A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to My Dissertation:

A Performance of Third Wave Teacher Leadership in a Bureaucracy

By

Daniele Vingelli

A dissertation submitted to

The Graduate School of Education

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Education

Graduate Program in Teacher Leadership

Written Under the Direction

_____

Dr. Carrie Lobman Chair

_____

Dr. Alisa Belzer Committee

_____

Dr. Lesley Morrow Committee

New Brunswick, New Jersey
May 2017

2017

Daniele Vingelli

ABSTRACT

Since the 1980s, there has been a growing body of literature in support of restructuring the nation's top-down educational system. At the same time, providing teachers with quality professional development (PD) has become a critically important task in this current era of accountability. When I began my dissertation work, I intended to study the impact of iterative, research-based professional development on my colleagues' practices and PD satisfaction. Upon investigation of my research questions, the constraints to professional development in a public school operating within the bureaucracy of the New York City Department of Education became apparent. It then seemed more pressing to explore the PD experiences of staff members, especially the challenges for the teacher leaders on our school's PD team in providing professional development within a top-down education system. The research questions I then developed for this study are: (1) What challenges does the PD team at a large urban high school navigate in attempting to plan and implement professional development over the course of one school year? (2) How does the instructional staff and administration experience the professional development processes at a large urban high school over the course of one school year? However, when attempting to answer my questions using the data that I had outlined for my original study, I realized that the participants' experiences were difficult to convey using traditional research methods. After studying the performative social sciences, I concluded that a performative piece would help give voice and life to the story, and hopefully reach more audiences and raise awareness regarding the need to restructure the current top-down system. Surveys, focus groups, a participant observation journal, and a binder of documentation comprised the data for the study. Data collection methods provided an ongoing set of responses to the professional development activities at the site from every group of stakeholders: myself as the team leader, PD team members, teachers, department level administrators, and the principal. The data collection procedures aided me in exploring my research questions, and provided me with enough varied information to deeply understand participants' perspectives to create the performance, which is presented herein as a screenplay of monologues. A review of the performance indicates that regardless of the PD structure in place at the site, changes in bureaucratic mandates and expectations caused changes to the school's PD model, and, subsequently, conflict and stress within the team and dissension among staff members. Relying upon the support system they developed was often one of the only things that helped the team counteract the bureaucratic structure and culture embedded in the site. Implications for policy, practice, and future research are included.

Keywords: professional development; PD team; teacher leadership; performative social science; bureaucratic structure

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my fellow teacher leaders. In these early decades of the 21st century, and now under a new federal bureaucracy, it is difficult to determine the fate of our students, school, and even the system in which we sometimes struggle but have also become accustomed. I know that regardless of setting and circumstances, our work will never cease.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my family, especially Aunt Judy and Uncle Richard, who made my Rutgers experience easier in so many ways. And last but certainly not least, a huge thank you to my parents, Marie and Lou, who have always believed in my abilities, supported my goals, and inspired me to achieve. I attribute so much of my educational and professional successes to the strong foundation you built in our home and the love you show in endless ways, and I recognize that I couldn't be luckier.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

I'm not sure when I first decided I would like the stressful and thankless job as the professional development (PD) team leader. But I was happy and grateful when I was told I could form a PD team for the 2014-2015 school year. As a third year Ed.D. student, I was extremely interested in addressing a problem of practice related to professional development at my site for my dissertation.

A great deal of my doctoral work involved studying effective professional development (Danielson, 2005; Dieker et al., 2009; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; MacFarlane, 2012; Moreno & Ortegano-Lane, 2008; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Steyn, 2005; Wells, 2007), and I wanted to infuse my learning into the design of our school-wide PD. Because many of my colleagues had demonstrated dissatisfaction with in-house professional development during my five years as a team member, I hoped incorporating their needs and wants into the design of professional development could raise teachers' PD satisfaction (Bayar, 2014; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014; Hursen, 2011; McFarlane, 2012; Nir & Bogler, 2007; Torff & Sessions, 2008) while simultaneously impacting their practices (Dingle, Brownell, Leko, Boardman, & Haager, 2011; Eberta-May et al., 2011; Steyn, 2005).

After chasing former team members around the building for days to see if they were willing to return to the team, imploring APs for suggestions for new members, and presenting the role as team member to prospects as an "opportunity" rather than a responsibility, I was able to get 10 teachers to join the team. We met for our first team meeting on October 2nd, optimistically and energetically following the iterative design I outlined in my dissertation proposal to raise PD satisfaction and impact our colleagues' practices; however…

A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to My Dissertation

Exploring my research questions led to a seemingly more profound exploration of the constraints of the bureaucracy of the NYC DOE on all those involved (Cuban, 1984; Ravitch, 1983; Reese, 2005; Tyack, 1976; Tyack & Hansot, 1986), especially in relation to providing opportunities for high quality professional development. Studies show that components of PD which positively impact teachers' learning, engagement, and motivation include: sustainability and relevance (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells, 2007); collaborative processes occurring in teachers' educational settings (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Wells, 2007); attention to educators' personal learning styles (Dieker et al., 2009; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells, 2007); and, experiential learning components (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007). Unfortunately, however in the New York City Department of Education, research-based PD is often sacrificed to meet the demands of bureaucratic bosses. With only so much time during the school year and day to disseminate rapidly changing information sent from the top-down, and to prove that feedback from city and state officials is being addressed with staff members, developing and adhering to a professional development plan that is built on the components of effective PD is not only the most pressing matter, as was the case at my site.

The professional development plan at the site for my study did not allow for impacting practicing or raising teachers' PD satisfaction. With only three scheduled professional development days allotted during the school year this study was conducted (two of which are included in the data), sustainability (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells, 2007) was clearly not embedded in the PD plan. Additionally, regardless of the extent to which we included collaborative processes occurring in teachers' educational settings (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Wells, 2007) during those three PD sessions, gave attention to educators' personal

learning styles (Dieker et al., 2009; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells,

2007), or provided experiential learning components (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner,

2007), the lack of consistency and focus made it impossible to impact teacher practices.

The team's goal to raise teachers' satisfaction with professional development at our site

was also a maddening and futile task. There were far too many teachers at our large urban high

school with varying needs and wants to satisfy everyone every time we had a PD session (Dingle

et al., 2011; Eberta-May et al., 2011; Steyn, 2005). Additionally, teachers' written PD feedback

did not always match their verbal or physical reactions to professional development at the site

(Dingle et al., 2011; Eberta-May et al., 2011). Finally, a review of teachers' requests for PD on

yoga and "drinking beer" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 17) helped me further realize

that providing our colleagues with the professional development they requested did not

necessarily equate to good PD. But most importantly, how could we raise teacher's PD

satisfaction if professional development at the site was devoid of the elements research has

shown to positively impact their satisfaction?

It may seem logical that if we really wanted to impact teacher practices as teacher

leaders at the site, we would have pushed to implement a professional development plan that

allowed for research-based PD. However, we also found ourselves quite constrained by the

bureaucratic system in NYC public schools. Although we were given power to design and

facilitate professional development, that power was quite limited- not only were we allotted only

the three PD days (when the PD team used to provide monthly PD in years prior), we were only

able to design PD that was approved by the administration, which was in-line with city and state

mandates and expectations. Therefore, while our role indicated that we could be trusted to

implement and facilitate professional development (Collay, 2013; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014;

Nazareno, Byrd, & Wieder, 2013; Silva, Gimbert, & Nolan, 2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004), the constraints of that role indicated otherwise.

We were also subject to the whims of our superiors. For example, shortly before the final professional development of the year, I was called down to the principal's office after a superintendent visit to learn that we would have to scrap ALL the work we had done to prepare for the last PD of the school year based on the visit and feedback. Just like that, weeks of work, GONE! And not only did we have to replan an entire two hour PD session for over a hundred teachers in two weeks, we were being forced to facilitate about a topic that our colleagues had explored again and again during PD, leaving us to be viewed far from favorably by our fellow teachers.

Teachers at the site also felt the effects of a top-down system that prevented them from being effectively developed. Although many teachers at the site are interested in professional development that allows them to deeply explore their content or elements of expertise, being subject to top-down managerial demands of administrators (Crowther, 1997; Cuban, 1984; Ravitch, 1983; Reese, 2005; Troen & Boles, 1993; Tyack, 1976; Tyack & Hansot, 1986) means they are often forced to engage in PD they have either already experienced or that does not apply to their subject matter. Much of the negative feedback we received during the intervention were merely complaints that the PD we provided had nothing to do with what our colleagues actually teach, which would definitely also explain low PD satisfaction.

Although we may be quick to blame the administrators at the site for the deficiencies in the PD structure, they were also limited by the bureaucracy of the NYC DOE. Subject to the top-down bureaucratic structure of the DOE (Crowther, 1997; Cuban, 1984; Ravitch, 1983; Reese, 2005; Troen & Boles, 1993; Tyack, 1976; Tyack, & Hansot, 1986), a visit from city or state

representatives forced administrators to use their PD resources to match bureaucratic feedback and expectations rather than intended goals, let alone address the research of effective PD. Although my principal had worked with me to establish the PD focus of learning strategies at the start of the school year, that decision was made to address city and state feedback from the previous year. As soon as our school received new feedback from the superintendent, it was then necessary for the administration to show that they were addressing the most recent feedback to be in good standing with the district and city. Although addressing the latest superintendent feedback meant disrupting the established PD plan for the school, undermining the work of the team, and forcing teachers to engage in professional development they did not need or want, the administration felt that it was what the bureaucracy required. While the professional development plan for the year was nowhere near adequate to ultimately be effective, it was the administration's goal to provide PD opportunities for their staff that would benefit their instruction, not to mention their evaluations. However, they were required to forgo their good intentions to appease their own superiors, as shortsighted as their intentions may have been.

Overall, a closer look at how the bureaucratic system that is the New York City Department of Education affected all aspects of professional development at the site made me realize that I needed to shift my focus for this study. It seemed much more appropriate and interesting to study the challenges faced by a team of teacher leaders on a professional development team in a large urban high school within the constraints of a bureaucratic public school system. Connected to a study about the challenges faced by the PD team at my site was also an exploration of the PD experiences of staff members, specifically teachers and administrators, who were constrained by the bureaucracy as well.

In studying the challenges faced by the team and the experiences of staff members, it became clear that all those involved in PD at the site had important perspectives and good intentions that needed to be equally shared. The remaining challenge was determining the best way to share their stories.

I was finding it difficult to illustrate the intricacies of our professional development program and the perspectives of team and staff members using traditional research methods. However, the task of understanding and presenting my data while maintaining the complexities of the story seemed to become easier when I began exploring the performative social sciences. In developing a performative piece, I was better able to allow the voices and experiences of all who engaged in PD in some way at the site to be developed, heard, and understood by audiences (Denzin, 2001; Denzin, 2013; Geertz, 1980; Gergen & Gergen, 2011; Gergen & Gergen, 2012; Roberts, 2009; Savin-Baden & Van Niekerk, 2007; Schechner, 1983). Our stories comprise this performative dissertation.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the 1980s, there has been a growing body of literature in support of restructuring the nation's top-down educational system (Danielson, 2005; Troen & Boles, 1993; Tyack, 1976; Tyack & Hansot, 1986). One method offered by theorists and researchers for breaking-down the bureaucracy of our public education system is to provide teachers with more power, especially in positions which allow them to share their ideas with colleagues, provide mentoring to newer teachers, engage in problem solving within their schools, and offer their knowledge and expertise through collaboration (Collay, 2013; Danielson, 2004; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Silva et al., 2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004), all which could be considered forms of professional development. Although many qualified teachers are reluctant to assume leadership positions at their sites due to varied challenges inherent in these positions (Barth, 2001; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Silva et al., 2000; Wasley, 1992), many others still are volunteering to provide varied formal and informal professional development to colleagues at their sites (Collay, 2013; Danielson, 2004; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Silva et al., 2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Providing teachers with quality PD has become a critically important task in this current era of accountability (Danielson, 2005). Yet, research shows that not all PD is valuable, and that some PD formats are more effective than others (Dieker et al., 2009; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; MacFarlane, 2012; Moreno & Ortegano-Lane, 2008; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Steyn, 2005; Wells, 2007), more satisfying to teachers, (Bayar, 2014; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014; Hursen, 2011; McFarlane, 2012; Nir & Bogler, 2007; Torff & Sessions, 2008), and are more likely to impact practices (Dingle et al., 2011; Eberta-May et al., 2011; Steyn, 2005).
We can look to the literature to learn about the efficacy of PD programs and teachers' perspectives on their experiences, as well as the experiences of teacher leaders willing to

withstand the challenges to design and implement professional development at their home

schools. However, traditional research formats alone may not give us a full picture of the PD

challenges and experiences of those working within the bureaucratic public education system.

Therefore, we should explore nontraditional qualitative research formats to learn more about

professional development from the perspectives of those directly involved in PD programs at

their schools so we can identify ways to reform an ineffective system (Denzin, 2001; Denzin,

2013; Geertz, 1980; Gergen & Gergen, 2011; Gergen & Gergen, 2012; Roberts, 2009; Savin-

Baden & Van Niekerk, 2007; Schechner, 1983).

This literature review is divided into three sections. The first section addresses teacher

leadership, specifically the components and challenges of contemporary teacher leaders with

often undefined leadership roles at their sites. The second section of the literature review

explores the design of professional development with regards to the efficacy and impact of PD

programs, as well as teacher satisfaction. And the third section unpacks the genre of performative

social science, specifically how it can illuminate research participants' experiences and possibly

affect societal change.

Teacher Leadership

When we think of leaders in our society, many of us may think of our teachers. Many of

us recognize that teaching is a profession that requires leadership skills, and teachers must

demonstrate these skills on a daily, hourly, and even minute-by-minute basis. Why is it then that

many teachers neither view themselves as leaders, nor want to be identified as 'leader' in their

profession (Barth, 2001; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Silva et al., 2000)? How can it be that

those who take the lead in the educational component of children's lives not only avoid the label

'leader,' but even find the title a detriment when trying to improve schools and student learning

(Barth, 2001; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Wasley, 1992)? To answer these questions it is important to understand the history of leadership in public education.

The History

Leadership in education has traditionally followed a bureaucratic structure: politicians enact educational laws which school administrators enforce (Crowther, 1997; Cuban, 1984; Ravitch, 1983; Reese, 2005; Troen & Boles, 1993; Tyack, 1976; Tyack, 1997). Following the 19th century industrial model, hierarchy in the public school system positions teachers as a labor force managed by administrators (Crowther, 1997; Cuban, 1984; Ravitch, 1983; Reese, 2005; Troen & Boles, 1993; Tyack, 1976; Tyack & Hansot, 1986). Therefore, while some argue that educators are always leaders (Barth, 2001; Collay, 2013), the traditional view of leadership in education made the terms 'teacher' and 'leader' mutually exclusive.

Although there are no definitive time periods within the evolution of teacher leadership, the literature recognizes three distinct "waves" (Berry, Byrd, & Wieder, 2013; Silva et al., 2000; Wasley, 1991; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). We saw the terms 'teacher' and 'leader' merge around the 1980s (Troen & Boles, 1993) in what is recognized as the first wave (Berry et al., 2013; Silva et al., 2000; Wasley, 1991; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). The first wave was sparked by a recognition that a system that stripped power from those who were in control of students' education for the majority of a school day was flawed. Reform reports of the 80s called for teacher leaders to help restructure the nation's schools (Danielson, 2005; Troen & Boles, 1993; Tyack, 1976; Tyack, 1997; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). In this initial stage of teacher leadership, hierarchal roles were developed that were continuous with the already existing bureaucratic education system. First wave leadership roles were awarded to teachers recognized for their instructional knowledge and expertise. Positions such as department head, master teacher, and

even union representative were designed and delegated so teachers would be leading their peers in ways that were similar to other administrators.

Again, although there is not a distinct beginning for each wave of teacher leadership, the second wave developed during the 90s. Teachers continued to be given titles such as department head and master teacher once the second wave of teacher leadership commenced. However, new roles were also added when teacher leaders began to provide professional development and training beyond their own schools. Similar to the first wave, leadership roles were created for teachers who were identified as having instructional expertise; second wave positions such as teacher leader, and staff and curriculum developer continued to provide teachers with positions of authority over their professional peers (Collay, 2013; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Nazareno, 2013; Silva et al., 2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). During the second wave, teachers often accepted leadership roles in schools other than where they taught to streamline instruction, such as creating new curriculum or providing training in a one-size-fits-all method of instruction.

At the start of the 21st century, problems began arising for leaders and teachers within the frameworks of the first and second waves of teacher leadership. Following the traditional power structure of the public education system, delegated leadership roles separate teachers leaders from their "non-leader" colleagues. Teacher leaders are seen as supervisors rather than peers with expertise to be shared. Although a lead or master teacher may offer knowledge and skills to their colleagues so they can develop instructionally and grow professionally, it may feel uncomfortable collaborating with a colleague viewed as a superior. In the evaluation-driven educational climate that has emerged in the first decades of the 21st century, we can imagine the tension that exists between teachers and their colleagues titled 'master teacher' if they are viewed as an extension of administrators who evaluate instruction. Similarly, because some forms of

teaching are rated as better than others, it seems understandable that a staff or curriculum

developer may experience resistance when training teachers on new instructional forms,

especially if they are recommending new practices to their more experienced peers who have

found success using their own practices for decades. Furthermore, it may be difficult to accept

instructional cues from superiors who are from outside the building and do not know nor teach

our students.

A New Wave

A third wave of teacher leadership has emerged that breaks traditional hierarchal

educational boundaries. Contemporary teacher leaders have more opportunities in the third wave

to extend themselves beyond the regular tasks and responsibilities required in the classroom.

Third wave teacher leaders share their ideas with colleagues, provide mentoring to newer

teachers, engage in problem solving within their school, and offer their knowledge and expertise

through collaboration (Collay, 2013; Danielson, 2005; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Silva et al.,

2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Teacher leaders in the third wave of teacher leaders can include

not only those who have been given formal positions, but also those who take on leadership

positions more organically. Although teachers who arise as leaders in their buildings do not

necessarily have a formal title, they often have the trust and respect of both their peers and their

superiors, which can help them to lead. Ideally, collegiality, collaboration, and relationships are

inherent in this third wave, which may help teacher leaders to overcome the institutional

restraints of the traditional bureaucratic structure of the public education system. From this

perspective, many teacher leaders are people who have a desire to see others succeed- their

colleagues and their students.

A review of the work of educational pioneer Charlotte Danielson substantiates the research on teacher leadership. At the forefront of today's push to assess and develop teachers, Danielson (2005; 2006) recognizes that teachers can become leaders without being assigned formal titles. Danielson (2005) explains teacher leadership as "that set of skills demonstrated by teachers who continue to teach students but also have an influence that extends beyond their own classrooms to others" (p. 12). Danielson (2006) describes the principal characteristic of teacher leadership as being "completely informal" (p. 1). Student learning is at the center of Danielson's Framework for Teacher Leadership (Danielson, 2005), and the ability to lead within one's department or team, across the school, and beyond the school is organized around the school's culture. Danielson (2006) actually cites cultural and structural factors to be the deciding conditions as to whether teacher leaders will flourish or suffer within individual sites. A closer review of the research on teacher leadership will illustrate how teacher leaders arise and are challenged in the third wave as noted by Danielson (2005; 2006).

The Rise of Third Wave Teacher Leaders

As already mentioned, a review of the literature indicates that teacher leaders can develop more organically today than in the initial phases of teacher leadership. Even if teachers are not identified as leaders by administrators, or even themselves, their colleagues may recognize them as such. In a mixed methods study of the Distributed Leadership Project, a four year longitudinal study of elementary leadership of 84 teachers from eight Chicago elementary schools, 67 teachers (79.8 %) identified other teachers as influential in their instructional practices (Spillane, Hallet, & Diamond, 2003). Oftentimes in the literature, teachers emerged as leaders when collaborating with colleagues. Research also suggests that teacher leaders were able to assert the most influence over their peers while in collaborative situations. In her qualitative study of three

teacher leaders working in public schools in various parts of the country and identified as leaders

by their colleagues and administrators, Patricia Wasley (1992) noted that the leaders engaged in

three types of collaborative relationships: mentoring, division of labor, and partnering.

Furthermore, Wasley (1992) noticed that regardless of the type, the collaborative relationships

became more effective leadership only when the leaders were able to influence their colleagues'

behavior and practices. But how is it exactly that teachers become recognized as leaders by their

peers as well as influence them?

At the heart of this wave of organic teacher leadership is a focus on instruction and a

willingness to collaborate (Boles & Troen, 1994; Collay, 2013; Crowther, 1997; Danielson,

2005; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Fay, 1992; Read & Hoff, 2005; Spillane et al., 2003; Troen

& Boles, 1994; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Educational researchers provide us with models

depicting the importance of student learning and collaboration in teacher leadership today. After

engaging in a qualitative case study of seven Maine schools from two separate studies of teacher

leadership in 2006-2007, Fairman and Mackenzie (2014) developed the Spheres of Teacher

Leadership Action for Learning to illustrate how teacher leaders developed at their sites. At the

center of their model is the goal of student learning, and they describe how teacher leaders move

from, through, and across different spheres to bring their instructional knowledge to those at their

site and beyond. The Spheres of Teacher Leadership Action for Learning model (Fairman &

Mackenzie, 2014) clearly posits student learning as the motivation for teacher leadership. Berry

et al. (2013) share a model from a brainstorming session at the Center for Teaching Quality

(CTQ) Collaboratory led by an award winning science teacher that demonstrates how

"teacherpreneurs" can prepare their students for an interconnected global world by collaborating

with members of the educational community and beyond. Based on their brainstorming, we can

see that student learning motivates teacher leaders to collaborate. All the aforementioned models

posit student learning as the focus and collaborating with others as essential for successful

teacher leadership.

Leading in the Third Wave

Across the literature, collaboration was an essential component to third wave teacher

leadership. Not only did teacher leaders find collaborating to be important in solidifying their

leadership, but they also found it to be enjoyable. One teacher leader in a qualitative study of

three teachers in the Mastery in Learning (MIL) Project (MIL), a national reform project (Fay,

1992), stated that, "empowerment also comes from working with others in the department who

will share and team. I like best finding interdisciplinary ways to solve issues, whether it's for the

students or the whole school" (p. 73). Collaboration was so important to teacher leaders in the

literature that they even worked to overcome boundaries to work with colleagues. When

collaborative opportunities were not available at their sites, teacher leaders were shown to take it

upon themselves to develop study groups and professional learning communities. They met

outside school, and used technology to communicate and find and share resources. In a five year

qualitative study documenting observations of 50 experienced teachers working in some of the

most challenging urban districts in the U.S. who are engaged in a teacher leadership master's

degree program, teacher leaders met with coaches, engaged in extra parent contact and tutoring,

and found ways to combat bullying when they felt it would benefit student learning (Collay,

2013).

Across the literature, trusting relationships were found to be tantamount for teacher

leaders to be successful in collaborating. Fullan (2001) refers to a focus on improving instruction

as an educator's "moral purpose," and states that, in reform efforts, "If moral purpose is job one,

relationships are job two" (p. 51). Fullan's (2001) theory on educational change is also evident in the literature on teacher leadership. One teacher leader in Fairman & Mackenzie's study (2014) with 23 years of classroom experience stated that, "Mostly what I have learned over the years is the value of people. I have found that no matter how few materials you have, it's really the people who make the whole thing work or not work (p. 785). Without the help of those they work with, teacher leaders cannot be successful. Within Fairman and Mackenzie's (2014) Spheres of Leadership model, teacher leaders were able to carry-out all the strategies they used to influence their peers- modelling, coaching, collaborating, and advocating- as a result of the relationships that existed or they forged based on trust. Developing trusting relationships with colleagues as well as administrators also helped teacher leaders be successful. One teacher in the Chicago Distributed Leadership Project (Spillane et al., 2003) identified trust as a basis for the construction of leadership. She stated, "I feel like the faculty trusts me and the principal trusts me... And I've come up with a lot of ideas for expressive arts that the principal trusts, and he... just lets me go. He just lets me do it" (Spillane et al., 2003, p.8).

A plethora of current research identifies third wave concepts of teacher leadership as imperative in reforming our public school system for the benefit of our students (Berry et al., 2013; Boles & Troen, 1994; Collay, 2013; Crowther, 1997; Danielson, 2005; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Fay, 1992; Fullan, 2001; Read & Hoff, 2005; Troen & Boles, 1994; Silva et al., 2000; Wasley, 1991; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). And the literature illustrates that third wave teacher leadership can exist and thrive in educational settings characterized by a focus on student learning, collaboration, and trusting relationships (Collay; 2013; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Fay, 1992; Silva et al., 2000; Spillane et al., 2003; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, what happens in environments in which the components to effective third wave teacher leadership are

missing? What prevents teacher leadership from flourishing even in an era that calls for third wave type teacher leadership more than ever before? If we believe that third wave teacher leadership can be a panacea, or at least a catalyst, in reforming our country's schools as stated in the literature, we must spend some time examining the conditions under which it is stymied as much as we should study when it is not.

Impediments to Teacher Leadership

Across the literature, time was shown to be a factor affecting teachers in leadership positions. Regardless of whether the leadership roles were delegated to teachers or developed organically, teachers leaders' schedules were constrained because their leadership responsibilities were in addition to their regular classroom responsibilities, not instead. When asked about the struggles of being a teacher leader in the Sizer Fellowship Program and in the Rhode Island Teachers and Technology Initiative (Barth, 2001), one of the 100 participants in this qualitative study put it plainly by stating, "It's always an add-on" (p. 445). Teachers' work is often already so mapped-out from bell to bell that is hard to imagine finding time to complete other responsibilities, especially without dipping into time outside one's paid hours. In reviewing the day of each of the three teacher leaders in the Mastery in Learning Project (MIL), a qualitative study of the national reform project within Bob McClure's National Education Association (Fay, 1992), they found that that each minute during and after the school day was accounted for as the leaders enacted their teaching and leadership responsibilities. Some teachers were reluctant to extend themselves beyond their classroom duties because they felt their plates were already too full with their regular responsibilities. One teacher leader in Fay's (1992) study explained the perspectives of many of her colleagues who have avoided leadership roles by saying, "I think at least half of the teachers are willing to take on a lot more responsibility, to

share and to do their thing differently. But they must be met halfway in terms of time" (Fay, 1992, p. 76). While there are, however, many teachers in the third wave who are willing and do accept that they will have to manage extremely tight schedules if they want to be leaders, there are other, possibly more formidable issues that they must face.

Some teacher leaders in the literature worked in environments in which they were not supported by colleagues. Rather than lauded for their drive and commitment to their work, teacher leaders were ostracized by their peers and supervisors. Another teacher leader in Barth's (2001) study shared that, "Sometimes I feel impeded in my work by other teachers and administrators who are threatened by my passion and enthusiasm" (p. 446). Administrators in the literature who seemed to be threatened by teacher leadership were often shown to make it particularly difficult for teacher leaders who developed organically at their sites. In the descriptive case study by Silva et al. (2000) of three teachers attempting to lead from their classrooms in a progressive school district in the northeastern U.S., one participant described her uncomfortable experience with her supervisor at staff meetings. He stated, "I always felt like she was looking over her shoulder at me like I was infringing on her territory. Like I knew too much... I think she has felt threatened as if I might show her up" (Silva et al., 2000, p. 787). Another participant in the study by Silva et al. (2000) said that when she spoke up at staff meetings, the administration deemed it "insubordination" (p. 792). Without the support of the administration, it would be exceedingly tough for teacher leaders to enact their leadership, regardless of how much they could be benefitting the students and school.

Even when teacher leaders in the literature worked in buildings in which their administrators were supportive of their leadership work, colleagues were often shown to be uncooperative. As leaders in the third wave, teachers often share ideas for ways to change and

improve the school to better students. However, this can be problematic when new practices or ideas introduced by teacher leaders infringe upon or challenge the methods and instruction their peers are accustomed to and comfortable with. One teacher leader in the MIL Project (Fay, 1992) shared that, "The faculty all have very different philosophies, very different ideas about improvement, and there is a lot of division- about how you handle kids, the teacher-student relationship, and the teacher mission" (p. 69). Additionally, as already mentioned, it is especially difficult to get seasoned teachers to oblige newer teacher leaders' reform efforts. In the case study of Clearwater Middle School (Read & Hoff, 2005), a difference of opinion in the need for reform between seasoned and newer teachers created a great deal of animosity between staff members, especially once the principal retired and there was no longer backing for the reform effort studied. It is also a challenge for teacher leaders to get their colleagues to change their methods when they do not see a need for change based on their instructional and content knowledge and expertise. Another teacher leader in thedescriptive case study by Silva et al. (2000) explained the difficulty in reforming curriculum by saying, "When you have 30 very committed, very well educated professionals who have strong feelings about their subject matter, their specific area of expertise, it is difficult to get them to come to some common ground" (p. 795). The literature illustrates that disparities in staff members' instructional viewpoints within a school can impede teachers' leadership work and even cause conflict.

Worse still than a lack of administrative or staff support for teacher leaders in the third wave is operating within the bureaucracy of the department of education. While the third wave itself may seem progressive because it allows for teachers to enact leadership and reforms organically, the system itself still operates under a traditional top-down structure. Although teacher leaders may receive cooperation from colleagues and support from administrators, they

are not the only people who have a say in what goes on in each building within the public school system. Because each site in the public education system is ultimately governed by many people, changes cannot be made within individual sites if superintendents and state officials are not on board. Furthermore, one can imagine how frustrating it would for a school to move forward with the work of its teacher leaders only to have to pull back once educational bureaucrats get involved. One teacher leader in the study by Silva et al. (2000) described changing a system that is seemingly impossible to change poignantly by saying, "It is a brick wall and I am banging my head against it and it is time to stop" (p. 790).

A review of the impediments to teacher leadership can help us understand why so many teachers, including many of the most successful teachers, may be apprehensive about taking on leadership roles. Understanding the barriers to teacher leadership may help make it clearer as to why when asked whether she was a leader at the site, one teacher in Barth's (2001) study responded, "I'm just a teacher. If you want to talk to the leader, he's down the hall in the principal's office" (p. 443). What teacher would want to accept leadership responsibilities, in addition to teaching responsibilities, when they are almost certain to be met with strife from so many of the people they work for or alongside?

It is a bit unnerving to realize that while there are still so many teacher leaders willing to work through and around barriers in the third wave, the system may still not provide them with the power they need to lead. Berry et al. (2013) share that as late as 2012 at a policy meeting in Washington D.C. to discuss the Common Core Standards and their implementation, teachers did not make the top three regarding the question of who should be involved in building global competencies into the Standards. How can teachers be seen as leaders even in the third wave if

those who have control over educational policy do not recognize the need for teachers to have power in education? And a better question, why should teacher leaders even bother?

Reforming Professional Development

In an era of accountability in the public education system, the blame for student and school failure is often placed on teachers. Failing test scores, especially in New York City, are seldom seen as a result of serving an extremely diverse and ever-growing student population with varying academic needs and levels. Instead, it has become commonplace to see ineffective teaching as the cause for students inabilities' to meet state imposed standards.

The implementation of The Danielson Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013) seemed to present a means for identifying teachers' specific inadequacies affecting student performance. However, when 98% of New York City teachers were rated 'effective' or 'highly effective' in 2014 while state exams deemed only 38% of students who earned scores of 75 or better 'college ready' (data.nysed.gov), teachers were far from vindicated. Governor Cuomo himself stated, "Who are we kidding…? The problem is clear and the solution is clear. We need real, accurate, fair teacher evaluations" (Mead*,* 2015). Clearly, government officials are focused on finding a system that undoubtedly blames teachers for today's educational woes.

Since the onset of the new teacher evaluation system, student and school failure, and ultimately teacher failure, is linked with a failure to develop teachers. Decades before recent teacher accountability efforts and the new teacher evaluation system, however, there was a growing body of literature that supports the need for ongoing professional development for teachers to help our children and our schools succeed (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey; Danielson, 2005; Danielson, 2006; Dieker et al., 2009; Garet, Porter, Desimone, & Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Guskey, 2002; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; MacFarlane, 2012;

Moreno & Ortegano-Lane, 2008; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Shulman & Shulman, 2004; Steyn, 2005; Wells, 2007; Wilson & Berne, 1999; York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Because professional development is often viewed as a means of increasing teachers' knowledge and altering their practices (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells, 2007), there is an assumption that teachers are not sufficiently prepared or equipped to help their students succeed academically. If we are going to say that a teacher's pedagogical skills, content knowledge, or ability to manage a classroom are to blame for their students' abilities to learn and demonstrate their understanding, then we must make sure we are providing teachers with the training they need to effectively educate students.

Although it seems simple that PD developers look to the research on effective professional development when designing PD programs, simple solutions are often overlooked, especially in the New York City Department of Education. Targeted and ongoing professional development that occurs within teachers' educational settings has been found to effect the most long-term change in practices (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Wells, 2007). Yet we still subject teachers to one-shot PDs based on a superintendent's evaluation or a company's newest educational software. Scholars have also demonstrated that engaging in ongoing professional development at teachers' home schools will garner the most positive results when teachers collaborate, especially on data- or curriculum-driven topics (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Wells, 2007). Then why are many teachers still enduring lecture-style PDs based on educational theory rather than on a regular basis? If the literature tells us that it is important to view teachers as individual learners with specific needs (Dieker et al., 2009; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Steyn, 2005; Wells, 2007), why are all

teacher at one site still subject to the same types of professional development sessions, regardless of their teaching experience, subject content, or observation results?

Education evaluators offer models to assess professional development programs and can help identify those PD programs that are meeting the needs of teachers and those which are not. Included in Guskey's (1995) five levels of PD evaluation are an assessment of participants' use of new knowledge and skills, as well as their reactions to and learning from professional development. But who is to say that we can accurately measure the degree to which teachers apply what they use in PD programs? And how do we determine what training teachers truly need? What role, if any, could teacher leaders play in helping assess the professional development needs of their colleagues? Another consideration is whether providing professional development that teachers say they need and want would actually benefit them. Is there even any evidence that suggest teachers know what kinds of PD activities would benefit or satisfy them?

Designing PD

When designing PD, we can look to the literature on professional development to determine what PD elements are found to be both effective for and satisfying to teachers. According to the research, teachers glean pedagogical knowledge and strategies from professional development activities that target their individual needs (Bayar, 2007; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014). However, just because the research indicates certain PD activities are effective in changing pedagogy does not mean that participants will be satisfied with the PD available to them. Interestingly, the literature indicates that many teachers are dissatisfied with the PD in which they are engaging (Bayar, 2014; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014; Hursen, 2011; McFarlane, 2012; Nir & Bogler, 2007; Torff & Sessions, 2008), especially that which they are *required* to attend (Bayar, 2014; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014). On the other hand, the research

also indicates that choice and voice in planning of professional development activities and

quality of instructors influence teachers' levels of satisfaction with PD activities (Bayar &

Kostereltoglu, 2014; Nir & Bogler, 2007).

Addressing the learning styles of educators during PD is essential in helping them acquire

and sustain new pedagogical beliefs and practices (Dieker et al., 2009; Lutrick & Szabo, 2012;

Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells, 2007). The efficacy of learner-centered PD practices in sustaining

change in teaching was made evident in both the study of the Trek21 project in the Appalachian

area (Wells, 2007) and the Ministry of Education's Physical Activity Initiative (PAI) in New

Zealand (Petrie & McGee, 2012). While a mixed methods approach was used to collect data

from pre-service, PreK-12, and higher education faculty in the PD for Trek21 on educating

teachers to be agents of technological change (Wells, 2007), the PAI study used qualitative data

from 14 PD providers and 25 teachers to explore whether PD helped teachers learn how to

increase students' physical activity and motivate them to become active learners (Petrie &

McGee, 2012). Although the studies focused on different content, used different methods of data

collection, and included participants holding varying positions within education, results

regarding learner-centered activities were quite similar. Data from both studies indicated that

learner-centered and engaging PD, specifically designed to address significant obstacles to

implementing new knowledge for individual teachers, were factors that contributed greatly to

sustained changes in pedagogy (Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells, 2007).

Conversely, responses from PD participants indicated that the absence of learner-centered

PD negatively impacted teachers' understanding and sustained implementation of new

pedagogies. In *assuming* that teachers would learn how to increase students' physical activity

and motivate them to become active learners, PAI PD providers ignored the question of how best

to teach participants to do so. Teachers reported that this lapse in PD design negatively affected their learning (Petrie & McGee, 2012). Similarly, Lutrick and Szabo (2012) conducted a small, qualitative study of five, white, female principals and assistant principals from one suburban school district. Results from Lutrick and Szabo's (2012) study found that there were negative consequences in taking teachers for granted as learners. One assistant principal pointed out, "Once you teach it, you can't expect teachers to be able to put it into practice" (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012, p. 8). The participant's comment indicates that just because something is taught does not mean that it will be learned. Regarding addressing teachers' learning styles during PD, the same assistant principal added, "I feel like going back and modeling what they should be doing and having conversation is what has worked for our campus" (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012, p. 8). This statement highlights the importance of taking into account teachers' individual learning needs during PD to help ensure that they will be able to understand and apply new pedagogies into their practice.

PD Satisfaction

A review of the literature indicates that teachers are more satisfied with professional development when they can choose the PD activities in which they would like to participate (Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014; Nir & Bogler, 2007). A mixed methods study of 841 randomly selected elementary school teachers from Israel who had at least three years teaching experience revealed that having a say in which professional development programs they were to attend positively affected teachers' PD views (Nir & Bogler, 2007). Interview data illustrated that the ability to raise demands for particular types of professional development, location preferences, and the principal's role in PD all impacted teachers' levels of satisfaction with their PD experiences. Closed-question survey results from the study also indicated that the ability to

refrain from choosing to participate in PD activities they did not feel matched their personal

needs resulted in greater teacher satisfaction with PD at their schools (Nir & Bogler, 2007).

Similarly, PD choice was also found to be a factor in a qualitative study in Turkey designed to

explore teachers' satisfaction with PD opportunities and factors that influenced their satisfaction.

Results from the study indicated that teachers tend to be more dissatisfied with PD when they

were given no choice in which professional activities they were required to engage in by their

principals (Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014).

The literature reveals that PD satisfaction is also the result of taking teachers' needs into

consideration when designing professional development (Bayar, 2007; Bayar & Kosterelioglu,

2014). One participant from Bayar and Kosterelioglu's (2014) qualitative study stated, "When

offered [a] PD activity [that] matches up with my personal needs, I am very happy to participate

in this activity. Otherwise it is really boring and I do not learn anything" (p. 327). This statement

underscores the relationship between addressing teachers' needs in the design of PD and their PD

satisfaction. Another qualitative study conducted in Turkey to explore the meaning and

components of effective PD produced similar results (Bayar, 2007). Eight male and eight female

teachers selected to participate in the study because they had participated in at least three PD

activities over the last 12 months noted that their PD satisfaction was largely determined by the

extent to which PD meets their individual needs (Bayar, 2007). One participant stated that

"...unless professional development activities [have] been organized according to teachers'

needs… we cannot talk about its efficiency" (Bayar, 2007, p. 323). Another participant from

Bayar's (2007) qualitative study noted, "I wish I could have more opportunities to participate in

the process of planning of professional development activities... I personally believe it could

motivate me more than any other things in professional development activities" (p. 323).

Designing PD activities with teachers' needs in mind, and even giving teachers the ability to design PD based on their own personal needs, greatly impacts teachers' levels of PD satisfaction.

Quality of instructors was also related to teachers' PD satisfaction in the literature (Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014; Nir & Bogler, 2007). Participants in the qualitative study conducted in Turkey and the mixed methods study conducted in Israel noted PD instructors as impacting their satisfaction with professional development activities (Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014; Nir & Bogler, 2007). One participant from Bayar and Kosterelioglu's (2014) qualitative study expressed dissatisfaction with PD instructors by saying, "I know more than most instructors in professional development activities. They just read whatever is in the slide shows" (p. 328). In Nir and Bogler's (2007) mixed methods study, the degree of intimacy characterizing the instructor-teacher interaction was identified as an essential component in teachers' satisfaction with PD processes. Therefore, the quality of professional development instructors and the level of interaction they will have with participants is another factor to be considered when exploring teachers' satisfaction with PD.

Other Factors Affecting PD Success

In addition to impacting teachers' PD satisfaction, the literature indicates that specific factors may also impact teachers' understanding and use of strategies learned during PD (Dingle et al., 2011; Eberta-May et al., 2011; Steyn, 2005). Knowledge of PD content (Dingle et al., 2011), amount of teaching experience or experience using PD strategies (Eberta-May et al., 2011), and desire to change practice (Dingle et al., 2011; Steyn, 2005) were common elements affecting post PD practices. Additionally, help applying new pedagogies in the classroom, including follow-up meetings, was shown to play a role in the extent to which teachers incorporated what they learned during professional development in their teaching (Dingle et al.,

2011; Eberta-May et al., 2011). Practical PD activities and various personal conditions were also shown to affect changes in teachers' practices (Dingle, et al., 2011; Eberta et al., 2011; Steyn, 2005).

Discrepancies in self-reported changes in practice and PD provider observations indicate the difficulty some teachers have in changing curriculum and instructional habits regardless of PD format. Such inconsistencies in practice were evident in a mixed methods study to determine whether participating in PD designed to teach and encourage the use of learner-centered strategies affected change in college faculty members' practices in the classroom (Eberta-May et al., 2011). Although 89% of participants who completed the post-PD survey said they began to incorporate active, learner-centered activities into their practices, 75% of those who agreed to have their classes filmed were shown to use lecture or teacher-centered instruction in the videotapes (Eberta-May et al., 2011).

Similarly, in a case study of three upper elementary special education teachers who attended PD on word study and fluency over a period of six months revealed inconsistencies in teacher reports on their practice as compared to provider observations (Dingle et al., 2011). One participant, Carla, noted that she felt she was incorporating the strategies taught during the Literacy Learning Cohorts (LLC) PD model, and was observed doing so; however, she was also observed to adhere quite firmly to the same curriculum and strategies she had been using for years (Dingle et al., 2011). The research indicates that regardless of how PD is formatted or delivered, it is difficult for some teachers to alter the teaching methods they have traditionally used.

Evaluating PD

A review of the literature herein demonstrates that it can be difficult to evaluate professional development in education. The results from the studies seem consistent with Guskey's (2002) assertion that PD that works best in one context with one group of educators may not be as successful in a different setting with another group educators. Furthermore, the literature conveys that PD programs may not even be effective with the a group of teachers in the same site. Although available research on PD satisfaction is sparse, the studies reviewed indicate that there are a great number of factors affecting teachers' satisfaction with professional development. Additionally, disparities in self reported versus observed changes in teacher practice can lead us to question whether empirical research alone can explain the efficacy of professional development programs. How, then, can we determine if PD determined essential in developing our teachers is working? Where are the studies that examine PD in context as Guskey (1995) recommends? What other research methods can help us explore PD programs in context in our public school system?

Understanding Performative Social Science

Qualitative research in the social sciences today is characterized by an overlap and mixing of genres (Denzin, 2001; Denzin, 2013; Geertz, 2001; Gergen & Gergen, 2011; Gergen & Gergen, 2012; Roberts, 2009; Savin-Baden & Van Niekerk, 2007; Schechner, 1983); the result of this genre blending is a category of qualitative research unto itself, known as the performative social sciences. Performative social science can be defined as, "the deployment of different forms of artistic performance in the execution of a scientific project" (Gergen & Gergen, 2011, p. 291). A "fusion of art and science" (Jones, 2012, p. 4), social science performances can include

art, photography, music, dance, poetry, fictional writing, video installations, multimedia

applications, dramatic monologues, and theatrical performances (Gergen & Gergen, 2011;

Geertz, 1980; Jones, 2012; Roberts; 2009). Because the performative social sciences allows

researchers to communicate their qualitative work using varied creative modalities, it can be

shared in more venues and reach a wider range of audiences.

While it may still be necessary to define and explain the performative social sciences

even for people who are themselves qualitative researchers, it is by no means a brand new field.

Denzin (2001) separates qualitative research into seven historical fields. He defines the sixth

field, the post-experimental, as "a performative sensibility… a willingness to experiment with

different ways of presenting an interview text" (Denzin, 2001, p. 25). According to Denzin

(2001), this period of experiment in research and its presentation began in 1996 and continues

through today. However, several years prior, Ivan Brady coined the term "artful scientists"

(Bochner & Ellis, 2003, p. 509) to describe social scientists who also see themselves as artists.

Although Richard Schechner is considered to be the founder of performance studies (Roberts,

2009), the phrase 'performative' is derived from *How to Do Things With Words*, in which

philosopher J.L. Austin highlights "the way words function as actions within relationships"

(Gergen & Gergen, 2012, p. 11). As is implied, the term 'performative' denotes that this form of

qualitative work will be performed for others (Bochner & Ellis, 2003; Gergen & Gergen, 2011;

Gergen & Gergen, 2012; Jones, 2012; Roberts, 2009; Saldana, 2003; Schechner, 1983; Turner &

Turner, 1982).

Developing Performances for Audiences

Theories have been developed to explore the research and communication aspects of

performative social science as it is developed for audiences. Bourriaud (2002) offers relational

aesthetics as a theory to explain complex connections across art and science. Also known as "socializing art" (Jones, 2012, p. 3), relational aesthetics, such as in the performative social sciences, allow audiences at large to "interact" with participants in qualitative research; regardless of whether these "interactions" take place via stage, film, or installation art piece, community members outside academia are able to learn about the perspectives of individuals they may never have encountered if research participants' stories had been relegated to the scientific community only.

It is imperative that performative researchers take great care in the portrayal of their subjects' lives and experiences for audiences. In discussing the six points of contact he believes exist when the work of anthropologists and theater people overlap, Schechner (1983) identifies "transformation of being" as the first. When developing a performative piece, it is necessary for researchers to become the characters they are portraying. If we do not internalize our participants' points of views, it is very difficult for us to write or speak from their perspectives. And we cannot truly understand their point of views, let alone convey them in a way that could be understood by others, if we do not think, feel, and view things as they would. Additionally, Conquergood (1985) notes that in trying to understand the lives of their subjects ethnographers should "try to surrender themselves to the centripetal pulls of culture, to get close to the face of humanity where life is not always pretty" (p. 2). To convey an authentic portrait of each participant in a study, it is necessary to make visible character traits, perspectives, or interactions with others that could be seen as unfavorable. In portraying the humanity of our subjects in a performance, Conquergood (1985) advises we aim for a Dialogical Performance. According to his definition, a Dialogical Performance requires we merge our world views, belief systems, and voice with that of our subjects so that "they can have conversation with one another" and "can

question, debate, and challenge one another" (Conquergood, 1985, p. 9). Bateson's (1972)

concept of framing also helps us think about the process of conveying the reality of our subjects.

Even if we do view a character trait, perspective, or interaction unfavorably, it is imperative to

challenge these judgements and understand our subjects' viewpoints and motivations so we can

portray them accurately and fairly.

It takes special skills for researchers to understand and portray their subjects' experiences

with accuracy and integrity (Conquergood, 1985; Estrella & Forinash, 2007; Gabriel & Lester,

2013; Gergen & Gergen, 2012; Jones, 2012; Saldana, 2003; Schechner, 1983; Turner & Turner,

1982); to do so, "They must work with real people, humankind alive, instead of printed texts"

(Conquergood, 1985, p. 2). There are strategies that can help qualitative researchers to listen and

interpret when working with real people in the process of developing a performance. When

describing how an arts-based exploration of her narrative began with research of doctoral-level

therapists from working-class or poor backgrounds similar to her own, Karen Estrella (2007)

states that she knew she would not "hear [her] story in theirs but rather hear a multiplicity of

perspectives- that is, multiple narratives" to help her and her readers "understand a bit more

about the role of multicultural issues in the life of a therapist" (p. 378). She says she has success

using the listening guide developed by Gilligan, Spencer, Weinberg, and Bertsch (2003).

Following the listening guide method (Gilligan et al., 2003), researchers read-through each

interview in a data set several times and use a color-coding method to note how the participant

"gives voice" (p. 379) to interactions and relationships within cultural and societal frameworks

(Estrella & Forinash, 2007). Having a method to hear what is said during interviews both overtly

and implicitly is beneficial as researchers aim to uncover the depth of participants' stories. Once

a participant's story is understood by the researcher, Saldana (2003) advocates portraying a

participant in an ethnodrama as three-dimensional using: (a) what the participant reveals about

himself in interviews; (b) any written notes or artifacts; (c) observations of or interviews with

others about the participants; and (d) research literature.

The Benefits of Performative Pieces

While listening strategies can help us learn to hear what our participants are truly saying,

engaging in all the processes to develop a performative piece can help us really learn about and

develop performances that more accurately represent our participants' experiences. Gergen &

Gergen (2012) share that immersing ourselves in our data to create a performance provides us

with "tacit and possibly unspeakable knowledge about something" (Estrella & Forinash, 2007, p.

381). "Framing" (Bateson, 1972) qualitative data to develop a performance piece enables

ethnographers to truly learn about their subjects in enacting their lives (Conquergood, 1985;

Turner & Turner, 1982). Turner and Turner (1982) feel that a great deal was absorbed when a

graduate student of contemporary marriage in Charlottesville at the University of Virginia cast

the anthropology department in a simulated wedding. The "actors" not only played their assigned

roles with vigor and realism, they understood their roles so much that some continued to stay in

character till well after the performance had ended (Turner & Turner, 1982). Turner and Turner

(1982) further discuss using various ethnographic performances as a teaching tool in

understanding other cultures' experiences of their social existence, moral pressures, pleasures

and rewards, and expressions of emotions in accordance with cultural expectations. When

conducting simulations at the University of Chicago of the winter ceremony of the Canadian

Mohawk Indians of Canada, the sacred Cannibal Dance of the Kwakiutl Indians of the Northwest

Coast, and the Barok ritual in New Ireland, Turner and Turner (1982) and their students

"undoubtedly learned something about that culture that [they] failed to understand in the field"

(p. 46).

As already stated, the performative social sciences enables the work of researchers and

ethnographers to reach audiences beyond the academic community (Bochner & Ellis, 2003;

Conquergood, 1985; Denzin, 2011; Denzin, 2013; Estrella & Forinash, 2007; Gabriel & Lester,

2013; Gergen & Gergen, 2011; Gergen & Gergen, 2012; Jones, 2012; Roberts, 2009; Saldana,

2003; Schechner, 1983; Turner & Turner, 1982). By presenting their research using avenues of

the arts, qualitative researchers are able to expose people to the lives of many different

individuals. For example, Conquergood (1985) was able to bring his performances of the stories

of the Lao and Hmong refugees of Chicago, with whom he lived for three years, to various social

service groups, businessman, lawyers, wealthy women's clubs, and high school students. The

biographies of older gay men and lesbians and their experiences ageing in rural Southwest

England and Wales began as a three year project entitled, "Gay England and Wales" (Jones,

2013) and became *Rufus Stone*, a professional film directed by Josh Appignanesi (2014). And in

Zurich's Museum of Modern Art, stereotypes about Muslim immigrants were undermined in a

video installation of a film about a Muslim dance instructor and his wife teaching hip-hop to

students at their studio in Switzerland (Gergen & Gergen, 2012).

The Consequences of a Performative Approach

Sometimes, the involvement of an audience will not always result in a positive

relationship between researcher and viewer. Conquergood (1985) noted that nonacademic

audiences were "deeply disturbed" (p. 3) when he performed stories of the Lao and Hmong

refugees of Chicago. He stated that some religious groups chastised him for "collaborating in the

'work of the devil'" and "encouraging the Lao and Hmong to hold fast to their 'heathenism'" (p.

3). Welfare workers also reprimanded Conquergood (1985) for slowing the assimilation process

of the Lao and Hmong refugees. Additionally, public school educators were angered that

Conquergood respectfully performed the Lao and Hmong's legend that the lunar eclipse is

caused by a frog in the sky who swallows the moon. Similarly, when viewing the video

installation at the Museum of Modern Art in Zurich with friend and painter, Regine Walter,

Gergen & Gergen (2013) share that Walter was both perplexed and put-off by a film which he

believed "constituted an alien invasion into a sanctuary reserved *for the arts*" (p. 15). The filmed

depiction of an ethnographic study about a Muslim immigrant raised questions about what

constitutes modern art, and why art forms would be excluded from scientific journals and books

(Gergen & Gergen, 2013). Regardless of whether audiences question or accept the lives,

cultures, and traditions presented in performative social science pieces, viewing begins as a

dialogue that can "break down old boundaries, open up channels of communication and

empower communities through engagement" (Jones, 2012, p. 1).

Conclusion

Denzin (2001) labels the future as the seventh and final moment in qualitative research.

He postulates that in this seventh moment many questions arise that are the basis for

performative social science, such as, "Who has the right to ask whom what questions? Who has

the right to answer? Who has the right to see what? Who has the right to say what? Who has the

right to speak for whom?" (Denzin, 2001, p. 87). What if we looked to our teacher leaders

involved in developing professional development in the third wave to ask and even attempt to

answer questions about the PD programs in which they are directly involved? Denzin (2013) also

states that rather than following traditional methods of design, technique, and analysis,

qualitative researchers can embrace an avant-garde view to create and present performative

research that can perhaps move people to action. What would it look like if we embraced the

performative social scientists to tell the story of PD in public schools? How could a performative

piece help us explore how staff members experience professional development at their sites, as

well as the challenges for teacher leaders providing PD in the third wave?

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

When I began my dissertation work, I intended to study the impact of iterative, research-based professional development on my colleagues' practices and PD satisfaction. However, this seemed to be a futile task. Generally, professional development in the New York City Department of Education is often used as a means to disseminate information about and train teachers in using ever-changing, top-down pedagogical demands. And PD at the site is no exception. With only three professional development sessions planned for the teachers at the site during the year I conducted this study, two of which comprise the data herein, PD was not fully aligned with the research on effective professional development, specifically regarding the research on sustainability (Lutrick & Szabo, 2012; Petrie & McGee, 2012; Wells, 2007). Therefore, it would have been immensely difficult for the teacher leaders to have any impact on their colleagues' practices, and even more difficult to increase their PD satisfaction. Hence, it seemed more pressing to explore the professional development experiences of staff members, including the challenges for the teacher leaders on the PD team attempting to lead within a top-down education system. Furthermore, when attempting to answer my questions using the data that I had outlined for my original study, I realized that the participants' experiences were difficult to convey using traditional research methods. After studying the performative social sciences, I concluded that a performative piece would help give voice and life to the story. My original research methods provided sufficient data to share the story completely from the perspectives of all those involved.

I outline the methodology for my study in this chapter. I begin by describing the setting, professional development sessions, and participants. Next, I provide a detailed description of the data collection methods. Following the methods, I outline the process that led me to the

performative social sciences as a qualitative research genre, and how I developed the characters, monologues, and performance. After describing the challenges in portraying other peoples' voices, I provide the member checking process, and analysis procedures. Finally, I conclude with an explanation of the filming process.

Setting

During the study, there were approximately 3,500 students, 250 staff members, and 150 teachers at the site. The socioeconomic status of students' families ranged from working to middle class. Sixty-six percent of the student body received free lunch. The student population was ethnically diverse- 39% Asian; 29% Hispanic; 28% white; and 4% black. English Language Learners comprise 20% of the student population, while 17% received special education services.

The school was deemed "in good standing" by the state during 2014-2015 academic school year (NY State Data, 2016). Still today, the school and its teachers provide many enrichment opportunities for students. Coaches run varsity and, in most cases, junior varsity teams for most every major competitive sport. Additionally, there are 23 clubs, run by 21 different teacher advisors, including an anime, chess and game club, a DJ club, and a mock trial team. Three of the teacher advisors also oversee three annual performances- the fashion, international, and talent shows.

While many large, comprehensive schools in NYC have been closed or broken-up into smaller schools since the Bloomberg administration began, this site has been functioning as is for just over 100 years. The staff, students, and much of the community are committed to this neighborhood educational institution (Fullan, 2001); for instance, the staff and students patronize many neighborhood businesses, many students have siblings who also attend the school or have

graduated, staff members have children or family members currently attending or have

graduated, and there are twenty staff members who are alums. In addition, the principal was a

teacher and assistant principal at the site before taking the role as principal. Some students can

walk to school, some need to commute via public subway or bus, and, for some, this commute

can take almost or more than an hour. Similarly, some staff members live in close enough

proximity to walk to work, others have a short commute to work by car or public transportation,

and some commute from other boroughs or even states.

Professional Development Sessions

The teacher leaders on the school's PD team provided professional development to their

colleagues on February 2nd and June 4th during the 2014-2015 school year. The administration

determined the schedule and the academic focus on instructional learning strategies for PD in the

building for the year. However, the PD team had complete control over the components and

design of the February 2nd PD. While the administration determined the components of the June

4th PD, the team had control over the format, specifically when the mandated components would

be addressed, and what role team leaders would play in facilitating and helping teachers

understand those components. The February 2nd PD session was one hour and thirty minutes

long, while the June 4th session was two hours and fifty minutes.

The February 2nd PD

The team had control of the design of the professional development sessions provided on

February 2nd. Three sessions comprised the agenda (see Appendix A): an orientation, a

technology training session, and a content-specific share-out session. The orientation provided

the opportunity for the team to review the Quality Review and DOE mandates, inform teachers

of the PD schedule for the afternoon, and reinforce the purpose of each session in helping

teachers engage students. During the second session, teachers could choose to attend leveled

training provided by team members, and ask questions and practice using one of the following

technology systems used at the site: beginning or intermediate Skedula, Promethean Board,

SESIS, Basic Computer Skills for a PC, website resource review, Prezi, or math calculator. The

final content-specific session including viewing and discussing a video highlighting a content-

specific learning strategy, lesson plan examples highlighting the use of engaging learning

strategies from team members and one-two department members, and student work illustrating

how the strategies were implemented. A three-question protocol created by the team was used to

facilitate discussion after each share-out. Refreshments were provided during the first and final

sessions, and the PD concluded with a feedback form.

The June 4th PD

Based on the administration's PD design requirements to address feedback from the

superintendent's visit to the site a couple of weeks prior, the team developed two sessions

focused on the student engagement component of the Danielson Framework for Teaching

Evaluation Instrument (2013) for the June 4th PD (see Appendix B): an interdisciplinary meeting

and a content/grade/learning level-specific meeting. The focus of the interdisciplinary meeting

was to provide teachers with the opportunity to analyze the components and rubric of 3c from the

Danielson Framework (2013), and determine where examples of learning strategies would fall

under the 3c rubric (Danielson, 2013). The meeting included colleague introductions, a

PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the superintendent's recent feedback and DOE mandates

regarding evaluating teachers based on engaging students in learning, a shared reading and

discussion of 3c of the Danielson rubric (2013), and group work and discussion about where

examples of learning strategies would fall under the 3c rubric (Danielson, 2013). The focus of

the second meeting during the June 4th PD was to give teachers the opportunity to work in

content and grade/learning-level teams to design strategies to effectively engage their students in

learning as specified by 3c of the Danielson (2013) rubric. Team members facilitated meetings

with their department colleagues, including providing a lesson plan and materials highlighting

the use of an engagement technique, group work to develop a lesson highlighting an engagement

technique for teachers' content subject, grade, or learning level, a share-out, and discussion using

a two-question protocol designed by the team. Light snacks were provided during both sessions,

and the PD concluded with a feedback form.

Participants

Team members, teachers, and administrators at the site comprised the participants for the

study. All participants engaged in at least one aspect of professional development at the site, and

their self-reported feedback provided valuable information to address the research questions for

both my original study, as well as the final performative piece.

There were eleven members including myself on the PD team at the site during the study.

Eight team members were female, and the remaining three were male. Six team members were

white, three were Hispanic, and two were Asian. This was the 7th consecutive year for one PD

team member, the 5th year for me, the third for another member, but only the first year on the

team for the remaining eight members. Three team members taught science, two taught math and

two physical education, and the remaining four members taught one of the following subjects:

English, social studies, ESL and foreign language.

There were approximately 150 teachers participating in each professional development session provided by the team. The participants were an ethnically diverse group of teachers of a range of ages, and with varying levels of teaching experience. Each teacher specialized in a specific content area, including English, math, science, social studies, music, art, technology, and physical education.

Five administrators participated in this study. Each administrator is the head of one of the following departments: English, social studies/art/music, math, science/technology, physical education, and instructional support services (special education).

Data Collection Methods

Surveys, focus groups, a participant observation journal, and a binder of documentation comprised the data for the study. Data collection methods provided an ongoing set of responses to the professional development activities at the site from every group of stakeholders: myself as the team leader, PD team members, teachers, department level administrators, and the principal. The data collection procedures aided me in exploring my research questions, and provided me with enough varied information to deeply understand participants' perspectives to create the performance.

Surveys

Seven anonymous surveys were used to collect data for this study. Five surveys were distributed online. Responses from online surveys were electronically collected and automatically organized by question using Google Documents (commonly referred to as "Google Docs") in preparation to be analyzed. Two paper surveys were distributed by team members to

participants in their rooms immediately following the February 2nd and June 4th PDs. Team

members imported responses to survey questions in charts organized by question using Google

Docs at the next team meeting following each PD session.

I administered three online pre-surveys to teachers participating in the school's in-house

professional development provided by the team. The first pre-survey was administered in late

October once the team began planning, the second three weeks prior to the February 2nd PD

session, and the third three weeks prior to the June 4th PD. The pre-surveys contained closed-

and open-ended questions that provided me with teachers' self-reported beliefs about the design

of school-wide PD, their level of PD satisfaction at three points during the school year, and the

type and/or level of technology training teachers felt they could benefit from during those three

points in the school year (see Appendix C).

Team members administered paper feedback surveys to teachers immediately following

their participation in the February 2nd and June 4th PD sessions. Feedback surveys were

comprised of closed- and open-ended questions about teachers' experiences and reactions to the

professional development in which they had just engaged (see Appendix D).

Finally, I administered follow-up surveys approximately three weeks after each

professional development session provided by the team. Follow-up surveys were comprised of

closed- and open-ended questions regarding teachers' self-reported beliefs about the design of

professional development provided by the team, and the impact school-wide PD had on their

instructional practices (Appendix E). Additionally, responses regarding teachers' PD satisfaction

from the final follow-up survey were compared to that at the beginning of the school year.

Administrator Survey

The seventh and final survey was administered to the administrators in the building in June 2015. Originally, I intended to conduct a focus group with the administrators. However, the principal forgot that she invited me to attend the final cabinet meeting of the school year. Therefore, it was necessary for me to administer a survey instead. The administrator survey contained six open-ended questions (Appendix F) regarding assistant principals' perspectives on professional development in the building, including their observations of the teachers in their department.

Focus groups

Three focus groups were used to collect data for this inquiry process. The first focus group was comprised of a diverse group of teachers who participated in the school-wide PD; the second was conducted with the same group of teachers; and the final focus group was conducted with the PD team. I recorded each focus group and transcribed the data using Rev.com, to which only I have access. Next, I organized transcript data by question on a Google Doc in preparation to be analyzed. All participants were asked to sign a consent form prior to participation informing them of the purposes of participation, and that their identities would remain anonymous in the write-up of the final report.

Two separate focus groups, each comprised of 12 teachers, were conducted approximately four weeks after each professional development session. I asked the teacher focus group participants 11 closed- and open-ended questions (Appendix G). I devised each focus group to include an assorted group of teachers based on gender, ethnicity, age, content specialty, and years teaching, with the intention of creating as diverse a sample as possible.

The final focus group was conducted in June of 2015 with the school's PD team. The PD team was asked 10 open- and closed-ended questions to provide me with information about their experiences on the team and providing professional development to our colleagues (see Appendix H).

Participant Observation Journal

I used a journal to document my participation in all aspects of this study. My journal included documentation of my participation in weekly PD team meetings, professional development sessions, and formal and informal interactions with staff related to PD. I created and stored my journal online using Google docs, and only I had access to it. Each journal entry was titled and categorized by type of event, dated, and written in consecutive order in preparation to be analyzed.

As PD team leader, I documented my full participant observations from the weekly team meetings in my journal. Immediately following each meeting, I jotted down notes to record all proceedings, discussion, and interactions. Notes on the proceedings included the agendas and workload and flow; discussion notes included conversations about PD, colleagues, and administrators, and systems within the DOE; and the mood of each meeting, including any incidents or conflicts, comprised notes on interactions.

Immediately following the completion of the PD sessions provided by the team, I documented how I participated in the PD activities in my journal. Documentation included notes on my responsibilities as team leader, the ways that I oversaw the PD activities in each session, my communication and interactions with team members and teachers, and how I made myself aware of what happened in each session at which I could not be present.

Throughout the duration of the study, I used my journal to record formal and informal interactions with staff members. Each time I formally met with any administrator(s), I recorded notes from the meeting, including purpose, results, and consequences for the team. Similarly, whenever I had an informal interaction with an administrator or colleague regarding PD, I used my journal to note the setting, the mood of the exchange, and how it related to PD and/or the team.

Documentation

I collected any documentation that was related to professional development at the site. Documentation included agendas and handout for each PD session, attendance from PD sessions and team meetings, and any paperwork from meetings with administrators. I organized documents by type in chronological order in preparation to be analyzed, and stored them in a binder to which only I had access.

The Performance

While some people begin the research process with the goal of creating an ethnodrama, for me the decision emerged during analysis. I began analyzing the data with the intention of writing a traditional dissertation using the standard layout for chapter four. I initially used Guskey's (2002) five critical levels of professional development evaluation as a theoretical framework. However, analysis using Guskey's Levels of PD Evaluation did not sufficiently highlight critical aspects of the story that were emerging from the data, especially the conflicts occurring in New York City during the time of data collection or the years leading up to it, and how they impacted the site and setting, or the perspectives of the participants.

Upon my chair's suggestion, I moved to creating a timeline to illustrate what the team, teachers, and administration were experiencing when particular events were occurring in the city, state, and DOE during specific time periods since the formation of the PD team. After reviewing the components of my story in the timeline, my chair introduced me to the genre of performative social science research. She presented the idea that the story in my data might be more effectively and powerfully conveyed as a performance rather than as a traditional dissertation. She advised me to begin researching the performative social sciences so I could develop characters and a script from the data to tell the story of what was happening at the site from the perspectives of each group of participants for whom I collected data. Therefore, I began the process of using the performative social sciences as a reporting approach. Next, I began using the performance to analyze my data.

Developing A Story Spine

My first step in creating and using the performance as a reporting approach was to develop a story spine (Adams, 2013). The purpose of the story spine was to outline the setting and participants' perspectives at various points throughout the duration of the project; this helped me identify connections between what was happening in the city, state, DOE, and at the site, to the experiences and perspectives of participants. Additionally, reviewing the story spine helped me identify the conflicts and pivotal moments to tell my participants' stories from start to finish.

Developing The Characters

Once I had an understanding of the pivotal moments throughout the study that needed to be included to accurately report on the participants' experiences, I needed to develop the characters to tell the story. To present the thoughts and feelings of all teachers in the school,

including the teacher leaders, it was necessary to create characters that embodied the

perspectives of groups of teachers at the site. My goal, therefore, was not to present my

participants as the characters, but rather to create individual characters embodying the groups of

teachers with shared stations and perspectives about professional development.

I had already read through each data set upon collection and made note of initial themes

using a coding system (Merriam, 2009). However, I then relied on Gilligan, Spencer, Weinberg,

and Bertsch's (2003) listening guide to identify perspectives in the data from which I could build

the characters. I repeatedly listened to and reread my focus group and survey data to find

differing opinions and points of view (Estrella & Forinash, 2007; Gilligan et al., 2003). Next, I

color-coded groups of similar perspectives (Estrella & Forinash, 2007; Gilligan et al., 2003).

Additionally, I made notes about what I thought each character was thinking or saying in

between the lines. Therefore, characters' voices in the performance were created from combining

data from individual data sets and across data sets (Gabriel & Lester, 2013), as well as my

interpretation of the data as researcher and participant observer (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009).

Next, I organized the color-coded information and my own notes together into a chart; this

organization method helped me group participants' perspectives so I could develop individual

characters to tell the stories of groups of participants.

One voice, however, was sometimes not enough to communicate the perspectives of all

the participants' voices contained in each group (Gabriel & Lester, 2013). For example, the PD

team was comprised of teachers who have been members for between five and eight years, two

to three years, and brand new members, as well as the team leader, all of whom had varying

opinions and feelings about their experiences on the team. Therefore, I created different

characters to represent the different groups on the team: The New Team Member, The Veteran

Team Member, The Team Leader, and The Team. Similarly, the teachers who participated in the

professional development sessions are of a range of ages, with a range of teaching experience,

who teach different subjects, and have varying professional development opinions and

experiences. Because the focus of collecting data from teachers was to highlight their PD

experiences and viewpoints, I created three characters to represent groups of teachers with three

levels of shared experiences and viewpoints: Ms. Gung Ho, Mr. On the Fence, and Ms.

Disgruntled.

Additionally, while members of the New York City (NYC) Department of Education

(DOE) and the site's district superintendent were not participants in this study, providing a voice

for these characters was necessary to help the reader understand how the other characters

experience the bureaucratic facets of the NYC DOE. I chose to combine voices of the DOE and

superintendent into one and represented "him" as a deity. The limited and supernatural character

of His Holiness provides the context for the story by sharing headlines of the time period from

"beyond," thereby helping the reader understand the perspectives of the participants that they

must abide by the all-powerful system of the NYC DOE.

Finally, the voices of the five assistant principals who provided survey data are combined

with my field notes on my interactions with the principal to create one character- The

Administration. Although the administrators at the site are individuals and their positions and

perspectives are far more complex in real-life, they are a unified force with the same mandates

and agendas for their staff members; therefore, it made the most sense to combine their voices

into one character. When I made choices about elaborating on and creating quotations for The

Administration and His Holiness, I kept in mind Saldana's (2003) words that "each individual

should be rendered with dimensionality, regardless of length of time on stage" (p. 221).

Writing the Characters' Monologues

I developed the characters' monologues by combining direct quotations from my data sources and creating original text for elaboration (Gabriel & Lester, 2013). I followed Saldana's (2003) guidelines for portraying a participant in an ethnodrama as three-dimensional: I used what participants revealed about their perceptions of themselves and other participants during interviews, as well as my observations, inferences, and interpretations of participants from my field notes, journal entries, and other artifacts. I was able to create the elaborated text for the characters after carefully reading and rereading through the data that I initially coded for that them, as well as the notes I created to further each character's voice. Additionally, I created transitions to help the flow from one quotation to the next as I combined the raw data (Gabriel & Lester, 2013) and elaborated text to develop the monologues. I kept the elaborated text and transitions consistent with the characters by continuously rereading back and forth between the data set and the performance to check that I was fairly representing the data and the participants' perspectives (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009).

I also utilized my knowledge of participants' perspectives and feelings taken from informal conversations, interactions, and observations with them as a participant myself. With eleven years at the site, six of which I participated in PD as a teacher, and as a fifth year team member, I incorporated my personal knowledge of the experiences of a teacher, team member, and team leader into the creation of elaborated text. Throughout the process of developing the performance, I acted as a "story-reteller… creatively and strategically edit[ing] the transcripts… to maintain rather than 'restory' [the participants'] narratives" (Saldana, 2003, p. 223) while staying true to the data.

Developing the Performance

As ethnodramatists, we must ask ourselves if the participant's story will be "credibly, vividly, and persuasively told for an audience through a traditional written report, video documentary, photographic portfolio, Web site, poetry, dance, music, visual art installation, or ethnodrama" (Saldana, 2003, p. 219). I chose to present the story on video because "film will reach a much larger audience than any academic paper" (Film Director, Josh Appignanesi, cited in Guttenplan, 2011).

As already stated, characters' voices in the performance were created from combining data from individual data sets and across data sets (Gabriel & Lester, 2013). I chose to create monologues for the characters instead of dialogue because my data sets consist of the participants' sharing their perspectives one-by-one, in the same way that actors would speak monologues. Therefore, using monologues to convey characters' perspectives seemed the most appropriate format for my performance because it was most consistent with the data.

Portraying Participants' Voices

It can be extremely complicated to portray participants' voices as a researcher. It is expected as a qualitative researcher that your interpretation of participants' perspectives will be present in your reports (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). However, as a performative social scientist, your interpretation of the participants' voices can become even more evident in the process of creating characters and writing words representing their perspectives, as well as physically embodying characters performing their vies and experiences. Conquergood (1985) discusses the "complex ethical tensions, tacit political commitments, and moral ambiguities inextricably caught up in the act of performing ethnographic materials (p. 4). To address the

complications inherent in creating a performance (Conquergood, 1985; Roberts, 2009; Schechner, 1983) devoid of "ethical pitfalls" (Conquergood, 1985, p. 11) that neither generalizes nor stereotypes my participants, I relied on the instruction and lessons from my research on the performative social sciences (Bochner & Ellis, 2003; Conquergood, 1985; Denzin, 2001; Denzin, 2013; Estrella & Forinash, 2007; Gabriel & Lester, 2013; Geertz, 1980; Gergen & Gergen, 2011; Gergen & Gergen, 2012; Jones, 2012; Roberts, 2009; Saldana, 2003; Schechner, 1983; Turner & Turner, 1982).

Saldana (2003) posits that the goal of the performative social sciences is to create an entertaining and informative experience for audiences "that is aesthetically sound, intellectually rich, and emotionally provocative. Therefore, it is necessary to develop and present intriguing characters who are both interesting to watch but also provide accurate and fair details about the participants' experiences, feelings, and opinions (Denzin, 2001; Denzin, 2013; Estrella & Forinash, 2007; Gergen & Gergen, 2011; Saldana, 2003). In developing and presenting my characters, I wanted to enable the audience to see them as individuals with unique qualities dependent upon their positions, teaching experience, age, culture, and personalities. The choices I made in style, mannerisms, and ways of speaking during the performance was neither to stereotype nor mock the participants, but rather to enable the audience to visualize, understand, and relate to the many individuals at the site, as well as in the NYC DOE in general. I wanted to engage the audience in the story at the site by enabling the audience to see the perspectives of different groups of people with varying perspectives on the same experiences (Bochner & Ellis, 2003; Estrella & Forinash, 2007; Gabriel & Lester, 2013; Jones, 2012; Saldana, 2003; Turner & Turner, 1982), and prompt the audience to understand the need for change (Gergen & Gergen, 2011; Gergen & Gergen, 2012). It is also important to remember when viewing the performance

that aside from myself as The Team Leader, the individual characters I play are not direct representations of the individual participants, but rather representative of groups of participants who share the same stations, feelings and perspectives about PD.

Member Checking

I engaged in member-checking to triangulate my data (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). I asked a veteran and new team member to read and comment on the performance to make sure they felt their voices were being heard and I was not presenting a one-sided story or over-elaborating. Both team members stated that they felt the performance and the characters representing their positions accurately depicted their experiences on the PD team. Additionally, I had two teachers from the site who were not part of the focus groups review through the performance and themes. Both teachers stated that they could either identify with the feelings of the teacher characters in the performance, or recognized them as depicting the feelings groups of their colleagues have expressed about professional development. They also said they agreed with my explanations of the themes related to teachers' PD experiences at the site. Finally, I asked my professor and peers to provide feedback on the performance and how I developed it to be sure that the process and perspectives of participants was clear.

Analysis

I began the process of using the performative social sciences as an analysis approach when I interpreted the data in my performance to finalize the themes for my discussion chapter. My first step in the analysis process was to find themes. To start the process of finding themes, I reviewed the codes I had initially noted in my dissertation journal (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). When I saw a code repeated in my journal several times, I read and reread through the

performance to make sure it matched the themes I originally coded for my data. I used a chart

and color-coding system to compare, organize, and match-up the themes and lines from the

monologues in the performance. Once I had read through all the data and gathered all the

evidence that I believed to be related to each code, I looked across that evidence to solidify the

themes. I continued this process until I felt I had identified all the themes present in the data to

address my research questions (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). Finally, I used the lines from

my original data and the performance to develop my discussion chapter.

Filming

I used QuickTime Player and iMovie on a Mac to record and edit the performance aspect

of this study. I created a storyboard to determine which elements of the data to include in the

performance. To develop the storyboard, I reviewed the performance and outlined the

components necessary to convey the story. Included in the performance are the participants, their

PD experiences, and the professional development challenges that exist within a bureaucratic

system.

CHAPTER FOUR: PERFORMANCE

Qualitative research is about more than just the traditional methodology (Denzin, 2013).

Performative social science is an alternative form of disseminating research that creates a space

for the stories of research participants to be told that might not be possible using a traditional

methodological approach (Denzin, 2013; Gabriel & Lester, 2013; Jones, 2012). Theoretically

grounded in connecting people across disciplines and beyond academia (Jones, 2012), a

performance piece helps give a voice to the experiences of research participants while providing

readers and audiences a chance to participate in the retelling (Gabriel & Lester, 2013). When

nonfictional events are successfully reenacted in an ethnodrama, "Both the researcher and the

audience gain understandings not possible through conventional qualitative data analysis"

(Saldana, 2003, p. 230). The monologues that comprise the following performance tell the story

to help answer the research questions:

1) What challenges does the PD team at a large urban high school navigate in attempting

to plan and implement professional development over the course of one school year?

2) How does the instructional staff and administration experience the professional

development processes at a large urban high school over the course of one school year?

Stage Directions

The following set directions will be adhered to in this filmed performance (Gabriel &

Lester, 2013). The researcher will be playing all roles, including that of herself in this story: The

Team Leader. Although I am the principal investigator in this study, it was necessary for me to

play a leading role and give my character extensive monologues created from my field notes and

journal entries because of the prominent position a team leader has on a professional

development team (Saldana, 2003). A costume will be used to denote each character because

Saldana (2003) identifies it is one of the most accessible and revealing scenographic elements in

an ethnographic work. Costumes are noted in the characters' descriptions. When speaking each

character's monologues to tell the story, the researcher will look directly into the camera. When

the voice of the DOE or the superintendent is spoken, the researcher will be in the costume of the

next character to speak, listening to the voice from "beyond," which is also the voice of the

researcher.

Characters (in order of appearance)

Ms. Gung Ho: a teacher who is excited about attending professional development (PD).

Whether a seasoned or new teacher, she has been inspired by or incorporated what she has

experienced in professional development in her instruction, and looks forward to opportunities to

learn new teaching techniques. Ms. Gung Ho wears a brightly colored dress, possibly a flower

print or other upbeat pattern, and shawl.

Mr. On the Fence: he has had some positive professional development experiences during his

seasoned teaching career, especially during the last several years when he has been able to

choose which PD to attend or the topic was directly related to his content area. However, he is

leery and often displeased with broad, theoretically-focused PD sessions. Mr. On the Fence

dresses casually, most likely in a sweater or button down shirt, and slacks.

Ms. Disgruntled: a teacher with about 12-15 years of experience. She enjoys teaching but hates

that professional development makes her feel as if she is doing something wrong instructionally.

She likes her students, but finds it unacceptable that the new teacher evaluation system blames

her for the performance of underachieving students, which is what she has gleaned from PD on

Danielson. Ms. Disgruntled dresses in all black and wears interesting jewelry which she acquired abroad while traveling.

His Holiness- both the Department of Education (DOE) and the Superintendent: he is an all-knowing, infallible entity who is not seen but heard clearly. He provides headlines relating to the NYC public school system, and warns teachers and administrators of the consequences of their instructional failures that he is certain to see. His voice is meant to help us understand how the other characters experience the NYC DOE and superintendent as a bureaucratic force.

The Administration: he represents the school's administrative cabinet. He provides us with both politically correct information on professional development at the site, as well as more straightforward viewpoints on PD that remind us of administrative accountability in the DOE. He wears a dark colored suit, patterned tie, and glasses.

The Team Leader: This is her fifth year working with the professional development team at the site, and this is her first year as PD team leader. In sharing some of her personal story, she also provides us with background information about the former and most recent role of the PD team leader, as well as the logistics and challenges in holding the position currently. The Team Leader wears a dress for a professional setting, most likely in a dark red or blue.

The New Team Member: this is her first year on the PD team at the site. She has only been teaching for a couple of years and while she is adept at providing instruction in her content area, she is still learning to balance all her professional responsibilities. Although she had some very negative experience facilitating professional development at the site, she still benefits from and enjoys working with team. The New Team Member wears a formal yet stylish shirt, most likely in a white or light color, pants, and jewelry.

The Veteran Team Member: this is her seventh year on the PD team. In sharing her personal

story, we learn more about the responsibilities, benefits, and downfalls of being a team member

at the site. The Veteran Team Member wears a patterned or dark blue blouse, a skirt, and glasses.

The PD Team: this is an androgenous character who encompassess the voices and experiences

of all team members. Hearing the character vent gives us even more information about the

challenges the PD team at a large urban high school must navigate in attempting to plan and

implement professional development over the course of one school year. The character wears a

brown or dark patterned shirt and slacks.

Prologue

Once upon a time…

… in a big, urban high school in New York City, a team of teacher leaders volunteered to

join their school's PD team. Their task would be to provide professional development to their

colleagues following a top-down system that treated PD as an opportunity to disseminate

information that could change from month-to-month, or even from day-to-day. Administrators in

the building developed and altered the PD plan from year-to-year as necessary to make sure the

school was meeting city and state expectations. Their goal was to see to it that the building

wouldn't be broken down into seven little schools under the big NYC school's nemesis- the

Bloomberg administration.

Unfortunately, because the administration's focus had to be on appeasing bureaucratic

bosses who were much more interested in a paper trail that make it look *like teachers were being*

developed professionally, than, say, research on effective professional development, our teacher

leaders would face endless challenges and struggles in their PD endeavors. But before we hear

their stories, let us hear what professional development was like at the site years before our story begins.

Every year the teachers, some of whom even attended that same high school, were provided with sporadic professional development. Sometimes administrators provided PD at a department meeting, or sometimes teachers got the opportunity to go outside the building for PD; sometimes PD was content-specific, while other times it was related to pedagogy. So while PD was provided consistently, the content, format, amount, and time teachers received PD was anything BUT consistent. Because of this, it makes sense that some teachers seemed to really like participating in PD, some tolerated it, and some really loathed it.

Act I, Scene One

Ms. Gung Ho: I really enjoy PD! "I've been to some conferences in places like at the UFT headquarters, where I was sent out for the day to go and do something, or, sometimes it was a training for one single thing with multiple sessions, sometimes it was a conference where you could just pick which of several things you go to one at a time. And I would get exposed to ideas that I would never run into here" (Febuary Teacher Focus Group, p. 38). But PD in the building has also been quite useful. "I just finished one professional development today and I think that it [will be] very helpful. I learned about Promethean Board. I always had trouble using the Promethean Board… And then I now find out that it is very helpful, and it can help me to demonstrate a lot of pictures without using the overhead projector, and I can, you know, have the students come up to the board and they'll have more interaction and can engage the classroom" (Febuary Teacher Focus Group, p. 52).

Mr. on the Fence: "My opinion [about PD] is mixed. On the one hand I think when we get professional development from the top down on a subject like differentiated instruction, and

accountable talk, you'll get a series of PDs in a row with the same subject in which we're kind of told, 'We want you to do this and this is how you do it.' On the other hand, when we get choices, and you get to go, 'I really want to learn this and somebody can teach me that,' I find them terrific" (Febuary Teacher Focus Group, p. 37).

Ms. Disgruntled: "I don't like PD and it would be nigh impossible to provide PD that I would like" (1st Pre-Survey of the School Year, Q4). "We need to have a cohesive curriculum in place but we are not given time to collaborate and plan with colleagues" (February 2nd Teacher Feedback, Q3). What about "time to assess our overwhelming amount of students to give them the proper attention" (1st Pre-Survey of the School Year, Q3)? However, even worse than robbing us of time and forcing us to attend pointless PDs, "we don't want our intelligence to be insulted or our professionalism to be insulted… If you're doing something that you already know and… it's being presented to you as if you don't know it, as if you're brand new, as if you don't already bring something to the table" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 4), it is insulting and infuriating.

Act I, Scene Two

One day…

… "Governors and state commissioners of education from 48 states, 2 territories and the District of Columbia committed to developing a common core of state standards in English-language arts and mathematics for grades K-12" (Development Process, 2017). A few years later, the new teacher evaluation system, the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013), was introduced, including Measures of Student Learning (MOSL). And with "New State Academic Standards… Said to Require $56 Million Outlay for City's Schools," (Baker, 2013, nytimes.com), teachers were expected to measure up.

The Voice of His Holiness, the DOE (spoken in a deep, drawn-out voice from the Heavens)-

Remember, with "Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo and Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg… aggressively

[pushing] for phasing in a new, more rigorous teacher evaluation process — with tens of millions

of dollars in state and federal aid to schools at stake" (Taylor, 2014), it is immensely important

that you be prepared, because we are sending your administrators to judge you, and if you don't

measure up, you will fail and even possibly terminated!

Act I, Scene Three

And because of that…

… The introduction of the Common Core Learning Standards and talk of more rigid

teacher evaluations caused a frenzy in NYC- while many educators were uncertain about the new

educational expectations, many educational bureaucrats swarmed the city to make sure the new

mandates were effectively being addressed. Therefore, the need for information to be

disseminated and training for teachers increased.

The administration decided to create a PD team to help inform and train the teachers

about implementing the CCS into their curricula and teaching based on the components of

Danielson, as well as city and state DOE mandates. From 2009, teachers from the building

worked with a team leader to provide school-wide PD to their colleagues. Following the

constructs of first and second wave teacher leadership, the team was initially led by a teacher

hired and appointed by the UFT Teacher Center to mentor new teachers and work with a team to

design and lead regular school-wide professional development. However, aligned with third

wave teacher leadership, the team itself was comprised of teachers who volunteered to meet

weekly during their limited prep time to design, prepare, and facilitate PD for the staff alongside

the team leader at specified times throughout the school year.

The Admin- (To the camera and very formally): To make sure our teachers were informed of the new Common Core Standards (CCS) and the Danielson Framework, we created a PD team "that is teacher driven and guided by administration" (Administrative Survey, Q1a). "The PD team's major role is to find out what the needs are for the school and work between the supervisors and the teachers in trying to offer valuable PD to all members of the school" (Administrative Survey, Q1), while helping "To have a school-wide instructional focus across all content areas" (Administrative Survey, Q1).

(Still to the camera but with one hand to the side of his mouth as if whispering and spoken more informally:) Let's be honest, we wish the PD team could create a bridge between us and the staff. We truly want "The PD team [to help us] understand the pulse of what the teachers want in terms of development. Having a team made up of teachers [can open] up more of a dialogue on what their fellow staff members may need assistance with" (Administrative Survey, Q1). And on paper, we certainly want to offer our staff the highest quality professional development. But we have bosses to answer to just like our department members.

In reality, the PD team helps us show the state and city that we are making sure our teachers are developing, especially in areas in which our bosses say our teachers need to develop. The real role of the PD team is to take "the feedback from our QR as well as our superintendent visit and create PD's around assisting us to reach our goals in addressing our weak points" (Administrative Survey, Q1a). Basically, having a PD team can prove to our bureaucratic bosses that we are trying to develop our teachers in some way and keep them off our backs.

Act I, Scene Four

But one day…

… A large incoming freshman class pushed the student register at this already large comprehensive high school to 3,700, and the administration felt they needed to use the teacher center space for classrooms. Subsequently, the teacher center position was discontinued.

In third wave teacher leadership fashion, a doctoral student (who saw a dissertation opportunity) volunteered to lead the school's PD team. Her goal was to work with a team to try to meet their colleagues' professional development needs and do whatever they could to make an extremely imperfect professional development structure even a tiny bit better, and hopefully turn Disgruntled and On-the-Fence teachers into teachers Gung Ho for professional development.

In late September of 2014, the principal notified the unofficially named team leader that she could put together a team to begin meeting weekly after school for paid overtime hours. The team would work to prepare and facilitate PD to teachers on the three scheduled NYC Chancellor's Conference Days- November 4th, February 2nd, and June 4th. The principal and team leader decided that the PD focus for the school year would be "learning strategies," and that each PD would be three hours. So after meeting with former team members to see if they were willing to return to the team, speaking to APs about their suggestions for new members, and offering the opportunity to join the team to new prospects, 11 teachers including the team leader, met for their first meeting on October 2nd; this was the 7th consecutive year for one PD team member, the 5th year for the team leader, and the third for another member, but only the first year on the team for the remaining eight members. The year would be filled with the hard, sometimes even grueling work, of attempting to navigate the challenges of providing professional development in a large urban high school as third wave teacher leaders within a bureaucratic system that still followed a top-down, first and second wave leadership structure.

Before we see their work in action, let's meet our teacher leaders, hear how they came to be PD team members, and understand some of their struggles in dealing with the tensions between what is intended for teacher leadership and the context of the bureaucracy....

The New Team Member: When my AP mentioned being on the PD team, I thought it was definitely in my best interest. I'm starting to put together my tenure packet this year and since my friend told me that being a team member helped him get tenure, I thought it could help me too.

I really hadn't anticipated how much work it would be though! Researching learning strategies in my content area, thinking about which ones would be most beneficial for my colleagues' classes and our students, planning and organizing 150 teachers into rooms for technology training or content sharing sessions; none of it is easy. I know we get paid but meeting every week is a lot, especially because there is so much to learn the first couple of years teaching and I have so many other things to do.

What's worse though are the negative attitudes and flat-out rude behavior from my colleagues during PD. It's nerve-racking enough to stand up there in front of everybody and try to do a good job facilitating PD, but it's extremely stressful when you expect that your colleagues are going to be blatantly disrespectful to you. I mean, I understand that a lot of the teachers in the building are upset about a lot of the changes in the DOE like the Common Core and Danielson, and many of them have been teaching at least three times as long as me, and see me as young and inexperienced. I could never imagine being so rude to someone who is just doing her job. But I am learning a lot. AND I get to work with a bunch of really cool, fun people. They've been very supportive and always make me feel better after a rough PD. We get to vent to each other about any negative experiences we've had with our colleagues and make each other

laugh about it. As for whether I'd still be a team member after I got tenure, I'm not sure. I guess

if I wasn't doing anything else to earn per session I'd consider it, but with all the stress that goes

along with it, I don't know if being on the team will always be a priority for me.

The Veteran Team Member: I first got started as a team member because it sounded like a

good move professionally. My AP made it seem like she had selected me above the other

teachers in my department, and I definitely didn't want to let her down by saying no. Plus I think

it will look really good on a resume when I decide to move on from this school.

But I must say that it has been very nice being in-the-know about city, state, DOE, and

administrative requirements. I feel like I get to hear about and understand what is expected of

teachers well before my colleagues. So when the DOE has a new curriculum mandate or some

new term like differentiation that they expect everyone to know and demonstrate in their

teaching, I have already been talking about it and working with the team to think of ways we can

present it in PD. For example, if I want to share website resources with my colleagues in the ESL

and foreign language departments, I need to consider which will be most useful to most people in

order to differentiate instruction, which sites would be manageable for teachers at all technology

levels, and which would help us meet classroom instructional requirements.

In addition to finding and becoming familiar with instructional resources, I have to learn

about new instructional strategies well enough to be able to turn-key them! Being a team

member is time consuming! And demanding! Even though we get paid, we have to meet once

per week, every week. Plus we have to do a lot of work to prepare for the PDs during our own

time because there is rarely enough time to prepare after we discuss what's on the agenda. With

all this work, I do wish we got a bit more credit from the principal for being a team member- just

an acknowledgement at a staff meeting or even a letter at the end of the year would make me feel

appreciated. Feeling under appreciated so often actually makes me think about quitting the team. In fact, I'm not sure *why* I keep coming back! Ultimately, I think it's nice to feel like I'm a part of something. The team is made up of a great group of people and it's nice to be able to have collegial conversations AND feel like these are my friends. We help each other out and I wouldn't want to let anybody down by quitting. Plus, like I said before, there is always that future resume I'm thinking of.

The Team Leader: Communication is a key component to being team leader. Not only must I regularly communicate with team members, but I must also be the liaison between the team and the administration, as well as keep teachers informed about upcoming PDs. I think the way I communicate in directing the weekly team meetings is also important. For instance, when team members get excited about something and talk all at once, or the conversation [veers] off track, "I [try] to let the convos die down before getting everyone back on track because, again, I want the environment to be casual, but also because I don't want to seem like the overbearing PD boss, especially because they are my peers as far as teaching is concerned" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 17). Similarly, the teachers are my peers, so it is important to me that I do not come off as bossy in my communication via email or when facilitating PDs. Also, I know the administrators are busy, so I don't want to seem too demanding of their time. Therefore, even writing texts to the team or emails to the teachers or administration takes time and effort because I am so conscious of how I speak or act.

I think that because I was so conscious of communication, it is that much more frustrating when I reach out to APs about new information and I don't hear back. Although I lead the team, I did not have access to all the new city and state DOE mandates, and I really need guidance

from administrators to guide the team, who in turn have to guide their colleagues! It is so much

harder to get my job done if I do not have open communication with the administration.

Another really difficult component to the team leader job is designing the PDs so there is

a balance between what the teachers want and what the administration expects. We spend all this

time gathering information from the teachers about their PD needs and wants, yet we are often

expected to design or even redesign PD merely based on top down requirements. When the PD

design is clearly aligned with DOE mandates and not teacher feedback, we suffer pushback from

our colleagues. It can be immensely challenging, to say the least.

Act II, Scene One

And ever since then…

… the team would have 32 meetings before the school year ended. They would do their

best to address teacher PD needs and requests using the feedback from prior and current PDs,

while still addressing administrative expectations and demands; they brainstormed best

practices and discussed how best to design PD under DOE constraints; they appealed to their

colleagues' humanity by making snacks and music, as well as bathroom breaks, regular

components to the PD agendas, even after often enduring their pushback and outbursts to

required PD; they consistently and sometimes frantically added evidence of their work to a

binder for the superintendent so they could justify their PD positions and help the administration

prove they were helping their teachers develop; they shared valuable department-specific

information that was rarely filtered throughout the school; they bonded over a dislike for

bureaucratic pressures, top-down mandates, and experiences with disgruntled colleagues; they

scrambled to design and redesign both the content and the logistics of PD sessions whenever

necessary; they bickered over semantics and debated pedagogy. But most importantly, they

worked as a team to get the tasks at hand complete each week so they could address

bureaucratic and administrative demands in providing school-wide PD to their colleagues.

Act II, Scene Two

And because of that…

… the team set out on the task of designing the Feb 2nd PD based on the topic of

learning strategies. Let's see what the start of a typical meeting preparing for a professional

development session looks like...

Our scene begins in The Team Leader's classroom around 3:20pm after the final period

of the school day. The Team Leader has already arranged enough desks in a circle for all team

members, and placed snacks and napkins on a desk in the center of the circle so everyone can

help themselves. Team members enter the room, some carrying bags and books, others carrying

laptops and coffee, and greet each other as they find their usual spots. They are generally

exhausted from the day, but seem to accept that they still have another two hours of work ahead

of them. As they say hello to one another, they take slices and comment on the banana bread The

Team Leader made for today's meeting. The Team Leader waits for everyone to arrive (some are

usually more on time than others). Once the greetings and chatter almost fully die down, The

Team Leader begins the conversation...

The Team Leader: Hello everyone. Thank you again for your work on the November 4th PD.

Let's all take a look at the agenda for today's meeting. (*Agendas are passed around.*) First, we'll

spend some time just talking about how each session of the PD went. Next, we are going to

review the feedback from the paper surveys we collected at the end of the November 4th PD.

We'll log into our Google Drive accounts and we will organize the data from the surveys from

our rooms into the chart I created. Let's take about 15 minutes to do that. Afterwards, we'll

reconvene to discuss the feedback, and use that to start brainstorming for the February 2nd PD. During the last part of the meeting, we'll take time to research learning strategies we think could possibly be beneficial to share during the February 2nd PD. Regardless of whether we end up using those strategies, we'll add them to our resource binder so we have evidence of our research on best practices for the administration and superintendent. So, first things first- let's go around and talk about how you felt the November 4th PD went, specifically, what worked or didn't work in each session, successes, and any problems. Please start with your experiences during the Orientation, then the technology session, then the content specific session. (*The Team Leader addresses The New Team Member immediately to her left.)* How do you feel everything went?

The New Team Member: I think the Orientation was pretty good. I felt like the music we had playing when teachers came in and the refreshments gave a good vibe to the start of the PD that carried over into the rest of the sessions. It was a little chaotic for us as team members to have to set everything up in the cafeteria in the morning before the Orientation AND in our rooms for the technology and content-specific sessions, but it was worth it when we got to the next sessions and everything was ready to go. The technology training was okay. I felt like I was able to help some people with their Skedula needs, and those people told me that the training was really helpful and they wished we had more time. One senior teacher even told me on her way out that this was the best PD she'd ever experienced. As for the content-specific training, that went really well! Asking my department member in advance to share-out a strategy was so beneficial. My department colleagues not only enjoyed seeing how he uses the learning strategy in his classroom, they also showed him a lot of respect during his presentation, and that made it easier for me to facilitate the rest of the meeting.

The Veteran Team Member: I think the Orientation was an effective start to the day. A couple of my colleagues actually commented to me during a later session that it was helpful to understand the day's purpose, and have a road map to guide them through the activities to come. However, if we use an orientation format again, we should have more than one area for teachers to sign-in. The line got long and some teachers were still waiting to sign in when we began going over the agenda. It would have made things go faster if there had been more than one sign in sheet. As for the technology session, things went pretty smoothly in my room, especially because I had some advanced users who acted as assistants and worked one-on-one with their colleagues. If we have a technology training session during the February 2nd PD, perhaps we should seek out advanced users and set them up as assistants from the very beginning so no time is wasted locating advanced users or figuring out how to use their skills. As for the content-specific session, my colleagues from my department seemed really engaged. Our colleagues from the other department, however, who were recently added to our department, seemed a little resistant to me as a facilitator. I think they will get used to our departments collaborating like this as time goes on, though. I mean, they have to get used to it—the state decided ESL is no longer their own entity at every instructional level, and since our administration cannot fight the state, we definitely can't.

The meeting continues in this manner, with all members of the team sharing their experiences with each session during the November 4th PD, one-by-one. Once all members have shared, The Team Leader reviews the general consensus from each team member's feedback, which she was jotting down as everyone spoke. Next, The Team Leader reminds everyone of the next task, which is to input the paper survey feedback from the November 4th into a chart organized by question in Google Docs. Once everyone entered and reviewed the November 4th

PD, The Team Leader begins the conversation about the feedback, and we see how our team leaders try to make the best of a challenging professional development situation at their site.

The Team Leader: Okay, so what did you all notice?

The Veteran Team Member: I think it's very interesting that so much of the feedback, especially the quantitative feedback, is positive. If we only went by teachers' feedback and didn't listen to their conversations and watch their reactions to talk of professional development, we would think teachers were very content with PD at the site.

The Team Leader: Well I know that a lot of teachers in my content area feel bad writing negative feedback—if they like the facilitator, they write positive comments, no matter what. I did see a lot of positive feedback about the music and bathroom breaks though, which I do take at face value.

The New Team Member: Oh yeah, so much of my feedback has that in there, too! A lot of the teachers also seemed to really like the technology training. Many of them said they want more time for tech training for the next PD.

The Veteran Team Member: Teachers in my room also want more time for content-specific portions. Their feedback was very positive in relation to strategy sharing.

The Team: Do you think the administration would give us more time for the February 2nd PD if we show them this feedback?

The Team Leader: No, I honestly do not think they would give us more time. They seemed pretty set on the PD plan when I spoke to the principal a few weeks ago. (*Little does the team know that the allotted time for the next PD* would *change, just not in their favor.*)

The Team: I wish we had a bit more control over the PDs we are supposed to be designing.

(There is general agreement over this from many of the members.)

The Team Leader: Yes, I think we all wish this. Rather than pushing for more time for PD, which I doubt we would get, perhaps we can use this feedback to support having another technology training session in the February 2nd PD.

The Veteran Team Member: There is also a lot of feedback from my room indicating that teachers really want to go out of the building for PD.

The New Team Member: Yes, I see feedback like that in my room, too! Is there any way we can make out of building PD happen for the February 2nd PD?

The Team Leader: The principal also seemed very adamant about us staying in the building for PD because there is a rigorous process to request out-of-building-PD from the superintendent.

The New Team Member: What about if we bring someone in to train the physical education teachers instead of leaving the building? Maybe train them in sin? I think the physical education teachers would really benefit and appreciate that. *(There is a lot of excited agreement from all team members.)*

The Team Leader: I will bring it up to the principal and see what she thinks about it.

The meeting continues with a review of the November 4th feedback, and the team leader jots down all the ideas being brainstormed for the next school-wide PD. Once this portion of the meeting is complete, The Team Leader will give everyone time to research best practices on learning strategies in their content areas that they can possibly share out during the February 2nd PD. The meeting will end with team members sharing those strategies and adding them to the binder. At approximately 5:10, The Team Leader will end the meeting and all will agree to see each other next week.

Act II, Scene Three

But one day…

...when the administration informed them that their allotted three hours for the February 2nd PD would go from three hours to an hour and a half because administrators needed more time with their department members to inform them of the newest top-down mandates, the team's working environment became a bit more tense. Let's hear about some of the tensions the PD scheduling change caused for our teacher leaders as they refocused on designing the required PD as best they could under the new restraints so we can understand the realities of a NYC school bureaucracy.

The Team Leader: Squeezing everything into an hour and a half PD is no easy feat, and it definitely added tension to the team meetings. "I decided that it is really my job to get a lot of the prep work done for the PD so I can model how things will go" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 39), such as having a copy of the final handouts and PowerPoint presentations done before we facilitate so I can model how the sessions will go and answer any questions for team members at least during the last couple of meetings before the PDs. "Everyone is too stressed and I want them to be comfortable" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 39). I believe it is also important in being a good leader that during times like when we were told only weeks before the February 2nd PD we would only have an hour and a half to facilitate instead of three hours and fifty minutes, the team members feel that, "our PD team leader didn't let it stress her, and just went with the flow to make sure we were able to accomplish what needed to be done" (PD Team Focus Group Absentee Responses, Q1). Going with the flow meant I had to come up with ways to fit our plan for a technology training and content-specific share-out session into a much shorter amount of time, and calmly share that with the team. If I do let allow my stress to get to the point that it shows, it brings negative energy and tension to the team.

Some team members really do add to my stress level though, especially when, relatively often, "several people [do] not come (to the meetings) till 3:25, 3:30, 3:35… Although the meeting is officially supposed to start at 3:15" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 17), or when "One (team member from) math was absent and the other (team member from) math said her counterpart had 'done the work,' which seemed to be an excuse for the woman present not to do anything" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 20). However, most people on the team usually show me a great deal of support in their actions and words. One day when a "team member walked in the room and saw me massaging my forehead slightly as I was waiting for everyone to come in and settle down, (he) told me not to worry, that they would help me handle everything" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 37). And they did...

The Team: I can't believe we only have an hour and half for this PD now! And I can't believe the administration wants to re-plan the whole PD in this short amount of time. They seem to really have no respect for our time. And I guess they really do not care about the feedback from other PDs at all. Teachers said they wanted more time for PD, not less! I can't imagine the backlash we are going to face from our colleagues either...

Act II, Scene Four

But still...

The team made the necessary adjustments to see out their plans for the February 2nd PD. Although the administration cut their allotted time virtually in half, the teacher leaders did have control of the design of the professional development sessions comprising the February 2nd PD. Three sessions comprised the agenda: an orientation, a technology training session, and a content-specific share-out session.

The orientation portion of the February 2nd PD was 15 minutes long. During the orientation the team reviewed the Quality Review recommendations, as well as new DOE mandates, with all teachers. Additionally, the team informed teachers of the PD schedule for the afternoon, and reinforced the purpose of each session in helping teachers engage students.

The technology portion of the February 2nd PD was 25 minutes long. During the session, the PD team provided training to teachers on a technology tool of their choice. Teachers could choose to attend training on one of the following technology systems used at the site in the classroom: beginning or intermediate Skedula, Promethean Board, SESIS, Basic Computer Skills for a PC, website resource review, Prezi, or math calculator. Team members prepared training on these tech tools based on participants' levels, and answered teachers' questions. Participants were provided with the technology tool during the session so they could practice what presenters demonstrated.

During the final portion of the February 2nd PD, team members facilitated share-out sessions with colleagues in their content areas. Team members began the meeting by showing a video highlighting a content-specific learning strategy. Team leaders then facilitated a discussion of the video using a three-question protocol they created. Next, team members and teachers shared learning strategies specific to their subject that they use to engage students. Team members provided a lesson plan example highlighting the use of the strategy, as well as materials and student work to show their colleagues how the learning strategy was used in that content area to engage students. Additionally, team members approached one or two colleagues about three weeks in advance to ask them to prepare to share an engaging learning strategy. Team members used the same three-question protocol to facilitate discussion after each share-

out. Light snacks of chocolate and chips were provided during this session. The meeting

concluded with a feedback form.

     Let's hear what worked for our teacher leaders in preparing for the February 2ⁿᵈ PD,

specifically, how they adjusted to the administration's changes in the allotted time. Let's also

hear teachers' reactions to the February 2ⁿᵈ PD so we can see how the design choices our

teacher leaders made for the agenda played out, and how the tensions created by a bureaucratic

system caused missteps...

The New Team Member: I think what was most helpful in preparing for the February 2nd PD

was when "I personally asked some of my senior colleagues" if I "Can present one of (their)

ideas to the PD team and to the rest of the department. They were more than willing to help and

that also gained their cooperation during the PD itself because they felt proud. It kept them under

wraps as well even though they didn't want to be there" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 4).

The Veteran Team Member: I think the February 2nd PD was successful because "teachers felt

like they had a really big role also because they were presenting their ideas. So we spoke to our

colleagues, we got volunteers who wanted to present, so it wasn't just us, the facilitator

presenting, it was everyone presenting and discussing. It didn't make it seem like we were the

teachers, at all. Actually that whole PD was a discussion lab. We were just there to make sure

things were running and teachers took it upon themselves to discuss about ideas. It opened up

conversation amongst the room" (PD Focus Group, p. 6).

Ms. Gung Ho: I think the February 2nd PD was wonderful! "It was enlightening to see

strategies from our colleagues;" I "Enjoyed seeing what my colleagues are doing so I can use

their ideas" (February 2nd Feedback, Q1). "I loved the day when we could choose our own

adventures. I elected to go to a PD on the Promethean Board, and it was excellent. I'd been using

them all year, but the presenter was more experienced than me and he helped me learn more about how they work. Now I use many more features and it helps my lessons" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 15).

Mr. On the Fence: "I felt very comfortable" during the February 2nd PD… "we walked into their rooms and there was this music and this food that we love. It brings it home… it's just, potato chips sometimes help. You know, just a token of appreciation that we are doing a good job, or sometimes it's good to hear it, too" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 4). It's especially nice to feel appreciated in this climate of the Common Core and Danielson and being observed so often. It can make you feel like you don't know what you're doing. And I know my subject well. In fact, I would enjoy PD more if it was very relevant to my content and teaching. "Hearing an English teacher or a Social Studies teacher talking about their approach sounds good to me, but it's nothing that I could really use" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 14). Also, "time is the problem with the teachers" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 4).

Ms. Disgruntled: In my opinion, the February 2nd PD was a big waste of time. "We are constantly being told we need to come-up with a uniform curriculum but (the administration) has yet to give us time to work with our colleagues to create a uniform curriculum. If they are not going to give us said time, then they need to stop holding the threat of having to use engageNY in its totality over our heads" (February 2nd Pre-Survey, Q2).

<div align="center">

Act II, Scene Five

And ever since then…

</div>

… the team continued to meet weekly. They reviewed the February 2nd PD feedback to determine what went well and what they could do to make the June 4th PD better. They continued to bond and strengthen their sense of community. And as always, the team continued

adding to and reorganizing the binder in anticipation of the day their administration would use it

as proof that the professional development needs of teachers, as deemed by outside observers,

were being met.

Act III, Scene One

But one day…

… the superintendent showed up, and did not like what he saw.

The Voice of His Holiness, *now* the superintendent (spoken in a deep, drawn-out voice from the Heavens): It seems to me that there is a lack of student engagement at your site. I visited seven classrooms (*out of about 63*) and saw students merely in their seats while teachers taught at the front of the room. Perhaps your teachers are unaware, but this is not what is expected according to Danielson. I should hope that NYC's definition of engagement is made more clear to your teachers and I will be back in due time to see that their lessons and instruction reflect their understanding.

The Administration: Even though we knew he was eventually coming, I still can't believe that today was the day for our superintendent visit! Good thing we have the team working with the staff on learning strategies! And even better that we can call the team leader RIGHT NOW and get a copy of the next PD plan so we can share it with the superintendent.

Even though the team's ideas to have meet and greets for the staff to help them transition to our new joined resource rooms next year are great, we shouldn't let them use formal PD time for these types of activities because we need time with our department members for more pressing matters- to address the superintendent's feedback and get our staff to improve on engaging students. We need to get the team to change whatever they had planned for our last PD and focus on engagement. We'll have the team leader "Elicit from the team about what

engagement means, how it is done in each class, do this exercise with the team to come up with those meanings in the school, then do the same exercise with teachers" (Dissertation Participation Journal, 5/13 PD Team Meeting). The team needs to help the teachers "determine what engagement means, and what constitutes highly effective and effective planning and instruction under this component" (Dissertation Participation Journal, 5/13 PD Team Meeting), so that will be the new focus for the June 4th PD.

The team leader: I knew I should have been nervous about this meeting with the administration! I knew they were going to tell me that the plan for the June 4th PD had to be changed. I can't believe I now have to go break the news to the team that all our hard work over the last few weeks has been for naught. And I have to stay on top of everything so that we can definitely complete the prep in time for the PD. I really hope that all the team members can come to our next meetings and get the work complete. I know I can count on most people, but I need for each and every team member to do his part if we are going to get all this done.

Act III, Scene Two

And because of that…

… Although the teacher leaders had already planned an entire PD session for June 4th based on administrative expectations, they had to REPLAN the ENTIRE PD based on the superintendent's feedback. In trying to redesign the last PD session of the year so it addressed the superintendent's feedback and met administrative guidelines while still addressing teacher feedback, there was stress and tension on the team that led to conflict. There was a general feeling amongst team members that much of their time had been wasted and the PD system at the site and in the DOE is unfair, the latter being the sentiment shared and expressed by teachers as

well. Let's hear about our teacher leaders' reactions to the administration's required change to the June 4th PD agenda, and the tensions and conflicts this caused for them.

The team leader: The day we had to throw weeks of prep work away and begin replanning for the last PD of the school year was definitely a low point for the team. After I informed the team of the administration's change and went over the meeting agenda with new expectations for the June 4th PD, we frantically began the process of re-planning and preparing materials for the next PD. In desperately trying to quickly reword the agenda and PowerPoint presentation, "there was some quibbling over semantics... I didn't help the situation because I was cursing as I tried to explain how I thought some words could be interpreted, and I think I came off rough and may have offended one team member" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 38), who I later made a point to call and apologize to. This extremely competent person (who has been on the team longer than I have), told me later on the phone that she feels "it's not right that we're expected to teach exactly what engagement is when we have to learn what it is better ourselves" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 38). She ended-up apologizing to me for her low patience level during the meeting also, and we both noted that the stress of replanning was getting to us.

The Team: RE-plan?! What do you mean we have to replan the June 4th PD? Do you mean we did all that work for nothing?! Planning and organizing 150 teachers into rooms for each session, now for nothing?! And all that time spent reviewing the PD feedback from the year so we could plan an agenda for June 4th that both met teacher needs and requests while addressing administrative requirements?! What a waste of time! Why does our whole PD have to revolve around what the superintendent says when he doesn't even know our school, let alone the needs of our students? And a PD about Danielson? About engagement? In June? We already saw that teachers are strongly opposed to learning about teaching techniques when there is little time to

elaborate when we reviewed the February 2nd PD. The AP of my department just gave us a PD

on engagement last week! And the way this PD is structured is very confusing. Like I told the

team, I'm "not going to do this PD if [I don't] understand how to do it" (Dissertation

Participation Journal, p. 38).

Act III, Scene Three

And finally…

… the June 4th PD came and the team did their best. The administration's goals for the

June 4th PD were to help teachers better understand the components and rubric of 3c- engaging

students in learning- from the Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument (2013)

to address feedback from the superintendent's visit to the site a couple of weeks prior. The

administration instructed the team that teachers should be given time during the June 4th PD to

analyze the components and rubric of 3c from the Danielson Framework (2013), determine

where examples of learning strategies would fall under the 3c rubric, and design strategies to

effectively engage their students in learning as specified by 3c of the Danielson (2013) rubric.

Based on these requirements, the team developed two sessions focused on the student

engagement component of the Danielson Framework (2013) comprised the agenda: an

interdisciplinary meeting and a content/grade/learning level-specific meeting.

The focus of the interdisciplinary meeting was to provide teachers with the opportunity to

analyze the components and rubric of 3c from the Danielson Framework (2013), and determine

where examples of learning strategies would fall under the 3c rubric (Danielson, 2013).The team

pre-separated teachers into rooms with their colleagues from different departments for the

interdisciplinary meeting, and set up group tables in the rooms so teachers could interact and

work with those colleagues seated at their tables for the duration of the meeting. At the start of

the meeting, team members had teachers introduce themselves to the room and state what they

taught and in which departments. Immediately following introductions, team members in each

room used a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the superintendent's recent feedback, as well

as the DOE mandates regarding evaluating teachers based on engaging students in learning.

Next, team members facilitated a shared reading of 3c of the Danielson rubric (2013),

and elicited responses from teachers regarding the components. Afterwards, teachers worked

with colleagues at their tables to determine where examples of learning strategies would fall

under the 3c rubric (Danielson, 2013). Team members pre-packed envelopes with examples of

learning strategies at each table on strips of paper. Teachers were asked to physically adhere

those strips to posters around the room designated for each level of engagement according to 3c

of the Danielson (2013) rubric: highly effective, effective, developing, or ineffective. Finally,

team members facilitated a share-out from each table as to why they felt the strategies would fall

under those designated areas within the Danielson (2013) rubric.

The focus of the second meeting during the June 4th PD was to give teachers the

opportunity to work in content and grade/learning-level teams to design strategies to effectively

engage their students in learning as specified by 3c of the Danielson (2013) rubric. Team

members facilitated meetings with their colleagues in their departments. Team members set up

groups of tables in the rooms so teachers could interact and work with those colleagues from

their similar content areas or grade or learning levels. For example, English, social studies, and

math teachers met with their department colleagues. However, English teachers were grouped at

tables with their colleagues who teach the same grade levels, and social studies and math

teachers were grouped with teachers of the same subject within those disciplines. Because

science, foreign language, and ENL instruction at the site is separated by levels of learning,

teachers met with their department colleagues but sat with teachers of the same learning levels.

Because their subjects all entail engagement activities by nature, physical education, art, music,

and technology teachers met together, but were grouped in tables with those who teach similar

types of instruction.

To start the content/grade/learning level-specific meeting, team members provided a

lesson plan example highlighting the use of an engagement technique from their own teaching,

as well as materials and student work to show their colleagues how they used the engagement

technique in their classes. Team members then facilitated a discussion about the engagement

technique modeled using a two-question protocol. Next, teachers were asked to collaborate with

their colleagues to develop a lesson for their content subject, grade, or learning level,

highlighting an engagement technique, add this to a poster, and prepare to share. Following the

share-out, team members used the same two-question protocol to facilitate discussion. Light

snacks of chocolate and chips were provided during this session, and the meeting concluded with

a feedback form.

Some team members got positive feedback from the teachers in their rooms and felt their

hard work had paid off because the PD was a success. Other team members did not leave the PD

feeling quite as successful. In fact, some lamented that they had never been treated so rudely by

their colleagues. Some teachers who were reportedly rude felt insulted by the PD and/or the

facilitators, or felt that their professional development time could have been better spent doing

something else. Let's hear our teachers' and team leaders' reactions to the June 4th PD so we

can understand how the bureaucratic demands on our teacher leaders affected their abilities to

lead before and during the last professional development sessions of the school year...

Ms. Gung Ho: To Me, the best part about the June 4th PD was that "it was clear. You could tell engagement and empower different ways of teaching that would fit into [the Danielson rubric] categories and which would be most engaging" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 12). Since the PD "was focused on one specific topic… it was clear on what we were talking about as opposed to trying to cover so many things in the hour or whatever you have, so I thought the focus was good" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 12). "My favorite part [was when we collaborated to create a lesson focused on engaging students] to share out with the classroom... Each department had their own group, and we actually prepared a big poster board that we were able to share some of our practices with each other" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 12), so we got to see how our colleagues teaching different levels or subjects within the same content area would engage their students.

Mr. On the Fence: I thought the June 4th PD was "pretty painless" (June Teacher Focus Group, p.13). "I was pleased that presenters kind of acknowledged the general resistance" of teachers by saying to us, 'Listen, we might not all like [engaging in a PD topic because the superintendent was displeased with our engagement strategies when he visited], but let's try and get through it and learn a little bit'... It brought us in and we listened to all that, and I think that it probably is the best way to approach faculty discouragement and resistance" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 13).

I think the difference between this PD and the February 2nd PD is that we got pigeon holed into one topic. I feel like I would benefit much more from opportunities to explore my subject so I can bring more to my teaching than just these general DOE informational PDs. "...-in both meetings- nobody from my similar discipline was in the meeting with me. Hearing an English teacher or a Social Studies teacher talking about their approach sounds good to me, but

it's nothing that I could really use. I'm doing something completely different, so to me it lacked the focus on each discipline, and how each subject could possibly use it" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 14).

Ms. Disgruntled: My reaction to the June 4th PD- "how many times are we gonna look at a handout of the Danielson rubric...? I mean, we don't need to see it again. We all know the Danielson rubric, we all teach by the Danielson rubric, to whatever extent. And, this sort of PD really doesn't work" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 4). And then, to have to engage in an activity that makes it seem like Danielson is the right way to teach is also offensive. "We believe that many [teaching methods] can be effective depending on the class and ways presented, and yet we were forced to artificially put it where Danielson wants it [during the June 4th PD]. It just kinda highlighted the way that a certain percentage of people in our profession, I think probably a high percentage, think the Danielson rubric is trying to make us all the same and not recognizing that there are many ways to do well" (June Teacher Focus Group, Follow-up Question).

The New Team Member: I had a terrible experience facilitating the June 4th PD. Teachers "came in with a very negative attitude and basically did not want to participate in any of the activities… At some point I had to stop [teachers from sharing their reasoning for categorizing strategies within the rubric for 3c] because teachers were being disrespectful and loud… and one of the teachers told us, 'It is not our job to reprimand teachers'" (Dissertation Participation Journal, June 4th PD Feedback). It just seemed that they were "very adamant about entering PD already with the mentality of 'I'm not going to use this. This is no use for me. Why do I need to be here.' My partner and I had to do our best to ignore the teachers who weren't participating or

talking to their colleagues. We had to focus on the teachers who were cooperating and willing to share, and encouraging them helped us get through the first session.

The Veteran Team Member: Getting the June 4th PD done wasn't easy. "I remember doing one thing, and then in three weeks we had to do something totally different, so time was an issue" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 4). Thank goodness [the team leader] modeled how we were to conduct the activities along with the PowerPoint, otherwise I would have been lost. It's really frustrating that not only was months of our time planning wasted because the topic completely changed based on the feedback from a last minute superintendent visit, but the administration gave us some touchy subjects to work with. Even some of the teachers wondered "why didn't the APs give a PD on 3c (engagement) since they are the ones who know it best?" (Dissertation Participation Journal, June 4th PD Feedback). "I know that the teachers in my department enjoy the fact that our first couple of PDs were linked… They said they saw continuity… For them it threw them for a loop when we just went from all that literacy and focus on that, and then all of a sudden, Danielson… it destructed the whole flow of the year, that we created off their feedback" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 5). Even in PD rooms in which, "Overall, the teachers were very respectful and professional," they still "were venting and angry that they are always receiving things to do in the June PD when there is no time to turn-key or receive more information or elaborate" (Dissertation Participation Journal, June 4th PD Feedback). Those of us who managed to deal with our colleagues with terribly negative attitudes did so "I think by keeping our composure, and just being open minded for the fact that some of these teachers don't agree necessarily with what we have to do… So just understanding and preparing ourselves" to "Just go with the flow, and being able to adapt to whatever comes your way" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 4).

The Team Leader: Seeing how stressed and upset the team was preparing for and after the June 4th PD was very rough. We did so much work this year gathering data about what teachers need and want from professional development, and we put so much time into designing a PD that at least addressed some teacher feedback even if we couldn't address it all; to see all that work go down the drain is disheartening, to say the least.

After the PD, a veteran team member came up to me and said I should "provide more support to the team members who are newer because one was very nervous and that may have impacted why her experience in the first session [with her colleagues] was so negative" (Dissertation Participation Journal, June 4th PD Feedback). I definitely feel that "as a leader, I should ask the team members if they are nervous beforehand so we can clean things up and prepare them best" (Dissertation Participation Journal, June 4th PD Feedback). However, if we are not given sufficient time to prepare, then there won't be sufficient time for the team to feel confident about facilitating, especially for the new team members who make up the majority of the team.

Also, in situations like the June 4th PD, in which the topic was focused solely on recent negative feedback from the superintendent, it is expected that we are going to have to deal with a great deal of negativity and push-back from teachers. Facilitating PD about the Common Core and Danielson is difficult enough, especially because many teachers at our site do not agree with these systematic changes; what is worse, however, is being forced to bring PD to our colleagues that they feel is unwarranted, especially when they have legitimate professional development requests. Don't get me wrong though, our colleagues are not very easy to please, nor do they seem to know WHAT they want- they always "joke" with us about how much they are dreading

going to our next PD, but then our feedback forms come back with mostly positive feedback, which really sent us mixed messages about their needs and wants, to say the least.

Act III, Scene Four

And ever since then…

Even though The Administration said: "I would like to see members of the PD team meet with the school cabinet from time to time so that they can learn more about the trends and needs that exist in our school. Map out a schedule in the beginning of this year, use the quality review and superintendent suggestions to guide their focus" (Administrative Survey, Q8);

And Ms. Gung Ho said: "I remember one day five years ago or so… We went to the American Indian Museum… While we didn't necessarily come back and teach Native American stuff, there is a camaraderie aspect to that, and [the students] sense that we intellectuals engage with new ideas" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 17). It would be great if we were able to go out of the building for PD, "maybe at least once a year… cause you get reinvented a little bit… you can bring these experiences back to the classroom. You can plan trips, virtual trips, just based on finally getting out of the building and seeing things you forgot about" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 3).

And Mr. On the Fence said: "I think we could all agree that we all want, we all like productivity. Just, doing things that are gonna be purposeful, and you know, just, maybe it's the choice that gives us that" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 6). I would also appreciate "some laid-back team building activities that don't specifically have anything to do with teaching. I just want to get to know people I work with. Because we're professionals, we'll find ways to discuss our students and help each other help them-- but there needs to be the ice-

breaker and the element of trust that a well-run team-building activity can provide" (June

Teacher Focus Group, p. 17).

Ms. Disgruntled: It seems that PDs at our school are only "focusing on what's expected" from

the DOE or the superintendent. "…it's like the dance, and this is what we need to do" (June

Teacher Focus Group, Q5); whether we agree with them or benefit from any of the PDs is hardly

a consideration. I do recognize that the PD team is doing their best and I think they are

"wonderful human beings whom I deeply respect and care for" (1st Pre-survey of the school

year, Q4). It's the DOE and the administration that I find questionable.

The New Team Member: The hardest part of being on the team for me this year was dealing

with rude colleagues. I still can't get over how flat-out nasty some of the teachers were to me! I

don't know if I'll ever be able to look at some of those people in the face. And if I stay on the PD

team, I hope they won't be in a room where I am facilitating.

"I do think that we did a great job, despite the fact that yes, maybe we have some

colleagues that weren't that nice, I guess it's going to happen anywhere, but it's nice to have a

community where you can feel like you're part of something, and you're doing something good

for the school" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 5)."You can always talk about our struggles and our

problems, and things that work in our classrooms and things that don't. So it's kind of a support

system, and it feels nice to be part of something throughout the day. Like you know, something

to look forward to" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 5).

The Veteran Team Member: I think being unfamiliar with the PD topic can cause a lot of

stress on us. We are teachers ourselves, not experts in bureaucratic mandates, yet we have to

quickly learn, understand, and design PD so our colleagues can become familiar with ever-

changing educational expectations. Maybe if we had "a professor who was proficient in [a given

topic] it would've been a lot easier, because we were just kind of going off what we already

know. If we had someone to tell us, 'All right, this is what you do, this is how you do it,' it might

have been a little bit easier" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 2). That's why the administration should

really be the ones giving certain PDs, especially regarding Danielson, because "The APs are the

most knowledgeable and trained on the observation tool" (Dissertation Participation Journal,

June 4th PD Feedback).

Also,"it would be nice to know our role, because in an activity where we have to have a

group participation and [teachers] don't want to participate… what do I do? Do I let [the

teachers] not be a part of [the PD] and then the feedback be like, 'You didn't involve me'?" (PD

Team Focus Group, p. 10). "As a school PD member, and as the DOE mandates, you have to be

part of PD, right? So who's enforcing that? I can't enforce that; I'm just your colleague. Who's

enforcing that? It needs to be done" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 11).

And The Team said: "I think there should be a clear set of expectations and outcomes for the

PD team in advance so the PD team knows the direction they are headed towards" (PD Team

Absentee Focus Group, Q9). And that plan should be adhered to for the rest of the year,

regardless of what type of feedback we get from a superintendent visit or a quality review, or any

other of the powers that be who happen to come to our site.

Also, why can't we go out of the building for PD?! Teachers (like me!) really want the

opportunity to go to a museum or hear a book talk to be inspired and find new material for

lessons. And what about PD that has nothing to do with instruction, like a pick-up basketball

game or a Trivia competition? Wouldn't it help us as a staff if we got to participate in these

activities together? I don't think these are unreasonable PD requests, and I know they do these

kinds of things for PD at my friend's school. I think our jobs would be a lot easier if we were actually able to respond to teacher needs and requests throughout the school year.

And The Team Leader said: It was not only frustrating, but also really surprising when the principal forgot to include me in the last instructional cabinet meeting, especially when she seemed "happy to provide me with the opportunity… but most concerned about when we could actually get all the instructional admin together, and when I told her I could come in once school was officially over also, she set a date with me" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 68). It seems odd to me that after all the work the team did and how much our work should be connected to the instructional cabinet's expectations, the principal wouldn't want to make it a point to enable us to formally communicate and discuss PD.

After that, I guess I shouldn't have been too surprised when I had "only received two responses... from the APs as of 4pm Monday" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 68) when I emailed them five days prior asking them to have the nine question survey complete by Monday. It kind of seems like if the principal didn't want to make communicating with me a priority, why would the other administrators? Additionally, even though there are so many teachers in the building and it would be very difficult to meet all their needs or address all their feedback, it would also be nice if we had more power in deciding how to design the PD so we really give teachers what they need, like "tech training" or a "PD on classroom management" (teacher surveys). If I ever get the chance to sit down with the administration, I think I would recommend "that the school no longer have a PD team… the administration clearly has an idea what and how PD should be given, so they should just provide it so teachers really take it in as what they HAVE to do" (Dissertation Participation Journal, p. 33). With all that being said though, I somehow think I'll find myself right back in the same position next year.

Epilogue

… and while we wish it could have been different, everything in the year to follow was indeed the same. The DOE continued to follow a top-down structure, and, therefore, so did PD. While administrators wanted to allow for professional development opportunities their staff members found meaningful, they often could not because they could not justify it to His Holiness, whether from city or state. Teachers continued to participate in school-wide PD because, well, participation was required, whether they loved it, tolerated it, or loathed it and lashed out. And the teacher leaders continued to support each other in planning and implementing professional development, regardless of the stress and conflict, and whether their colleagues liked it or not.

Perhaps another story at another site with another cast of characters under another bureaucracy would be different. But we would have to hear another story to find out...

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

One goal of a performative piece is to enable us to immerse ourselves in a social science story so we can understand the experiences and perspectives of all participants. The goal of the performative piece presented in this dissertation was to help the reader understand how teacher leaders at a large urban high school navigated the challenges of planning and implementing professional development over the course of one school year, as well as the PD experiences of the instructional staff and administration at the site. The next step is to explore what can be learned from this performance, especially as it relates to the literature on teacher leadership and professional development.

I begin the discussion with an examination of the themes present in the data as they relate to research on teacher leadership and professional development. Because this is a nontraditional dissertation and I presented the data in the form of a performance in chapter four, I utilize quotations from both the original data and the performance to support and explain the themes in this chapter. After presenting a summary of those themes, I conclude with implications for practice, policy, and future research.

Support

The literature indicates that collaboration and instruction are at the forefront of teacher leadership activities in the third wave (Boles & Troen, 1994; Collay, 2013; Crowther, 1997; Danielson, 2005; Danielson, 2006; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Fay, 1992; Read & Hoff, 2005; Spillane et al., 2003; Troen & Boles, 1994; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Working collaboratively to share instructional strategies with each other and staff members was built into the PD team at the site. However, findings from this performative study indicate that in collaborating to develop

school-wide PD, teacher leaders on the team also found a support system in their fellow team

members. One new team member shared,

> "...it's nice to have a community where you can feel like you're part of something, and
>
> you're doing something good for the school. You can always talk about our struggles and
>
> our problems, and things that work in our classrooms and things that don't. So it's kind of
>
> a support system, and it feels nice to be part of something throughout the day. Like you
>
> know, something to look forward to" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 6).

A veteran team member revealed a similar perspective about the support she received from her

fellow PD teacher leaders as colleagues and friends when she said, "The team is made up of a

great group of people and it's nice to be able to have collegial conversations AND feel like these

are my friends. We help each other out" (Performance, p. 66).

As the team leader, I also felt supported from my fellow teacher leaders, especially

during some of the most stressful times during the study. I noted in my Participation Observation

Journal the day a "team member walked in the room and saw me massaging my forehead slightly

as I was waiting for everyone to come in and settle down, [and he] told me not to worry, that

they would help me handle everything" (Dissertation Participation Journal, 5/28 PD Team

Meeting). This study adds to the literature on third wave teacher leadership to show that while

while collaborating on instruction (Boles & Troen, 1994; Collay, 2013; Crowther, 1997;

Danielson, 2005; Danielson, 2006; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Fay, 1992; Read & Hoff, 2005;

Spillane et al., 2003; Troen & Boles, 1994; York-Barr & Duke, 2004), third wave teacher leaders

can develop and benefit from a collegial support system among their fellow teacher leaders in

dealing with any stress associated with their roles.

Stress: Causes and Effects

One cause for stress for the PD team was operating within a bureaucratic education system. The literature identifies the ability for teachers in the third wave to assume leadership responsibilities beyond the classroom without being granted formal positions (Collay, 2013; Danielson, 2005; Danielson, 2006; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Silva et al., 2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004) as a step towards breaking traditional educational boundaries (Troen & Boles, 1993; Tyack, 1976; Tyack & Hansot, 1986). However, the New York City Department of Education still follows a top-down bureaucratic structure. Following that top-down structure, the PD team answered to the administration, but the administration was also subject to the demands and expectations of city and state higher ups. Therefore, while the team was given and developed a particular PD plan based on directives, expectations, and freedom from the administration, a visit from a state liaison or the district superintendent, to whom the administration answers, could change that, and cause insurmountable stress.

Sometimes the stress of operating within a bureaucracy can be so immense that it actually breaks down the collegial support system teacher leaders provide for each other. When a visit from the superintendent drastically changed the PD plan quite close to the final professional development session of the year, the team found themselves at their weekly meeting frantically re-planning and preparing materials for the next PD, and "quibbling over semantics regarding the June 4th agenda" (Dissertation Participation Journal, 5/28 PD Team Meeting). As the team leader I even found myself "cursing as I tried to explain how I thought some words [in the revised PD plan] could be interpreted" (Dissertation Participation Journal, 5/28 PD Team Meeting), possibly offending a veteran team member, and feeling as if I had to apologize later. Although team members relied on each other for support in dealing with the consequences of

working within a bureaucracy, the same bureaucracy managed to to cause conflict within the team.

Conflict

Having undefined roles within a bureaucratic system, may have been cause for conflict for PD team members. The fact that teacher leaders' roles in the third wave develop organically and are often undefined (Danielson, 2005; Danielson, 2006; Spillane et al., 2003; Wasley, 1992) seemed to be praised in the literature in contrast to the clearly defined managerial-type positions of teacher leaders in the first and second waves (Collay, 2013; Fairman & Mackenzie, 2014; Nazareno, 2013; Silva et al., 2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, findings indicate that their loosely defined roles may have hampered the professional development leadership efforts of team members at the site and caused conflict not only within the team, but also with colleagues and the administration.

Having a loosely defined position caused conflict for me at times during team meetings. Although I knew my role and responsibilities because I had experience on the team for many years, I was never officially awarded the title 'PD team leader.' Therefore, I was sometimes uncomfortable asserting authority during team meetings. I felt like I didn't want to "seem like the overbearing PD boss, especially because [the team members were] my peers as far as teaching is concerned" (Dissertation Participation Journal, 3/12 PD Team Meeting). At times I felt like I had no formal authority as the team leader. I noted in my Dissertation Participation Journal the day a new team member fell asleep during one of the meetings. I wrote,

> "This was a few minute joke between the team… until a few of the guys from the
>
> building caught sight of this team member [who they are friendly with] and began
>
> gawking and laughing at him. They put lotion on his hand, a carrot in his ear, and began

taking pictures of him. It was funny for him but also embarrassing for the team- it seemed

as if we were getting paid to do nothing. I wanted to wake him because I thought it

looked badly on the team and me, but I also wanted him to be a little embarrassed- he

was clearly using his time to be a joke. I felt in a weird place because I'm the team

leader, but I also didn't want to seem overbearing. I feel very weird about the whole

thing" (Dissertation Participation Journal, 3/19 PD Team Meeting).

Perhaps if I felt more like I had a supervisory role than I would have been more apt to speak up

and assert control during occasions that called for authority.

Operating as teacher leaders without formal positions and definitive authority also caused

conflict between team members and colleagues. The research on teacher leadership suggests that

disparities in instructional viewpoints between teacher leaders and their colleagues can cause

staff members to be uncooperative, impede the work of teacher leaders, and create general

conflict (Barth, 2001; Fay, 1992; Read & Hoff, 2005; Silva et al., 2000). However, evidence

from this study indicates that a lack of respect for the roles and responsibilities of informal

teacher leaders on the PD team actually caused dissention among staff members during

professional development sessions. A veteran team member highlighted the conflict and

dissention from colleagues she experienced during PD somewhat explicitly when she said, "...it

would be nice to know our role, because in an activity where we have to have a group

participation and [teachers] don't want to participate… what do I do? (PD Team Focus Group, p.

12). She went on to underscore her frustration at holding an undefined leadership position by

saying, "as the DOE mandates, [teachers] have to be part of PD, right? So who's enforcing that?

I can't enforce that; I'm just [a] colleague. Who's enforcing that?" (PD Team Focus Group,

p.12).

A veteran team member described how uncooperative some colleagues behaved during a professional development session when she said that the teachers were "very adamant about entering PD already with the mentality of 'I'm not going to use this. This is no use for me. Why do I need to be here?'" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 2). A new team member complained about her colleagues' resistance during one of the professional development sessions by saying, teachers "came in with a very negative attitude and basically did not want to participate in any of the activities… At some point I had to stop PD because teachers were being disrespectful and loud… and one of the teachers told us, 'It is not our job to reprimand teachers'" (Field Notes, June 4th PD Feedback). Although administrators in the building had directly communicated to staff members that they should be respectful and compliant during PD sessions, teachers knew team members had no power to punish them for noncompliance, and, as a result, were often unafraid to act-out. In turn, PD team members often found themselves disrespected and uneasy about asserting themselves during school-wide professional development.

Perhaps team members may have been more comfortable asserting themselves as professional development leaders in the building if they were confident their positions were acknowledged by the administration. Teacher leaders in the previous research often felt their work was threatened and impeded by administrative supervisors (Barth, 2001; Silva et al., 2000). Conversely, one administrator in this study stated that the PD team's job was to "understand the pulse of what the teachers want in terms of development" (Administrative Survey, Q1). Another administrator described working "between the supervisors and the teachers in trying to offer valuable PD to all members of the school" as the the team's role (Administrative Survey, Q1). However, conflict with the administration seemed to stem from discrepancies in communication about team members' roles. What was communicated to us about our roles did not seem to aline

with what the administration expected. In fact, what was *not* being stated about our roles seemed to communicate a great deal more than what was directly stated.

Unspoken Messages

One unspoken message the team received from the administration was that they did not really have power in the design of professional development. Administrators stated that, "The PD team's major role is to find out what the needs are for the school and work between the supervisors and the teachers in trying to offer valuable PD to all members of the school" (Administrative Survey, Q1), while taking "the feedback from our QR as well as our superintendent visit and [creating] PDs around assisting us to reach our goals in addressing our weak points" (Administrative Survey, Q1a). And the administration did indeed give the team freedom to reach the stated goals for the first two PD sessions of the school year. However, when the administration received and had to address negative feedback from a superintendent visit, the team completely lost a say in the design of the final professional development session of the year. Subsequently, while the message about how limited our actually power was in the design of school-wide PD was not directly stated, it was undoubtedly understood.

Although we had already spent weeks planning the agenda and logistics of the June 4th PD, the team was given specific instructions on how the session should be reformatted. We were told that we had to use the June 4th PD to help "determine what engagement means, and what constitutes highly effective and effective planning and instruction under this component" (Field Notes, Meeting with Administration). We were also told that the way in which should reach the newly assigned goal of the June 4th PD was to "Elicit from the team about what engagement means, how it is done in each class, [and] do this exercise with the team to come up with those meanings in the school, then do the same exercise with teachers" (Field Notes, Meeting with

Administration). Indirectly, the message the team received from the administration's instructions was that we were not capable of designing a PD on engagement that could help us address the superintendent's feedback. As already stated though, the administration was subject to the top-down educational bureaucracy just as we were all were; therefore, messages about PD and the team were a result of that system.

Another unspoken message from the bureaucratic system was that team members' time was not valued. Many teachers in the literature were reluctant to assume leadership positions because it was often added on to the work they were already responsible for and they just did not have the time (Barth, 2001; Fay, 1992). Conversely, during the study, team members at the site were not only given extra time outside the school day to meet and prepare for school-wide PD, they were also compensated for those hours. However, when they were required to reformat the June 4th PD and scrap weeks of planning and preparation, the message received was that the team's time and work was both unacceptable and undervalued. But team members were not the only ones in the building to feel that those designing in-house PD were inconsiderate of their time.

Design of PD

Teachers in the building also felt as if their time was not considered in the bureaucratic PD structure. Many teachers felt that it was illogical to have pedagogically-based PD sessions at the end of the school year because there was no time for follow-up. When discussing the final professional development session, a veteran team member shared that the teachers "were venting and angry that they are always receiving things to do in the June PD when there is no time to turn-key or receive more information or elaborate" (Field Notes, June 4th PD Feedback).

Similarly, a disgruntled teacher asked, "What is the point of learning a new strategy if we have no time to implement it?" (February Teacher Focus Group, p. 5).

Other teachers felt that professional development time could be used more productively. One teacher stated, "We need to have a cohesive curriculum in place but we are not given time to collaborate and plan with colleagues" (February 2nd Teacher Feedback, Q3). Another teacher gripped about "time to assess [the] overwhelming amount of students [and] give them the proper attention" (1st Pre-Survey of the School Year).

Worse still than their time being disrespected, teachers felt the bureaucratic PD structure did not respect them as professionals. Teachers felt that they were often being asked to engage in professional development that undermined their knowledge and abilities. When asked about a PD experience he did not enjoy, one teacher spoke for himself and his colleagues when he said, "we don't want our intelligence to be insulted or our professionalism to be insulted… [like] if you're [learning] something that you already know and… it's being presented to you as if you don't know it, as if you're brand new, as if you don't already bring something to the table" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 4). At the site, seasoned teachers, especially, did not feel that they needed to be taught how to teach, or be exposed to the same pedagogical strategy or educational theory repeatedly in PD. One seasoned teacher's reaction to the June 4th PD- "how many times are we going to look at a handout of the Danielson rubric...? I mean, we don't need to see it again. We all know the Danielson rubric, we all teach by the Danielson rubric, to whatever extent. And, this sort of PD really doesn't work" (February 2nd Teacher Focus Group, p. 4).

Many teachers at the site are opposed to the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013), as an evaluative or teaching tool; therefore, teachers became very upset when they were forced to

engage in PD that promoted Danielson (2013). Another seasoned teacher stated, "We believe that many [teaching methods] can be effective depending on the class and ways presented, and yet we were forced to [engage in a PD activity that asked us to] artificially [categorize teaching strategies] where Danielson wants [them]. It just kind of highlighted the way that a certain percentage of people in our profession, I think probably a high percentage, think the Danielson rubric is trying to make us all the same and not recognizing that there are many ways to [teach] well" (June Teacher Focus Group, p. 14). Forcing them to engage in professional development that went against their pedagogical beliefs negatively affected teachers' PD satisfaction.

Gauging PD Satisfaction

Although many of the their open-ended responses indicated that they were unhappy with the content of PD, teachers' satisfaction with professional development at the site was deceiving. Research on effective PD indicates that many teachers are dissatisfied with the PD in which they are engaging (Bayar, 2014; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014; Hursen, 2011; McFarlane, 2012; Nir & Bogler, 2007; Torff & Sessions, 2008), especially that which they are *required* to attend (Bayar, 2014; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014). Interestingly, while teachers at the site were required to engage in school-wide professional development, questions directly related to PD satisfaction indicated teachers at the site felt otherwise.

When asked a close-ended question about how satisfied they are with the PD the team has been providing, 58 out of the 93 teaches who responded to the first electronic survey of the school year said they were very satisfied or satisfied. Similarly, although only 16 teachers responded to the electronic pre-survey in June, 13 of these teachers said they were very satisfied or satisfied with the PD provided by the team. It seemed odd then, but was very common, for teachers to "'joke' with [team members] about how much they are dreading going to our next

PD" (Performance, p. 78), and demonstrate "negative attitudes and flat-out rude behavior…

during PD…[and be] blatantly disrespectful" (Performance, p. 64).

Discrepancies between their self-reported vs. observed behaviors indicate that collecting

responses to questions related to satisfaction alone may not be enough to gauge teachers'

satisfaction with the school-wide professional development. Rather than thinking about

individual teachers' perceptions in relation to PD satisfaction, as is found in the literature (Bayar,

2014; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014), we can analyze what I am calling *PD morale*.

PD Morale

I define PD morale as the general attitude teachers have about professional development,

demonstrated in their comments, demeanor, actions, interactions, and overall attitude before,

during, and after they participate in PD. While individual teachers may have varying levels of

satisfaction with school-wide professional development, these outlooks combined result in an

overall feeling, and, consequently, general actions, which constitute PD morale. PD morale in a

building manifests itself in the way, overall, teachers talk about attending school-wide PD, the

way teachers enter a room for professional development, how punctual they are, and where they

sit. PD morale is apparent in the way teachers participate in professional development sessions,

how engaged they are, how they react and respond to facilitators' directions and requests, and the

content of their reactions and responses. We can assess PD morale by paying attention to how

teachers discuss a PD session, before and after, in the cafeteria, resource room, or lounge, their

facial expressions and body language during discussions about PD, and the content of their

comments to colleagues, administrators, and friends.

While satisfaction levels pertain to the individual, PD morale pertains to the whole group,

and can result from the way individual teachers influence each other, other groups of teachers,

and the way groups of teachers influence the whole school. Although one teacher may report that she is satisfied with in-house PD, she may agree with her colleagues that she would rather be doing other work rather than attending professional development after hearing them complain about what a waste of time a session is sure to be. While they may enter a PD session willing to participate, seeing their colleagues disrespect the facilitator or process may cause another group of teachers to also become obstinate or merely disengage.

More so than just calculating how satisfied teachers say they are on feedback forms, we can note informal comments and observe teachers' actions and attitudes before, during, and after professional development sessions to gauge their PD morale. It is important to note that just because teachers exhibit low PD morale does not necessarily mean that the professional development they are engaging is bad. However, identifying low PD morale could be a starting point in assessing the pros and cons of a professional development program. Additionally, when teachers report they are satisfied with PD because they like or respect the facilitator (Bayar, 2007; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014), or their needs were taken into consideration in the design of professional development (Bayar, 2007; Bayar & Kosterelioglu, 2014), especially if those needs are merely snacks and bathroom breaks, we can look to other indicators to more accurately assess teachers' morale related to PD.

Discussion Summary

Low PD morale at the site was directly related to the bureaucratic structure of professional development. During the study, the PD team followed a third wave teacher leadership model- the team leaders and members volunteered to develop and facilitate school-wide professional development, and they were given the freedom from the administration to do so. However, regardless of the PD structure in place, the site operates within the bureaucracy of

the NYC Department of Education. Thus, changes in bureaucratic mandates and expectations

caused changes to the school's PD model, and, subsequently, conflict and stress within the team

and low PD morale among the staff.

Relying upon the support system they developed was often one of the only things that

helped the team counteract the bureaucratic structure and culture embedded in the site.

Regardless of their beliefs in the team's ability to design professional development that would

meet the needs of the school and staff alike, administrators reassumed control of the PD plan

when addressing feedback from their superiors no matter how it infringed upon team members'

and teachers' time. Unspoken messages about the limited power of third wave teacher leaders

outweighed their roles as PD developers, so much so that their colleagues thought it acceptable

to act out their qualms with a top down PD structure by being blatantly disrespectful during

professional development sessions. Although stress from and conflict with the administration and

staff caused tension among the team, the friendships and collegial camaraderie they formed

propelled the majority of team members to agree to work on the team for yet another year.

Reviewing the performance and data within this dissertation can help us understand the

challenges faced by a PD team in providing high quality professional development in a large

urban high school, including areas for improvement, and implications for policy, practice, and

future research.

Implications

Denzin (2013) posits that rather than following traditional methods of design, technique,

and analysis, qualitative researchers can utilize a performative approach that can perhaps

promote change. The following are implications from this performative study that can possibly

promote change in schools with similar types of third wave professional development teams that exist within a bureaucracy.

Implications for Practice

Teacher leaders who opt to be professional development leaders at their large high schools within an even larger bureaucracy should expect to deal with conflict and stress. As seen in the performance, they must often deal with backlash from colleagues who are frustrated with required professional development based on top-down expectations and demands. To mitigate some of the PD dissension from staff members, team members can include certain components in the design of professional development sessions.

Data from this study indicates that staff members were less resistant to PD when their basic needs were met. For instance, teachers at the site acknowledged how pleasant it was to have music and refreshments provided when they entered a professional development session. Additionally, they were happy to have bathroom breaks built into the agenda, which had not been the case in the past. Although refreshments and bathroom breaks may seem frivolous, they made PD participants at the site feel comfortable, appreciated, and more willing to participate, and, therefore, should be included in the design of professional development.

Data from this study also revealed that teachers' content areas should be considered when designing professional development. Teaches at the site were much more engaged and enthusiastic when PD sessions were relevant to their specific content areas. Similarly, teachers felt like the ability to see what their content-colleagues are doing with their classes was a beneficial and productive way to spend PD sessions. Because providing opportunities for teachers to share best practices with their content colleagues can be enlightening and rewarding for participants, it should considered when designing PD.

Choice should also be a consideration in the design of professional development sessions. Data from the study indicated that teachers found value in the ability to choose PD that was directly related to their needs. During their second focus group, teachers identified choice in professional development sessions, including those that were based in training using a classroom tech tool, as their favorite. Teachers also noted their need for and desire to engage in team building PD activities. They felt that they would be more comfortable discussing students and instruction once they developed trust. Additionally, they discussed how going elsewhere for PD, especially to museums, was enjoyable and enlightening. Even if administrators find it hard to see how practical, team building, or PD sessions outside the building help staff members reach their goals, teaches recognize that their work improves when they can choose these types of PD sessions. Therefore, if PD providers allow teachers opportunities to choose how they are being developed professionally, they may find their staff members are much more willing and engaged in PD.

Implications for Policy

Administrators working within a bureaucracy like the NYC DOE are subject to top-down demands. As seen in the performance, meeting the often immediate demands and expectations of their bureaucratic superiors can force administrators to alter and even override the school-wide systems they have in place. While the administration saw it in the school's best interest to change the PD plan during the study to be in good standing with the district, it was not in the best interest of effectively developing teachers.

In addition to causing the team insurmountable stress in replanning, changing the design of the final professional development session of the year only a couple of weeks prior caused teachers to be confused and detached from the PD focus. When discussing her experience with

colleagues from her department during the June 4th PD, one team member stated, "it destructed the whole flow of the year, that we created off their feedback" (PD Team Focus Group, p. 16). Because teachers had become accustomed to a particular PD structure all year, it was disjointing to suddenly experience a completely different type of professional development session at the very end of school year. Additionally, with little planning time, team members were unable to ensure that teachers were grouped with their content colleagues to garner the most benefit from a discussion of the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013) for evaluating student engagement in particular subjects. In reflecting on the June 4th PD, one teacher stated, "I feel like I would benefit much more from opportunities to explore my subject so I can bring more to my teaching than just these general DOE informational PDs... so to me it lacked the focus on each discipline, and how each subject could possibly use it" (June Teacher Focus Group, p.14).

If the design of professional development is rushed and a PD session is conducted at an inopportune time, teachers may benefit very little, if at all. Therefore, even when given feedback from educational higher-ups that must be immediately addressed, administrators should look to other opportunities rather than disrupting a set school-wide PD plan, such as during department meetings or scheduled teacher-team time. It should also be noted that changing a professional development plan relatively last minute could indeed be appropriate and effective if developers believe that it will be of greater benefit to participants than the original plan. However, PD developers would actually have to be considered and questioned to make an appropriate decision.

It would also be beneficial if administrators who opt to have teacher-led professional development teams, or other third-wave-type teacher teams, regularly communicate with the teacher leaders involved. In the case of the site in this study, perhaps the administration would have decided against changing the final PD plan of the year had they conferred with the team

about the pros and cons. Though, unfortunately, regular conferencing and communication between administrators and team members was not the norm.

Although they met with the PD team weekly when it was run by a UFT point person, a lack of communication between the administration and the team was common during this study. As team leader, I met with the administrative cabinet periodically to gather information that I would turn-key to the team, or vice versa. However, there was never any time set for team members and administrators to come together to discuss school-wide professional development. It was even difficult to find time to conduct a focus group with administrators at the end of the school year to gather feedback for both my dissertation and leading in the team in the following school year. Although I volunteered to come in after school hours once the semester had ended, the principal forgot about our meeting and I was forced to send administrators an online survey rather than discuss PD at our site face-to-face.

If the team actually had opportunities for face-to-face communication with them, perhaps administrators would have also been aware of team members' need for professional development. During their focus group, team members discussed the stress they experienced in being expected to become experts on the engagement component of the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013) for the June 4th PD, and facilitate as such. One new team member was so nervous about presenting herself as an expert in Danielson, she stated during a team meeting she was uncertain if she would even participate in the June 4th PD. Perhaps team members would have been less stressed and doubtful about facilitating the June 4th PD if they had been given explicit instruction on the engagement component of the Danielson Framework.

Because the change to the PD plan was so last minute, providing time for professional development for team members may not have been feasible. Therefore, perhaps it would it be

most feasible for administrators themselves to facilitate certain professional development

sessions, even when there is a PD team on site, especially when they are the experts on a specific

topic. While taking the control over the design AND facilitation of the last professional

development session and giving it to administrators may have eliminated some stress and strife

from the teaches leaders in this study, whether staff members would have been any more

receptive to the top-down design of the June 4th PD remains unknown.

Implications for Future Research

The performance ends with the notion that the story of a different set of third wave

teacher leaders providing professional development at a different site might indeed be different,

even under the same bureaucratic system. Perhaps the conflicts and stress the team experienced,

as well as the support they found in each other was unique to this team. And perhaps the

experiences of the staff and administration would have been different even under similar

circumstances.

Right now, there is very little research on teacher leaders, specifically professional

development teams in large urban high schools, and almost no performative social science

projects on this topic. To find out whether the story of teacher leaders and professional

development in a bureaucracy is unique to this site, and how other stories might be similar or

different elsewhere, more qualitative and performative social science studies like this one should

be conducted.

REFERENCES

Adams, K. (2013, June 5). *Back to the story spine.* Retrieved from

      http://www.aerogrammestudio.com/2013/06/05/back-to-the-story-spine/

Baker, A. (2013, February 28). *New State Academic Standards Are Said to Require $56 Million*

      Outlay for City's Schools. Retrieved from

      http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/01/education/new-york-schools-detail-cost-of-meeting-

      new-standards.html

Barth, R. S. (2001, February). Teacher Leader. Phi Delta Kappan, 443-449.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry,*

      evolution, and epistemology. San Francisco: Chandler Pub. Co.

Bayar, A. (2014). The components of effective professional development activities in terms of

      teachers' perspective. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *6*(2), 319-

      329. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2014.02.006

Bayar, A., & Kosterelioglu, I. (2014). Satisfaction level of teachers in professional development

      activities in turkey. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature, and History*

      of Turkish or Turkic, *9*(2), 321-333.

Berry, B., Byrd, A., & Wieder, A. (2013). *Teacher Preneurs: Innovative Teachers Who Lead But*

      Don't Leave. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (2003). An introduction to the arts and narrative research: Art as

      Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9(4)*, 506-514. doi:10. 1177/1077800403254394

Boles, K., & Troen, V. (1994). Teacher leadership in a professional development school

      (pp. 1-29).

Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Relational aesthetics*. Dijon: Les Presses du réel.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher

      learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & C. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of research in*

      education (pp. 249–305). New York, NY: Sage.

Collay, M. (2013, October). Teaching is Leading. Educational Leadership, 72-76.

Common Core State Standards Initiative (2017). *Development Process*. Retrieved from

      http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/

Conquergood, D. (1985). Performing as a moral act: Ethical dimensions of the ethnography of

      performance. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 5(2)*, 1-13.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*

      approaches (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Crowther, F. (1997). Teachers as leaders: An exploratory framework. *The International Journal*

      of Educational Management, 11(1), 6-13. Retrieved from

      http://search.proquest.com/docview/229204018?accountid=13626

Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890-*

      1990. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2008). *The reflective educators guide to professional*

      development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Danielson, C. (2005). What is teacher leadership? In *Teacher Leadership that Strengthens*

      Professional Practice (pp. 12-27). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Danielson, C. (2006). *Teacher Leadership that Strengthens Professional Practice*. Alexandria,

      VA: ASCD.

Danielson, C. (2013). *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument: 2013 Instructionally Focused Edition* (pp. 1-45). Retrieved from http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/practicerubrics/Docs/danielson-teacher-rubric-2013-instructionally-focused.pdf

Denzin, N. K. (2001). The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research, 1(1)*, 23-46. Retrieved February 11, 2016.

Denzin, N. K. (2002). *Interpretive Interactionism.* London: Sage

Denzin, N. K. (2013). Performing methodologies. *Qualitative Social Work, 12(4),* 389-394.

Dieker, L. A., Lane, H. B., Allsopp, D. H., O'Brien, C., Butler, T. W., Kyger, M., Lovin, L., & Fenty, N. S. (2009). Evaluating video models of evidence-based instructional practices to enhance teacher learning. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 32*(2), 180-196. doi: 10.1177/0888406409334202.

Dingle, M. P., Brownell, M. T., Leko, M. M., Boardman, A. G., & Haager, D. (2011). Developing effective special education reading teachers: The influence of professional development, context, and individual qualities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 34*(1), 87-103.

Eberta-May, D., Derting, T. L., Hodder, J., Momsen, J. L., Long, T. M., & Jardeleza, S. E. (2011). What we say is not what we do: Effective evaluation of faculty professional development programs. *Bioscience, 61*(7), 550-558. doi: 10.1525/bio.2011.61.7.0

Estrella, K., & Forinash, M. (2007). Narrative inquiry and arts-based inquiry: Multinarrative perspectives. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 47(3)*, 376-383. doi:10.1177/0022167807301898

Fairman, J. C., & Mackenzie, S. V. (2014, April 15). How teacher leaders influence others and understand their leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 18(1)*, 61-87. doi:10.1080/13603124.2014.904002

Fay, C. (1992). Empowerment through leadership: In the teacher's voice. In C. Livingston & R. M. McClure (Eds.), *Teachers as Leaders: Evolving Roles* (pp. 57-90). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Gabriel, R., & Lester, J. N. (Eds.). (2013). *Performances of Research: Critical Issues in K-12 Education.* New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Garet M. S., Porter A. C., Desimone L., Birman B. F., & Yoon K. S. (2001). What makes PD effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 915–946.

Geertz, C. (1980). Blurred genres: The refiguration of social thought. *The American Scholar, 49*, 165-182.

Gergen, M. M., & Gergen, K. J. (2011). Performative Social Science and Psychology. *Historical Social Research, 36(4)*, 138th ser., 291-299. doi:128.6.218.72

Gergen, M. M., & Gergen, K. J. (2012). *Playing with Purpose: Adventures in performative social science.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Cress Press.

Gilligan, C., Spencer, R., Weinberg, M. K., Bertsch, T., Camic, P. M., Rhodes, J. E., & Yardley, L. (2003). *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design, (pp. 157-172).* Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Guskey, T. R. (1999, April 1) *Evaluating Professional Development.* American Educational Research Association. Montreal. Lecture.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development.

    Educational Leadership, 59(6), 45-51.

Guttenplan, D. D. (2011, July 10). Shunning the journals, scholar brings work on older gays to

    life in film. *New York Times*.

Hursen, C. A. (2011). Determine the attitudes of teachers towards professional development

    activities. *Procedia Technology, 1*, 420-425. doi: 10.1016/j.protcy.2012.02.094

Jones, K. (2012). Connecting Research with Communities through Performative Social Science.

    The Qualitative Report, 17, 1-8. Retrieved from

    http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/jones.pdf

Lutrick, E., & Szabo, S. (2012). Instructional leaders' beliefs about effective professional

    development. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 78*(3), 13-22.

MacFarlane, B. (2012). Differentiating teacher professional development with design.

    Understanding Our Gifted, *24*(2), 9-14.

Mead, R. (2015, March 11). When a Teacher's Job Depend on a Child's Test Scores. *The New

    Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/when-a-

    teachers-job-depends-on-a-childs-test

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (1st ed.). San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., Caffarella, R. S., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood*. San Francisco,

    CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moreno, R., & Ortegano-Layne, L. (2008). Do classroom exemplars promote the application of

    principles in teacher education? A comparison of videos, animations, and narratives.

    Education Technology Research and Development, 56, 449-465.

National School Reform Faculty. (2014). Resources. Retrieved from

http://www.nsrfharmony.org/free-resources

Nazareno, L., Byrd, A., & Wieder, A. (2013). Advocating for a bold brand of teacher leadership. In B. Barnett (Author), *Teacher Preneurs: Innovative Teachers Who Lead but Don't Leave* (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Nir, A. E., & Bogler, R. (2007). The antecedents of teacher satisfaction with professional development programs. *Science Direct: Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 377-386. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2007.03.002

Taylor, K. (2014, October 1). New York Schools Chancellor Replaces 8 Superintendents. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/22/nyregion/in-shake-up-new-york-schools-chief-changes-8-superintendents.html

NY State Data. (2016). Retrieved from https://data.nysed.gov/

Petrie, K., & McGee, C. (2012). Teacher professional development: Who is the learner? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(2), 59-72.

Ravitch, D. (1983). *The troubled crusade: American education, 1945-1980.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Read, A., & Hoff, D. L. (2005). Clearwater: A Case Study in Curricular Innovation and School Reform. *UCEA Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 8 (1)*, pp. 6-17.

Reese, W. J. (2005). *America's public schools: From the common school to "no child left behind".* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Roberts, B. (2009). Performative social science: A consideration of skills, purpose, and context. *Historical Social Research, 34(1)*, 307-353. doi:128.6.218.72

Saldana, J. (2003). Dramatizing data: A primer. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9(2)*, 218-236. doi:10.1177/1077800402250932

Savin-Baden, M., & Van Niekerk, L. (2007). Narrative inquiry: Theory and practice. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 31(3)*, 459-472. doi:10.1080/03098260601071324

Schechner, R. (1983). Points of contact between anthropological and theatrical thought. *South Asian Anthropologist, 4(1)*, 9-30.

Shulman, L. S. & Shulman, J.H. (2004). How and what teachers learn: A shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36(2),* 257-271.

Silva, D. Y., Gimbert, B., & Nolan, J. (2000). Sliding the doors: Locking and unlocking possibilities for teacher leadership. *Teachers College Record, 102(4)*, 779-804.

Spillane, J. P., Hallet, T., & Diamond, J. B. (2003). Forms of capital and the construction of leadership: Instructional leadership in urban elementary school. *Sociology of Education, 76(1)*, 1-17. Retrieved July 27, 2016, from www.jstor.org/stable/3090258.

Steyn, G. M. (2005). Exploring factors that influence the effective implementation of professional development programs on invitational education. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice, 11*, 7-34.

Torff, B., & Sessions, D. (2008). Factors associated with teachers' attitudes about professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 123-133.

Troen, V., & Boles, K. (1993). Teacher leadership: How to make it more than a catch phrase. *Education Week, 13(9)*, 27-29.

Turner, V., & Turner, E. (1982). Performing ethnography. *The Drama Review: TDR, 26(2)*, 33-50. Retrieved June 6, 2016, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1145429

Tyack, D. B. (1976). Ways of seeing: An essay on the history of compulsory schooling. *Harvard Educational Review, 46(3)*, 355-389.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1986). Protest movements and social justice. In D. Tyack (Ed.), *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980 (*pp. 224-236*).* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Wasley, P. A. (1992). Working together: Teacher leadership and collaboration. In C. Livingston & R. M. McClure (Eds.), *Teachers as Leaders: Evolving Roles* (pp. 21-56). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Wells, J. G. (2007). Key design factors in durable instructional technology professional development. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 15*(1), 101-122.

Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 173-209.

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research, 74(3)*, 253-316. doi:10.3102/00346543074003255

APPENDIX A

FEBRUARY 2nd, 2015 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FOCUS: Learning strategies for student engagement

PURPOSE: PD provided by the PD team will enable teachers to become familiar with the
               Quality Review recommendations, and learn how to utilize a technology tool, as
               well as content-specific strategies, for classroom activities related to engagement.

<u>SCHEDULE</u>

1. **PD Orientation in Teacher's Cafeteria**   **1 - 1:15 PM**

   The orientation provides the opportunity for the team to review the Quality Review
   recommendations with all teachers. Additionally, it provides the opportunity for the team
   to inform teachers of the PD schedule for the afternoon, and reinforce the purpose of each
   session in helping teachers engage students.

2. **"Passing"**   **1:15 - 1:25 PM**

3. **Tech Training**   **1:25 - 2 PM**

   Teachers will be trained to use a technology tool of their choice, specifically as it relates
   to instruction and engagement.

   - *Skedula (Beg/Inter)*   - *Website Resource Review*
   - *Promethean Board Training*   - *Prezi*
   - *SESIS*   - *Math Calculator*
   - *Basic Computer Skills for PC*

Levels and Topics:

<u>Brand New User</u>

-Creating an account

-Learning the tabs

-Setting-up a grade book

-Creating assignments

-Messages

-Sending and receiving messages

-Writing anecdotal logs

Beginning-Intermediate User

-Setting-up a grade book: creating categories

-Registering students

-Writing multiple anecdotal logs

-Sending and receiving messages

-Setting averages (points/weights)

-Generating invitations

b. Promethean Training and Topics:

-Registering your computer

-Calibrating

-Creating flipcharts

-Downloading PowerPoint Presentations

-Utilizing PowerPoint Presentations

-Annotating over the desktop

-Configured (connecting laptops/desktops)

-Creating quizzes

-Online games

-Taking snapshots

-Finding/dragging/hiding pictures/objects

c. SESIS Training and Topics:

-Logging on

-Finding students

-Finding specific information on students

-Teacher anecdotal vs. psychological reports

-Testing accommodations

-Disability classification

d. Basic Computer Skills for PCs Training and Topics:

-Creating Word documents

-Inserting Images

-Basic Excel functions

-Using Shortcuts: cutting and pasting, printing properties, etc.)

-Projecting

-Basic PowerPoint Presentations

-Saving to a thumb drive

e. Website Resource Review:

-CCS online

-State Regents online

-Resources for Teachers

-Resources for Students

4. "Passing"   **2 - 2:10 PM**

5. Content-specific PD   **2:10 - 2:45 PM**

> PD team members will share and/or facilitate as their colleagues share content-specific strategies for engaging students.

- *Math*
- *English*
- *SS*
- *Science*
- *Music/Art*
- *ESL*
- *Foreign Language*
- *Phys. Ed*

- Content-specific PD entails the following:
  - Content-specific video on a learning strategy
  - Responding to video using a three question protocol
  - Facilitator shares-out a content-specific learning strategy, including unit/lesson plan, handouts/resources, and examples of student work
  - Responding to shared learning strategy using a three question protocol
  - Pre-determined staff members will share-out content-specific learning strategies, including unit/lesson plans, handouts/resources, and examples of student work
  - Staff members will respond to each learning strategy shared by their colleagues (immediately following each share-out) using a three question protocol

Three-Question Protocol for Reviewing and Responding to Learning Strategies

1. How did this activity or assignment promote in-depth student learning?

2. How were students able to demonstrate or explain their thinking?

3. Why would this strategy work for your students? If it wouldn't work, how could this strategy be modified to fit your students' needs?

6. Feedback Form   **2:45 - 2:50 PM**

APPENDIX B

JUNE 4th, 2015 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FOCUS: Engaging students in learning

PURPOSE: PD provided by the PD team will enable teachers to become familiar with the components and rubric of 3c from the Danielson Framework. Each session will foster teachers' understanding and ability to identify and create activities to engage their students in highly effective and effective learning under 3c.

SCHEDULE

Session 1: Understanding 3c: Engaging Students in Learning   **8:30-9:35**

(Interdisciplinary Meetings)

Teachers will have the opportunity to work in groups with colleagues from other departments to analyze the components and rubric of 3c from the Danielson Framework. Additionally, they will collaborate to determine where examples of learning strategies would fall under the 3c rubric. Facilitators will model an engagement strategy, as well as manage teacher collaboration and share-outs.

Passing   **9:35-9:45**

Session 2: Designing Engaging Instruction   **9:45-11:00**

(Content & Grade/Learning Level Meetings)

Teachers will have the opportunity to work in content and grade/learning-level teams to design strategies to effectively engage their students in learning as specified by 3c of the Danielson rubric. Because rooms will be comprised of groups of teachers from all disciplines, teachers will have the opportunity to share and assess strategies for engaging students in learning across content areas following a protocol for collegial discussion. Facilitators will model engagement strategies, as well as manage teacher collaboration and share-outs following a protocol for collegial discussion.

Two-Question Protocol for Discussing Engagement Techniques

1. What components of 3c were addressed using this technique?

2. What category do you think this technique would fall under 3c in the Danielson rubric and why?

APPENDIX C

Pre-survey

* Required

1. How satisfied are you with the PD the team has been providing? *

Mark only one oval

○ Very Satisfied
○ Satisfied
○ Somewhat satisfied
○ Unsatisfied
○ This is my first year in the school.

2. Please explain your level of satisfaction with the PD the team has been providing.

3. How much do you think the PD provided by the team has reflected your previous feedback? *

Mark only one oval

○ Very much
○ Somewhat
○ Not at all
○ This is my first year in the school.

4. Please identify the type of technology training you would be MOST interested in engaging in the upcoming PD session. *

Mark only one oval

○ Beginning Skedula
○ Promethean Board
○ SESIS
○ Basic Computer Skills for PCs
○ Website Resource Review

APPENDIX D

<u>**Feedback Survey**</u>

1. What did you think of the format of this PD? Please explain thoroughly.

2. To what extent do you think the format of this PD reflected your previous PD feedback?

Mark only one oval

○ Very much
○ Somewhat
○ Hardly at all

3. Please explain your response regarding the extent you think this PD reflected your previous PD feedback.

4. How do you think this PD could have been improved?

5. What would you like to see in the next PD provided by the team?

APPENDIX E

Follow-up Survey

* Required

1. To what extent did the last school-wide PD impact your instructional practices? *

Mark only one oval

○   A great deal
○   A fair amount
○   Somewhat
○   Hardly at all

2. Please explain your response regarding the extent you think the last school-wide PD impacted your instructional practices.

3. How satisfied were you with the design of the last school-wide PD? *

Mark only one oval

○   Very Satisfied
○   Satisfied
○   Somewhat Satisfied
○   Unsatisfied
○   This is my first year in the school.

4. Please explain your level of satisfaction with the design of the last school-wide PD? *

5. How much do you think the PD provided by the team this year has reflected your previous feedback? *

Mark only one oval

○   Very much
○   Somewhat

○   Not at all

6. Please explain why you think the PD provided by the team this year has reflected your previous feedback.

7. How satisfied are you with the PD the team has been providing overall? *

Mark only one oval

○   Very Satisfied
○   Satisfied
○   Somewhat satisfied
○   Unsatisfied

8. Please explain your level of satisfaction with the PD the team has been providing.

APPENDIX F

Administrator Survey

* Required

1. Explain what you believe to be the role of the PD team. *

1a. Explain how this is similar or different to the role of the PD team in the past.

2. Describe what you observed during the school-wide PD sessions provided by the team this school year. *

3. Tell me how you think PD provided by the team impacted the instructional practices of teachers in your department this year. *

4. Tell me how you think the team could more positively impact the instructional practices of teachers in your department. *

5. Describe the way teachers in your department talked about the school-wide PD sessions provided by the team this school year. *

6. In your opinion, how would you describe the PD morale (the overall satisfaction level with PD) among teachers in your department regarding the school-wide PD sessions provided by the team this school year? *

7. Tell me how you think the PD morale (the overall satisfaction level with PD) among teachers in your department regarding the school-wide PD sessions provided by the team could be improved. *

8. How do you think the administration and the team could work together to improve school-wide PD? *

9. Are there any other comments you would like to make? *

APPENDIX G

FEBRUARY 2015 TEACHER FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. What subject do you teach?
2. How many years have you been teaching?
3. What are your views on professional development in general?
4. Describe a professional development experience you really enjoyed.
5. Describe a professional development experience you did not enjoy.
6. How do you feel about engaging in PD at our school?
7. How do your feelings about engaging in PD at our school *now* compare to the *beginning* of the school year?
8. In what ways do you feel each PD session you engaged in this year reflected your feedback from the last PD?
9. Tell me about some of the learning strategies you were exposed to during PD.
10. In what ways do you feel that you have utilized the learning strategies you were exposed to during PD this year in your classroom?
11. Describe a professional development experience would you like to have at our school in the future.

JUNE 4$^{\text{TH}}$ TEACHER FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. Please describe the best part about the June 4$^{\text{th}}$ PD.
2. Please describe the worst part about the June 4$^{\text{th}}$ PD.
3. Please describe a meaningful PD experience you had this year.
4. Please explain how PD provided by the team this year impacted your instructional practices.
5. Please explain the types of PD do you think could have positively impacted your instructional practices.
6. Defining PD morale as the overall sense, attitude, or vibe teachers in the building have towards professional development, in what ways do you think PD morale improved this year?
7. In what ways do you think the PD morale in our building decreased this school year?
8. What advice would you give to the administration regarding our school-wide PDs?
9. What advice would you give to the PD team regarding our school-wide PDs?
10. Any other thoughts or comments about the school-wide PD here?

APPENDIX H

PD TEAM FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. What department do you teach in?
2. How long have you been a member of the PD team?
3. Tell me about the process of designing PD this school year.
4. Tell me about some of the verbal/nonverbal feedback you received/observed from teachers regarding the design of PD this year.
5. How was the design of PD this year valuable to the team?
6. How was the design of PD this year valuable to teachers in the building?
7. Tell me about some of the verbal feedback you received from teachers regarding the design of PD this year.
8. Tell me about teachers' engagement during PD this year.
9. In what ways do you think the PD design affected teachers' engagement during PD this year?
10. In what ways do you think the PD design affected teachers' instructional practices this year?