic Data

The population for this study consisted of eleven elementary schools in the selected school district. White students made up 94.6% of the student population; 2.1% percent of the student body was Hispanic or Latin American; 1.9 were multiracial. The remaining 1.4% of the student population was African American, Asian, Native American, and Pacific Islander. Males represented 51%, and females represented 49% of the student population; genders were almost evenly distributed. 49% of students come from low-income families. Students with disabilities made up approximately 21% of the student population. 94% of teachers had 3 or more years of experience and 100% of teachers were state-certified.

The sample consisted of 109 teachers from eleven elementary schools in the selected school district. 18 teachers had less than five years of experience, and 91 teachers had greater

than five years of experience. The sample also included 2018-2019 student achievement scores for grades 3, 4, and 5 from coordinating schools. 109 randomly selected scores from each grade level for both English Language Arts and Mathematics were used.

Findings

Research Question 1

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students' mathematics scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. No significant relationship was found ($r(107) = .007, p = .941$); therefore, the coefficient of determination was not computed. The null hypothesis is retained. Results from the test are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Mathematics Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	.007	.941
Mathematics Scores	323.71		

Note. Significance at $p < .05$

Research Question 2

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀2: There is no relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and low-income students' mathematics scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. No significant relationship was found ($r(107) = .010, p = .920$); therefore, the coefficient of determination was not computed. The null hypothesis is retained. The null hypothesis is retained. Results from the test are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Low-Income Students' Mathematics Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	.010	.920
Low-Income Students' Mathematics Scores	326.36		

Note. Significance at $p < .05$

Research Question 3

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between students with disabilities achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between students with disabilities achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students with disabilities mathematics scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. No significant relationship was found ($r(107) = .016, p = .871$); therefore, the coefficient of determination was not computed. The null hypothesis is retained. The null hypothesis is retained. Results from the test are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students' with Disabilities Mathematics Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	.016	.871
Students' with Disabilities Mathematics Scores	298.49		

Note. Significance at $p < .05$

Research Question 4

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

Table 7

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students' English Language Arts scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. No significant relationship was found ($r(107) = .016, p = .870$); therefore, the coefficient of determination was not computed. The null hypothesis is retained. Results from the test are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7

Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students' English Language Arts Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	.016	.86
Students' English Language Arts Scores	329		

Note. Significant at $p < .05$

Research Question 5

Research Question 5: Is there a relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between low-income students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and low-income students' English Language Arts scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. A positive, very weak correlation which was not significant was found ($r(107) = .062, p = .523$); therefore, the

coefficient of determination was not computed. The null hypothesis is retained. Results from the test are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Low-Income Students' English Language Arts Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	.062	.523
Low-Income Students' English Language Arts Scores	333.27		

Note. Significant at $p < .05$

Research Question 6

Research Question 6: Is there a relationship between students with disabilities achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between students with disabilities achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students with disabilities English Language Arts assessment scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. A significant, negative, weak correlation was found ($r(107) = -.199, p = .038$). To determine the variance explained by teacher perceptions of administrative feedback on students with disabilities English Language Arts scores, the determination coefficient was computed. The results ($r^2 = .039$) suggest that about 4% of the variance in students with disabilities English Language Arts scores

could be explained by teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. The null hypothesis is rejected. Results from the test are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

Correlation Coefficient of Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students' with Disabilities English Language Arts Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i> ²
Teacher Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	-.199	.038	.039
Students' with Disabilities English Language Arts Scores	329.54			

Note. Significant at $p < .05$

Research Question 7

Research Question 7: Is there a relationship between students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between students' achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

Statistical analysis was not completed for this question because fewer than 30 participants responded that they had less than five years of experience.

Research Question 8

Research Question 8: Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between students' achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for less than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

Statistical analysis was not completed for this question because fewer than 30 participants responded that they had less than five years of experience.

Research Question 9

Research Question 9: Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between student achievement on standardized mathematics assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students' achievement on mathematics scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. A positive, very weak correlation which was not significant was found ($r(107) = .028, p = .774$); therefore, the coefficient of determination was not computed. The null hypothesis is retained. Results from this test are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

Correlation Coefficient of Teachers' with more than Five Years of Experience Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students' Mathematics Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i> ²
Teachers' with More than Five years experience Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	.028	.774	.0008
Students' Mathematics Scores	323.72			

Note. Significant at $p < .05$

Research Question 10

Research Question 10: Is there a relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback?

H₀1: There is no relationship between student achievement on standardized English Language Arts assessments and teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between teachers who have taught for more than five years perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students' English Language Arts scores for 11 elementary schools in a select district. No significant relationship was found ($r(107) = .005, p = .958$). Therefore, the coefficient of determination was not computed. The null hypothesis is retained. Results from this test are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11

Correlation Coefficient of Teachers' with more than Five Years of Experience Perceptions of Administrative Feedback and Students' Mathematics Scores

Category	<i>M</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i> ²
Teachers' with More than Five years experience Perceptions of Administrative Feedback	49.18	.005	.958	.003
Students' English Language Arts Scores	329			

Note. Significant at $p < .05$

Summary

In this chapter, Teacher perceptions and student achievement scores were correlated. Student achievement scores were randomly selected from English Language Arts and mathematics assessments from eleven elementary schools in a specified district. Additionally, 109 kindergarten through fifth grade teachers' perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback were used. Analysis of this research was based on ten research questions and ten null hypotheses that included examining scores from a random selection of the whole population, low-income students, and students with disabilities. Additionally, teachers with more than five years of experience perceptions were correlated with English Language Arts and mathematics scores. No significant relationships were found between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and student mathematics assessment scores from the whole population, low-income students, and students with disabilities. Additionally, no significant relationships were found between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and student English Language Arts assessment scores and subsets. Research question six, the correlation of teacher perceptions and students' with disabilities English Language Arts scores indicated a significant, negative, weak relationship; meaning that as teacher perceptions increased students with disabilities

achievement decreased. Statistical analysis was not completed for questions seven and eight because fewer than 30 participants responded that they had less than 5 years of experience.

Chapter 5

Summary of Findings, Discussions, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter contains a summary of the findings, conclusions, limitations, and recommendations for future research. The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and student achievement. This research correlated teacher perceptions with composite mathematics and English Language Arts achievement scores; comparisons of achievement scores using student subpopulations and teachers' years of experience were also completed. This study was conducted with data from a teacher perceptions survey and archived achievement data from 2018-2019 for grades 3, 4, and 5 from a select school district in Tennessee. A review was conducted on evaluating feedback to improve teachers' capacity for effective classroom instruction. It was found that Tennessee's TEAM model placed a great emphasis on administrative feedback to teachers as a way to impact student achievement positively. This research could help professionals who will use the results as a resource when considering the impact of feedback and best practices for teacher evaluations.

Summary of Findings

This study's statistical analysis was based on ten research questions and ten null hypotheses presented in chapters 1 and 3. All research questions, except for Questions 7 and 8, were analyzed using Pearson correlation tests. Research questions 7 and 8 were not analyzed because less than thirty teachers responded that they had less than five years of experience. All data were analyzed at the .05 significance level. Survey responses were totaled to generate a composite score for each participant. The total number of participants in the survey was 109 teachers from grades K-5 in a specified school district. Findings indicated that teacher

perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback did not significantly correlate with student achievement scores in mathematics and English Language Arts, with low-income students, or between teachers with more than five years of experience. Analysis of teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback did not have a significant relationship with students with disabilities mathematics achievement scores. However, it did have a significant, negative, very weak correlation with students with disabilities English Language Arts Scores.

Discussions of Findings

Results indicated no significant relationship between students' achievement scores on mathematics or English Language Arts and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. These findings did not support Hargreaves and O'Connor's (2018) conclusion indicating that inquiry and feedback increase instructional effectiveness. Feedback is a continuous process that manifests across interactions, supports, and relational aspects of organizational culture (Jug et al., 2019). An earlier generalization in chapter 2 indicated four dimensions of feedback were needed to positively impact student achievement: utility, retention, sensitivity, and confidentiality (King et al., 2019). Teacher perceptions were only one indicator from a list of feedback components. The use of a granular feedback component may have diminished the representation of any relationship between feedback and student achievement.

The lack of significance between teacher perceptions and student achievement scores illustrated that feedback is more valuable when it is viewed as a process and not monological input. Ajjawi and Boud (2018) described the feedback loop as three-dimensional; feedback is like a thread that connects cognition, social, and structural aspects of dialogue. Teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback is an attenuated perspective. An inference can be made from the lack of significance in current research that multiple aspects of feedback should

be considered for future research. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) all variables impact, and some are just smaller than others. Considering the results of current research, resources and time would be better used exploring different or combined components of feedback. This conclusion is supported by Hattie's (2012) indication that education resources should be thoughtfully allocated to ensure that the maximum amount of impact is generated using the least amount of resources.

No significance was found between low-income student mathematics and English Language Arts achievement scores and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. The results indicated no significant relationship between low-income student mathematics and English Language Arts achievement scores and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. Creating equity across public schools has motivated federal education reform efforts (Executive Office of the President, 2015). These outcomes supported the theory that national education reforms have a relatively low impact when mandated outside of contextual settings (Buttram & Farley-Ripple, 2016; Dee & Jacobs, 2010). Huggen et al. (2017) indicated that the more localized and aligned goals were, the greater the impact on student learning. Thus far, the analysis showed no significant relationship between teacher perceptions and student achievement; the narrow lens of teacher perceptions focused on a snapshot of feedback from specific stakeholders' perspectives. Hughes et al. (2014) indicated that all stakeholders must be vested in the feedback loop to generate a shift from product to process.

This analysis echoed findings from NCLB; overall outcomes were negligible and missed the goals of generating equitable access to instruction and closing gaps between student subpopulations (Berberick et al., 2016; Dee & Jacob, 2010; Whitney, 2018). In this case, the impact of teacher perceptions was not significant. It can be inferred that the single component of

teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback does not establish a significant correlation with student outcomes; however, based on the literature review, when combined with other aspects of feedback it has the potential to positively influence student achievement (Joyce & Showers, 1983; Hirsch, 2017; Hughes et al., 2014).

This pattern was reiterated by a lack of significance between students with disabilities' mathematics achievement scores and teacher perceptions. This outcome supported the theory that national education reforms have a relatively low impact when mandated outside of contextual settings (Buttram & Farley-Ripple, 2016; Dee & Jacobs, 2010). Huggen et al. (2017) indicated that the more localized and aligned goals were, the greater the impact on student learning. Thus far, the analysis showed no significant relationship between teacher perceptions and student achievement; the narrow lens of teacher perceptions focused on a snapshot of feedback from specific stakeholders' perspectives. Hughes et al. (2014) indicated that all stakeholders must be vested in the feedback loop to generate a shift from product to process.

No significant relationships were found between students' mathematics and English Language Art achievement scores and teachers with more than five years of experience perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. This finding did not support previous research. As administrators and teachers gained experience, they increased their ability to actively receive and interpret feedback to positively impact student achievement (Fuller, 1969; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kulhavy, 1977; Van Der Lans et al., 2018). In the select district, 94% of teachers had more than three years of experience. 83% of surveyed teachers had five or more years of experience. The lack of significance was in contrast to research that teachers with more experience have a greater impact on student achievement (Papay, 2012; Sineck, 2017). Based on

the reviewed literature, a correlation between teacher perspectives and student achievement was expected because most survey participants had more than five years of experience.

These findings also did not support previous research. Literature indicated that as administrators and teachers gained experience, they could narrow feedback to focus on instructional practices to positively impact student achievement (Fuller, 1969; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kulhavy, 1977; Van Der Lans et al., 2018).

Analysis between students with disabilities achievement scores and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback differed between mathematics and English Language Arts. The results indicated no significant relationship between students with disabilities mathematics achievement scores and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. However, a significant, negative, very weak relationship was found between students with disabilities' English Language Arts achievement scores and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. Students with disabilities' English Language arts scores decreased slightly as teacher perceptions rose.

The latest federal and state of Tennessee reforms promoted the idea that all means all; All Tennessee districts and schools will be held accountable for and provide access to effective instruction for all students, and most notably traditionally underserved populations (Executive Office of the President, 2015; Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.a). Buttram & Farley-Ripple (2016) indicated that high expectations in isolation are ineffective; they generate dysfunctional learning environments. In the spring of 2020, all schools across Tennessee closed due to a global pandemic. While all students experienced a loss of access to instruction, students with disabilities lost access to other school-related support and accommodations associated with their Individual Education Programs (IEP). Many students with disabilities were unable to access

needed resources; this may have widened the gap between teacher expectations and students with disabilities outcomes. Gregg (2019) indicated that understanding the context of equity across subgroup populations is crucial for accurate diagnosis and intervention. During the pandemic hiatus, students with disabilities' contexts for learning were altered tremendously. Hattie and Timberly (2007) explained that task-specific directions, feedback, and observations are crucial to developing skill sets. Students with disabilities had IEPs to ensure that tasks were broken down into accessible chunks of instruction. Teachers relied on interactions and observations to assess and advance learning experiences. The closure of schools in 2020 prevented teachers and students from interacting in the traditional classroom setting. The lack of interaction, observation, and formative assessment opportunities were variables that may have influenced the results of this analysis.

Research questions 7 and 8 focused on the relationship between students' mathematics achievement scores and teachers with less than five years of experience perceptions of administrative team feedback. Analysis was not computed because less than 30 participants responded that they had less than five years of experience.

The results from this study indicated that teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback did not have a significant correlation with student achievement scores in mathematics and English Language Arts, with low-income students, or between teachers with more than five years of experience. Analysis of teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback did not have a significant relationship with students with disabilities mathematics achievement scores. However, it did have a significant, negative, very weak correlation with students with disabilities English Language Arts Scores.

Despite a lack of significance, analyses showed diminutive positive correlations between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students' mathematics and English Language Arts achievement scores except for research question 6, the relationship between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and students with disabilities English Language Arts achievement scores. Prior research supported the inference that a relationship between perceptions of feedback and student achievement would exist (Blazar & Kraft, 2015; Fuller, 1969; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kulhavy, 1977; Van Der Lans et al., 2018). The current study's small sample size resulted in $p > .05$. A larger sample size would provide a more accurate representation of teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. Isolation of teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback was an attenuate strand of investigation. Broadening research to include more feedback elements can provide a deeper understanding of how various aspects of the feedback are interdependent.

At the time of this study, requirements for the TEAM evaluation model and accountability measures for Tennessee teachers were altered to reflect the interruption of teaching and learning due to a global pandemic (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.c.). Teachers had the option to nullify their level of effectiveness scores (LOE), use student data from 2018-2019, or use a different measure of student growth, such as benchmark or universal screener data for 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.c.). As a result, teachers did not participate in feedback as frequently during the 2019-2020 school year. Administrators were required to complete all TEAM evaluations during the 2020-2021 school year; however, teachers had to nullify their LOE scores (Tennessee Department of Education, n.d.c.). Hattie (2012) identifies the quality and quantity of feedback as crucial for positively impacting student achievement. The lack of feedback during the 2019-2020 school

year may have influenced teacher perceptions of administrative feedback. Scott (2017) indicated that impactful feedback needs to be face to face, fierce, and examine unseen aspects of practice. The lack of interaction between stakeholders is an important variable that may have skewed teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and feedback implementation.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of the study is that multiple surveys distributed through email to teachers across the select district during the two-week window responses were collected for the Teacher Perceptions of Administrative TEAM Feedback survey. Due to this, surveys overlapped, the number of emails received was increased, and a context of competition for potential participants' attention was created. Another limitation of this study was the State of Tennessee legislative changes to implementing the TEAM evaluation model and use of accountability measures. These modifications resulted in less feedback communication between administrators and teachers. The quantity and quality of feedback most likely impacted teacher perceptions of feedback.

Conclusion

There are two general conclusions inferred from this study. The first conclusion is that feedback is a complex process that impacts student learning through a layering of actions and practices. The lack of significance between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback and student achievement scores confirmed that feedback is a multidimensional teacher evaluation component (Ajjawi & Boud, 2018). A variety of factors influences feedback. The lack of significant correlation between teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback with student achievement scores in mathematics and English Language Arts, with low-income students, or between teachers with more than five years of experience and students with disabilities mathematics achievement scores reaffirms the theories of previous research. The

positive impact of feedback cannot be attributed to a single indicator (Ajjawi & Boud, 2018; Martinez et al., 2016). It can be inferred that the impact of feedback is reliant on a combination of actions and practices.

The second conclusion inferred from this study is that collaborative feedback can be used to evaluate current practices, specifically with students with disabilities. Collaborative feedback can improve students with disabilities access to effective instruction by providing entry points by aligning students' current skill mastery and IEP accommodations with standards-based instruction. Collaborative feedback is most effective when it was specific, longitudinal, and delivered through the lens of emotional intelligence (Gutierrez, 2018). Feedback should be explicitly identified to ensure that teachers understand there is an expectation of interpretation (Jug et al., 2019). It is crucial that administrators, special education teachers, and classroom teachers deliberately and continuously examine equitable practices through feedback. This examination has the potential to shrink learning gaps for students with disabilities.

Recommendations for Practices

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made for practice:

1. Teachers and administrators should participate in the authentic, frequent dialog that leads to the transference of feedback to classroom practices. Actionable feedback should be clearly connected to evaluations (Ripley, 2016). It can be inferred from current research that teacher perceptions are one component of feedback loops. However, other components, such as quantity and quality of feedback, also contribute to feedback on student achievement (Jug et al., 2019). Clear expectations and actionable feedback

support effective evaluations that build teacher capacity and positively impact student learning.

2. A variety of opportunities for collective efficacy and collaborative feedback should be encouraged to refine teachers' classroom practices. Teachers need to participate in collaborative professional development that spans beyond the nomological input of administrative TEAM feedback (Ajjawi, 2018). The multidimensional nature of feedback means that context and content are crucial (Huijgen et al., 2017). Teachers that actively participate in feedback dialogue across varying contexts positively impact student learning (The New Teacher Project, 2015). Districts and administrators should not overly rely on state-mandated models that promote nomological feedback. They should allocate time and resources to ensure that collaborative feedback is relevant to actionable tasks and is sustained over time (Hirsch, 2017).
3. Administrators and teachers should advocate and continuously reflect on students with disabilities' access to learning experiences. A blending between grade-level expectations and the specific needs of students with disabilities should be evaluated regularly. Collaborative partnerships with special education teachers, administrators, and teachers should result in clear connections between students with disabilities IEPs and content standards (Gregg, 2019). Meeting students academically by providing accommodations ensures success for all students and supports accountability among professional stakeholders (Executive Office of the President, 2015). This process ensures that expectations and student supports are aligned with student needs. Administrators and teachers should work collaboratively to provide adequate, grade-level instruction for students with disabilities.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. The interconnectedness of feedback and teacher evaluation models has been a foundational part of education reforms (Berberick et al., 2016; Patrick & Mantzicopoulos, 2016; Putman et al., 2018). Additional research should be conducted to explore the relationship between feedback, teacher LOE scores, and student achievement. This topic of research would greatly benefit districts and administrators in establishing teacher evaluation implementation guidelines.
2. Pandemic-related school closures and reopening limitations result in amendments to implementing the TEAM evaluation model and Tennessee's accountability measures during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years. The quantity and quality of feedback are directly related to the transference of feedback into classroom practices (Gutierrez, 2018; Jug et al., 2019). Administrators and teachers had fewer opportunities to participate in feedback dialogue. Administrators must modulate the quantity of feedback based on priority (Jug et al., 2019). A recommendation for future research is a comparison of quantity and quality of administrative evaluation feedback to teachers during and post-pandemic school years. Such research could add insight into how resource allocation and time impact feedback from evaluation models' ability to influence teacher instructional practices and student achievement.
3. Study results indicated a significant, negative, very weak relationship between students with disabilities English Language Arts achievement scores and teacher perceptions of administrative TEAM feedback. Collective efficacy can greatly influence teachers' abilities to understand better IEP obligations and impact students with disabilities learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). It is recommended that future research focus on the

use of collaborative feedback between classroom teachers, special education teachers, and administrators and its impact on expectations for students with disabilities, access to effective instruction, and alignment with state learning standards.

References

- Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2018). Examining the nature and effects of feedback dialogue, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43 (7), 1106-1119.
- Berberick, D.M., Clementson, C.J., Hawkinson, J.K., & Rolandson, D.M. (2016). A comparison of principal practices and music educator perceptions regarding teacher evaluation. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 209, 43-62.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change, vol VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Blazar, D., & Kraft, M. A. (2015). Exploring mechanisms of effective teacher coaching: A tale of two cohorts from a randomized experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(4), 542-566. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43773526>
- Bradley, J. (2015). *Designing schools for meaningful professional learning: A guidebook for educators*. Corwin. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483339269>
- Bridges, W., & Bridges, S. (2016). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change*. Da Capo: Lifelong Books.
- Brown., R. (2018). *Dare to lead: Brave work, tough conversations, whole hearts*. Random House.
- Bryant, C.B. (2013). Perceptions of Tennessee school principals about the Tennessee

- Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) [Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University]. Digital Commons. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1120>
- Buttram, J. L., & Farley-Ripple, E. N. (2016). The role of principals in professional learning communities. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 15(2), 192-220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2015.1039136>
- Cantrell, S., & Kane, T. (2013). *Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET Project's three-year study*. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. <http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/resource/ensuring-fair-and-reliable-measures-of-effective-teaching-culminating-findings-from-the-met-projects-three-year-study/>
- Clason, D., & Dormody, T. (1994). Analyzing data measured by individual likert-type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(4), 31—35. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43997753>
- Cohen, J. & Goldhaber, D. (2016). Building a more complete understanding of teacher evaluation using classroom observations. *Educational Researcher*, 45(6), 378-387
- Davis, J., Lampley, J., & Foley, V. (2016). The relationship between growth scores and the overall observation ratings for teachers in a public school system in Tennessee. *Journal of Learning in Higher Education*, 12(1), 45-51. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etsu-works/3028/>
- Dee, T., & Jacob, B. (2010) The impact of no child left behind. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 149-207. www.jstor.org/stable/41012846

- Dodson, R. (2017). An analysis of principal perceptions of the primary teaching evaluation system used in eight U.S. States. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 12(5). <http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/773>
- Edmunds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leader*, 22 (10), 15-24.
<https://www.midwayisd.org/cms/lib/TX01000662/Centricity/Domain/8/2.%20Edmonds%20Effective%20Schools%20Movement.pdf>
- Ellis, J., & Laughland, T. (2017). Where to next? Examining feedback received by teacher education students. *Issues in Educational Research*. 27 (1), 51-63.
<http://www.iier.org.au/iier27/ellis.pdf>
- Executive Office of the President. (2015). Every Student Succeeds Act: A progress report on elementary and secondary education. White House Archives.
https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/documents/ESSA_Progress_Report.pdf
- Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1161894>
- Goldring, E., Grissom, J.A., Rubin, M., Neumerski, C.M., Cannata, M., Drake, T. & Schuermann, P. (2015). Value added: Principals' human capital decision and the emergence of teacher observation data. *Educational Reseracher*, 44(2), 96-104.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/24571536>
- Goodwin, B., Cameron, G., & Hein, H. (2015). *Balanced leadership for powerful learning*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Gordon-Phan, S. (2019). The impact of principals' communication practices on school success environment: An intrinsic case study [Doctoral dissertation, University of New England]. DUNE:DigitalUNE. <https://dune.une.edu/theses/242>
- Great Schools (n.d.). K-12 school quality information and parenting resources. <https://www.greatschools.org/>
- Gregg, N. (2019, August 23). Improving equity: What makes accountability indicators meaningful? Center for Assessment. <https://www.nciea.org/blog/assessment-systems/improving-equity-what-makes-accountability-indicators-meaningful>
- Gunal, Y. & Demirtash, R.N. (2016). A pathway to educational accountability: The relationship between effective school characteristics and student achievement. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(9), 2049-2054. <https://www.hrpub.org/download/20160830/UJER15-19507090.pdf>
- Gutierrez, L. T. (2018). Building teacher self-efficacy through administrator feedback [Doctoral dissertation, San Jose State University]. Scholarworks. <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.w5yn-55tc>
- Hall, P. & Simeral, A. (2008). *Building teachers' capacity for success: A collaborative approach for coaches and school leaders*. Association of Supervisors and Curriculum Development.
- Hargreaves, A. & O'Connor, M. (2018). Solidarity with solidity: The case for collaborative professionalism. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 100(1), 20-24. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26552420>
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact of learning*. Routledge.

- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 88-112. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4624888?seq=1>
- Heil, L. & Berg, M. H. (2017). Something happened on the way to completing the edTPA: A case study of candidates' perceptions of the edTPA. *Contributions to Music Education*, 42, 181-200. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26367442>
- Herrell, K. (2018). Teacher perceptions of the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) [Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University]. Digital Commons. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3374>
- Hirsch, J. (2017). *The feedback fix: Dump the past, embrace the future, and lead the way to change*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hitt, D.H. & Tucker, P.D. (2016). A systematic review of key leader practices to influence student achievement: A unified framework. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(2), 531-569. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24752863>
- Horne, J. B. (2012). *Instructional coaching: Teachers' perceptions of practice and effectiveness* [Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University]. Digital Commons. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1458>
- Hughes, G., Smith, H., & Creese, B. (2014). Not seeing the woods for the trees: Developing a feedback analysis tool to explore feed forward in modularised programmes. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(8), 1079-1094. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.969193>
- Huijgen, T., Van De Grift, W., Van Boxtel, C., & Holthuis, P. (2017). Teaching historical

- contextualization: The construction of a reliable observation instrument. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 32(2), 159-181.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44951883>
- Jamshidian, S., Yamani, N., Sabri, M., & Haghani, F. (2019). Problems and challenges in providing feedback to clinical teachers on their educational performance: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 8, 8.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6378827/>
- Jiang, J.Y., Sporte, S.E., & Luppescu, S. (2015). Teacher perspectives on evaluation reform: Chicago's REACH students. *Educational Researcher*, 44(2), 105-116.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/i24571360>
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D.K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 7(4), 396-403.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276394797_Likert_Scale_Explored_and_Explained
- Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. (1981). Transfer of training: The contribution of coaching. *The Journal of Education*, 163 (2), 163-172. <https://jstor.org/stable/42772926>
- Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (1983). *Power in staff development through research on training*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jug, R., Jiang, X., & Bean, S. M. (2019). Giving and receiving effective feedback: A review article and how to guide. *Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine*, 143, 244-250. <https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2018-0058-RA>
- Kane, J., Stasiger, O., Contrell, S., Archer, J., Buhayar, S., Kerr, K., Kawakita, T., &

- Polikoff, M. (2012). *Gathering feedback for teaching combining high-quality observations with student surveys and achievement gains*. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. <http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/resource/gathering-feedback-on-teaching-combining-high-quality-observations-with-student-surveys-and-achievement-gains-3/>
- Keller, M.M., Hoy, A.W., Goetz, T. & Franzel, A.C. (2016). Teacher enthusiasm: Reviewing and redefining a complex construct. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(4), 742-769. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44955363?seq=1>
- Koedel, C., Li, J., Springer, M.G. & Tan, L. (2017). The impact of performance ratings on job satisfaction for public school teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(2), 241-278. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44246025>
- Kraft, M., & Gilmour, A. (2016). Can principals promote teacher development as evaluators? a case study of principals' views and experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(5), 711-753. <http://doi:10.1177/0013161x16653445>
- Kulhavy, R. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(1), 211-232. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170128>
- Lavigne, A., & Chamberlain, R. (2016). Teacher evaluation in Illinois: school leaders' perceptions and practices. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 29(2), 179–209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11092-016-9250-0>
- Leiva, M., Montecinos, C., & Aravena, F. (2016). Instructional leadership among novice principals in Chile: Practices for classroom observation and feedback to teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, Assessment and Evaluation*. 22 (2), 1-17.
- Lemov, D. (2015). *Teach like a champion 2.0: 62 techniques that put students on the path*

- to college*. Jossey-Bass: A Wiley Brand.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22 (140), 55.
- Little, D. A. (2019). Growth scores and TEAM observation ratings for teachers in a Northeast Tennessee school district [Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University]. Digital Commons. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3612>
- Louangrath, P.I., & Sutanapong, C. (2018). Validity and reliability of survey scales. *International Journal of Research & Methodology in Social Science*, 4(3), 99-114. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331175672_VValidity_and_Reliability_of_Survey_Scales
- Martinez, J.F., Schweig, J. & Goldschmidt, P. (2016). Approaches for combining multiple measures of teacher performance: Reliability, validity, and implications for evaluation policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 38(4), 738-756. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44984563>
- McClarty, K.L., Way, W.D., Porter, A.C., Beimers, J. N., & Miles, J. A. (2013). Evidence-based standard setting: Establishing a validity framework for cut scores. *Educational Researcher*, 42(2), 78-88. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23462361>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass: A Wiley Brand.
- Moran, R. (2015). The implications of teacher performance assessment and the impact on teacher decision making. *Language Arts*, 93(2), 96-107. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/24577542>

- Murphy, J.A. & Hallinger, P. (1984). Policy analysis at the local level: A framework for expanded investigation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(1), 5-13/
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1163941>
- Papay, J., (2012). Refocusing the debate: Assessing the purpose and tools of teacher evaluation. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(1), 123-141.
- Putnam, H., Ross, E., & Walsh, K. (2018). *Making a difference: Six places where teacher evaluation systems are getting results*. National Council on Teacher Quality.
<https://www.nctq.org/publications/Making-a-Difference>
- Ripley, T. (2016). Teacher perceptions of individual professional learning plans (Plan No. 2949) [Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, Clemmer College]. Open Access Digital Commons. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2949>
- Scott, S. (2017). *Fierce conversations: Achieving success at work & in life one conversation at a time*. New American Library.
- Sinek, S. (2017). *Leaders eat last: Why some teams pull together and others don't*. Portfolio Penguin.
- Steele, C. F. (2009). *The inspired teacher: How to know one, grow one, or be one*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Steinberg, M.P. & Kraft, M.A. (2017). The sensitivity of teacher performance ratings to the design of teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Researcher*, 46(7), 378-396.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44971872>
- Strategic plan: Sullivan County Department of Education (2020). [pdf].
http://www.sullivank12.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/2020_Strategic-Plan.pdf
- Suárez-Alvarez, J., Pedrosa, I., Lozano, L.M., García-Cueto, E., Cuesta, M., & Muñoz, J. (2018).

Using reversed items in Likert scales: A questionable practice. *Psicothema*,30(2), 149-158. <http://www.psicothema.com/pdf/4463.pdf>

Tennessee Department of Education (2013). TEAM teacher certification module 3.

<https://team-tn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Team-Teacher-Certification-Module-3.pdf>

Tennessee Department of Education (2016). TEAM teacher and principal evaluation

framework: Process, guidelines and forms reference manual. <https://team-tn.org/teacher-evaluation/>

Tennessee Department of Education (2018a). EdTPA information for districts.

https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/licensure/ed-prep/edTPA_Info_for_Districts_508CR.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education (2018b). TEAM teacher evaluation evaluator handbook.

https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/teamtn/TEAM_Teacher_Evaluator_Handbook_2018-19.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education (n.d.a). Report Card. <https://reportcard.tnk12.gov/>

Tennessee Department of Education (n.d.b). TNReady.

<https://www.tn.gov/education/assessment/tnready.html#:~:text=TNReady>

The New Teacher Project (2015). The mirage: Confronting the hard truth about our quest

for teacher development. https://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP-Mirage_2015.pdf

Tuma, A., Hamilton, L., & Tsai, T. (2018). *A nationwide look at teacher perceptions*

of feedback and evaluation systems: Findings from the American Teacher Panel. Rand Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2558.html

- Van der Lans, R., Van de Grift, W., & Van Veen, K. (2018). Developing an instrument for teacher feedback: Using the Rasch Model to explore teachers' development of effective teacher strategies and behaviors. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 86(2), 247-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2016.1268086>
- Whitney, C. (2018). The effects of No Child Left Behind on children's socioemotional outcomes. *AERA Open*, 3 (3), 1-21.
- Wiśniewski B., Zierer K., & Hattie J. (2020). Power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 3087. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A SURVEY

Please respond to the following questions regarding administrative feedback to teachers.

1. Did you teach grade 3, 4, or 5 during the 2018-2019 school year?

- Yes
- No

2. Which best describes the number of years you have taught?

- < 5 years
- > 5 years

3. Receiving administrator feedback is beneficial.

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |

4. The content of administrator feedback is relevant to my current teaching assignment.

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |

5. I intend to use what I learn from administrator feedback to support student learning.

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |

6. Student learning in my classroom has been positively impacted by administrator feedback.

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |

7. Receiving administrator feedback has helped me focus on student growth.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

8. Administrator feedback empowers me to support student learning in my classroom.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

9. I feel prepared to implement what I have learned from administrator feedback.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

10. I feel that students experience better lessons because of feedback from my administrator.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

11. Discussing instruction goals with my administrator supports student learning.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

12. Administrator feedback increased my content knowledge to better support student growth.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

13. I have used ideas discussed with my administrator to guide student learning.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

14. Administrator feedback enables me to provide better learning experiences for students.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

15. Administrator feedback was NOT beneficial to classroom instruction.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

16. Administrative feedback was aligned with classroom learners' needs.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

17. I use ideas from administrator feedback on a regular basis in my classroom.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

18. Administrator feedback has NOT increased my effectiveness as a teacher.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

19. Areas of growth selected based on administrative feedback make sense to me.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

20. Administrative feedback has provided instructional ideas that can be used in my classroom to promote student learning.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

21. I do NOT use what I learn from administrative feedback to guide instruction.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

22. I have changed the way I interact with students because of administrative feedback.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

23. I have input into goals for areas of growth.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

24. I have already implemented ideas from administrative feedback into my classroom to support student learning.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

25. I have used ideas from administrative feedback with students.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

26. I have seen evidence of increased student learning because of administrator feedback.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

27. My administrator feedback experiences were NOT beneficial to my students or me.

strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree