THE PERCEPTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ON STUDENT
ACHIEVEMENT BY CONDUCTING WALKTHROUGHS

By

Todd E. Keruskin

BA, California University of Pennsylvania, 1996

M.S.Ed., California University of Pennsylvania, 2002

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

The School of Education in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of Pittsburgh

2005

FACULTY ENDORSEMENT AND
FINAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Faculty Member	**School**

_____   **Education**

Mr. Joseph S. Werlinich, Chairman

_____   **Education**

Dr. Susan Goodwin

_____   **Education**

Dr. Otto Graf

_____   **Education**

Dr. Sean Hughes

_____

Dr. Heidi Ondek

                                _____

                                                Date

THE PERCEPTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT BY CONDUCTING WALKTHROUGHS

Todd Edward Keruskin, Ed.D.

University of Pittsburgh, 2005

Advisor: Joseph Werlinich _____

The purpose of this study was to focus on High School principals using the walkthrough model and to evaluate how the walkthrough model improves student learning. This data was then analyzed to determine if walkthrough models impacted student learning and student achievement in High Schools in Newport News in Virginia. The goal was to identify key indicators of success from the high school principals that use the Walkthrough Observation Tool from the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania.

For the first part, the researcher used an historical approach. This included the era of accountability, clinical supervision, differentiated supervision, the history of walkthroughs, and models of walkthroughs. The second phase of this study focused on the high school principals' perspectives on how the walkthrough tool has impacted student achievement in their schools. The third phase of this study focused on the teachers' perspectives on how walkthroughs has impacted their instruction and student achievement.

The results of this study showed that the Walkthroughs did impact instruction and student learning from the perspectives of the principals and teachers. The study showed that Walkthroughs are a tool to make sure teachers are focusing on the look-fors that are

defined each year. The study showed that the look-fors improve the instruction in the classrooms and ultimately improved student achievement. The look-fors start to permeate through the classrooms and throughout the school.

This study offers hope to high school principals that are facing the current reform movements and are struggling to improve instruction and student achievement. The Walkthrough tool does not cost any money to implement; but it takes a commitment from the principal to be an instructional leader and spend time focusing on the look-fors in the classrooms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a debt of gratitude to a number of people who have supported and encouraged me throughout the preparation of this dissertation. To my committee, Mr. Joseph Werlinich, Dr. Sean Hughes, Dr. Susan Goodwin, Dr. Otto Graf, and Dr. Heidi Ondek, I thank you for your genuine interest and generous input in this study.

To my parents, Paul and Mary Ann Keruskin, without them and the unconditional love they afforded me and the respect for education they instilled in me, my educational journey would not have been possible.

To my incomparable wife, Sharon Keruskin, and my two daughters, Megan and Anna Keruskin, for their consistent understanding and encouragement throughout the process of this dissertation and doctoral, I dedicate this work to them for their patience with, support of, and faith in me.

To Tim Gabauer, with whom I traveled this educational road, beginning and ending the journey together, for the camaraderie during the enjoyable trips to Pitt – even the breakdown in Homestead – and his unending words of encouragement helped me to persevere.

To my incredible sister-in-law, the late Laura Friend, who also began this journey with me, but unfortunately, did not finish it, for the inspiration she gave me during her battle with cancer. Her forbearance and courage gave me the inner strength to pursue any goal to which I aspired. Laura, you are my hero!

To Loretta Medenciy, for her assistance in editing my work, I offer sincere appreciation for the time and immediate feedback.

To my colleagues in the Baldwin-Whitehall School District, who provided excellent role models in their active pursuit of advanced degrees, I appreciate the concern for my progress in this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The principal of a successful school is not the instructional leader but the coordinator of teachers as instructional leaders. (Glickman, 1991, p. 7)

Over thirty years ago, it was uncommon to see school leaders and business executives out of their offices and at "ground level", where the real work is done in the factories, stores, and in the classrooms. It was not until the 1970s that the executives at Hewlett-Packard developed a tool called Management by Wandering Around. Tom Peters and Robert Waterman (1980) examined the most successful companies in the United States and revealed that business leaders in those companies not only stayed close to their customers but interacted with their workers at the ground level. They were involved with the daily routines and were frequently seen by workers everyday. In 1990s, Frase and Hetzel (1990) introduced the book titled, *School Management by Wandering Around*, and many school leaders began using this model because of its success in the business world. In the 21st century, school leaders are now working at the ground level with teachers to face the challenges such as the accountability provisions of No Child Left Behind.

On January 8, 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Public school principals, faced with this new legislation that requires stronger accountability for student achievement, are strategizing on how to transform schools to improve instruction and student learning in an era of limited funds and resources. Americans have voiced concern for the last two decades about declining test scores and the unprepared work force that will result. That concern was reinforced when in 1999 when the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) were released. That study confirmed that American students in public education were falling behind most of the European countries (Stigler & Hiebert, 1999). Therefore, in light if these findings, new legislation, and the dissatisfaction with public education, principals are now being called upon to exercise strong instructional leadership in their schools to improve student achievement

To accomplish this, principals need to engage teachers, students, supervisors, and subject matter specialists in classroom observations and discussions about teaching, assessment, and curriculum. Due to the standards-based and accountability-oriented environment, principals are now expected to be instruction leaders that coach, mentor, and support teachers as their teachers approach the difficult task of increasing student achievement. To accomplish this task, school officials must devise different strategies to provide leadership for improved instruction while striving to meet the other needs of the staff and students in the school.

One model that has been used in schools to improve instruction for the last thirty years is the clinical supervision model. Goldhammer (1969) believed that clinical supervision is a way of making instruction more purposeful and responsive to students' needs. The clinical supervision model consists of five stages: preobservation conference, observation, analysis and strategy, supervision conference, and the post-conference analysis. The frustration voiced by most administrators using this model is that conducting all five stages with one teacher is very time consuming (Hargreaves, 1994; Harris, 1997). Harris (1997) believes that the clinical supervision model ignores the needs of veteran teachers to grow professionally. An additional factor is that clinical supervision fails to foster the conditions associated with interdependent collegiality that can promote teacher growth and student learning (Hargreaves, 1994; Harris, 1997).

One of the best ways to foster collegiality is with a differentiated supervision model that enables teachers to work together, helping each other grow professionally (Glatthorn, 1997). The differentiated model evolved in the 1990s to help provide teachers with options about different kinds of evaluation services each teacher can receive. It provides options for both veteran teachers and the new teachers. New teachers under this supervision model are provided with an intense evaluation that involves several observations and conferences by the principal. In contrast to clinical supervision, veteran teachers that are successful in the classroom not need intense development under the differentiated supervision model. This model therefore can help the veteran teachers focus intensely on an area of weakness.

Another effective tool to focus on student work, teacher instructional techniques, and student engagement in learning is the Walkthrough (Graf & Werlinich, 2002). In the

era of standards-based and accountability-oriented environment, the walkthrough tool provides a way to increase student achievement by improving instruction and observing first hand the needs of staff and students in the school. A walkthrough is an organized observation that requires the principal or supervisor to frequently visit classrooms to look at instructional practices and to assess student learning (Fink & Resnick, 2001). Although walkthrough tools vary in names, steps in organizing, length of time, collaboration or accountability, and different debriefing techniques, the common element for all them is brief but focused visits in the classroom. The walkthrough tool is an approach to creating a collaborative environment where teachers, students, and principals have reflective dialogues. It also is an excellent way for principals to exercise being an instructional leadership without having a huge budget at their disposal. It does not require money to engage teachers in reflective dialogue. Many principals do worry though about how they will find time to be an instructional leader and still deal with the daily managerial issues. They realize that it requires a firm commitment from the principal to live the walkthrough model on a daily basis. He must schedule time everyday to be in classrooms and schedule discussions with teachers about instruction and student learning. Walkthrough models can be altered to fit the needs of the school, the students, the teachers, and especially the principal that ultimately determine its success or failure.

There are several walkthrough models that are available to the principal. The following models were examined in the review of literature: School Management by Wandering Around, The Downey Curriculum Walk-Through, The LearningWalk, and The WalkThrough Observation Tool – Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania. The different walkthrough models were examined by the following: steps used to organize the walkthrough; a reflective approach to create a collaborative environment; a way to hold teachers accountable; things to look for when conducting the walkthrough; the time for the walkthrough; and ways to debrief after the walkthrough.

The impact on schools has been tremendous when principals have used and lived the walkthrough tool. The research has shown that when school leaders conduct walkthroughs the following will occur: enhanced teacher satisfaction as defined by higher frequency of "flow" experiences, improved teacher attitudes toward professional

development, improved teacher attitudes toward teacher appraisal, increased perceived teacher efficacy of other teachers and of school, improved classroom instruction, improved teacher perception of principal effectiveness, improved student discipline and student acceptance of advice and criticism, and improved teacher-perceived effectiveness of the school. If the walkthrough increases classroom instruction and improves teachers' attitude toward professional development, then student achievement increases. Also, if principals use the walkthrough tool to remove obstacles for teachers such as student discipline, student achievement will increase.

If school districts want to improve instruction and increase student achievement, principals or supervisors must take an honest look of the quality of instruction in each classroom. The walkthrough tool is way for principals to do this in an organized and structured way. By conducting frequent visits to classrooms, principals or supervisors are conveying to the teachers that they hold instruction and student learning in high regard. It is also a means whereby rapport and trust can be engendered between teacher and principal, fostering a cooperative approach to solving whatever problems arise.

Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study was to focus on High School Principals using the walkthrough model and to evaluate how the walkthrough model improves student learning. This data was then analyzed to determine if walkthrough models impacted student learning and student achievement in High Schools in Newport News School District in Virginia. The goal was to identify the key indicators of success from the high school principals that use the Walkthrough Observation Tool from the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania.

Research Questions

1. What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs identified by the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania?
2. What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs that are identified by the five high school principals in Newport News School District in Virginia?
3. What elements and procedures are identified by the high school principals in Newport News School District that do not appear in the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania's Walkthrough Tool?
4. What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning identified by the high school principals in Newport News School District?
5. What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning identified by the high school teachers in Newport News School District?
6. What is the congruence between the principals' perspectives and the teachers' perspectives of conducting Walkthroughs?

Definitions of Terms

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – As part of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), it makes schools accountable to students, their parents, teachers, and the community. AYP measures student results for three indicators: Attendance or graduation rate; Test participation; and student Test Performance.

Clinical Supervision – A process having the format as clinical supervision, but occurs in one or two sessions throughout the year. This process attempts to remove the adversarial role of the administrator and create an atmosphere of trust between evaluator and evaluate.

Clinical Supervision Conference – A principal or supervisor meets one-on-one with the teacher to reflect on the teacher's performance or the performance of the teacher's students.

Collegial Walkthrough – Someone that has a shared commitment to improving instruction and student achievement acts as the principal or supervisor.

Debriefing the Faculty – Feedback is given to the entire faculty and is focused on what is present in the school, not on an individual teacher. The feedback is usually a general overview focusing on the "look-fors." This meeting should take place immediately after several Walkthroughs.

Differentiated Supervison – Refers to any formally adopted method of supervising teachers that provides them with options with respect to the type of supervision they are given. The options include cooperative professional development and self-directed professional development (Glatthorn, 1997).

Empowered School Districts – Any Pennsylvania school district that has a combined average of 50 percent or more students scoring in the bottom-measured group in the PSSA in math and reading for the previous three years.

Learning Community – A group of educators committed to working collaboratively as learners to improve achievement for all students in a school.

Observational Walkthrough – This Walkthrough is conducted by the building principal and someone from outside the school district.

Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) – The state test used by the Pennsylvania Department of Education to measure school performance. It is the basis for holding school districts accountable by identifying low achieving schools.

Pre-Observation Conference – A meeting between administrator and teacher prior to a teacher observation for the purpose of obtaining information about the teacher, students, and lesson prior to the observation.

Supervision – An on-going process aimed at improving instruction throughout a teacher's career.

Supervisor – A person that is most directly involved in the supervision of a teacher.

Supervisory Walkthrough – This Walkthrough involves the building principal and a central office administrator that work together to examine the teaching practices and student learning.

Walkthrough – A walkthrough is an organized tour through the school using "look-fors" to focus on instruction and learning.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The goal in a learning community is to build connections between people, socially and intellectually. Controls interferes with this process; it distances people from one another. Commitment strengthens interpersonal connections. As I have argued elsewhere, building learning community is tantamount to developing a commitment to shared learning. (Prawat, 1993, p. 9)

This review of the related literature features: the era of accountability, a historical perspective on supervision, clinical supervision, problems with clinical supervision, differentiated supervision, a historical perspective on walkthroughs, modes of walkthroughs, models of walkthroughs, steps for organizing the walkthrough, debriefing tools, a principal's perspective on the walkthrough, a teacher's perspective on the walkthrough and the link between walkthroughs and student learning. The review process starts with a review of clinical supervision, the emergence of differentiated supervision, and then finally the walkthrough tool. The walkthrough tool will be linked to improvement of student learning as indicated by the last 25 years of research literature.

The Era of Accountability

In 1983, <u>A Nation at Risk</u> was published and Americans' dissatisfaction with public education grew across the United States. At the same time, The Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) came out to reinforce the growing consensus that American students in public education were falling behind most of the European countries (Stigler and Hiebert, 1999). Dissatisfaction with the state of public education was evident when the National Household Education Survey conducted by the US Census Bureau (2001) found that home schooling had increase almost 50% since 1994. Prior to the No Child Left Behind Act, The Pennsylvania Department of Education, aware of the problems facing education, enacted the Education Empowerment Act in May of 2000 to help districts that had low student achievement. To identify school districts with low student achievement for a period of three years, the Pennsylvania Department of Education used the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA). The Education Empowerment Act "provides for power

management tools and grants targeted to make needed improvements in student achievement and school operations."

On January 8, 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). This new legislation requires stronger accountability for student achievement, increased flexibility and local control, expanded options for parents, and concentration resources on proven educational methods (NCLB). Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, stated that "No country has ever made the bold commitment that every boy and girl will excel-regardless of race, family-background, or income" (Paige, 2002).

Because of the increasing national emphasis on the problems facing education and the means of addressing them, for the first time in history public school principals face challenges such as the accountability provisions of No Child Left Behind and standards-based reform, provisions that are designed to make schools more accountable for their contributions to student learning. To facilitate the transformation of schools in an era of limited funds and resources amidst cries for higher accountability, administrators seem to have increased their interest in ascertaining the best practices in supervision that will bring about increased teacher growth and development (Cooper, 1983).

The views of accountability in schools have changed dramatically over the last several decades. For example, in 1970, ASCD defined accountability in this limited way: professional educators are accountable to parents, students, and for the quality of their performance. In cooperation with representatives of these groups, educators should develop criteria by which to determine professional accountability. Now in the 21st century, ASCD (2001) defines accountability as students, parents, the public appropriately holding educators accountable for providing equitable, high-quality learning experiences *for all students*. Unfortunately educators know too well that historical funding inequities, flawed staffing patterns, and episodic professional development are barriers to ensuring that each student learns. Therefore, holding educators accountable for results requires providing clearly articulated expectations, sufficient resources, access to data from multiple assessments, and appropriate professional development to learn the new skills and knowledge required.

School administrators have always been busy, but now they are extraordinarily so, inundated with demands for more work and better results with fewer resources and less time. Administrators have never faced such a challenge of the accountability provisions in the history of education while also dealing with the dissatisfaction of Americans with public education. To succeed, administrators must be able to equip teachers and supervisors with the means to transform schools to improve student achievement by becoming more of an educational leader who is able to build networks within the schools to enhance instructional practices.

Supervision – A Historical Perspective

In understanding the history of supervision models that promote teacher growth, brief attention will be paid to the historical development of supervision. This will include the early history of clinical supervision and the emergence of the differentiated supervision model. In the 1930s, Dewey's combination of democracy and scientific thinking and the National Education Association's influenced supervision into democratization on group deliberation and problem solving. In the 1960s and 1970s, the post-Sputnik era, contributed to this democratization of supervision. Administrators were required to spend more time and attention to organizational goals, long-range planning and changing strategies.

Mosher and Purpel (1972), clinical supervision theorists, believed in three principles that were key elements of a democratic supervision model:
(1) Supervision should protect the integrity of all teachers; (2) Supervision should release and sustain the talent of the teacher; and (3) Supervision techniques should avoid threat, insecurity and didacticism, while encouraging full staff involvement in educational planning and teacher solidarity. The search for a truly democratic form of supervision model would be guided by the above elements. Where education supervision model was once an inspection model, it has now moved to the other side of the continuum, characterized by more democratic forms of supervision (Pajak, 1993).

Clinical Supervision

In response to the need for a more productive and meaningful student teaching experience, clinical supervision was developed by Morris Cogan at Harvard University in the 1950s (Pajak, 1993). Cogan (1973) developed clinical supervision to have the capacity to develop responsible teachers capable of analyzing their performance, who were open to assistance from others, and who were self-directing. In the 1960s, clinical supervision became very popular. It emphasized reflective problem-solving, targeted individual classrooms directly, and focused on teachers as the agents of change. The original clinical supervision models include the works of the following: Cogan (1973); Goldhammer (1969), as student of Cogan who continued the refinement of the clinical supervision model; and Mosher and Purpel (1972), whose book on supervision in the early 1970s emphasized the advantages of working with teachers in groups. The early models of clinical supervision emphasized collegiality and mutual discovery of meaning.

According to Goldhammer (1969), clinical supervision is meant to imply supervision up close. The purpose of clinical supervision is to utilize close observation, detailed observational data, face-to-face interaction between the supervisor and teacher, and an intensity of focus that binds the two together in an intimate professional relationship (Goldhammer 1969). Instead of concentrating on supervisors, Cogan (1973) was always concerned with the teacher's universe and what the teacher was thinking when he or she made decisions.

The Clinical Supervision model consists of five stages which Goldhammer (1969) refers to as the "sequence of supervision." The first stage in the clinical supervision model is the preobservation conference. The main purpose for this stage is to provide mental framework for the next four stages of the supervision model. In addition, this stage is intended to eliminate problems of reestablishing mutual adjustments from the supervision conference and to reduce anticipatory anxieties as the teacher and supervisor prepare to join again in important collaboration (Goldhammer, 1969).

The second stage in the clinical supervision model is the teacher observation. The purpose of this stage is for the supervisor to observe what is happening in the classroom so that the supervisor and teacher can talk about it afterwards. The supervisor needs to write down everything that is said and that he sees. Instead of generalities, the supervisor

copiously records all verbal and nonverbal behavior. His main responsibility will be to analyze what took place in the classroom.   According to Goldhammer (1969), it is critical to develop a plan from the data analysis, "Today's data are employed as a source of tomorrow's problems for supervision" (p.61).

The third stage in the clinical supervision model is analysis and strategy. The first purpose of this stage is to analyze or make sense of the data that was collected during the observation. The supervisor is demonstrating to the teacher that the involvement in the analysis of his or her teaching demonstrates the degree of commitment to the teacher. The next step of this stage is to plan the management of the supervision conference to follow. The supervisor must determine what issues need to be addressed, which data to cite, and what goals the teacher should aim for in teaching. According to Goldhammer (1969), "The hope is that the teacher's confidence in supervision is more likely to be inspired if he perceives that Supervisor has put a great deal of work into it than if Supervisor appears to be working off the cuff" (p. 67)

The fourth stage in the clinical supervision model is the supervision conference. This conference is intended to provide a time to plan future teaching in collaboration with another professional educator. If the conference is useful, the supervisor leaves the teacher with something concrete in hand, namely, a design for the next sequence of instruction. Secondly, the conference is intended to decide what directions supervision should take and by what methods it should operate. Next, the conference is intended to acknowledge the positive efforts that the teacher puts forward and the reward for that effort. Teachers have very few opportunities for their value to be acknowledged by other educators who understand quality teaching. The conference is also intended to define treatable issues in the teaching and to authenticate the existence of issues that have been sensed intuitively (Goldhammer, 1969).

The final stage in the clinical supervision model is the post-conference analysis. The basis of the post-conference is for assessing whether supervision is working productively and for determining its strengths and weaknesses. According to Goldhammer (1969), the principle rationale for the final stage "is that examined behavior is more likely to be useful—for everyone—than unexamined behavior; that, perhaps, the only truly worthwhile existence is an examined existence" (p. 71).

Goldhammer (1969) offers clinical supervision as a way of making instruction more consciously purposeful and responsive to students' needs. His model describes a sequence of skill acquisition for teachers, counseling for teachers, unpredictability and uncertainty in the classroom, and favors intense self-examination by the teacher. He believes feedback is for improvement not evaluation. However, Goldhammer (1969) gives slight attention to the benefits of supervising teachers in groups.

By contrast, Mosher and Purpel (1972) view clinical supervision as inextricably bound up with the content of teaching. Their model of clinical supervision incorporates counseling for teachers. They believe in providing clinical supervision to groups of teachers who analyze one another's lessons and advocate data collection by videotaping. They too favor intense self-examination by teachers involved in the clinical supervision process. Their model is different because they believe that clinical supervisors must be curriculum specialists who help teachers improve what to teach as well as how to teach. Mosher and Purpel (1972) express their concern about the stress that new teachers deal with as they establish professional identities, and they recommend ego counseling for these teachers.

Problems with Clinical Supervision

According to Reavis (1978), clinical supervision has a long history and is supported by a substantial body of literature and research, but Reavis believes that clinical supervision has been developed by an elite corps of professionals compared to other forms of supervision. Sullivan (1980) believes clinical supervision to be more democratic than other forms of supervision. According to Weidmer (1995), effective clinical supervision increases the desire and skill for self-improvement that it enables teachers and supervisors to grow while promoting excellence in teaching and learning. However, more recent research contends that while clinical supervision has advanced beyond traditional supervision it is still not adequate to promote teacher growth and development at a premium level. Smyth (1997) believes that clinical supervision has lost its collaborative emphasis and has been a mechanism of teacher inspection and surveillance, rendering teachers unable to gain control over their classroom world and work. Harris (1997) also believes that clinical supervision is a model that does not

promote teacher growth and improve student learning. Harris (1997) believes it ignores the needs of veteran teachers to grow professionally. Hargreaves (1994) echoes the belief that clinical supervision does not foster the conditions associated with interdependent collegiality that can promote teacher growth and student learning. One additional factor is that administrators feel the clinical supervision model is extremely time consuming. Thus, Gordon (1997) calls for a radical shift from control supervision to collegial supervision.

According to Garman (1997), "Glatthorn suggested we may bury part of clinical supervision especially the part where administrators and supervisors observe and confer with competent experienced teachers. A sharply modified version is okay for student teachers, novice teachers, and marginally competent tenured teachers. He wants to see teachers observing each other working in a variety of ways. Otherwise, he claims clinical supervision is dysfunctional" (p. 231). In Garman's (1997) view, "Glatthorn equated clinical supervision to what school administrators do when they hold two observations and two conferences. He echoes the popular complaint that the original behavior and techniques of clinical supervision have been coopted by administrators for the annual evaluation of teachers" (p. 232). If Glatthorn's conclusions are valid, it is imperative that supervisory practices progress toward professional systems of shared decision-making and mutual problem-solving, from monitoring to leadership and ultimately to self-direction (Celso, 1997).

Differentiated Supervision

Differentiated supervision is an approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the different kinds of evaluative services they can receive (Glatthorn, 1997). Glatthorn's model of differentiated supervision encompasses several of the essential elements for a successful approach to supervision that is focused on teacher development. Differentiated supervision can be examined from four perspectives: the profession, the organization, the supervisor, and the teacher.

The first perspective that Glatthorn (1997) examines is the importance of professionalizing teaching. According to Glatthorn (1997), "if teaching is to become more of a profession and teachers are to be empowered, then they must have more

options for supervision" (p. 4). Since clinical supervision model puts the supervisor in a position to develop a solution for the teacher, who has the problem, this perspective of clinical supervision sees teaching as a craft, not as a profession. Conversely, differentiated supervision operates on the belief that teaching is a profession (Glatthorn, 1997). He believes that teachers should have more control over their profession development so that they can grow professionally. Glatthorn (1997) also believes that teachers need input and feedback from their colleagues and students, not always from supervisors.

The second perspective that Glatthorn (1997) examines is the impact the differentiated supervision model has on an organization. According to McLaughlin and Yee (1988), a collegial environment provides many opportunities for interactions and creates expectations that colleagues will serve as sources of feedback and support. That kind of environment produces teacher stimulation and motivation to grow professionally. An essential component to the approach of differentiated supervision is for teachers to work together and help each other grow professionally at a premium level.

Glatthorn (1997) also examines the supervisor's perspective in the differentiated supervision model. With increasing demands, responsibilities, and accountability, principals need to find a realistic solution to finding time for highly effective supervision. Most supervisors report that they are only making one or two observations of most classroom teachers (Badiali and Levin, 1984). The pressures of schools making Annual Yearly Prograss (AYP) and No Child Left Behind, supervisors need to find a way to promote teacher growth while promoting excellence in teaching and learning. According to Glatthorn (1997), "differentiated supervision enables the supervisor to focus clinical efforts on those teachers needing or requesting them, rather than providing perfunctory, ritualistic visits for all teachers" (p. 9).

Finally, Glatthorn (1997) examines the teacher's perspective on the differentiated supervision model. He believes that teacher's preferences on professional development vary according to their years of experience. For example, the more experienced teachers request professional development more focused on their needs while teachers with little experience value the intensive assistance of the clinical supervision model. Supervisors would agree that most experienced teachers have the necessary skills to be successful in

the classroom and do not need an intensive development. Walkthroughs are effective to meet the needs of this teacher if any new incentives or programs are implemented in the classroom.

Components of Differentiated Supervision

Glatthorn's differentiated supervision model also provides intensive development to nontenured and tenured teachers, but his differentiated supervision model separates supervision from evaluation. He believes that his supervision model works best when supported by a differentiated system of teacher evaluation. Glatthorn's (1997) model of differentiated supervision consists of three main developmental options: intensive development, cooperative professional development, and self-directed development. Glatthorn's (1997) model of supervision consists of two evaluation options: intensive evaluation and the standard evaluation.

The three developmental options in Glatthorn's differentiated supervision model are the choices teachers have in fostering their professional development. The first option that Glatthorn (1997) gives is the approach intense development. This option is very similar to the intense assistance of the clinical supervision model. Generally, all nontenured teachers participate in this intense development and tenured teachers that appear to have serious instructional problems. The intense development is provided by the supervisor and who works with the teacher toward significant growth.

The next developmental option that Glatthorn (1997) gives is the cooperative development. This option entails small groups of teachers working together to help each other grow professionally. According to Glatthorn (1997), teachers "hold professional dialogues, conduct action research, observe and confer with each other, and develop curriculum and learning materials" (p. 7).

The last developmental option that Glatthorn (1997) gives is the self-directed development. Self-development enables teachers to work independently and supervise themselves. The teacher is responsible for his or her own individual growth without relying on the supervisor. The teacher sets individual goals to grow professionally, gets feedback from students, and makes final assessment of the progress towards the goal.

Glatthorn (1997) believes that the differentiated supervision model works better with only two evaluation models. The first model is the intensive evaluation model that is for all teachers working on intensive development. According to Glatthorn (1997), "the intensive evaluation is used to make high-stakes decisions: grant tenure, deny tenure; promote, not promote; and renew contract, not renew contract" (p. 7). The intense evaluation must be supported by specific research-supported criteria in addition to several informal and formal observations. The intense evaluation must also include conferences where best practices and observed instruction are discussed. This intense evaluation is usually carried out by the building principal or vice principal.

The second evaluation model in the differentiated supervision model is the standard evaluation. The standard evaluation is provided to teachers not working in intense development. Glatthorn (1997) believes these teachers are more experienced and have proven themselves to be competent. Therefore, the evaluation used for these teachers is the state or district minimum number of observations and conferences.

It is essential that principals schedule a time each day to conduct informal observations. According to Glatthorn (1997), a principal at the end of one week who has set aside an hour daily would have observed at least 20 teachers. Glatthorn (1997) believes that if a teacher is not working in intense development, then principals need to conduct frequent informal visits to classrooms that last 5 to 10 minutes. The principal should be focusing on the learning processes at work, taking note of how many students are on-task, and observing what the teacher is doing to facilitate learning.

The differentiated supervision model that Glatthorn (1997) presents is certainly not the answer for all of the educational problems in the United States, although it does offer ways to provide teachers with options for professional growth that can exert a positive influence on the professional development of teachers. According to Glatthorn (1997), teachers need to believe in the professional developmental because it is instrumental in achieving school improvement.

Historical Perspective – Walkthroughs

It was uncommon to find school leaders and business executives out of their offices and in the hallways, classrooms, and in the factories years ago. Over the years,

research has been conducted on effective businesses and schools. The terms walkthrough, management by wandering around, The Learning Walk, drive-bys, and the three-minute walks are all examples of a tool by which leaders and managers connect with the workers.   Effective leaders have used Management by Wandering Around (MBWA) throughout the ages. Peters and Robert Waterman (1980) discovered that the business leaders of the most successful companies stayed close to the people doing the work. These business leaders were involved with the daily routines of the business, frequently on the work floor where the real work was taking place, listening and talking with workers trying to find any undercurrents, strengths, weaknesses, problems, and possible solutions to fix problems that workers were experiencing on a daily basis.

This MBWA model dates all the way back to our 16th president of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln spent most of his time with the troops on the front line. He wanted a firsthand report regarding the Civil War. These people were number one on his list because they were the ones that would win the war. According to McKenna (1993), President Lincoln met with his cabinet members and his generals in their homes, offices, and in the field to provide leadership and direction. General Colin Powell had the same philosophy in the 1992 Gulf War. General Powell believed that you must go where your flock is, meaning his troops.

The first formal walkthrough process was initiated by a company named Hewlett-Packard (Trueman, 1991). Mangers from Hewlett-Packard were trained on developing management skills by the wandering around model and they were expected to practice it. Following Hewlett-Packard's example, MBWA took off in research and in practice.

MBWA was formally introduced to administrators in education in 1990 (Frase & Hetzel, 1990). In the early 1990's, though very little research was conducted on MBWA, many educators jumped on board because of the successes of effective managers in the business field. Elliot Eisner (2002) said that since schools are being held more accountable, principals need to spend one-third of their time in classrooms. Frase (1990) has seen any percentage between 30 and 50 that principals are in classrooms, but he believes that it is what the principal does while he is wandering around. He also believes that teachers like to see their principals in their classrooms because their presence validates the teachers' hard work.

Models – Walkthroughs

Over the years, leaders and managers have been trained on various models like MBWA, the Walkthrough tool, The Downey Curriculum Walk-Through Tool, and even The LearningWalk. There are more models used across education with different titles or different variations, but all of them have one key element that does not change; all have steps that create organized visits in the work learning areas. The majority of them focus on improving work or teaching to remove any obstacles that the workers or teachers face on a daily basis. Some of the models are used to hold teachers accountable, and others are used to gather information about instruction and learning to create staff development programs. The following are overviews of models that are used in school districts across the United States: School Management by Wandering Around, The Downey Curriculum Walk-Through, The LearningWalk, and The Walkthrough Observation Tool – Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania.

School Management by Wandering Around

Management By Wandering Around (MBWA) is one way of uniting all stakeholders in a school district by bringing teachers, administrators, students, and parents together in the search of excellent schools. MBWA holds teachers accountable, works with marginal teachers, and it can also be used to dismiss teachers. The principal that uses this method does not just talk about it, he lives it. According to Frase & Hetzel (1990), the principal that uses MBWA encourages and empowers teachers to create better schools.

The principal that never leaves his office sends a negative message to the staff and students they are not important. By contrast, the MBWA principal is in the classrooms, hallways, cafeteria, department meetings, and faculty rooms on a daily basis. The principal is wandering around the school for a reason. He is observing and listening to find out what the strengths, weaknesses, and any problems or potential problems in their school might be. Management By Wandering Around is not new idea for managers or leaders and it is not a difficult process to understand. However, according to Frase & Hetzel (1990), "More often than not, it has been forgotten or put aside in favor of ethereal and seemingly more impressive activities which can be completed only behind closed

doors" (p. 20). The principal that is wandering around the school engaging teachers and student on a daily basis is sending clear a message: he cares enough to be involved. According to Cohen (1983), effective schools are characterized by a district set of values: (1) a genuine caring about individuals, (2) a mutual trust, (3) an openness to differences in attitudes and feelings, and (4) a respect for the authority of expertise and competency. The MBWA principal does not just speak to these values but lives them everyday with interactions with parents, teachers, and students.

The MBWA principal cannot just wander around the school smiling at everyone and expect to create an excellent school. According to Frase and Hetzel (1990), he must have a focus so that the walks are purposeful and productive ones and the walks should have four key elements: (1) what are the "look-fors" in the classroom; (2) how to establish an orderly environment through effective discipline; (3) how to manage time to be effective in the MWBA process; (4) how to create a positive and safe learning and physical environment. These four key elements will help create and implement professional development programs to keep high-quality teachers informed of the best effective instructional practices.

Frase and Hetzel (1990) believe that by using the MBWA, the principal will start to understand the strengths and weaknesses of every teacher because of the frequent classroom visits. They also believe that administrator's number one goal is to put the more competent or better teachers instructing the students. When the principal finds a weakness of a teacher, it is his responsibility to provide assistance to that teacher. When attempting to dismiss a teacher, the principal should keep all notes collected from the MBWA activities as records for the hearing, as he could be called upon to show evidence of support given to the teacher in the areas of weaknesses.

The principal must make MBWA a priority and allocate time accordingly. The principal needs to live and breathe MBWA since research states that effective schools have strong leadership with leaders that are highly visible throughout the school. By practicing MBWA, the principal will be able to understand where the instruction is strong and weak because of frequent classroom visits and he can then undertake the task of working with teachers to overcome any deficiencies found in the MBWA.

The Downey Curriculum Walk-Through

The Downey Curriculum Walk-Through has evolved over the years and has been influenced by Madeline Hunter, Sue Wells Welsh, Eric Berne, Stephen Covey, and Fenwick English. According to Downey (2004), the more recent stage in the evolution of the Downey Curriculum Walk-Through Model is the focus on teacher decisions not on the teacher actions. This focus on teacher decisions enables principals and teachers to collaborate on the criteria being used in making those decisions. The Downey Walk-Through Model is sometimes called the 3 minute walk-through model. The goal of the Downey Walk-Through Model, a five-step process, is to gather focused data in a 3 minute time period. The first step in this model occurs within the first two seconds of the walkthrough. The goal for this step is to collect data that indicates whether or not the students appear to be oriented to the work, and this is done when the principal first walks into the room. If he notices that several students off-task or that there are many interruptions, the principal will try to figure out what is causing this particular behavior.

The second step of the Downey Walk-Through Model, which will take most of the three minutes, dictates that the principal document the curricular objectives being taught, Here the goal is to determine the content of the student learning. According to English (1993), the purpose of step two is for the principal to compare the alignment of the taught curriculum to the district's curriculum.

The next step of the Downey Walk-Through Model asks the principal to look at the instructional teaching practices. After he determines the curricular objectives being taught, the principal documents the teaching practices being used to teach the objective. This model stresses the importance of not making judgments about specific teaching practices but instead noticing the instructional decisions being made by the teacher. This model does not recommend that the principal have a follow-up conversation after every walkthrough. In fact, follow-up conversations may only occur every two or three months, even though the principal will be conducting weekly visits.

The fourth step is called "walking the walls." "Walking the walls" are learnings that have been taught or that might be taught in the future. The principal has three minutes to identify the objective and the teaching practices to be determined by just what he finds on the walls of the classroom. If there is not enough time to note what kind of

curricular objectives and instructional practices are there, some principals conduct wall-walks after school.

During the last step in the Downey Walk-Through Model the principal takes note of any safety or health issues he observes. Some examples of what a principal could encounter are a broken threshold at an entryway, dim or burned-out lights, lack of adequate ventilation, and any presence of chemical odors.

As noted previously, while follow-up conversations do not occur after every walk-through in the Downey Curricular Walk-Through Model, there are three different types of follow-up conversation that Downey outlines in his model. Dependent or direct follow-up conversation is defined by Downey (2000) as when the supervisor gives feedback to the teacher and then teaches the teacher in the feedback conversation. In the second type of follow-up conversation, the independent or the indirect follow-up, the supervisor invites the teacher to reflect on the three minute segment of observed teaching and then finishes the conversation with a reflective question. The last type of follow-up conversation is the interdependent or the collegial. Wherein the supervisor, in a conversation with the teacher, poses a reflective question and continues with conversations in the future if teacher chooses to do so.

After the Downey Walk-Through Model is implemented in a school, Downey (2004) believes the culture of the school will change and become more of collaborative and reflective. He further believes that schools will become inquiry based because his Walk-Through Model increases the communication between teachers and principals. He emphasizes that to create the inquiry-based collaboration, there are two key elements to the Downey Walk-Through Model: "frequent, short classroom visits, and conversations with teachers about how and why teachers make the decisions they do when planning, implementing, and evaluating their teaching" (Downey et al., 2004, p. 125).

The LearningWalk

In 1997, The Institute for Learning out of the University of Pittsburgh developed a protocol to develop a learning community in schools called the WalkThrough. In 2001, The Institute for Learning changed the name of the WalkThrough model to The LearningWalk. The Institute for Learning is part of the Learning Research and

Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. The Institute for Learning describes their WalkThrough Tool as an organized visit through classrooms, looking at teaching and learning through the Principles of Learning. They believe that there are three components to the WalkThrough: Orientation that establishes a focus; the WalkThrough that provide an opportunity to observe teaching and student learning; and debriefing to solve any problems and plan for the future. This WalkThrough Tool focuses on what Richard Elmore calls, "the core of educational practice" (Elmore, 1996, p.2). Elmore's article describes the key elements of educational practice as how teachers gain knowledge and understand how their students learn, and how they use that knowledge in the classroom. The Institute for Learning developed five steps to implement their WalkThrough model, the first of which prepares the staff for a Walkthrough. The principal describes the different WalkThrough modes and identifies which mode will be used in the school. In addition, he should explain the difference between each WalkThrough mode.

The Institute for Learning (1999) describes three modes by which WalkThrough can be organized: observational, collegial, and supervisory. The observational WalkThrough is conducted by the building principal and a person from outside the school district who familiar with the Principles of Learning, since the WalkThrough is focused on them. Working with an outside person can help identify any issues of instruction and student learning that may have been overlooked. The next type is the collegial WalkThrough. In the collegial WalkThrough someone that is as committed to the instruction and student learning would serve in the principal's role. Having other educators conducting a WalkThrough will help an isolated environment move to a more collaborative one. The last type of WalkThrough is the supervisory WalkThrough. This WalkThrough may involve the building principal and someone from central office. The principal and the central office administrator closely observe the teaching and student learning centered on the Principles of Learning.

The next step is for the supervisor to be trained to use comments and questions to advance student learning. The Institute of Learning goal for the WalkThrough model is for teachers to be able think more deeply about their own teaching and student learning.

Principals, supervisors, and teachers using the WalkThrough model must be aware of how to respond to teachers in a positive way.

The third step is for the WalkThrough questions to be related to the Principals of Learning. The principal or supervisor should be focusing on the Principles of Learning and examples would be the academic rigor, high level thinking, and students engaged in strategic problem solving in the classroom. The teachers may choose a certain Principle of Learning to focus on in their classroom. After modeling that principle in the classroom, the teacher can advance his or her teaching using questions from that principle.

The fourth step is to explain the participants' responsibilities during an observational WalkThrough. The WalkThrough experience must be a positive one for both the teacher and the principal or supervisor. The principal needs to share the purpose of the WalkThrough and to share how to be successful in the WalkThrough process. The principal should explain what instructional practice should be observed throughout all classrooms.

The final step in The Institute for Learning WalkThrough model is to provide appropriate feedback to the school staff. The feedback needs to come immediately after the visit. The Institute for Learning suggests a post-WalkThrough letter. The letter should include any feedback from what was observed along with the direction that the teacher should move for the future. Another way to provide feedback is to talk to the teacher in the hallway. Another option would be to have collegial sharing groups as a follow-up debriefing session to the WalkThroughs. The group conference can help the principal debrief several teachers and validate effective teaching practices.

Walkthrough Observation Tool – Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania

Otto Graf and Joseph Werlinich (2002) designed a walkthrough observation tool to collect data around teaching and learning and sharing perceptions and ideas with teachers. They believe that the Walkthrough provides a strong indicator that instruction and learning are the priorities of the school. They believe that the Walkthrough Observation Tool is a way to change a culture in a school and in classrooms and that change occurs when the teacher and the principal work together to view, discuss, and

revise a lesson to satisfy all students learning. "Principals and teachers begin to focus on those things that make the difference in improving academic achievement" (Graff & Werlinich, 2002, p. 6).

According to Graf and Werlinich (2002), the implementation of their Walkthrough Tool is a development process. The first step to implementing the Walkthrough Tool is for the principal to become visible in the classrooms and to reinforce effective teaching practices and positive efforts. This will in turn create trust and establish a rapport between the teacher and the principal. The goal for the principal in this step is to collect data around the instructional practices.

The second step in implementing the Walkthrough Tool is for the principal to meet with the staff to establish clear expectations for the Walkthrough. While establishing expectations, the principal needs to talk about the professional behavior for teachers participating in the Walkthrough process. The principal must also talk about confidentiality regarding things observed in the classrooms.

The next step is for the principal to establish a focus with the teachers centered on key elements of effective instruction to improve student achievement. Graf and Werlinich (2002) believe that part of the Walkthrough Tool is built around an intense instructional focus and the focus can be developed by "look-fors." "Look-fors" are descriptors that should be present in classrooms so that all students can learn. Once the teachers and principal decide on what descriptors or "look-fors" improve student achievement and learning levels in their school, they work together to implement those strategies. The "look-fors" should reflect the district's standards, goals, and vision. Teachers and principals working together move a school's culture from a closed, isolated environment to a collaborative environment. The integral part of this Walkthrough Observation Tool is that the students, teachers, and the principal become part of the learning environment. Another integral part of this Walkthrough Observation Tool is that it creates opportunities for teachers to share ideas and effective teaching strategies.

The principal then needs to schedule the Walkthrough and try to visit five to ten classrooms. During each visit the principal collects data with specific examples of the "look-fors" of effective instructional practices. It is important for the principal to talk

with students during the Walkthrough and ask them what they are learning, what good work looks like, and how they evaluate their work.

The next step in the Walkthrough process is for the principal to debrief with the teachers and give them specific feedback from what he has observed. Eventually the principal can provide feedback to the staff as a whole. Graf and Werlinich (2002) believe that this process validates effective teaching and learning and encourages its continued use. The pedagogy will improve by creating a collaborative environment when teachers share effective teaching strategies and ideas focused on student achievement.

The principal then can invite teachers to participate in the Walkthrough process. Teachers can work with other teachers to improve instruction by visiting each others' classrooms. Teachers' working with teachers moves the instructional leadership solely away from the principal and creates a shared leadership between teachers and the principal.

Following all the above steps will result in a culture change focused on effective teaching strategies which will in turn improve student achievement. The Walkthrough does not become just an event; it becomes part of the culture. "The Walkthrough Observation can be the needed connector that advances learning for everyone" (Graf & Werlinich, 2002, p. 10).

Walkthrough – Enhanced Teacher Satisfaction as Defined by Higher Frequency of "Flow" Experiences

It is no secret that teachers express very little joy in American public schools today and they feel very isolated from other teachers and administrators (Steinberg, 1998). Teachers also feel that they are not achieving their number one goal, helping students learn (Little & McLaughlin, 1993). To counteract the joyless feeling permeating education, Csikszenmihalyi (1990) developed the theory called flow. Flow is defined as "the most satisfying and motivating experience a person can have" (Downy et.al., 2004, p. 23). According to Caouette (1995), teachers do experience flow as do many other people in other fields and certain workplace factors can influence the frequency and quality of their flow experience.

There are several factors that impact the flow experiences for teachers in public schools. Standard noises and interruptions such as bells, announcements, fire drills, student behavior and unsuccessful lessons can prevent or hinder flow experiences. Therefore, administrators must provide teachers with environments where they can have successful lessons and hence, flow (Frase, 1998). Administrators must provide time for teachers to plan lessons because Frase (1998) found that teachers feel that a prerequisite to flow is to plan, "Teachers believe that their optimal experiences, 'flow' are dependent on it" (p. 15).

A later study conducted by Larry E. Frase (2001), examined the frequency of principal classroom visits and how the frequency affects it flow or teacher satisfaction. He found that teacher satisfaction increased with frequency of principal classroom visits. Frase also found that principal's classroom visits not only helped alleviate teachers' feelings of isolation, but it made the principal more aware of the teachers' work conditions and more inclined to remove any obstacles that interfere with their teaching. Frase (2004) believes that walkthroughs "informs the principal and elicit strong ideas for feedback and assistance" (p. 150).

What does the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 have to do with flow? This Act of 2001 contains the most sweeping changes to the public school system since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. Since new legislation calls for stronger accountability for student achievement, the added pressures on teachers has cause morale in public schools across the United States to become even lower along with the motivational level of the teacher work environment. Because of the added pressures on administrators to produce high test scores, they are focused on programs and initiatives to increase test scores for all students rather than motivating teachers to teach. Should administrators be concerned about the mental health of teachers if it doesn't result in higher test scores? What is known is that principal walkthroughs are positively related to a higher frequency of teacher flow experiences, or satisfaction (Frase, 1998). A study conducted by Nian Zhu (2001), found that the frequency of teacher flow experiences is directly connected to student cognition levels. The study revealed that student cognitive engagement rates were higher when teachers experience flow than when teachers were not experiencing flow. The study also revealed that when teachers are experience

satisfaction or flow, 25 percent more students are cognitively engaged in the material being presented.

At this time of high stakes testing and increased pressures on administrators and with public schools across America failing, it is extremely important for administrators to pay attention to the motivational factors of the teachers' work environment (Zhu, 2001). Both of Zhu's studies prove that walkthroughs increase teacher satisfaction or flow experiences and walkthroughs with their effect on flow will increase the number of students cognitively engaged in a lesson.

Walkthrough – Improved Teacher Self-efficacy

Administrators want teachers to believe strongly that they can produce learning in their classrooms. Success is achieved when teachers believe they have done a good job. According to Frase (1998), teachers that believe strongly that they can perform tasks required for all students to learn means the teacher has high self-efficacy. The benefits of high teacher self-efficacy are obvious. There have been two studies that link walkthroughs and increased teacher efficacy and teacher efficacy with student achievement.

Ashton and Webb (1986) conducted a study to see if teacher efficacy is linked or related to student achievement. The study found that teachers with high self-efficacy had students that had higher achievement levels than students of teachers with low self-efficacy levels. Another study conducted by Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2000) found a direct relationship between teacher efficacy and student achievement. "They found that collective teacher efficacy was positively associated with differences between schools in student-level achievement in both reading and mathematics" (Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy, 2000, p. 22).

There are two studies that help administrators find ways to increase teacher efficacy, which will in turn increase student achievement and test scores. The Chester and Beaudin (1996) study found that schools that offer opportunities for teachers to reflect on teaching and learning with their colleagues and for administrators and teachers to collaborate create more positive changes in self-efficacy beliefs with all teachers than schools where such opportunities are limited. The study showed that new teachers that

were observed five times in a semester had higher self-efficacy beliefs than those teachers that were not observed by the principal. In addition to observing the teachers, the timing, frequency of feedback, and the focus of the feedback are as important as the brief observations. Without the feedback, teachers feel a sense of uncertainty or anxiety because the supervisor is not validating or improving the teachers' instructional practices (Chester 1991, 1992).

The second study is the Frase (2001) study that focused on how the frequency of walkthroughs by supervisors related to high teacher self-efficacy. The study showed that the principal conducting regular walkthroughs in classrooms can affect or control efficacy of others and the organization efficacy. The study showed that the increase in walkthroughs by supervisors predicts teacher perception of organizational effectiveness.

The studies revealed the benefits of efficacy and how walkthroughs affect teacher self-efficacy. High self-efficacy is a key element in improving student achievement because teachers with high self-efficacy believe strongly that they can perform tasks required for all students to learn. The studies also showed that the walkthroughs by the supervisor in classrooms are linked to higher teacher self-efficacy. Chester and Beaudin (1996) showed that walkthroughs by supervisors increase the self-efficacy with even new teachers.

Walk-through – Improved Teacher Attitudes Toward Professional Development

The purpose of professional development is to improve a teacher's ability to teach, but teachers across the country believe that the typical professional development days are a waste of time and have very little impact on their teaching. According to Annunziata (1997), teachers believe that professional development days are one-shot deals, superficial and faddish programs, feel-good sessions, make-and-take or bag-of-tricks content, and consultant-driven presentations.

It is the opinion of the U.S. Department of Education's Professional Development Team that professional development serves as the bridge between where prospective and experienced educators are now and where they will need to be to meet the needs of all students (Culbertson, 1996). The team also believes that the current professional development practices are inadequately designed for teachers to meet new challenges of

guiding all students in achieving higher standards of learning and development (Culbertson, 1996).

Professional development and the evaluation process need to be meaningful to teachers because they can offer the teachers the means to further their instructional expertise, therefore directly affecting student achievement. Further, Orlich and his team (1993) found scant evidence linking professional development to student achievement, and the evidence that did link professional development to increased student achievement was spurious due to use of inappropriate measurement techniques and research designs (p. 7). Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) believe that the traditional top-down teaching strategies will not improve student achievement. They prefer professional development practices that allow teachers to reflect on their practices and to fashion new knowledge and beliefs about content, pedagogy, and learners. This program is much more than the mere support for teachers' acquisition of new skills or knowledge. It involves teachers as both learners and teachers and allows them to struggle with the uncertainties that accompany each role. Teachers feel a sense of reward and even a powerful motivation when they successfully help students learn (Scholastic, 2000).

A study was conducted by Frase (1998) that focused on principal walkthroughs and professional development. He found that the frequency of principal classroom visits predicted teachers' perceived value of teacher evaluation and professional development. Without changing the professional development practices, Frase found that when principals conducted walkthroughs more often, teachers expressed a higher regard for professional development practices.

Professional development programs in a school district are usually conducted by outside experts or personnel from central administration. Frase and Streshly (1994) suggest a link with published findings that indicate that teacher evaluation ratings are heavily inflated. The study by Frase (1998) proves that walkthroughs improve the teacher's attitude regarding professional development, which will in turn improve student achievement.

Walk-through – Improved Teacher Attitudes Toward Teacher Appraisal

The purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve instruction which will then improve student achievement. The teacher evaluation process has been labeled inadequate (Scriven, 1981), of little value in helping teachers improve their instruction (Frase & Streshly, 1994, 2000), and deficient (Frase & Streshly, 1994). All fifty states require teacher and supervisor evaluation of some sort, but unfortunately throughout the Unites States supervisors are conducting ineffective supervision and professional development practices. It goes without saying, supervisors must do a better job to improve classroom instruction.

Principal training has been nonexistent for effective supervision and staff development practices (Duke, 1995). According to Annunziata (1997), effective supervision and staff development must intertwine to improve instruction and ultimately improve student achievement. Teachers across the United States hold teacher appraisal in low esteem (Frase & Streshly, 1994). Regardless, teacher evaluation is not going away and supervisors must find a way to improve the process to make it more effective.

A study conducted by Frase (2001) focused on teacher appraisal and principal walkthroughs in classrooms. The study found that those teachers whose principals conducted classroom walkthroughs that focused on instruction and curriculum held the teacher appraisal process higher than the other teachers. Those teachers with high appraisal felt that the principal had an understanding and a vested interest in the learning process. Principals conducting walkthroughs in classrooms are able to see obstacles that teachers face and the principals can remove obstacles to help the teacher and improve instruction. As a result, Frase believes this to be the reason teachers whose principals conduct regular walkthroughs hold teacher appraisal high.

To repeat, effective teacher evaluation can improve instruction which will in turn improve student achievement. Principals must be aware that supervision practices and professional development practices must work together to improve classroom instruction. Teachers that hold the teacher appraisal process in high regard usually have a principal that has shown a vested interest in their curriculum, instruction, and has removed obstacles that the teacher faces.

Walk-through – Improved Classroom Instruction

Decades ago it was not proven that high-quality instruction results in higher levels of student achievement. In fact, in the late 1960s, researchers thought that schools made little difference in student achievement, but in the 1970s, several studies were conducted that proved high-quality instruction produces high student achievement. More than three decades of research on the effects of instruction on student achievement are almost creating a new science in education (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Principals should focus on the research of effective instructional practices and intertwine professional development and supervision practices around effective instructional practices.

In the late 1960s, James Coleman (1966) in the famous report entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity" analyzed data from 4,000 schools, 60,000 teachers, and 600,000 students and concluded that school really made little difference in student achievement. At the beginning of the 1970s, new studies were conducted on the effects of instruction on student achievement. The results concluded that individual teachers can have a profound impact on student achievement even in schools that are ineffective. Brophy and Good (1986) stated, "The myth that teachers do not make a difference in student learning has been refuted" (p. 370).

Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) analyzed tests scores of 100,000 students across the United States and concluded that the classroom teacher has much more impact on student achievement than one thought. There conclusion from their study was

> The results of this study will document that the most important factor affecting student learning is the teacher. In addition, the results show wide variation in effectiveness among teachers. The immediate and clear implication of this finding is that seemingly more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor. *Effective teachers appear to be effective with students of all achievement levels, regardless of the level of heterogeneity in their classrooms.* If the teacher is ineffective, students under the teacher's tutelage will show inadequate progress academically regardless of how similar or different they are regarding their academic achievement (p. 63).

Teddlie, Kirby, and Stringfield (1989), conducted a study investigating differences at the classroom level in effective and ineffective schools. The principal

in the effective school was described by one observer as "having her finger on the pulse of the school" (Teddlie et al., 1989, p. 231). The principal was seen in the hallways and in classrooms and actively participated in the classrooms. The principal in the effective schools appeared to be knowledgeable of innovations in every classroom and ensured that the staff was aware of the current trends and practices in education (Teddlie et al., 1989; Water et al., 2003). By contrast, the principal in the ineffective school was visible in the hallways and greeted visitors when they entered her school. She praised her staff and felt that everything was great in her school. However, she very little time in classrooms to be able to state that she had a great school and great teachers. The amount of time that the teachers spent on academics in the effective schools was dramatic compared to the ineffective schools.

What is the driving force for the teachers at the effective schools compared to those in the ineffective schools? Teddlie et al. (1989) found four underlying practices at the effective schools that did not appear at the ineffective schools. The first practice was that the principal conducted walkthroughs with a clear, present academic focus. The second was that the teachers worked with students to master the basic skills rather than focusing on the skills they would need for college. The next practice was the display of academic successes in classrooms, the office, and the hallways. The final practice was an emphasis on applied teaching or interactive teaching in the classrooms of the effective schools.

Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003), conducted a systematic meta-analysis of nearly every study available that purported to examine the effects of leadership on student achievement reported since the 1970s. The data from the study found a substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement. The study found twenty-one specific leadership responsibilities significantly correlated with student achievement. The two highest responsibilities of a principal that impacted student achievement were situational awareness and intellectual stimulation. Situational awareness is the awareness of the details and undercurrents of the building and how the principal uses that information to address current and potential problems. Intellectual stimulation ensures that the teachers are aware of

the most common theories and practices. This study concluded that school leaders can have a positive impact on student achievement.

There is strong research telling us that high-quality instruction results in high levels of student achievement. There is also strong evidence that with an increase of walkthroughs by principals and a focus on instruction and curriculum are linked to improved instruction in the classrooms. The principal cannot expect to improve instruction by just visiting classrooms. The principal needs to have an intense academic focus, have the knowledgebase of innovations in the classroom, and the knowledge base of current trends and practices.

Walk-through – Improved Teacher Perception of Principal Effectiveness

Principals want their staff to believe in them and believe that they are effective principals, but conducting walkthroughs in classrooms does not guarantee that teachers will believe that a principal is effective. According to Smith and Blasé (1991), principals must conduct walkthroughs with an academic intense focus and show a vested interest in the instruction and curriculum.

Andrews and Soder (1987) conducted a study to investigate interactions between principals and teachers in terms of the principal as a resources provider, instructional resource, a communicator, and a visible presence. A principal that is a resource provider is one that achieves that school's vision and goals by supervising personnel and making use of all the resources in the school. A principal that is an instructional resource is one who develops an academic focus and actively engages in staff development and supervision. As a communicator, the principal articulates and models the vision of the school and adheres to clear academic standards for instruction and teacher behavior. A principal that has a visible presence is in classrooms, hallways, department meetings, and talks with staff and students throughout each day.

Andrews and Soder (1987) used gains in individual student normal curve equivalent scores on the California Achievement Test as a measure of improved academic performance. The researchers divided the schools into three groups based on the staff perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader in the school. The

students' achievement scores in the strong-leader schools were increasingly higher than those of schools with weak instructional leaders. There was a profound difference in terms of ethnicity and economically disadvantaged students with strong instructional leaders compared to weak leaders. There were huge gains over a period of two years with strong-leader schools especially with economically disadvantaged students in reading and black students in mathematics. Economically disadvantage students in reading and black students' in mathematics lost an average of 23 points over the same period of time with the weak-leader schools.

A principal can improve teacher perception by increasing the frequency of walkthroughs in classrooms and by having an intense academic focus. Research states that strong instructional leaders make a profound difference in student achievement in contrast to weak leaders. If strong instructional leaders are making an impact on student achievement, then the outcome will be high teacher self-efficacy (Frase, 1998).

Walk-through – Improved Student Discipline and Student Acceptance of Advice and Criticism

Every vice principal could sit in his or her office and react to every discipline issue that happens in the school. Often a vice principal wonders if there are any good students anymore. How can a vice principal start to be more proactive and decrease student discipline? According to Balse (1987) and Smith and Blasé (1991), principal walkthroughs in classrooms, hallways, and cafeteria are positively related to improved discipline and acceptance of advice.

Joseph J. Blasé (1987) conducted a study that examined teachers' perspectives on effective school leadership. Blasé (1987) reported that teachers felt that effective principals are those who are available to teachers, who arrive to work early and stay late, and are involved with everything. Teachers that were interviewed in this study explained that effective principals are visible in the school, hallways, classrooms, and the cafeteria, where trouble with students could occur. They feel that principals help control and stabilize student behavior simply by being visible. One of the teachers stated, "Kids are just better when the principal is around, and teachers are more willing to get involved" (Blasé, 1987, p. 597).

Accessible principals are viewed by teachers as "informed" and aware of the undercurrents in the school. Teachers tend to accept decisions that are made by an informed principal because the teacher realizes that the principal is well aware of the undercurrents in the school. Accessible principals tend to help teachers feel connected with their school because of the principals' attitude and behaviors. When teachers feel a sense of belonging, they are less likely to turn their heads regarding student behavior. Students tend to accept any advice or criticism from accessible principals because they are seen everywhere and they have earned the respect of the students.

Principals that are visible in their schools, classrooms, and hallways are linked to improved student discipline and acceptance of advice. Teachers feel that just the principal's presence in areas where student misbehavior could occur impacts student discipline. Teachers tend to become more vested when they see their principal everywhere in the school. Accessible principals usually establish a rapport with students because the principal is talking with them and because he sees them everywhere on campus, they tend to accept his advice or criticism.

Walk-through – Improved Teacher-Perceived Effectiveness of the School

When teachers feel what they are doing is effective and when they believe their school is effective, that can only lead to higher self-esteem, pride, confidence, and an increase in student achievement (Frase, 1998). If teachers feel they are connected to the school, they are more likely to perform tasks at a higher level. Effective walkthrough practices can have an impact on the perceived levels of school success.

A study conducted by Frase (2001) examined the walkthroughs by principals and perceived levels of the overall school success. Frase found that teachers tend to have higher perceived levels of school success when principals conduct regular walkthroughs. The other key component to increase perceived levels of effectiveness of school success is the intense academic focus on instruction and curriculum while conducting walkthroughs.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

        In light of the current reform movements, all principals are now faced with improving instruction and student achievement. Unfortunately, very little research has been done on how walkthroughs impact student achievement at the high school level. Analyzing the perspective of five current high school principals who have been working for several years with the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy, this study will describe the key indicators from their perspective of how the walkthrough tool impacted their students' achievement.

Statement of the Problem

        What is the impact of Walkthroughs conducted by high school principals on student achievement?

Research Questions

1. What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs identified by the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania?
2. What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs that are identified by the five high school principals in Newport News School District in Virginia?
3. What elements and procedures are identified by the high school principals in Newport News School District that do not appear in the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania's Walkthrough Tool?
4. What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning identified by the high school principals in Newport News School District?
5. What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning identified by the high school teachers in Newport News School District?
6. What is the congruence between the principals' perspectives and the teachers' perspectives of conducting Walkthroughs?

Methodology and Procedures

This descriptive, qualitative inquiry explored the perceptions of how walkthroughs impacted student learning. The process involved three phases. First, a historical literature review was conducted. The second phase examined the five high school principals' perspectives on how the walkthrough tool impacted student achievement. The last phase was to examine teachers' perspectives at each of the high schools on the impact of walkthroughs on their instruction and on student achievement. The researcher used a descriptive research design that incorporated interviews with the five high school principals utilizing walkthroughs and five teachers at each of the five high schools in Newport News School District in Virginia.

For the first part, the researcher used an historical approach. This included the era of accountability, clinical supervision, differentiated supervision, the history of walkthroughs, and models of walkthroughs. The second phase of this study focused on the high school principals' perspectives on how the walkthrough tool has impacted student achievement in their schools. The third phase of this study focused on the teachers' perspectives on how walkthroughs has impacted their instruction and student achievement. According to Eichelberger (1989), "the purpose of descriptive research is to estimate the nature and degree of existing conditions" (p. 173). In this study, the "existing conditions" was the walkthrough tool used in the high schools identified.

This research is qualitative, and by design, qualitative research is concerned with an "overall understanding of the situation studied" (Eichelberger, 1989, p.102). The researcher conducted interviews because it was the best method for obtaining an "overall understanding" on how the walkthrough tool impacted student achievement.

Sample

Interview

This study examined and reported on how walkthroughs impacted student achievement in five public high schools. The researcher identified the sample by contacting Joseph Werlinich and Dr. Otto Graf from the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy to ascertain which high schools that were currently using the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy Walkthrough Tool. Joseph Werlinich and Dr. Otto

Graf identified five high schools in the Newport News School District in Virginia that have been using their walkthrough tool for several years. The researcher is member of the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy and has been trained on the steps and procedures of their Walkthrough Tool.

For the purpose of this study, five high school principals from the Newport News School District in Virginia will participated in interviews; representing all of the high school principals in the district.

In October 2004, all five high schools were fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education based on their student achievement on the Standards of Learning (SOL) tests. Accreditation requires a student pass rate of 70 percent or higher in all four content areas. Accreditation ratings also reflect adjustments made for schools that successfully remediate students who initially fail reading, writing, or mathematics tests.

Four out of the five high schools did not qualify to be fully accredited during the 2002-2003 and the 2003-2004 school years. Those four schools were on the list of provisionally accredited/ needs improvement. During the 2004-2005 school year, all five school were fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education.

Data Collection

Interviews

To gather the necessary descriptive data, a semi-structured interview was conducted individually with each of the five principals by the researcher. By interviewing these principals, the researcher collected descriptive data regarding their perceptions and experiences. According to Patton (1990), "The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in and on someone else's mind" (p. 278).

Interviews were conducted with five teachers at each high school to describe their perception of the impact of walkthroughs on their instruction and on student achievement. The goal of this meeting was to collect an in-depth description of how the instructional practices of teachers have been impacted by the walkthrough model for increased levels of student achievement.

Since the semi-structured interview expects the researcher to enter the other person's perspective, the interview questions are more open-ended. Patton (1990) also believes that is crucial that interview questions do not indicate any bias on the part of the interviewer, but simply access the perspective of the person being interviewed.

Interview questions – Principal

The following questions will guide the principal interviews:

1. Describe your teacher supervision model over the last several years.
2. How long ago did you implement the walkthrough model?
3. Describe your walkthrough model.
4. Describe the steps and procedures when you implemented the walkthrough model.
5. Were there any internal barriers when implementing the walkthrough model?
6. What are the most important procedures or steps for successful implementation?
7. What are the most important procedures of your walkthrough model?
8. How much time do you spend in each walkthrough?
9. How often do you conduct walkthroughs?
10. What are you looking for during your walkthroughs?
11. What are you seeing during your walkthroughs?
12. What kind of feedback do you give back to the teachers?
13. What methods do you use to share the feedback?
14. What is the connection between the walkthrough and your supervision model?
15. What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?
16. What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?
17. How are walkthroughs impacting you as an instructional leader?

Interview questions – Teacher

The following questions will guide the teacher interviews:

1. How has your supervision model changed over the years?
2. Describe your supervision model today.

3. In your own words, what does the walkthrough tool mean to you?

4. What are the principals looking for when they conduct a walkthrough in your classroom?

5. What kind of feedback do you get from the principal after a walkthrough?

6. What are the indicators of how walkthroughs has impacted your teaching?

7. What are the indicators of how walkthroughs has impacted student achievement?

8. What advice would you give to an administrator that was about to implement the walkthrough tool?

Data Analysis

Interviews were conducted to gather the data used for this study. All interviews were tape recorded. The interviews then were transcribed and the process of content analysis was utilized to examine the data. According to Patton (1990), "content analysis is the process of identifying, coding, and categorizing the primary patterns in the data. This means analyzing the content of interviews" (p.381).

In this study, the data collected in each interview were coded and identified emerging themes were created. Lincoln and Guba (1985) summarized three ways that themes can be identified: (1) consensus themes – when the majority of the principals state the same theme, (2) supported themes – when approximately half of the principals state a theme, and (3) individual themes – when only one or two principals state a theme. The themes were then categorized according to the frequency and not the importance of the theme. In order to categorize the information Guba (cited in Patton, 1990) suggested the researcher begin looking for similarities and differences between the different categories. After the themes were developed, the researcher then employed quantitative measures to analyze and report the qualitative data. This was accomplished by marking each of the topics or themes with the number of informants who stipulated that theme. Finally, a descriptive summary followed the data and the researcher referred to the literature. It is a common process in qualitative research to connect ideas that emerge from the data to the literature.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to focus on High School Principals using the walkthrough model and to evaluate how the walkthrough model improves student achievement. The researcher interviewed key school personnel involved with the walkthrough model in their high schools. This chapter includes a report on the interviews and an analysis of the data collected. The first part contains a profile of each high school, as provided by the respective principals in a semi-structured interview process. A discussion of each research question and a report of major and minor themes follow. A summary of the chapter is provided in the final section.

Profile of the High Schools

The Newport News Public Schools division in Virginia educates approximately 33,200 children in four early childhood centers, 28 elementary schools, eight middle schools, and five high schools. The five high schools that were the focus of this study have seen an increase in student achievement.   In October 2004, all five high schools were fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education based on their student achievement on the Standards of Learning (SOL) tests.

All of the high schools have students from grades nine to twelve and the enrollment in the five high schools range from 1675 to 2075 students. The average percent of minority student in the five high schools is 64%. The average percent of economically disadvantaged students is 27%.

The researcher also interviewed the assistant superintendent in the Newport News School District. The assistant superintendent was formerly a high school principal in High School E that was studied. The assistant superintendent was a key administrator for the implementation of the walkthrough tool in all five high schools.

At the beginning of each interview, the principal was asked to explain to the interviewer about their high school. Their responses are outlined, as follows:

High School A:

Total Enrollment: 1896

Gender:

      Male   1046

      Female   850

Ethnicity:

      Native American   16

      Asian/Pacific Islander   90

      Black   975

      Hispanic   153

      White   660

      Unspecified   2

Special Education: 198

Talented and Gifted: 19

Economically Disadvantaged: 371

The principal of High School A explained that the High School serves the northern section of Newport News Virginia and sits on a 32-acre campus. The school was built at a cost of $3 million in the early 1960s, opening in the fall of 1965 to approximately 1,280 students in grades 8 to 12. With the opening of Dozier Intermediate School in 1974, High School A became a senior high school, serving students in grades 10 to 12. With the adoption of a citywide middle school plan several years later, a ninth grade was added.

In 1987, High School A received national recognition for an academic excellence and scope of program by the United States Department of Education. Last school year, High School A was fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education. School accreditation ratings for 2004-2005 are based on student achievement on Standards of Learning (SOL) test and other tests in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science administered during 2003-2004 or on overall achievement during the three most recent years. The results of tests administered in each subject area are combined to produce overall passing percentages in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science.

High School B:

Total Enrollment: 1675

Gender:

      Male   791

      Female   884

Ethnicity:

      Native American   11

      Asian/Pacific Islander   15

      Black   1329

      Hispanic   23

      White   297

      Unspecified   0

Special Education: 159

Talented and Gifted: 3

Economically Disadvantaged: 748

        The principal of High School B explained that the High School is an Engineering and Technology Magnet school. Last school year, High School B was fully accredited through the Virginia Department of Education. School accreditation ratings for 2004-2005 are based on student achievement on Standards of Learning (SOL) test and other tests in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science administered during 2003-2004 or on overall achievement during the three most recent years. The results of tests administered in each subject area are combined to produce overall passing percentages in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science.

High School C:

Total Enrollment:	2075
Gender:	
Male	1040
Female	1035
Ethnicity:	
Native American	13
Asian/Pacific Islander	59
Black	913
Hispanic	50
White	1035
Unspecified	5
Special Education:	192
Talented and Gifted:	41
Economically Disadvantaged:	386

The principal of High School C explained that the High School serves the southern section of Newport News, Virginia. High School C is an Aviation Academy Magnet School. Aviation technology classes are offered in pre-engineering subjects—physics, electricity, materials, aircraft drawings, and fluid lines. Students are dual-enrolled with the Hampton University Aeroscience Center Center, completing a portion of the A & P certification. Completion of these courses can lead to an associate's degree in aviation maintenance.

Last two school years, High School C has been fully accredited through the Virginia Department of Education. School accreditation ratings for 2004-2005 are based on student achievement on Standards of Learning (SOL) test and other tests in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science administered during 2003-2004 or on overall achievement during the three most recent years. The results of tests administered in each subject area are combined to produce overall passing percentages in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science. During the 2001-2002 school year, High School C was provisionally accredited and met state standards.

High School D:

Total Enrollment:	1881
Gender:	
Male	909
Female	972
Ethnicity:	
Native American	15
Asian/Pacific Islander	55
Black	940
Hispanic	102
White	766
Unspecified	3
Special Education:	149
Talented and Gifted:	28
Economically Disadvantaged:	556

The principal at High School D explained that the High School offers a rigorous and comprehensive two-year program; the International Baccalaureate Academy prepares students to earn the IB diploma. The coursework is designed to provide students with a well-rounded education and to facilitate geographic and cultural mobility. Many colleges and universities give preference in admissions and advanced standing or credit to students with IB diplomas. Students begin the program by taking Pre-IB courses in the ninth grade at High School D.

The last two school years, High School D has been fully accredited through the Virginia Department of Education. School accreditation ratings for 2004-2005 are based on student achievement on Standards of Learning (SOL) test and other tests in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science administered during 2003-2004 or on overall achievement during the three most recent years. The results of tests administered in each subject area are combined to produce overall passing percentages in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science. During the 2001-2002 school year, High School C was provisionally accredited and needed improvement.

High School E:

Total Enrollment:	1891
Gender:	
Male	832
Female	1059
Ethnicity:	
Native American	18
Asian/Pacific Islander	69
Black	1009
Hispanic	121
White	672
Unspecified	2
Special Education:	133
Talented and Gifted:	24
Economically Disadvantaged:	438

The principal at High School E explained that the High School is a Performing Arts Magnet School. Students may specialize in music, dance, drama, creative writing, communication, and visual arts.

In the last three school years, High School E has been fully accredited through the Virginia Department of Education. School accreditation ratings for 2004-2005 are based on student achievement on Standards of Learning (SOL) test and other tests in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science administered during 2003-2004 or on overall achievement during the three most recent years. The results of tests administered in each subject area are combined to produce overall passing percentages in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science. High schools are fully accredited if students achievement pass rates of 70 percent or above in all four areas.

Addressing the Research Questions

      The following section outlines each of the research questions identified in this study and defines the series interview questions asked of each principal. The individual informant data for each research questions were analyzed to identify similarities and organized into themes that emerged. Lincoln and Guba (1985) summarized three ways that themes can be identified: (1) consensus themes – when the majority of the principals state the same theme, (2) supported themes – when approximately half of the principals state a theme, and (3) individual themes – when only one or two principals state a theme.

1. Research Question #1

What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs identified by the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy?

      The researcher has been a member of the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy for the last two years and has been involved in several walkthrough seminars conducted by Joseph Werlinich and Dr. Otto Graf. The researcher, presently a high school principal that is at the initial stages of implementing the walkthrough tool in his traditional high school, has also been apart of group walkthroughs at other school districts through the Principals Academy and round table discussions after the walkthroughs.

      According to Graf and Werlinich (2002), the implementation of their Walkthrough Tool is a development process. The following are steps for organizing the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania's Walkthrough Tool (Graf and Werlinich, 2002):

1. Conduct a preliminary Walkthrough to learn important information about the staff, students, curriculum, and the school. The goal of this Walkthrough is to see the school in operation and to begin collecting base-line data around a wide spectrum of effective instructional practices.

2. Conduct a Walkthrough meeting with the staff. This meeting sets the stage for the Walkthrough and helps to establish clear expectations for the staff related to the Walkthrough. Specific school goals, special programs or areas of focus for the school should also be reviewed at this meeting.

3. Establish guidelines for all participants in the Walkthrough. Clear expectations need to be established concerning the professional behaviors for individuals participating in this process. Participants must maintain the highest degree of confidentiality regarding things observed in the classrooms. While feedback is important, negative or judgmental comments to others regarding a teacher or a student are not appropriate.

4. Establish a focus for subsequent Walkthroughs. The principal and teachers work together to identify the specific elements of effective instruction or guiding principles of learning that they wish to target for implementation. This step includes the identification of "look-fors" – a precise descriptor of teaching strategies or guiding principles of learning that tell the observer what the strategy actually looks like when applied in the classroom. It is critical to engage teachers when establishing a focus for Walkthroughs. This step creates clear expectations for the teachers and helps build commitment to the process.

5. Connect the "look-fors" to established standards. When developing "look-fors" in the classroom, they should reflect the district's standards for curriculum and instruction. This is an important step with respect to developing a common language for staff and for establishing a matching set of indicators around instruction and learning.

6. Schedule the Walkthrough. The principal should establish an agenda for the Walkthrough and communicate the agenda to the teachers. The exact number of classroom visitations may vary, but a typical Walkthrough includes visits to five to ten classrooms. The principal should indicate to teachers the specific "look-fors" that will be focused during the Walkthrough.

7. Identify type of data to be collected. Sources of data include student learning behaviors, student's work, teacher's behaviors, material utilized, physical arrangement of the classroom, and class activities.

8. Collect data. The person(s) conducting the Walkthrough should collect data during the Walkthrough. Note specific examples of effective practice and exact details about the implementation/use of "look-fors".

9. Observe student behaviors that impact learning. A major area of emphasis for the Walkthrough should be centered on the students. Walkthrough participants may observe students' behaviors, level of engagement, and quality of work. Talking to students about what they are doing and how they evaluate their work presents a wonderful opportunity for assessing effective teaching and learning.

10. Start by validating effective practices. The Walkthrough begins as a process for validating powerful teaching practice, effective use of guiding principles of learning, and the effective learning strategies demonstrated by students.

11. Debrief with teachers. Debriefing with teachers and, in some instance, with students is a critical step in the Walkthrough process. Giving specific feedback based on firsthand observation is a powerful tool.

12. Utilize a variety of strategies for debriefing with teachers (and in some instances students). Providing feedback to the staff as a whole and to individual teachers is a critical step. As this process develops, ample opportunities exist to engage teachers in discussion about areas to improve and to engage teachers in a learning community by sharing ideas and strategies with each other. The following are debriefing tools: Oral Feedback, written feedback, group conference, growth conference, teacher reflection on classroom, teacher walkthroughs, student walkthroughs, clinical supervision conference, study groups, videotape lessons, professional portfolios, examine student work, share teaching artifacts, review teacher's lesson plans, and devise projects.

13. Coach each other. The Walkthrough provides an excellent opportunity for participants to talk about instruction and learning and to coach another. While this process begins with the principal and other administrators walking through classrooms and the school, including teachers in the process is a powerful tool.

14. Create a school culture embedded in improving teaching and learning. The Walkthrough should be seen as part of the culture and not as an event. To

make this process a part of the culture, principals must establish a visible

presence in classrooms.

2. Research Question #2

What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs that are identified by the high school principals in Newport News School District in Virginia?

The specific interview questions asked of the participants to acquire data to

answer Research Question Number Two were:

- Describe the steps and procedures when you implemented the walkthrough tool?
- Were there any internal barriers when implementing the walkthrough model?
- What are the most important procedures or steps for successful implementation?
- What are the most important procedures of your walkthrough model?
- How much time do you spend in each walkthrough?
- How often do you conduct walkthroughs?
- What are you looking for during you walkthroughs?
- What kind of feedback do you give to the teachers?
- What methods do you use to share the feedback?

Central Administrator stated,

Four or five years ago we started the walkthrough tool. A principal from another building went to workshop with Dr. Graf and Joe Werlinich in Portland, Oregon, about walkthroughs. Then the next summer, all five of the high school principals went to the same workshop with Joe and Otto. When we came back from the workshop, we decided that all five of us were going to implement the walkthrough tool. We discussed the walkthroughs as a team and discussed how we were going to implement it as a team of high school principals. The high school teachers knew this was happening across all five high schools and it was not some crazy idea that my principal had. I had my faculty answer several questions to determine the look-fors. What instructional strategies impact student learning the most? What does a quality classroom look like? After the faculty answered those questions, we determined two look-fors for that year. At first, only the administrators did the walkthroughs and then we got the lead teachers involved in their departments. After the comfort level came up, the lead teachers started to conduct walkthroughs outside of their departments. And finally we have teachers doing peer walkthroughs throughout the building. We always give the walkthrough form to the teacher after we conduct the walkthroughs and we usually have a debriefing after school or on professional development period.

Principal A stated,

We started to implement the walkthrough model about 4 years ago. We explained to the staff that this is not "I gotcha." It's simply another way that we can see the

great works that you are doing and share that with other teachers in the building. I found some literature on walkthroughs and went through the literature in the department meetings instead of the entire faculty. I used this forum because of the questions that I knew they would have. I explained to them that the walkthrough tool is an opportunity for us to showcase their talents. I also explained that we need to share our skills with other people. Finally I talked to them about walkthroughs give us an opportunity to see what we normally don't see. Teachers created the look-for form with two focus areas. I wanted another focus area or look-for, but I used what they came up with. Initially only the administrators did the walkthroughs and we only pulled out the positives. No negatives! The following year I had lead teachers conducting the walkthroughs in their departments for the 1st semester and then we had all teachers conducting walkthroughs as teams.

Principal B stated,

We initially introduced the walkthrough tool to the entire faculty. Principals started conducting the walkthroughs and gave positive feedback on a 3x5 note card. It was immediate feedback because we would put the note card on the teacher's desk as soon as we were leaving. You would see the teacher going to the desk and reading the note card almost before you were out of the classroom. A form was then created by the entire school that was a little more user friendly. The look-fors helped us narrow the lens to focus on specific things in the classroom. We then publish the data from the walkthroughs on our weekly newsletter to the staff. It would say something like, as a result of the walkthroughs, 20 teachers, 300 students, and this is what we saw this week. The walkthrough tool gave us a bigger picture of the entire school and helped us create professional development days on the areas that we were weak in. Besides giving the form back to the teachers after the walkthrough, we usually have a debriefing or round table discussion facilitated by an administrator or a lead teacher. Lead teachers are now conducting walkthroughs especially with the new teachers in their department. The lead teachers also conduct walkthroughs with the new teachers in classrooms with exceptional veteran teachers. Then they will have a round table discussion about what they saw and how it can help them in their classroom.

Principal C stated,

Since this is my first year as building principal, we are at the beginning stages of the walkthrough model. Teachers at the beginning of the year were not very comfortable with the walkthrough model. The past principal used the walkthrough model as an "I gotcha" instead of a tool to take snapshots. I worked with the staff this year to try to earn their trust. Then we started to talk about walkthroughs and I explained my non-threatening thoughts of walkthroughs. We then started to talk about measurable goals and placing them on the board. I thought about small steps and let's create a look-for form with only a couple of things that the teachers already do. Lead teachers are at the beginning stages of

conducting walkthroughs in their departments. Last Tuesday was the first time that the lead teachers went out into the building.

Principal D stated,

Six years ago, this schools was pretty much close your door and teach. Before I met Joe and Otto, we started with small goals like objective on the board and varied instruction, basic stuff. After I and the other four high school principals spent some time with Joe and Otto, we decided that this is something we need to implement together. My first step was educating the staff on the walkthrough model as a whole. I wanted to show them the whole picture. This is what a walkthrough looks like. This is why we are doing this. Then I went to each department and sold the model again at a smaller level. I then opened it up for any questions. I showed them what the look-fors were and we educated them on what the look-fors look like. I also found the right people to make this a successful implementation, the bus theory from the book, Good to Great (Collins, 2001). All of the teachers are conducting the walkthroughs with there peers. It was kind of funny, there was sometimes where we didn't think the staff was ready for the next step and they voiced to the administrators that they were ready. And what I mean about next steps is from the administrators conducting the walkthroughs to the lead teachers, and to the entire faculty conducting the walkthroughs. We may even get students involved in the process next year.

Principal E stated,

Implementing the walkthroughs in this high school was relatively easy. The past principal created a school culture of collaboration. The walls in this school for the last several years have been torn down. Teachers feel very comfortable talking to other teachers about teaching. When we implemented the walkthrough tool here at this high school, we explained to the staff that this was separate from the formal supervision model. We explained that this was not formal and was not an evaluation. We talked about the walkthrough model as an informal process to give us a snapshot of what is occurring in the classrooms and in the entire school. The lead teachers and I came up with the look-for form. The lead teachers are the leaders of their department and they talked with their departments about the look-fors. Having over 120 teachers in this building, I thought it would be easier to use the lead teachers. After we agree on the look-fors each year, the lead teachers go over the forms with their departments. The lead teachers and I conduct walkthroughs every week and on Tuesdays we talk about what we are seeing as a team. The teachers get the look-for form back after every walkthrough. We do bring them together throughout the year to discuss what was observed. Kind of like a round table discussion.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Educate the staff on the walkthrough and the process		Find the right people to get on the bus, bus theory (Collins, 2001)

Collectively define the look-fors with the staff		
Share the look-fors with the staff.		
Debrief after the walkthrough		
Principal conducts Walkthroughs		
Lead teachers conducts Walkthroughs		
The entire faculty conducts Walkthroughs		
Give the results to the staff on the walkthroughs conducted – as a whole		

Figure #1 – Research Question #2A – Describe the steps and procedures when you implemented the walkthrough tool?

THEME 1: No barriers – Smooth transition was mentioned by four

administrators.

Central Administrator stated,

> There really weren't any barriers when we implemented the walkthrough tool. We defined the walkthrough process, explained why we were implementing the tool, and assured the teachers it was a way to collect data for our school.

Principal B stated,
> The transition was very smooth when we implemented the walkthrough tool. I explained to the teachers that we need to share the great practices that we use in the classroom because of the era of accountability of the SOLs. Therefore, the teachers understood why we were implementing the walkthrough tool.

Principal D stated,
> If it is presented the right way, then the teachers will see what is good for kids. There were some teachers that didn't like it, but those teachers have opened their eyes. I explained to the teachers that we either come up with a plan to improve our school or the state will come in and take over our school and give us a plan. I think the way I explained the process is the reason that we had no problems initially with implementation of the walkthrough.

Principal E stated,
> The culture of this school was one that already started to break down the walls. Teachers had to conduct peer observations twice a month even before the

walkthrough was implemented. The transition of the walkthrough tool in our school was very smooth due to the culture of the building.

THEME 2: Comfort level was low was mentioned by one administrator.

Principal C stated,

When we first implemented the walkthrough tool, the comfort level was not where it needed to be. Teachers commented on why the principals were targeting them. They also did not want the lead teachers in their classrooms. But after the first year, teachers started to see it was not a formal observation tool that would be connected to the supervision model.

THEME 3: Negative talk by teachers was mentioned by one administrator.

Principal A stated,

There was one situation at the beginning when a teacher told another teacher about something negative they saw. The statement ran through the building like wild fire and there were some bad feelings. I addressed it with the teacher and discussed it with the entire faculty. I also believe that you must explain to your teachers from the very beginning that this process is not "I gotcha", it is snapshots of this school.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	No barriers – Transition was smooth	Comfort level was low
		Negative talk by teachers was about what they saw during the walkthroughs

Figure #2 – Research Question #2B – Were there any internal barriers when implementing the walkthrough model?

Central Administrator stated,

I think the most important step is to collectively set the look-fors and what ever the faculty comes up with, use it. The administrators and lead teachers in the school can help evolve those look-fors into deeper and deeper and more meaningful look-fors. The second most important part for successful implementation is to explain to the teachers that walkthroughs are not evaluation, but it's a way for us to collect data about our school. The third important step

initially is when you conduct walkthroughs, give extremely positive feedback to the teachers.

Principal A stated,

The principal must be upfront with the teachers. Explain to them why we are doing this. I got the teachers involved in the process from the beginning. I asked the teachers what they wanted to see as a result of these walkthroughs and they created the look-fors. You must explain to the teachers that this is not "I gotcha". It is simply another way to see the great works that you are doing and share those works with other teachers.

Principal B stated,

Have the teachers create the look-for form together. We had teachers answer a series of questions. What instructional strategies help all students learn? What instructional strategy impacts learning the most? What does a quality classroom look like? And then we had the answers to those questions hanging in the faculty room for several weeks. The teachers added several additional answers over those weeks.

Principal C stated,

The most important thing for successful implementation is to have the trust of your teachers. The past principal used the walkthrough as "I gotcha." I first earned the trust of the staff and then slowly began to talk and educate them about the walkthroughs. I thought about small steps and had the teachers create a look-for form with only two focus areas.

Principal D stated,

The most important step is to educate the staff on what a walkthrough looks like, why we are doing this, explain to them what you are looking for. The second most important step is to find the right people, the bus theory from Good to Great (Collins, 2001).

Principal E stated,

The most important procedure is that the walkthrough tool becomes a routine in the building and a routine for the principals. Another important procedure is to explain that this is not an evaluation tool. It is a tool for us to take a 10 minute snapshot.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Teachers collectively create the look-fors for the walkthrough tool.	Educate the staff about walkthroughs.	Making the walkthrough a routine for the teachers and the principals.

		Earning the trust of the staff
		Finding the right people

Figure #3 – Research Question #2C – What are the most important procedures or steps for successful implementation?

THEME 1: Ten minutes time spent in the classrooms during a walkthrough

was mentioned by three administrators.

Central Administrator stated,
> I conducted a walkthrough once a week. During the 1st semester, I called it "walkthrough Tuesdays" and the 2nd semester "walkthrough Thursdays. I would schedule those afternoons to conduct my walkthroughs. I would stay in each classroom for 10 minutes.

Principal A stated,
> We conduct walkthroughs once every nine weeks. We spend 10 minutes in each class and we have over one hundred teachers.

Principal C stated,
> I usually stay around 10 minutes. With only having two focus areas which are a measurable goal and all student actively engaged, I do not need additional time. I try to conduct a walkthrough with every teacher in the building at least once a nine weeks. There are some walkthroughs that I stay longer because I'm simply enjoying the class.

THEME 2: Five to Ten minutes time spent in the classrooms during a

walkthrough was mentioned by two administrators.

Principal B stated,
> I try to spend Tuesday morning or afternoon to conduct my walkthroughs. I usually spend between 5 and 10 minutes in the classroom. It also depends on what we are looking for or our focus. If we are looking for higher-ordered thinking questions, then we may stay longer.

Principal D stated,
> I try to conduct walkthroughs once a month. It's very hard sometimes to get in the classrooms, but you must schedule it. My lead teachers conduct walkthrough

once a week in their departments. My lead teachers and I usually spend 5 to 10 minutes in each classroom.

THEME 3: Ten to Fifteen minutes time spent in the classrooms during a walkthrough was mentioned by one administrator.

Principal E stated,

I conduct walkthroughs on a weekly basis. My lead teachers conduct walkthroughs 2 to 3 times a week. We spend anywhere from 10 to 15 minutes in each of the classrooms.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	10 minutes – time in classroom	10 – 15 minutes – time in classroom
	5 – 10 minutes – time in classroom	

Figure #4 – Research Question #2D – How much time do you spend in each walkthrough?

Central Administrator stated,

Over the last four years, we had several focuses or look-fors when conducting our walkthroughs. We started very small. I think the first look-fors were student engagement and an objective written on the board. We then evolved into differentiated instruction, higher-order thinking skills, and clear expectations.

Principal A stated,

The two look-fors that we are focusing on this year are a measurable goal or objective and higher-order thinking skills. We have had several staff development days this year on these two look-fors. I hope that these focus areas become a habit and we can continue with several other focus areas.

Principal B stated,

We progressed over the years. We initially gave positive feedback using a 3x5 note card. We then looked at patterns at we saw that was occurring in the school. This year we are looking for questioning techniques and the use of technology. We are looking for higher-order questioning techniques such as synthesis, evaluation, and analysis. Those are the two focus areas that we have had this year and they have been driving our staff development days.

Principal C stated,

There are two look-fors on our walkthrough form. The first look-for in our walkthrough tool is a clearly stated and measurable objective(s). You simply check off yes or no and write the objective. The second look-for in our walkthrough tool is to observe if all students actively engaged, passively engaged, or disengaged. We document what the teacher was doing and what the students were doing.

Principal D stated,

One of our focuses this year comes from the Lorraine Monroe Leadership Institute on blackboard configuration. By conducting walkthroughs last year, I noticed that we as a school were everywhere on goals on the chalkboard. The look-fors this year are blackboard configuration, higher order thinking skills, and accountable talk that comes from Hunter. Examples of the blackboard configuration are that the objective is clearly communicated and measurable. There are checkpoints and timelines to guide the students throughout the lesson. Finally, the classroom activities engage all students in the learning. This focus has been a struggle this year. The look-for, higher order thinking skills, there must be questioning techniques that reach beyond simply recall. We are looking for teachers to incorporate synthesis, evaluation, and analysis questioning.

Principal E stated,

The look-fors that we defined as a school this year were high and clear expectations, active use of knowledge, and high order thinking skills. Under the high and clear expectations, we are looking for an objective that is clearly communicated and visually displayed. We are looking for rubrics that help students understand expectations. There is evidence of classroom routines and checkpoints and timelines that help students complete their work. Those are some examples of high and clear expectations. Under active use of knowledge, we are looking for reading strategies that are being used to increase content retention. Graphic organizers are used for note making and for understanding the textbook. Technology is used as a learning tool. Those are some examples of active use of knowledge. Some examples of higher order thing skills are questioning techniques that include a focus on synthesis, evaluation, and analysis.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Student engagement	The use of technology
	Written objective or measurable goal	Blackboard configuration
	Higher-order thinking skills	Active use of knowledge
	Clear expectations	Differentiated instruction

Figure #5 – Research Question #2E – What are you looking for during your walkthroughs?

Central Administrator stated,

> The walkthrough form is placed in the teachers mailboxes after every walkthrough conducted by an administrator, a lead teacher, or a group of teachers. During department meetings, lead teachers would go over what was observed as a department. We never talked about an individual walkthrough. Our weekly newsletter was used to explain what we collectively as school and I always put one thing or strategy to push. We always debriefed with the teachers that we visited. Sometimes we would take our new teachers on walkthroughs and then have them debrief on what they saw. That was very effective with the new teachers. It really set the tone for what we as a school expect from our teachers. If we visited all the science classrooms in one day, then all the science teachers would stay after school and we would debrief. This is what we are seeing in the science classrooms today.

Principal A stated,

> When we have groups of teachers conducting walkthroughs throughout a period, then those teachers will come back into my conference room and debrief on what they saw. The group of teachers will give written feedback to the teachers that they visited. Sometimes the teachers will email each other to discuss a certain student, great job, or even a helpful hint.

Principal B stated,

> The teachers that we visit receive the look-for form and are asked to participate in a round table discussion usually facilitated by administrator or a lead teacher. We also publish the results in weekly newsletter that is sent to all the teachers. We would state that we visited x amount of classrooms, x amount of students, and this is what we saw.

Principal C stated,

> At this point, we are only using the look-for form with the two look-fors. The teachers receive this form after every visit.

Principal D stated,

> A copy of the walkthrough form is a two-ply and a copy goes into the teachers' mailboxes. We debrief with the teachers and talk to them about the strengths and weaknesses that we observed as a group. We never single out one teacher in those debriefing sessions. Teachers also have an opportunity to explain their thoughts of the lesson went while the walkthrough occurred and how the lesson went after the walkthrough. Teachers email each other great job notes and even talk about a strategies.

Principal E stated,

> The minimal debriefing technique that we use is getting the look-for sheet back to the teacher that we visited. Usually we have round table discussions and talk about corrections that need to take place. The lead teachers and I meet every week and they also keep me updated on what they are seeing. The lead teachers

conduct walkthroughs every week. I also include an instructional audit in our weekly newsletters, talking about the strengths and weaknesses that were observed during the walkthroughs that week.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Look-for sheet returned to the teacher that was visited	Results of the walkthroughs posted on weekly newsletter	
Debriefing – Round table discussion	Email – Good job notes	
	New teachers' walkthroughs and debriefings	
	Debriefing by lead teachers on what was observed in their visits	

Figure #6 – Research Question #2F – What kind of feedback do you give back to the teachers?

3. Research Question #3

What elements and procedures are identified by the high school principals in

Newport News School District's walkthrough tool that do not appear in the Western

Pennsylvania Principals Academy's walkthrough tool?

The following are elements and procedures that the high school principals that were interviewed identified that did not appear in the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy's walkthrough tool:

THEME 1: Lead teachers conducting walkthroughs was mentioned by all five administrators.

Central Administrators stated,

> At first, only the administrators did the walkthroughs. And then we got the lead teachers involved in their departments. And after the comfort level came up, the lead teachers started to conduct walkthroughs outside of their departments. And finally we have teachers doing peer walkthroughs throughout the building.

Principal A stated,

> The second year I had lead teachers conducting the walkthroughs in their departments for the 1st semester and then we had all teachers conducting walkthroughs as teams. The lead teachers are conducting walkthroughs on weekly basis.

Principal B stated,

Besides giving the form back to the teachers after the walkthrough, we usually have a debriefing or round table discussion facilitated by an administrator or a lead teacher. Lead teachers are now conducting walkthroughs especially with the new teachers in their department on weekly basis. The lead teachers also conduct walkthroughs with the new teachers in classrooms with exceptional veteran teachers. Then they will have a round table discussion about what they saw and how it can help them in their classroom.

Principal C stated,

Lead teachers are at the beginning stages of conducting walkthroughs in their departments. Last Tuesday was the first time that the lead teachers went out into the building.

Principal D stated,

All of the teachers are conducting the walkthroughs with their peers. It was kind of funny. There was sometimes when we didn't think the staff was ready for the next step and they voiced to the administrators that they were ready. And what I mean about next steps is from the administrators conducting the walkthroughs to the lead teachers, and to the entire faculty conducting the walkthroughs.

Principal E stated,

The lead teachers and I came up with the look-for form. The lead teachers are the leaders of their department and they talked with their departments about the look-fors. Having over 120 teachers in this building, I thought it would be easier to use the lead teachers. After we agree on the look-fors each year, the lead teachers go over the forms with their departments. The lead teachers and I conduct walkthroughs every week and on Tuesdays we talk about what we are seeing as a team.

THEME 2: Make sure the teachers realize that the walkthroughs is not "I gotcha" was mentioned by four administrators.

Principal A stated,

We explained to the staff that this is not "I gotcha." It's simply another way that we can see the great works that you are doing and share that with other teachers in the building.

Principal C stated,

Teachers at the beginning of the year were not very comfortable with the walkthrough model. The past principal used the walkthrough model as an "I gotcha" instead of a tool to take snapshots. I worked with the staff this year to try to earn their trust.

Principal D stated,

At first the staff though that the walkthroughs were about accountability or "I gotcha." We had to earn their trust and demonstrate that it was about improving our school.

Principal E stated,
I explained to the staff it is not about "I gotcha"; it's about getting snapshots of the school to drive instruction and staff development.

THEME 3: Debriefing tool – Weekly newsletter explaining the walkthroughs was mentioned by four administrators.

Central Administrator stated,
Our weekly newsletter was used to explain what we collectively as a school and I always put one thing or strategy to push.

Principal B stated,
We then publish the data from the walkthroughs on our weekly newsletter to the staff. It would say something like, as a result of the walkthroughs, 20 teachers, 300 students, and this is what we saw this week.

Principal D stated,
We also publish the results from the walkthroughs in a monthly newsletter. It's always things that we see in the classrooms. We list items that we talk about during the debriefing sessions.

Principal E stated,
I also include an instructional audit in our weekly newsletter talking about the strengths and weaknesses that were observed during the walkthroughs that week.

THEME 4: Collective effort from all five high schools in the school district when implementing the walkthrough model was mentioned by all five administrators.

Central Administrator stated,
Then the next summer, all five of the high school principals went to the same workshop with Joe and Otto. When we came back from the workshop, we decided that all five of us were going to implement the walkthrough tool. We discussed the walkthroughs as a team and discussed how we were going to implement it as a team of high school principals. The high school teachers knew this was happening across all five high schools and it was not some crazy idea that my principal had.

Principal A stated,
All of the others' high principals agreed to implement this tool and we did it together. We visited each others schools and helped one another throughout the process. We also started to work with the middle schools with this tool.

Principal B stated,
> When I was a middle school principal last year, the five high school principals invited the middle school principals to do walkthroughs in their high schools. I was very familiar with the process before I came to this school. All the teachers knew that the high school principals were implementing this tool and they could not transfer to another high school. They were all using the walkthrough tool!

Principal D stated,
> After I and the other four high school principals spent some time with Joe and Otto, we decided that this is something we need to implement together.

Principal E stated,
> I was an assistant principal when we implemented the walkthrough model and it was amazing. The five high principals would meet every month and discuss the walkthrough tool and how it was going. They would conduct walkthroughs at other buildings. They worked together to implement it across all five high schools.

4. Research Question #4

What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning and student achievement identified by the high school principals in Newport New School District?

The specific interview questions asked of the participants to acquire data to answer Research Question Number Four were:

- What is the connection between the walkthrough and your supervision model?
- What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?
- What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?
- How are walkthroughs impacting you as an instructional leader?
- Were there any other initiatives that were implemented at the same time as the walkthrough tool?

Central Administrator stated,
> It wasn't about walkthroughs at first. It was about what do we look for to help all students succeed. It has been a school improvement tool. It's not about walkthroughs; it's really about the "look-fors" and we walk through to see how we are doing and gather data on how we are doing with these look-fors that we set. For me it connected the "look-fors" to the walkthroughs to the feedback. I don't think walkthroughs will impact instruction unless you give the teachers a focus where you want them to grow that year. Whatever you want more of or less of and that is the look-for that and then talk with the faculty about what we were

seeing. As you begin to see more of whatever, meaning look-fors, and the quality of that, that is how as a principal we know we are getting there. Getting there meaning improving instruction.

It is the sense you get as a principal that the habit is permeating throughout the classrooms and the fact that you see it through the walkthroughs is different when you see it in a formal observation because it is more of a habit if everyone is seeing throughout the building versus when I announce I will be on Thursday and that teacher will plan whatever that goal is for the year or the nine weeks.

Principal A stated,

I believe that the "look-fors" help teachers get organized or focus on the instructional strategies for that year. I like the walkthroughs because there are no more dog and pony shows because they don't know when the walkthroughs are going to occur. I have seen a dramatic difference in student engagement since we implemented the walkthroughs. Administrators and lead teachers are asking students questions about the learning that period and know this. Students know that they have to be engaged because we will ask questions. There is no doubt that instruction has improved because of the walkthrough tool. But it is not just the walkthrough, it's the look-fors. The look-fors give an instructional focus for the year and if teachers are focusing on that look-for, then instruction is improving. The look-for had to be a weakness that was observed last year during the walkthroughs. I believe without the look-fors instruction would not change and you would have a dog and pony show. Teachers need to focus on certain areas and we have seen last years focuses become habits this year. It's old news, the look-fors last year. We are raising the expectations for teachers and in turn the teachers are raising the expectations of the students.

Principal B stated,

I have seen the walls come down over the last 3 or 4 years. That is the biggest and most positive change that occurred here. Teachers are sharing what they know regarding best practices. Teachers realize that we need to share with other teachers because of the accountability of the SOLs. Walkthroughs have helped teachers realize that if you are doing something and you are making a difference, we all need to know about it. We debrief with teachers and the lead teachers or the administrator will talk about what they saw during the visits and have teachers talk about the strategies they used. After the debriefing, teachers will invite me back into their classrooms because they are using that strategy that was talked about in the debriefing. So to answer your question, the collaboration between teachers about best instructional practices and observing the those practices in action in every walkthrough, in almost every classroom, tells me that instruction is definitely improving.

Principal C stated,

You see teachers look forward to you coming into their classrooms. Teachers want the walkthrough form after every walkthrough. I had a teacher looking in his mailbox every period after a visit who finally came to my office to request the

form. I have seen over this year teachers feeling more comfortable coming in for suggestions after a walkthrough occurred. Since we implemented the two look-fors this year, the two look-fors are occurring in almost every classroom. The look-fors help us change instructional practices.

Principal D stated,

Walkthroughs have helped us on how we have developed our staff development and our focus or look-fors. We used to have staff development days that were all over the place with no tie into the previous in-service day. We are now going to talk about higher-order thinking questions, differentiating instruction, accountable talk and best ways for our teachers to collaboration. We really wanted to focus on teachers learning to collaborate with one another. To answer your question, through staff development days that are scaffolding to our weaknesses as a school and focus areas or look-fors that teachers use in their classrooms have definitely improved the instruction in our entire school.

Principal E stated,

The availability of current data has helped us improve the instruction of this entire school. The walkthrough is a tool for us to gather that data. We are a data driven school. I believe the best data is the data that I can see in the classrooms: asking questions to students and talking with teachers. Improved teacher performance and their instructional practices are occurring due to the look-fors and how we better plan our staff development. We conduct walkthroughs to make sure that teachers understand certain instructional practices and are using those instructional practices that are outlined through the look-fors and through the staff development days. You must hold your teachers accountable to the look-fors and the staff development practices or you will not improve instruction. The walkthrough must become a routine and teachers will understand the priority that you place on instruction.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Look-fors improve instruction – walkthroughs are a tool to make sure teachers are focusing on the look-fors	The habit (look-fors) starts to premiate throughout the classrooms and the school	
	Teachers are practicing the look-fors defined at the beginning of the year	
	Last years look-fors are old news; they are simply a habit	
	Current data collected in classrooms provides us focus on professional development days	

| | There is collaboration of best practices and observing those practices throughout the school | |
| | Change in student achievement is dramatic | |

Figure #7 – Research Question #4A – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?

Central administrator stated,

Principal A stated,

> Walkthroughs have been a step for us to improve student achievement. It starts with the teacher. When the teachers are held accountable, they are going to hold their students accountable. If teachers know we are looking for certain strategies, they tend to plan and organize their lessons around that strategy. We are fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education because of our student's achievement scores. The achievement scores are rising because our teachers are using better instructional practices. The reason they are using better instructional practices is because of the look-fors and the collaboration between the staff about best practices. To answer your question, it's simple; walkthroughs have impacted student achievement because it helped us focus on the best instructional practices and our test scores on the SOLs have changed dramatically. Our SAT scores are on the rise also. There are no other initiatives that have occurred in the last several years to make a difference in our SOL tests and the SATs. But it's not all the walkthroughs, it's the debriefing or collaboration and the focus areas or look-fors that improved student achievement.

Principal B stated,

> Based on the fact teachers are more willing to share as a result of the walkthroughs and the debriefing, students are going to benefit from the best practices used in the classrooms. Our test scores have increased dramatically and we are now fully accredited due to the best practices used by the teachers in the classrooms. We have less students being recycled, which means less students failing. I have seen it first hand, teachers were all over the board with instructional practices years ago and now you will see a goal or an objective on the board in every classroom, higher order thinking skills in every classroom, and many other sound practices. The key is that all teachers are using the best practices and they continue to share them. I also think that students know that we are coming in and asking questions. Students seem to be more focused and it forces them to pay more attention because they know we will ask questions. Most students do not want their teacher to look bad in front of visitors, most students.

Principal C stated,

Our teachers are using better instructional practices and I have observed those better practices through my walkthroughs. Although those look-fors that you put in place for this year, teachers do not automatically use them. It's a fight sometimes all year until it becomes a habit for them. But the habits are instructional practices that will help all students learn. I have observed teachers using better instructional practices and students are definitely more engaged and our test scores on the SOLs and the SATs have increased dramatically.

Principal D stated,

If I look at where we were several years ago, it was really bad. I have never been in a place where no one knew that they were sinking or naked and everyone sees it. AYP, NCLB, and the SOLs are here and not going away. We have seen things that we have never seen before, 85% of our seniors are now going to a 2 year or 4 year college and 6.6 million dollars in scholarship last year. Our minority rate is around 53% and we have every special education category except one in this school. If you have a focus, an instructional focus that looks at best practices and if you hold the teachers accountable for those focuses, your student achievement scores will increase. The indicator that walkthroughs have impacted student achievement here at this high school is that we are using better instructional practices and we are seeing more students pass the SOLs than ever and SAT scores have increased. There have not been other initiatives in the last several years that were directly tied to instruction. We are also fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education.

Principal E stated,

We know what our classrooms look like due to walkthroughs and we now know how to better implement instructional strategies. We see first hand where the teachers struggle throughout the year with the new instructional practices and it helps us plan professional development days to help them. With our teachers improving instruction, we have seen a dramatic increase in our SOL scores. We are now fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education and it is due to better instructional strategies in the classroom.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education	Increase of students attending 2 or 4 year colleges	More scholarship money being awarded
Increase in SOL Scores	Increase in SAT scores	
Increase in Test Scores	Less students being recycled	
	Less students failing courses	

Figure #8 – Research Question #4B – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?

Central Administrator stated,

> The walkthrough model forces principals to get out into the classrooms. But just conducting walkthrough will not make a principal a better instructional leader. What are they doing during the walkthroughs? What data are they collecting? What are they doing with the data? What are they looking for during the walkthrough? We walk through classrooms to see how we are doing and gather data on how we are doing with those look-fors that we defined as our weakness. Also, by conducting Walkthroughs and listening to teachers debrief about the walkthroughs helps a principal learn more strategies.

Principal A stated,

> The main thing I see with walkthroughs regarding the principalship, I'm empowering other people, teachers to be supportive to each other. By listening to lead teachers explaining different instructional practices and sharing ideas has helped me become a better instructional leader. I have had many opportunities to share what I see with other teachers to help them do a better job. It has impacted me as a principal; I cannot be in every classroom everyday. The peer walkthroughs give me additional information, so I can support all teachers and find out what may school may need overall.

Principal B stated,

> The walkthrough has forced me to get out into classrooms. It has also forced me to get away from those operational issues that occur each day. Those operational issues can tie your entire day up. The walkthroughs help you find out what is truly going on in the classrooms. Besides instruction, it also gives me an opportunity to see first hand any issues that student could possibly have. If I see things that need to be corrected, I sit with that teacher and we talk about different strategies to help the teacher be more successful. Then I conduct several follow-up walkthroughs to see if the teacher followed any of my recommendations.

Principal C Stated,

> When Joe and Otto first introduced the walkthroughs, I thought about it as something we need to do as a principal. I then said okay, we will do it when Joe, Otto, or any other central administrators come to visit. But I started to see a difference! It was workable, fairly easy to do, and we were getting great feedback. I went with Joe and Otto to the other schools and saw first hand some things that I wanted to implement in my school. I thought about how successful the walkthroughs really were. As a new principal in this building, it has helped me see what is really occurring in the schools and what our needs and strengths are.

Principal D stated,

> It pushes or puts pressure on you to get out into the classrooms. It forces you to get out of the managerial tasks that occur in second in the office. With all the

demands on a high school principal, it is very difficult to conduct walkthroughs. I'm not going to sit here and lie to you; it's difficult to find the time; you must schedule it! To be an instructional leader, you first need to get in the classrooms and then assist teachers in best practices.

Principal E stated,

It makes it easier for me to do what I'm supposed to do anyways, which is to be in classrooms. I'm only supposed to be in the classrooms for 10 minutes, not 90 minutes. I'm there to get snapshots of the teaching. The walkthrough gives the principal a structure when they are in the classroom. The look-fors help the principal become more of an instructional leader because they focus on your school and the specific instructional strategies that your school needs. The real value of the walkthrough is the ability to gather data of what is occurring in the building and as an instructional leader, I can start to help teachers and the entire school focus on a weakness.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
It forces or pressures you to get in classrooms	The look-fors give a structure to assist teachers	It helps me focus on the students' needs and then instructionally help teachers
	Look-fors help me focus on the school's needs which puts me into an instructional leader position	
	It enables me to gather data and I then can assist instructionally	
	Listening to debriefing sessions results in more tools in my toolbox to assist teachers	

Figure #9 – Research Question #4C – How are walkthroughs impacting you as an instructional leader?

5. Research Question # 5

What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning and student achievement identified by the high school teachers in Newport News School District?

The specific interview questions asked of the participants to acquire data to answer Research Question Number Five were:

- What are the indicators of how walkthroughs has impacted you teaching?
- What are the indicators of how walkthroughs has impacted student achievement?
- What advice would you give to an administrator that was about to implement the walkthrough tool?
- In your own words, what does the walkthrough tool mean to you?
- What the principals looking for when they conduct a walkthrough in your classroom?
- What kind of feedback do you get from the principal after a walkthrough?

School A:

Teacher #1 stated,

I have learned a great deal through peer walkthroughs. I have stolen so many different ideas from instructional strategies to classroom management strategies. During the debriefing sessions, I have also learned a great deal about what works and what does not. It has given me a lot more tools for my toolbox. I'm touching student's lives more now than I ever have before. There are fewer students that have to get recycled in my classes. Students are passing the SOLs!

Teacher #2 stated,

I have never observed another teacher before during my 23 years! After my first peer walkthrough I realized how much I grew from observing that teacher for 10 minutes. After my first walkthrough from the principal, the debriefing session helped me feel that I was not by myself in this school. Other teachers were facing the same problems that I was dealing with. We started talking about different strategies in dealing with those problems in the classroom and before I knew it, those problems went away.

School B:

Teacher #1 stated,

It helps us maintain the quality of instruction that occurs in our classrooms. The better instruction that occurs, students are more engaged and student achievement will increase. I use different instructional strategies and I have seen a dramatic difference in student engagement and I have more students passing the SOLs.

Teacher # 2 stated,

It is important that instruction is vibrant and that teachers use different strategies so they do not get stagnant. I'm glad that the walkthroughs give us a forum to discuss best practices and keeps us up-to-date with any new strategies that are out there in education. I learn things from new teachers that are coming out of college with different techniques, even though I have been teacher for 23 years. I also feed off of the newer teachers with their enthusiasm for teaching.

Teacher #3 stated,

I think about best practices more than ever. When I use great instructional practices my students tend to be more engaged. I have discipline problems when students are not engaged and seem to be bored. If we are struggling with a certain strategy, the principal will recommend teachers to conduct walkthroughs that use that strategy. It's become a culture of discussing best practices and trying to implement them into the classroom. There is a lot of support from the lead teachers, the administrators, and other teachers.

School C:

Teacher #1 stated,

I pick up different techniques from the feedback on the walkthrough form and from the debriefing sessions after the walkthrough. It's kind of like a round table discussion about want was observed through the walkthroughs. It's very positive in nature and we never talk about an individual teacher.

Teacher #2 stated,

Honestly, I don't think the walkthroughs are changing my instruction directly. The look-fors are things I have been doing for years. Once the look-fors change, it may impact my instruction. The debriefing sessions have impacted my instruction because of all the different techniques that we talk about. I know teachers that have changed for the better because they are concentrating on the look-fors.

Teacher #3 stated,

I'm not sure if it will. I never had people come into my classroom and critique me. Being in other classrooms in the last several years, I observed some techniques that I have implemented into my classroom. I have noticed that teachers are taking more time and planning a clear and measurable objective for each day. It's one thing at a time. We will add to our look-fors to create better instructional practices in all the classrooms.

School D:

Teacher #1 stated,

By having teachers going to visit other teachers that are using best practices, I have seen them go back into their classrooms and use those best practices. It's been amazing!

Teacher #2 stated,

The collaboration between teachers during the debriefing sessions has impacted instruction. Teachers leave those sessions and try new practices or techniques.

Teacher #3 stated,

The flow and the organization of the teacher are improving. Last week I was in a classroom and everything fell together with this teacher, everything just flowed.

Due to the walkthroughs I had an opportunity to see it first hand. But the look-fors are what got that teacher more organized and helped the transitions.

Teacher #4 stated,
Students will ask why isn't the "Do Know" (sponge activity) on the board. It's become a culture, regarding the look-fors, a habit with the teachers and the students.

School E:

Teacher #1 stated,
Nobody is surprised when your door opens and there is no change in the instruction or no change in the stride.

Teacher #2 stated,
No matter how seasoned a teacher is, you can always find something new to implement in your own classroom. Conducting walkthroughs has sparked so many different thoughts and ideas in my own teaching. I may not implement a technique or a strategy that I observed through a walkthrough exactly; I may change it to fit my style or my classroom.

Teacher #3 stated,
It's nice to see my students in other classrooms. We have lots of discussion about classroom management and dealing with certain students. A student could be an angel my class, but when I observe that same student in another class he could be off the wall. I have helped teachers with those types of students and give them certain strategies that I use with them. It also has happened the other way around. Teachers have given me different strategies to use. It has given me so many different tools for my toolbox. Not just classroom management techniques, but instructional practices that get more students engaged.   The discussions and the walkthroughs have helped me become such a better teacher.

Teacher #4 stated,
When I conduct peer walkthroughs, I ask students several questions about what they are learning. Over the last several years, most students are able to answer the questions. What is the objective for today? What are you learning? Why are you learning this? Students answering these questions tells me that the quality of instruction has increased. The walkthrough has been a tool to help all of us focus on instruction.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	It has helped with the collaboration between colleagues, sharing instructional practices and	Students are able to answer certain questions about the learning that is occurring in the classroom

	classroom management techniques	
	It has given me more tools in my toolbox	
	SOL scores have increased	
	More students are now engaged using the best practices that were discussed during a debriefing session	
	More students are now engaged using the best practices described on the look-for form.	
	Less students are being recycled	
	Open door culture, collaboration of best practices having helped us all.	

Figure #10 – Research Question #5A – What are the indicators of how walkthroughs has impacted you teaching?

School A:

Teacher #1 stated,

> We are under the gun because of the SOLs. I'm not sure if walkthroughs are impacting student achievement, the jury is still out, it's still new to us.

Teacher #2 stated,

> In my opinion, I think walkthroughs have increased student achievement and the graduation rate. Our SOL scores have increased dramatically and the graduation rate has also increased over the last four years. Walkthroughs have really opened the doors not for just the teacher, we want the teacher to get it, but because of the number of students we have reached. If we improve our teaching skills, of course, we will improve student achievement. We don't talk about the students much, but they are the ones that are getting all the benefits.

School B:

Teacher #1 stated,

> I would say indirectly, not directly. The amount of time and training and discussions on staff development and walkthroughs being a part of that, that's what impacts my instruction and student achievement. We all complain about the debriefing meetings, but they are so valuable. We are always implementing

different strategies that we hear and discuss at the debriefing sessions. Since that
occurred, I have seen my SOL scores rise over the last several years.

Teacher #2 stated,

It has helped me be more creative and has definitely given me more tools for my
toolbox. Debriefing after walkthroughs has helped me use the different strategies
in my classroom. Students are more engaged than ever before. The look-fors
helped me focus on a couple of areas and it started to become a routine. I have
seen an increase of student engagement and an increase on the number of students
that are passing the SOLs on the first try. Our graduation rate is also increasing.

Teacher #3 stated,

I agree with everyone. I use so many different strategies the kids never get bored.
My students' SOL scores have increased and I know it's because I'm a stronger
teacher, using best practices.

School C:

Teacher #1 stated,

Anything that helps your teaching will have an impact on your students. I know
the better techniques that I have been using in my classroom have a direct
correlation with student achievement.

Teacher #2 stated,

My lessons are more organized and students seem to be better behaved in the
classroom. Since they are better behaved, students are more engaged in the
lesson. We are at the beginning stages of the walkthroughs, so I'm not sure about
student achievement. If students are more engaged, then I would say that student
achievement will increase.

Teacher #3 stated,

Teachers are planning more for their lessons around clear and measurable
objectives and making sure that they are being met. Since teachers are planning
more, students are definitely being impacted. During last week's walkthroughs, I
have seen more students' on-task and less behavior problems than at the
beginning of the year when I did walkthroughs. That is throughout the building,
not just a couple of classrooms.

Teacher #4 stated,

Students have even noticed that all teachers have an objective on the board. They
have commented to me that they like every teacher having the same structure
regarding objectives on the board. I think it is very powerful that students picked
up the look-for of clear and measurable objective on the board. I have also s
witnessed students more focused and grades have increased in my classroom.
The administration has put such an emphasis on instruction with these

walkthroughs that it has filtered down through the teachers and now through the students.

School D:

Teacher #1 stated,
> By conducting walkthroughs, I can see how far they are on the course curriculum. If they are behind with the curriculum, I will have a team meeting to discuss the pace because of the SOLs.

Teacher #2 stated,
> The walkthroughs have helped us keep everyone on the same page in social studies. Students will be assessed on certain material on the SOLs and we must make sure that they receive that information.

Teacher #3 stated,
> Walkthroughs have helped us gauge how our students are going to do on the SOLs. Since we have implemented the walkthroughs and created the look-fors around our weaknesses, we are now fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education and our SOL scores have increased. How do I know it's because of the look-fors and the walkthroughs? Because I have seen teachers using better instructional practices more than ever. It was appalling at what I saw several years ago, but it has changed. Teachers are collaborating with each other and talking about best practices.

School E:

Teacher #1 stated,
> If the walkthroughs are seeing the look-fors being implemented, then the quality of instruction is improving which will have a direct impact on student achievement. The look-fors in this building are being accomplished and our SOL scores have dramatically increased over the last several years.

Teacher #2 stated,
> More students are engaged! The emphasis on instruction and administrators being more visible in classrooms and looking for best practices has dramatically changed over the last several years. I have seen a change in my SOL scores. My students would also say they have seen a change in my teaching over the last several years. I believe that it is due to the collaboration that the walkthroughs give us.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	SOL scores have increased	I'm not sure, the jury is still out

	Graduation rate have increased	
	Teaching skills have improved which has direct correlation with student achievement	
	Students are more engaged and my classroom grades have increased	
	Less students are failing course and being recycled	

Figure #11 – Research Question #5B – What are the indicators of how walkthroughs has impacted student achievement?

School A:

Teacher #2 stated,

> Do not scare the teachers! Teachers do not like change. There was an immediate fear that the principal was coming after me.

Teacher #1 stated,

> The principal talked with us about the walkthroughs, he educated us on the walkthroughs. He stated that this is not about "I gotcha." This is about improving all of us.

Teacher #3 stated,

> He was honest with us! Be honest with your staff and slowly walk them through the process and what it is exactly going to look like.

Teacher #1 stated,

> He let us create the walkthrough form and every faculty member had input into the form.

Teacher #2 stated,

> To be upfront! To explain that the walkthroughs are an important strategy; it's not a bad thing. It's a positive thing.

School B:

Teacher #1 stated,

> Let your staff know that walkthroughs are not about criticizing or catching you doing something bad. Explain to your staff the walkthrough model and the process. Explain that this process is to increase student achievement. Explain the

look-fors and model the look-fors to your staff. Don't let them be surprised on what you are looking for.

Teacher #2 stated,
I think you should tell the students that principals will be conducting walkthroughs for teachers and students. Explain to the students that you will be looking through their notebooks and asking them questions.

Teacher #3 stated,
I also agree, you must explain in detail the purpose of the walkthrough and explain the look-fors. You don't want them to be surprised after the walkthrough.

Teacher #1 stated,
I think walkthroughs need to be announced at the beginning. Slowly get your staff used to having people in their room. After several walkthroughs, I became very comfortable. I was very uncomfortable at first. I thought I had to have a perfect lesson and perfect classroom.

Teacher #3 stated,
I disagree. As a teacher of 27 years, I can't stand to wait around knowing that someone is coming into my room. Just show up and come in. I get nervous waiting for that walkthrough to occur if I know it's going to occur.

School C:

Teacher #1 stated,
The one thing I would suggest and teachers would hate me for this, but walkthroughs need to be random and unannounced. A random walkthrough will show the real colors of that teacher. If the teacher suddenly changes his or her style, students will pick up and probably embarrass the teacher. I had student say we never did this before or ask what the teacher was doing. I believe random and unannounced walkthroughs are a true indication of the building.

Teacher #2 stated,
Explain the process and the purpose to your staff. Last year we had no idea why we were doing the walkthrough process and this year we did such a better job explaining it.

Teacher #3 stated,
The principal and lead teachers must be very clear on what they are looking for. Let your staff know what the assistant principals and lead teachers are looking for during the walkthroughs. Provide immediate feedback so a teacher doesn't have to wait several days on how they did and forget the lesson that was observed.

Teacher #4 stated,

> Make it a learning process for your teachers. Keep it extremely positive at first. It's a process and it's hard to get over 100 teachers all on the same page. I think teachers should create the look-fors, so they buy into the entire process or at least have some type of input.

School D:

Teacher #1 stated,

> You must get faculty buy in! You want to take your faculty to another school that is using the walkthrough model.

Teacher #2 stated,

> Have the faculty design the look-fors and learn how to use them, modeling the look-fors.

Teacher #3 stated,

> Let them help figure out what to do if the walkthroughs are not very good. Also, talk about student achievement and relate the walkthroughs around student achievement. Our ultimate goal is to focus on student achievement. Why are we doing this? To help teachers be more organized for student learning.

School E:

Teacher #1 stated,

> I would make it clear that it is not evaluative and it not going to be intimidating. Make it as less threatening as possible for your staff.

Teacher #2 stated,

> Try to establish a culture of going into the classrooms. Try to put peer observations into the teachers' contract. Try to explain to your staff that it's okay to have people come in and out of your classroom. Try to get away from the closed door culture.

Teacher #3 stated,

> Explain to them that this is not about evaluating teachers! It's about gathering data about our school, so we can plan professional development days around our weaknesses.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Educate the staff of the purpose of walkthrough	Be honest with your staff
	Explain that it is not an evaluation process	Explain to the students you will looking at the their work and asking them

	questions about learning
	Explain and model the look-fors to your staff	Announce the walkthroughs at the beginning stages of implementing the walkthrough
	Keep the walkthrough random and unannounced	
	Collectively create the look-for form with your staff	
	Don't scare the teachers, keep it extremely positive	

Figure #12 – Research Question #5C – What advice would you give to an administrator that was about to implement the walkthrough tool?

Survey – Teachers

   After the teacher interviews were completed at each school, the researcher gave each teacher a survey to be completed. The researcher wanted to give teachers that may not have felt comfortable talking during the interview, an opportunity to explain their views on the walkthrough process. From five high schools that were interviewed, a total of 17 teachers were surveyed during a two day period. The following are the results from the survey:

1. How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?
   47%   VERY OFTEN
   41%   SOMETIMES
   12%   RARELY
   0%   NEVER

2. How often do you receive principal feedback from a walkthrough?
   76%   ALWAYS
   12%   SOMETIMES
   12%   RARELY
   0%   NEVER

3. Does the principal's feedback from walkthroughs impact your instruction?
   65%   ALWAYS
   29%   SOMETIMES
   6%   RARELY
   0%   NEVER

4. Does the principal's feedback from walkthroughs impact student achievement?

47% ALWAYS
47% SOMETIMES
6% RARELY
0% NEVER

5. How is the walkthrough impacting you as a teacher?

Improved teaching methods (9)

Evaluation and feedback from my own teaching (8)

Sharing of educational strategies (7)

Keeps teacher focused on lesson (7)

Students more engaged and focused (6)

Support for new teachers (3)

Showcase of instruction (2)

6. Research Question # 6

What is the congruence between the principals' perspectives and the teachers' perspectives of conducting walkthroughs?

The specific interview questions asked of the principals and teachers to acquire data to answer Research Question Number Six were:

- Principal – How often do you conduct walkthroughs?
- Teacher – How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?

- Principal – How often do you give feedback after a walkthrough?
- Teacher – How often do you receive feedback from a walkthrough?

- Principal and Teacher – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?

- Principal and Teacher – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?

School A:

Principal A stated,
> We conduct walkthroughs once every nine weeks. We spend 10 minutes in each class and we have over one hundred teachers.

Teacher #1, #2, #3 stated,

> The assistant principals conduct walkthroughs at least once a month and the principal at least once a nine weeks. Peer walkthroughs are conducted every nine weeks.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Principal – Every nine weeks		
Assistant Principal – Once a month		
Peer Walkthroughs – Every nine weeks		

Figure #13 – Research Question #6A – Principal A – How often do you conduct walkthroughs? Teachers from School A – How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?

School B:

Principal B stated,

> I try to spend Tuesday morning or afternoon to conduct my walkthroughs. I usually spend between 5 and 10 minutes in the classroom. It also depends on what I am looking for or our focus.

Teacher #1 and teacher #2 selected on the survey that the principal conducts walkthroughs very often in their classrooms. They both stated that every week a principal or lead teacher conducts walkthroughs.

Teacher #3 selected on the survey that the principal sometimes conducts walkthroughs in his classroom.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Principal – Every Tuesday morning or afternoon	Principal or lead teachers conduct walkthrough on a weekly basis.	Principal sometimes conducts walkthroughs

Figure #14 – Research Question #6A – Principal B – How often do you conduct walkthroughs? Teachers from School B – How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?

School C:

Principal C stated,

> I usually stay around 10 minutes. With only having two focus areas which are a measurable goal and all student actively engaged, I do not need additional time. I try to conduct a walkthrough with every teacher in the building at least once every nine weeks. There are some walkthroughs that I stay longer because I'm simply enjoying the class.

Teacher #1 stated,

> The principal is usually in my classroom every quarter. The principal will come into my classroom on other days that I invite him in on a certain lesson.

Teachers #2, #3, and #4 selected on the survey that the principal sometimes conducts walkthroughs in their classrooms. Sometimes was defined as once every month.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Every nine weeks the principal conducts walkthroughs		

Figure #15 – Research Question #6A – Principal C – How often do you conduct walkthroughs? Teachers from School C – How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?

School D:

Principal D stated,

> I try to conduct walkthroughs once a month. It's very hard sometimes to get in the classrooms, but you must schedule it. My lead teachers conduct walkthroughs once a week in their departments. My lead teachers and I usually spend 5 to 10 minutes in each classroom.

Teacher #1 stated,

> It seems that there are teachers, lead teachers, and administrators in our classrooms every day.

Teachers #2 and teacher #3 stated,

> I agree. The door is always open and you never know who is coming through it. Lead teachers conduct walkthroughs every week.

Teacher #1 stated,

> I agree. My lead teacher is in my room every week.

Teachers #1, #2, and #3 selected from the survey that the principal conducts walkthroughs very often.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Principal – Every month		
Lead Teachers – Every week		

Figure #16 – Research Question #6A – Principal D – How often do you conduct walkthroughs? Teachers from School D – How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?

School E:

Principal E stated,
> I conduct walkthroughs on a weekly basis. My lead teachers conduct walkthroughs 2 to 3 times a week. We spend anywhere from 10 to 15 minutes in each of the classrooms.

Teacher #7 stated,
> I'm a lead teachers and I conduct walkthroughs every week in my department. The principal rarely conducts walkthroughs in my classroom.

Teachers #1, #2, #3, and #4 selected from the survey that the principal conducts walkthroughs very often.

Teachers #5 and #6 selected that the principal conducts walkthroughs sometimes.

Teachers #7 and #8 selected that the principal conducts walkthroughs rarely.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Principal – Every week	Principal rarely conducts walkthroughs	
Lead Teachers – Every week	Principal sometimes conducts walkthroughs	

Figure #17 – Research Question #6A – Principal E – How often do you conduct walkthroughs? Teachers from School E – How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?

School A:

Principal A stated,
> When we have groups of teachers conducting walkthroughs throughout a period, then those teachers will come back into my conference room and debrief on what they saw. The group of teachers will give written feedback to the teachers that they visited. Sometimes the teachers will email each other to discuss a certain student, great job, or even a helpful hint.

Teachers #1, #2, and #3 selected that the principal always gives some form of feedback after each walkthrough.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Feedback is given after every walkthrough		

Figure #18 – Research Question #6B – Principal A – How often do you give feedback after a walkthrough? Teachers from School A – How often do you receive feedback from a walkthrough?

School B:

Principal B stated,
> The teachers that we visit receive the look-for form and are asked to participate in a round table discussion usually facilitated by administrator or a lead teacher.

Teachers #1, #2, and #3 selected from the survey that the principal always gives feedback after every walkthrough.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Feedback is given after every walkthrough		

Figure #19 – Research Question #6B – Principal B – How often do you give feedback after a walkthrough? Teachers from School B – How often do you receive feedback from a walkthrough?

School C:

Principal C stated,
> At this point, we are only using the look-for form with the two look-fors. The teachers receive this form after every visit.

Teachers #1, #2, #3, and #4 all selected that the principal always gives feedback after every walkthrough.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Feedback is given after every walkthrough		

Figure #20 – Research Question #6B – Principal C – How often do you give feedback after a walkthrough? Teachers from School C – How often do you receive feedback from a walkthrough?

School D:

Principal D stated,
> A copy of the walkthrough form is a two-ply and a copy goes into their mailboxes. We debrief with the teachers and talk to them about the strengths and weaknesses that we observed as a group.

Teachers #1, #2, and #3 selected that the principal always gives feedback after every walkthrough.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Feedback is given after every walkthrough		

Figure #21 – Research Question #6B – Principal D – How often do you give feedback after a walkthrough? Teachers from School D – How often do you receive feedback from a walkthrough?

School E:

Principal E stated,

> The minimal debriefing technique that we use is getting the look-for sheet back to the teacher that we visited. Usually we have round table discussions and talk about corrections that need to take place.

Teachers #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6 selected that the principal always gives feedback after every walkthrough.

Teachers #7 and #8 selected that the principal rarely gives feedback after a walkthrough.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
Feedback is given after every Walkthrough		Principal rarely gives feedback after Walkthroughs

Figure #22 – Research Question #6B – Principal E – How often do you give feedback after a walkthrough? Teachers from School E – How often do you receive feedback from a walkthrough?

School A:

Principal A stated,

> I believe that the "look-fors" help teachers get organized or focus on the instructional strategies for that year. I like the walkthroughs because there are no more dog and pony shows because they don't know when the walkthroughs are going to occur. I have seen a dramatic difference in student engagement since we implemented the walkthroughs. Administrators and lead teachers are asking students questions about the learning that period and know this. Students know that they have to be engaged because we will ask questions. There is no doubt that instruction has improved because of the walkthrough tool. But it is not just the walkthroughs; it's the look-fors. The look-fors give an instructional focus for the year and if teachers are focusing on that look-for, then instruction is improving. The look-for had to be a weakness that was observed last year during the walkthroughs. I believe without the look-fors instruction would not change and you would have a dog and pony show. Teachers need to focus on certain areas and we have seen last years focuses become habits this year. It's old news, the look-fors last year. We are raising the expectations for teachers and in turn the teachers are raising the expectations of the students.

Teacher #1 stated,

> I have learned a great deal through peer walkthroughs. I have stolen so many different ideas from instructional strategies to classroom management strategies. During the debriefing sessions, I have also learned a great deal about what works

and what does not. It has given me a lot more tools for my toolbox. I'm touching student's lives more now than I ever have before. There are fewer students that have to get recycled in my classes. Students are passing the SOLs!

Teacher #2 stated,
I have never observed another teacher before during my 23 years! My first peer walkthrough I realized how much I grew from observing that teacher for 10 minutes. After my first walkthrough from the principal, the debriefing session helped me feel that I was not by myself in this school. Other teachers were facing the same problems that I was dealing with. We started talking about different strategies in dealing with those problems in the classroom and before I knew it, those problems went away.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Variety of instructional practices and best practices	Increase in student engagement
		Organization and focus

Figure #23 – Research Question #6C – Principal A and Teachers from School A – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?

School B:

Principal B stated,
I have seen the walls come down over the last 3 or 4 years. That is the biggest and most positive change that occurred here. Teachers are sharing what they know regarding best practices. Teachers realize that we need to share with other teachers because of the accountability of the SOLs. Walkthroughs have helped teachers realize that if you are doing something and you are making a difference, we all need to know about it. We debrief with teachers and the lead teachers or the administrator will talk about what they saw during the visits and have teachers talk about the strategies they used. After the debriefing, teachers will invite me back into their classrooms because they are using that strategy that was talked about in the debriefing. So to answer your question, the collaboration between teachers about best instructional practices and observing those practices in action in every walkthrough, in almost every classroom, tells me that instruction is definitely improving.

Teacher #1 stated,
It helps us maintain the quality of instruction that occurs in our classrooms. The better instruction that occurs, students are more engaged and student achievement

will increase. I use different instructional strategies and I have seen a dramatic difference in my students' engagement and I have more students passing the SOLs.

Teacher # 2 stated,

It is important that instruction is vibrant and that teachers use different strategies so they do not get stagnant. I'm glad that the walkthroughs give us a forum to discuss best practices and keeps us up-to-date with any new strategies that are out there in education. I learn things from new teachers that are coming out of college with different techniques, even though I have been a teacher for 23 years. I also feed off of the newer teachers with their enthusiasm for teaching.

Teacher #3 stated,

I think about best practices more than ever. When I use great instructional practices, my students tend to be more engaged. I have discipline problems when students are not engaged and seem to be bored. If we are struggling with a certain strategy, the principal will recommend teachers to conduct walkthroughs that use that strategy. It's become a culture of discussing best practices and trying to implement them into the classroom. There is a lot of support from the lead teachers, the administrators, and other teachers.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Increase in student engagement	Increase in teacher enthusiasm for new strategies
	Sharing of best practices	
	Increase of teacher collaboration	

Figure #24 – Research Question #6C – Principal B and Teachers from School B – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?

School C:

Principal C stated,

You see teachers look forward to you coming into their classrooms. Teachers want the walkthrough form after every walkthrough. I had a teacher looking in his mailbox every period after a visit and who finally came to my office to request the form. I have seen over this year teachers feeling more comfortable coming in for suggestions after a walkthrough occurred. Since we implemented the two look-fors this year, the two look-fors are occurring in almost every classroom. The look-fors help us change instructional practices.

Teacher #1 stated,

> I pick up different techniques from the feedback on the walkthrough form and from the debriefing sessions after the walkthrough. It's kind of like a round table discussion about want was observed through the walkthroughs. It's very positive in nature and we never talk about an individual teacher.

Teacher #2 stated,

> Honestly, I don't think the walkthroughs are changing my instruction directly. The look-fors are things I have been doing for years. Once the look-fors change, it may impact my instruction. The debriefing sessions have impacted my instruction because of all the different techniques that we talk about. I know teachers that have changed for the better because they are concentrating on the look-fors.

Teacher #3 stated,

> I'm not sure if it will. I never had people come into my classroom and critique me. Being in other classrooms in the last several years, I observed some techniques that I have implemented into my classroom. I have noticed that teachers are taking more time and planning a clear and measurable objective for each day. It's one thing at a time. We will add to our look-fors to create better instructional practices in all the classrooms.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Sharing of best practices	Look-fors are occurring throughout the school
		Teacher are taking more time to plan for their lessons

Figure #25 – Research Question #6C – Principal C and Teachers from School C – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?

School D:

Principal D stated,

> Walkthroughs have helped us on how we have developed our staff development and our focus or look-fors. We used to have staff development days that were all over the place with no tie into the previous in-service day. We are now going to talk about higher-order thinking questions, differentiating instruction, accountable talk and best ways for our teachers to collaboration. We really wanted to focus on teachers learning to collaborate with one another. To answer your question, through staff development days that are scaffolding to our weaknesses as a school

and focus areas or look-fors that teachers use in their classrooms have definitely improved the instruction in our entire school.

Teacher #1 stated,

By having teachers going to visit other teachers that are using best practices, I have seen go back into their classrooms and use those best practices. It's been amazing!

Teacher #2 stated,

The collaboration between teachers during the debriefing sessions has impacted instruction. Teachers leave those sessions and try new practices or techniques.

Teacher #3 stated,

The flow and the organization of the teacher are improving. Last week I was in a classroom and everything fell together with this teacher, everything just flowed. Due to the walkthroughs I had an opportunity to see it first hand. But the look-fors are what got that teacher more organized and helped the transitions.

Teacher #4 stated,

Students will ask why isn't the "Do Know" (sponge activity) on the board. It's become a culture, regarding the look-fors, a habit with the teachers and the students.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Look-fors occurring throughout the school	Sharing – variety of instructional practices
	Collaboration of best practices	An increase of flow and organization of a lesson

Figure #26 – Research Question #6C – Principal D and Teachers from School D – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?

School E:

Principal E stated,

The availability of current data has helped us improve the instruction of this entire school. The walkthrough is a tool for us to gather that data. We are a data driven school. I believe the best data is the data that I can see in the classrooms: asking questions to students and talking with teachers. Improved teacher performance and their instructional practices are occurring due to the look-fors and how we better plan our staff development. We conduct walkthroughs to make sure that teachers understand certain instructional practices and are using those instructional practices that are outlined through the look-fors and through the staff

development days. You must hold your teachers accountable to the look-fors and the staff development practices or you will not improve instruction. The walkthrough must become a routine and teachers will understand the priority that you place on instruction.

Teacher #1 stated,

Nobody is surprised when your door opens and there is no change in the instruction or no change in the stride.

Teacher #2 stated,

No matter how seasoned a teacher is, you can always find something new to implement in your own classroom. By conducting walkthroughs has sparked so many different thoughts and ideas in my own teaching. I may not implement a technique or a strategy that I observed through a walkthrough exactly; I may change it to fit my style or my classroom.

Teacher #3 stated,

It's nice to see my students in other classrooms. We have lots of discussion about classroom management and dealing with certain students. A student could be an angel my class, but when I observe that same student in another class he could be off the wall. I have helped teachers with those types of students and give them certain strategies that I use with them. It also has happened the other way around. Teachers have given me different strategies to use. It has given me so many different tools for my toolbox. Not just classroom management techniques, but instructional practices that get more students engaged.   The discussions and the walkthroughs have helped me become such a better teacher.

Teacher #4 stated,

When I conduct peer walkthroughs, I ask students several questions about what they are learning. Over the last several years, most students are able to answer the questions. What is the objective for today? What are you learning? Why are you learning this? By students answering these questions tells me that the quality of instruction has increased. The walkthrough has been a tool to help all of us focus on instruction.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Look-fors are occurring throughout the school	Students are able to answer questions about the learning
	Sharing a variety of instructional practices	

Figure #27 – Research Question #6C – Principal E and Teachers from School E – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted instruction?

School A:

Principal A stated,

Walkthroughs have been a step for us to improve student achievement. It starts with the teacher. When the teacher is held accountable, they are going to hold their students accountable. If teachers know we are looking for certain strategies, they tend to plan and organize their lessons around that strategy. We are fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education because of our student's achievement scores. The achievement scores are rising because our teachers are using better instructional practices. The reason they are using better instructional practices is because of the look-fors and the collaboration between the staff about best practices. To answer your question, its simple, walkthroughs have impacted student achievement because it helped us focus on the best instructional practices and our test scores on the SOLs have changed dramatically. Our SAT scores are on the rise also. There are no other initiatives that have occurred in the last several years to make a difference in our SOL tests and the SATs. But it's not all the walkthroughs, it's the debriefing or collaboration and the focus areas or look-fors that improved student achievement.

Teacher #1 stated,

We are under the gun because of the SOLs. I'm not sure if walkthroughs are impacting student achievement, the jury is still out; it's still new to us.

Teacher #2 stated,

In my opinion, I think walkthroughs have increased student achievement and the graduation rate. Our SOL scores have increased dramatically and graduation rate has also increased over the last four years. Walkthroughs have really opened the doors not for just the teacher, we want the teacher to get it, and because of the number of students we have reached. If we improve our teaching skills, of course, we will improve student achievement. We don't talk about the students much, but they are the ones that are getting all the benefits.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	Fully Accredited	Not sure; jury still out
	SOL scores increased	
	Graduation Rate increased	
	SAT scores increased	

Figure #28 – Research Question #6D – Principal A and Teachers from School A – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?

School B:

Principal B stated,

> Based on the fact teachers are more willing to share as a result of the
> walkthroughs and the debriefing, students are going to benefit from the best
> practices used in the classrooms. Our test scores have increased dramatically and
> we are now fully accredited due to the best practices used by the teachers in the
> classrooms. We have less students being recycled, which means less students
> failing. I have seen it first hand: teachers were all over the board with
> instructional practices years ago and now you will see a goal or an objective on
> the board in every classroom, higher order thinking skills in every classroom, and
> many other sound practices. The key is that all teachers are using the best
> practices and they continue to share them. I also think that students know that we
> are coming in and asking questions. Students seem to be more focused and it
> forces them to pay more attention because they know we will ask questions. Most
> students do not want their teacher to look bad in front of visitors, most students.

Teacher #1 stated,

> I would say indirectly, not directly. The amount of time and training and
> discussions on staff development and walkthroughs being a part of that, that's
> what impacts my instruction and student achievement. We all complain about the
> debriefing meetings, but they are so valuable. We are always implementing
> different strategies that we hear and discuss at the debriefing sessions. Since that
> occurred, I have seen my SOL scores rise over the last several years.

Teacher #2 stated,

> It has helped me be more creative and has definitely given me more tools for my
> toolbox. Debriefing after walkthroughs has helped me use the different strategies
> in my classroom. Students are more engaged than ever before. The look-fors
> helped me focus on a couple of areas and it started to become a routine. I have
> seen an increase of student engagement and an increase on the number of students
> that are passing the SOLs on the first try. Our graduation rate is also increasing.

Teacher #3 stated,

> I agree with everyone. I use so many different strategies the kids never get bored.
> My students' SOL scores have increased and I know it's because I'm a stronger
> teacher, using best practices.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
SOL scores have increased	Less students recycled	
	Test scores increased	
	Graduation rate increased	

Figure #29 – Research Question #6D – Principal B and Teachers from School B – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?

School C:

Principal C stated,
> Our teachers are using better instructional practices and I have observed those better practices through my walkthroughs. Although those look-fors that you put in place for this year, teachers do not automatically use them. It's a fight sometimes all year until it becomes a habit for them. But the habits are instructional practices that will help all students learn. I have observed teachers using better instructional practices and students are definitely more engaged and our test scores on the SOLs and the SATs have increased dramatically.

Teacher #1 stated,
> Anything that helps your teaching will have an impact on your students. I know the better techniques that I have been using in my classroom have a direct correlation with student achievement.

Teacher #2 stated,
> My lessons are more organized and students seem to be better behaved in the classroom. Since they are better behaved, students are more engaged in the lesson. We are at the beginning stages of the walkthroughs, so I'm not sure about student achievement. If students are more engaged, then I would say that student achievement will increase.

Teacher #3 stated,
> Teachers are planning more for their lessons around clear and measurable objectives and making sure that they are being met. Since teachers are planning more students are definitely being impacted. During last week's walkthroughs, I have seen more students' on-task and less behavior problems than at the beginning of the year when I did walkthroughs. That is throughout the building, not just a couple of classrooms.

Teacher #4 stated,
> Students have even noticed that all teachers have an objective on the board. They have commented to me that they like every teacher having the same structure regarding objective on the board. I think it is very powerful that students picked up the look-for of clear and measurable objective on the board. I have also witnessed students more focused and grades have increased in my classroom. The administration has put such an emphasis on instruction with these walkthroughs that it has filtered down through the teachers and now through the students.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes

	SOL scores have increased	
	SAT scores have increased	
	More students engaged and test scores have increased	

Figure #30 – Research Question #6D – Principal C and Teachers from School C – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?

School D:

Principal D stated,
> If I look at where we were several years ago, it was really bad. I have never been in a place where no one knew that they were sinking or naked and everyone sees it. AYP, NCLB, and the SOLs are here and not going away. We have seen things that we have never seen before, such as 85% of our seniors are now going to a 2 year or 4 year college and 6.6 million dollars in scholarship last year. Our minority rate is around 53% and we have every special education category except one in this school. If you have a focus, an instructional focus that looks at best practices and if you hold the teachers accountable for those focuses, your student achievement scores will increase. The indicator that walkthroughs have impacted student achievement here at this high school is that we are using better instructional practices and we are seeing more students pass the SOLs more than ever and SAT scores have increased. There have not been other initiatives in last several years that were directly tied to instruction. We are also fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education.

Teacher #1 stated,
> By conducting walkthroughs, I can see how far they are on the course curriculum. If they are behind with the curriculum, I will have a team meeting to discuss the pace because of the SOLs.

Teacher #2 stated,
> The walkthroughs have helped us keep everyone on the same page in social studies. Students will be assessed on certain material on the SOLs and we must make sure that they receive that information.

Teacher #3 stated,
> Walkthroughs have helped us gauge how our students are going to do on the SOLs. Since we have implemented the walkthroughs and created the look-fors around our weaknesses, we are now fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education and our SOL scores have increased. How do I know it's because of the look-fors and the walkthroughs? Because I have seen teachers using better instructional practices more than ever. It was appalling at what I saw several

years ago, but it has changed. Teachers are collaborating with each other and talking about best practices.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
	SOL scores increased	More students going to college
	SAT scores increased	More students receiving scholarship money
	Fully Accredited	

Figure #31 – Research Question #6D – Principal D and Teachers from School D – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?

School E:

Principal E stated,

> We know what our classrooms look like due to walkthroughs and we now know how to better implement instructional strategies. We see first hand where the teachers struggle throughout the year with the new instructional practices and it helps us plan professional development days to help them. With our teachers improving instruction, we have seen a dramatic increase in our SOL scores. We are now fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education and it is due to better instructional strategies in the classroom.

Teacher #1 stated,

> If the walkthroughs are seeing the look-fors being implemented, then the quality of instruction is improving which will have a direct impact on student achievement. The look-fors in this building are being accomplished and our SOL scores have dramatically increased over the last several years.

Teacher #2 stated,

> More students are engaged! The emphasis on instruction and administrators being more visible in classrooms and looking for best practices has dramatically changed over the last several years. I have seen a change in my SOL scores. My students would also say they have seen a change in my teaching over the last several years. I believe that it is due to the collaboration that the walkthroughs give us.

Consensus Themes	Supported Themes	Individual Themes
SOL scores increased	Fully Accredited	

Figure #32 – Research Question #6D – Principal E and Teachers from School E – What are the indicators of how your walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?

CHAPTER FIVE:

CONCLUSIONS, PERSONAL REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

The purpose of this study was to focus on High School principals using the walkthrough model and to evaluate how the walkthrough model improves student learning. This data was then analyzed to determine if walkthrough models impacted student learning and student achievement in High Schools in Newport News in Virginia. The goal was to identify key indicators of success from the high school principals that use the Walkthrough Observation Tool from the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania.

For the first part, the researcher used a historical approach. This included the era of accountability, clinical supervision, differentiated supervision, the history of walkthroughs, and models of walkthroughs. The second phase of this study focused on the high school principals' perspectives on how the walkthrough tool has impacted student achievement in their schools. The third phase of this study focused on the teachers' perspectives on how walkthroughs has impacted their instruction and student achievement. According to Eichelberger (1989), "the purpose of descriptive research is to estimate the nature and degree of existing conditions" (p. 173). In this study, the "existing conditions" was the walkthrough tool used in the high schools identified.

This research is qualitative, and by design, qualitative research is concerned with an "overall understanding of the situation studied" (Eichelberger, 1989, p.102). The researcher conducted interviews because it was the best method for obtaining an "overall understanding" on how the walkthrough tool impacted student achievement.

In this study, the data collected in each interview was coded and identified and then emerging themes were created. Lincoln and Guba (1985) summarized three ways that themes can be identified: (1) consensus themes – when the majority of the principals state the same theme, (2) supported themes – when approximately half of the principals state a theme, and (3) individual themes – when only one or two principals state a theme.

The themes were then categorized according to the frequency and not the importance of the theme. In order to categorize the information Guba (cited in Patton, 1990) suggested the researcher begin looking for similarities and differences among the different categories. After the themes were developed, the researcher then employed quantitative measures to analyze and report the qualitative data. This was accomplished by marking each of the topics or themes with the number of informants who stipulated that theme. Finally, a descriptive summary followed the data and the researcher referred to the literature. It is a common process in qualitative research to connect ideas that emerge from the data to the literature.

The following addresses each research question with regard to the high school principal interviews and the literature. The literature and similar studies conducted support the findings of this study in areas of implementing walkthroughs and the effectiveness of walkthroughs.

Addressing the First Research Question: What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs identified in the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy?

The researcher is a part of the Western Pennsylvania principals Academy for last two years. The researcher had been involved with several walkthrough seminars conducted by Joseph Werlinich and Dr. Otto Graf. The researcher had also been a part of group walkthroughs at other school districts through the Principals Academy and participated in round table discussions after the walkthroughs. The researcher is a high school principal that is at the initial stages of implementing the walkthrough tool in his traditional high school.

Otto Graf and Joseph Werlinich (2002) designed a walkthrough observation tool to collect data around teaching and learning and sharing perceptions and ideas with teachers. They believe that the Walkthrough provides a strong indicator that instruction and learning are the priorities of the school. They believe that the Walkthrough Observation Tool is a way to change a culture in a school and in classrooms and that change occurs when the teacher and principal work together to view, discuss, and revise a lesson to satisfy all students learning. "Principals and teachers begin to focus on those

things that make the difference in improving academic achievement" (Graff & Werlinich, 2002, p. 6).

According to Graf and Werlinich (2002), the implementation of their Walkthrough Tool is a development process. The first step to implementing the Walkthrough Tool is for the principal to become visible in the classrooms and to reinforce effective teaching practices and positive efforts. This will in turn create trust and establish a rapport between the teacher and the principal. The goal for the principal in this step is to collect data around the instructional practices.

The second step in implementing the Walkthrough Tool is for the principal to meet with the staff to establish clear expectations for the Walkthrough. While establishing expectations, the principal needs to discuss appropriate professional behavior for teachers participating in the Walkthrough process, emphasizing confidentiality regarding things observed in the classrooms.

The next step is for the principal to establish a focus with the teachers centered on key elements of effective instruction to improve student achievement. Graf and Werlinich (2002) believe that part of the Walkthrough Tool is built around an intense instructional focus and that the focus can be developed by "look-fors." "Look-fors" are descriptors that should be present in classrooms so that all students can learn. Once the teachers and principal decide on what descriptors or "look-fors" should or willimprove student achievement and learning levels in their school, they work together to implement those strategies. The "look-fors" should reflect the district's standards, goals, and vision. Teachers and principals working together move a school's culture from a closed, isolated environment to a collaborative environment. The integral part of this Walkthrough Observation Tool is that the students, teachers, and the principal become part of the learning environment. Another integral part of this Walkthrough Observation Tool is that it creates opportunities for teachers to share ideas and effective teaching strategies.

The principal needs to schedule the Walkthrough and than try to visit five to ten classrooms per Walkthrough. During each visit the principal collects data with specific examples of the "look-fors" of effective instructional practices. It is important for the principal to talk with students during the Walkthrough and ask them what they are learning, what good work looks like, and how they evaluate their work.

The next step in the Walkthrough process is for the principal to debrief with the teachers and give them specific feedback from what he has observed. Several different strategies can be used in debriefing. The following are debriefing tools: oral feedback, written feedback, group conference, growth conference, teacher reflection on classroom, teacher walkthroughs, student walkthroughs, clinical supervision conference, study groups, videotape lessons, professional portfolios, examination of student work, sharing of teaching artifacts, review of teacher's lesson plans, and projects. Eventually the principal can provide feedback to the entire staff. Graf and Werlinich (2002) believe that this process validates effective teaching and learning and encourages their continued use. The pedagogy will improve by creating a collaborative environment when teachers share effective teaching strategies and ideas focused on student achievement.

The principal then can invite teachers to participate in the Walkthrough process. Teachers can work with other teachers to improve instruction by visiting each others' classrooms. Teachers working with teachers move the instructional leadership solely away from the principal only and creates a shared leadership between teachers and the principal.

Following all the above steps will result in a culture change focused on effective teaching strategies which will in turn improve student achievement. The Walkthrough does not become just an event; it becomes part of the culture. "The Walkthrough Observation can be the needed connector that advances learning for everyone" (Graf & Werlinich, 2002, p. 10).

Addressing the Second Research Question: **What are the key elements and procedures of walkthroughs that are identified by the five high school principals in Newport News School District in Virginia?**

In 2001, all five high school principals decided that they were going to implement the Walkthrough tool simultaneously. It was to be a team effort. They decided to educate their staff by using similar approached and by starting to conduct Walkthroughs in their buildings. They also met once a month at each others' buildings to conduct group Walkthroughs and to give that principal feedback It should also be noted that the teachers knew that they could not transfer to another high school because all of the high

schools were involved. Some teachers even retired after a year because they did not feel comfortable with the Walkthrough tool.

When asked specifically, "Describe the steps and procedures when you implemented the Walkthrough tool," all the high principals started with explaining how they educated the staff on what a Walkthrough was and how the process worked. This follows step two from the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania which explains meeting with the staff. "This meeting sets the stage for the Walkthrough and helps to establish clear expectations for the staff related to the Walkthrough" (Graf and Werlinich, 2002). Most of the principals believed that this step is one of the important steps. Teachers cannot think of the Walkthroughs as "I gotcha." Four principals explained that the Walkthrough tool was not formal and not an evaluation. They explained that the Walkthrough was an informal process to give them snapshots of the type of instruction occurring in the classrooms. All five principals stated that if the principal does not do a good job educating the staff and selling the Walkthrough model, change will not occur.

Once you set the foundation or the expectations of the walkthroughs, all five high principals stated that the staff should collectively define the look-fors in the school. They all stated that whatever staff comes up with, use it. All the principals shared the look-fors with their staff and modeled the look-fors. They revisit the look-for form every semester or every year and add new techniques or instructional practices to the form.

During the first year of implementation, all five high school principals conducted the Walkthrough process themselves. The following year, they had their teachers conduct Walkthroughs through their own departments. The following year, lead teachers did Walkthroughs outside their departments and now the entire faculty is conducting Walkthroughs throughout the school. Three principals stated that they spend ten minutes during each Walkthrough, two principals spend five to ten minutes during each Walkthrough and one spends ten to fifteen minutes.

At one of the five schools teachers talked negatively to other teachers about what was observed during a Walkthrough. The principal addressed the faculty as a whole and explained the appropriate professional behavior for teachers participating in this process. The principal wished he had talked earlier to the staff about expected professional behaviors of individuals participating in the Walkthrough process, thereby clarifying his

expectations from the beginning. He stated that the other four principals helped him through the situation. They still operated as a team even though they were in five different buildings.

All five high school principals interviewed stated that immediate feedback is critical after each Walkthrough. All five principals returned the look-for sheet to the teachers and all five schools conducted some type of debriefing session. The debriefing sessions were sometimes with the teachers that conduct the Walkthroughs or write the teachers observed.

The consensus themes identified included:

- Educate the staff on the Walkthrough and the process – Clear Expectations
- Collectively define the look-fors with the staff
- Principal conducts the Walkthrough at first
- Lead teachers conduct Walkthroughs
- The entire faculty conducts Walkthroughs
- Debrief after the Walkthrough
- Share the results with the entire staff on the Walkthroughs conducted.

The supported themes identified included:

- 10 minutes – time in the classroom
- 5 – 10 minutes – time in the classroom

The individual themes identified included:

- Find the right people to get on the bus – "Bus Theory" (Collins, 2001)
- 10 – 15 minutes – time in the classroom

It was evident that all five high principals worked together to implement the Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania Walkthrough Tool. The researcher conducted separate interviews with the principals and they were all using the same language regarding the Walkthrough process. There were seven consensus themes that emerged from the interviews when the principals explained the steps and procedures of implementing the Walkthrough model.

**Addressing the Third Research Question: What elements and procedures
are identified by the high school principals in Newport News School District that do
not appear in the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy's walkthrough model?**

There were several elements and procedures identified in the interviews with the
five high school principals and one central administrator that did not appear in the
Principals Academy of Western Pennsylvania's Walkthrough Tool. The following are
elements and procedures that were identified: the process cannot be thought of as "I
gotcha," lead teachers and teachers conduct Walkthroughs, Walkthrough data included in
the weekly newsletter, and having a collective effort from all five high schools in the
district.

Step thirteen of the Principal Academy of Western Pennsylvania's Walkthrough
Tool states, "Coach each other. The Walkthrough provides an excellent opportunity for
participants to talk about instruction and learning and to coach one another. While this
process begins with the principal and other administrators walking through classrooms
and the school, including teachers in the process is a powerful tool" (Graf and Werlinich,
2002). Although the Principal Academy of Western Pennsylvania's Walkthrough Tool
does not go in-depth regarding teachers conducting Walkthroughs throughout the school,
all five high school principals that were interviewed and one central administrator, stated
that it was key to get lead teachers involved in the Walkthrough process, after the
administrators. All five high schools have students from grades nine to twelve and the
enrollment in the five high schools range from 1675 to 2075 students. Since the high
schools are very large, all the principals felt that to make a real change in instruction and
student achievement the lead teachers had to play a direct role in Walkthroughs.

The following are debriefing tools that the Principals Academy of Western
Pennsylvania's Walkthrough Tool uses: oral feedback, written feedback, group
conference, growth conference, teacher reflection on classroom, teacher walkthroughs,
student walkthroughs, clinical supervision conference, study groups, videotape lessons,
professional portfolios, examine student work, share teaching artifacts, review teacher's
lesson plans, and devise projects. Three principals and one central administrator stated
that a great debriefing tool is collecting Walkthrough data and publishing it in the
school's weekly newsletter. For example: we visited 45 classrooms, 900 students, and

92% of teachers had a written and measurable objective on the board and 85% of the students were fully engaged in the learning activity. The principal and the central administrator felt this was a way to explain how they were are collectively doing focusing on the look-fors.

All five high school principals and one central administrator stated that the reason for the success of Walkthroughs in Newport News School District was the collective effort from all five high schools. There was no way for teachers ignore this initiative because all of the high schools were implementing it. The principals helped one another with explaining the process and setting clear expectations. They conducted Walkthroughs in each of their buildings and gave feedback on what they observed. They met at each of the high schools once a month to discuss how the process was going. It was a committed team effort among all five high schools and principals to implement the Walkthrough tool and make it successful.

The consensus theme identified included:

- Collective effort from all five high schools in the district when implementing the walkthrough model.

The supported themes identified included:

- Lead teachers conducting walkthroughs
- Debriefing tool – Weekly newsletter explaining the data collected during the Walkthroughs

Addressing the Fourth Research Question: What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning identified by the high school principals in Newport News School District?

When asked specifically, "What are the indicators of how your Walkthrough model has impacted instruction?" all five principals and one central administrator talked at length about how much instruction has improved since the implementation of the Walkthrough tool. The central administrator stated, "It has been a school improvement tool. It's not about walkthroughs; it's really about the look-fors and we walk through to see how we are doing and gather data on how we are doing with these look-fors that we

set." All five principals stated that the look-fors were what improved instruction and Walkthroughs was a tool to make sure teachers were focusing on the look-fors. Most of the principals stated that the look-fors started to become a habit that eventually permeated the classrooms and the entire school. Teachers started to enjoy staff development days because they focused on weaknesses and encouraged discussion on how to improve instruction. Therefore, all five high school principals explained that Walkthroughs are improving instruction because of the sense they get as a principal that the habit or look-fors are permeating the classrooms. Most of the principals stated that last year's look-fors are habits now and old news.

Teddlie, Kirby, and Stringfield (1989), conducted a study investigating differences at the classroom level in effective and ineffective schools. The principal in the effective school was described by one observer as "having her finger on the pulse of the school" (Teddlie et al., 1989, p. 231). The principal was seen in the hallways and in classrooms and actively participated in the classrooms. The principal in the effective schools appeared to be knowledgeable of innovations in every classroom and ensured that the staff was aware of the current trends and practices in education (Teddlie et al., 1989; Water et al., 2003). All five principals and one central administrator stated that conducting Walkthroughs without having an intense focus or creating the look-fors will not improve instruction and student achievement. All it will do is create a principal that is highly visible.

The consensus themes identified included:

- Look-fors improve instruction, Walkthroughs are a tool to make sure teachers are focusing on the look-fors.

The supported themes identified include:

- The habit (look-fors) starts to permeate the classrooms and the school.
- Teachers are practicing the look-fors defined at the beginning of the year
- Last year's look-fors are old news; they have become habits
- Current data collected in classrooms helps principals to focus on professional development days

- There is collaboration of best practices and observing of those practices throughout the school
- Change in student achievement is dramatic.

When asked specifically, "What are the indicators of how your Walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?" all five principals and one central administrator stated that teachers are using better instructional practices than ever before and that is why our SOL scores have increased and we are now fully accredited. Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) analyzed tests scores of 100,000 students across the United States and concluded that the classroom teacher has much more impact on student achievement than one thought. Their conclusion from their study was

> The results of this study will document that the most important factor affecting student learning is the teacher. In addition, the results show wide variation in effectiveness among teachers. The immediate and clear implication of this finding is that seemingly more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor. *Effective teachers appear to be effective with students of all achievement levels, regardless of the level of heterogeneity in their classrooms.* If the teacher is ineffective, students under the teacher's tutelage will show inadequate progress academically regardless of how similar or different they are regarding their academic achievement (p. 63).

The principals also stated that the debriefing sessions, the collaboration that occured after the Walkthroughs, and the focus areas or look-fors have all helped teachers utilize best practices to help improve student learning. Four of the five principals stated there has been an increase in SAT scores and a resulting increase in the number of students attending two or four year colleges.

Several years ago Newport News School District implemented another initiative of recycling students that fail a course. If a student is failing a course after the first marking period, the student starts the course again from the beginning. Four of the five principals have seen fewer students failing courses and less students being recycled. Therefore, the principals concluded that the instruction is getting better in the classrooms because of fewer students failing courses, fewer students being recycled, and an increase in the SOL scores. Teachers and students are held accountable. The SOL exams hold both teachers and students accountable.

The consensus themes identified included:

- Fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education

- Increase in SOL scores

- Increase in test scores

The supported themes identified included:

- Increase of students attending 2 to 4 year colleges

- Increase in SAT scores

- Less students being recycled

- Less students failing courses

The individual theme identified included:

- More scholarship money being awarded

Addressing the Fifth Research Question: **What are the indicators of how walkthroughs impact student learning identified by the high school teachers in Newport News School District?**

There is strong research confirming us that high-quality instruction results in high levels of student achievement. Teachers in Newport News School District love having the walls torn down in the classroom, sharing techniques, and instructional practices. One teacher stated, "Other professions share ideas all of the time. The medical field shares different surgery techniques and what medicine to use on certain patients. Teams of doctors meet on weekly basis to discuss and collaborate about their patients. Our patients are the students." Another teacher stated, "It helps us maintain the quality of instruction that occurs in our classroom." The majority of teachers that were interviewed felt that the debriefing sessions, the look-fors, and the collaboration among teachers has definitely improved their instruction, which, in turn has a direct impact on student learning.

Teachers from all five high schools are conducting Walkthroughs on a weekly, monthly, or every marking period basis. Teachers are seeing other teachers trying different instructional practices, so they are now using these best practices. A teacher

stated, "By having teachers going to visit other teachers that are using best practices, I have seen them go back into their classrooms and use those best practices. It's been amazing." Teachers have also seen more students engaged than ever before. All of the high schools at one point in time had student engagement on their look-for form, and teachers and administrators are seeing more student engagement when conducting Walkthroughs.

The supported themes identified included:
- Sharing instructional practices and classroom management techniques has helped with collaboration among teachers.
- It has given me more tools in my toolbox.
- SOL scores have increased.
- More students are now engaged because more teachers are using the best practices that were discussed during debriefing sessions.
- More students are now engaged using the best practices described on the look-for form.
- Less students are being recycled.
- Open door culture and collaboration of best practices have helped teachers and administrators.

The individual theme identified included:
- Students are able to answer certain questions about the learning that is occurring in the classroom

When asked specifically, "What are the indicators of how your Walkthrough model has impacted student achievement?" the majority of teachers that were interviewed stated that the SOL scores have increased and graduation rate has increased, teaching skills have improved which has a direct correlation with student achievement, and fewer students are failing courses and being recycled.

One teacher stated, "Walkthroughs have helped us gauge how our students are going to do on the SOLs. Since we have implemented the Walkthroughs and created the

look-fors around our weaknesses, we are now fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education and our SOL scores have increased." Another teacher stated, "I have seen teachers using better instructional practices than ever before. It was appalling what I saw when we first started the Walkthrough process."

The majority of teachers from all five high schools have seen a dramatic change in the last several years with regard to instruction and with administrators and lead teachers in the classrooms. One teacher stated, "More students are engaged! The emphasis on instruction and administrators being more visible in classrooms and looking for best practices has dramatically changed over the last four or five years. I have seen a change in my SOL scores." Another teacher stated, "I agree with everyone. I use so many different strategies the kids never get bored. My students' SOL scores have increased and I know it's because I'm a strong teacher using best practices." Administrators in these five high schools have put such an emphasis on instruction by using the Walkthrough process; it has now filtered down to the teachers and to the students.

The supported themes identified included:
- SOL scores have increased.
- Graduation rate has increased.
- Teaching skills have improved.
- Students are more engaged.
- Class grades have increased.
- Less students are failing and being recycled.

The individual theme identified included:
- I'm not sure; the jury is still out.

Addressing the Sixth Research Question: **What is the congruence between the principals' perspectives and the teachers' perspectives of conducting walkthroughs?**

School A:

The congruence between the principal's perspective and the teachers' perspectives at School A was very similar. The principal stated that he conducts Walkthroughs every nine weeks, but his assistant principals conduct them every month. The teacher is always given feedback. He also stated that teachers conduct Walkthroughs every nine weeks.

The three teachers interviewed all agreed with the principal. They all stated that the principal conducts Walkthroughs every nine weeks while the assistant principals every month. Two of the three teachers and the principal stated that the variety of instructional practices and the use of the best practices have definitely improved their instruction. All the teachers and the principal thought that the Walkthroughs have impacted student achievement because of the accreditation, increase of SOL scores, increase in the graduation rate, and increase in SAT scores. One teacher stated that the jury was still out about Walkthroughs impacting student achievement.

There were four consensus themes that were identified by the principal and the teachers. There were two supported themes that the majority of interviewees identified and two teachers identified two individual themes.

The consensus themes identified included:

- The principal conducts Walkthroughs every nine weeks.
- The assistant principals conduct Walkthroughs every month.
- Teachers conduct Walkthroughs every nine weeks.
- Feedback is given after every Walkthrough.

The supported themes identified included:

- Variety of instructional practices and best practices has improved instruction.
- The following impacted student achievement: fully accredited, SOL scores increased, graduation rate increased, SAT scores increased.

The individual themes identified included:

- Walkthroughs have impacted instruction because more students are engaged and teachers are more organized and focused.
- Impact on student achievement – Not sure, the jury is still out.

School B:

The congruence between the principal's perspective and the teachers' perspectives at School B were very similar. The principal and the teacher stated that the principal conducted Walkthroughs every Tuesday morning or afternoon. The principal stated that feedback was given after every Walkthrough and the teachers agreed with the principal. The principal and the teachers all agreed that the Walkthroughs have increased their SOL scores. The principal and two teachers stated that the lead teachers conducted Walkthroughs on a weekly basis. They also believed that the Walkthroughs have impacted instruction because students were engaged and teachers were collaborating about best practices. The principal and the two teachers stated that the Walkthroughs have improved instruction because fewer students are being recycled, test scores are increasing, and the graduation rate has increased.

There were three consensus themes that were identified among the principal and the teachers. There were four supported themes that the majority of interviewees identified and two teachers identified two individual themes.

The consensus themes identified included:

- The principal conducts Walkthroughs every Tuesday morning or afternoon.
- Feedback is given after every Walkthrough.
- Impact on student achievement – SOL scores have increased.

The supported themes identified included:

- Principal or lead teachers conduct Walkthroughs on a weekly basis.

- Walkthroughs have impacted instruction because more students are engaged.
- Instruction has improved because students are more engaged and teachers are collaborating with one another.
- Impacted on student achievement – Less students are being recycled and test scores, and graduation rates have increased.

The individual themes identified included:

- Principal sometimes conducts Walkthroughs.
- Instruction has improved because teachers are more enthusiastic to try new strategies.

School C:

The congruence between the principal's perspective and the teachers' perspectives at School C were very similar. The principal stated that he conducts Walkthroughs every nine weeks and all of the teachers agreed. They also agreed that the principal gives feedback after every Walkthrough. Three of the four teachers believed that their instruction has improved due to the collaboration during the debriefing sessions. The principal also stated that teachers are using best practices because of the debriefing sessions. The principal and three teachers stated that Walkthroughs have increased student achievement in the areas of SOL scores, SAT scores, and overall test scores.

There were two consensus themes that were identified among the principal and the teachers. There were two supported themes that the majority of interviewees identified and one teacher identified an individual theme.

The consensus themes identified included:

- Principal conducts Walkthroughs every nine weeks.
- Feedback is given after every Walkthrough.

The supported themes identified included:

- Instruction was impacted because of sharing of best practices.

- Impacted on student achievement indicated by – SOL scores increase, SAT scores increase, more students engaged, and test scores increase.

The individual themes identified included:

- Instruction impacted by the look-fors occurring throughout the school and teachers taking more time to plan lessons.

School D:

The congruence between the principal's perspective and the teachers' perspectives at School D were very similar. Principal and all three teachers agreed that the principal does conduct Walkthroughs every month and lead teachers conduct Walkthroughs every week. They also agreed that the principals or lead teachers give feedback after every Walkthrough. The two lead teachers and the principal agreed that the look-fors occurring in the building has had a direct impact on improving instruction. They also agreed that the Walkthroughs and look-fors have impacted student achievement pertaining to the SOL scores, and SAT scores. Now they are fully accredited.

There were three consensus themes that were identified among the principal and the teachers. There were three supported themes that the majority of interviewees identified and two teachers identified two individual themes.

The consensus themes identified included:

- Principal conducts Walkthroughs every month
- Lead teachers conduct Walkthroughs every week
- Feedback is given after every Walkthrough

The supported themes identified included:

- Impact on instruction indicated by look-fors occurring throughout the school and collaboration of best practices
- Impact on student achievement indicated by SOL scores increase, and SAT scores increase. We are now fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education

The individual themes identified included:

- Impacted instruction – Sharing a variety of instructional practices and an increase of flow and organization of a lesson
- Impacted student achievement – More students going to college and more students receiving scholarship money

School E:

The congruence at School E between the perspectives of the principals and teachers were very similar. All four of the teachers interviewed agreed that the principal does conduct Walkthroughs every week as the principal stated. They also agreed with the principal that the lead teachers do conduct Walkthroughs every week. The four teachers stated that they always get feedback from the principal or lead teachers after every Walkthrough like the principal stated. The principal and all the teachers stated that the Walkthroughs have impacted instruction because of the increase in SOL scores.

There were four consensus themes that were identified between the principal and the teachers. There were three supported themes that the majority of interviewees identified and two teachers identified one individual theme.

The consensus themes identified included:

- Principal conducts Walkthroughs every week.
- Lead teachers conduct Walkthroughs every week.
- Feedback is given after every Walkthrough.
- Impact on student achievement is indicated by increased SOL scores.

The supported themes identified included:

- Principal sometimes conducts Walkthroughs.
- Impact on instruction is indicated by look-fors occurring throughout the school and a sharing of a variety of instructional practices.
- Impact on student achievement by full accreditation by the Virginia Department of Education.

The individual themes identified included:

- Impacted instruction – Students are able to answer questions about the learning process.

The researcher interviewed the principals and the teachers, and also conducted a survey of the teachers. Using all three ways to gather information for this study, the principals and teachers at all five high schools are talking the same language and are observing great strides in improving instruction by using the Walkthrough process.

Concluding Remarks

The results of this study showed that the five high school principals, the central administrator, and the majority of the teachers in the five high schools believe that the Walkthrough process has had a positive impact on instruction and student achievement in their schools. This study also showed the tangible educational improvements resulting from five high school principals working together to successfully implement the Walkthrough process in their schools.

This study revealed Walkthroughs did impact instruction in classrooms in the Newport News School District. The five high school principals, the central administrator, and the majority of the teachers believe that the Walkthrough process has improved instruction in their schools. The principals and teachers feel the look-fors that are seen in classrooms during Walkthroughs are the key indicators that the Walkthroughs have impacted instruction. Several of the principals stated that the look-fors start to permeate the school. The majority of principals and teachers saw these look-fors become habits for the teachers in their classrooms. They also believe that revisiting the look-fors to address any weaknesses definitely improves instruction as does adding new ones. The principals and the teachers believe that the debriefing sessions after Walkthroughs are excellent ways to have teachers collaborate about best practices. Principals and teachers who have conducted Walkthroughs have also seen students more engaged and focused than ever before. Several principals stated that teachers are using better instructional practices and students are more on-task.

The five high school principals, the central administrator, and the majority of the teachers believe the Walkthrough process has improved student achievement in their buildings. The key indicators that the Walkthrough process has impacted student achievement are that the SOL scores have increased over the last four years. Because Walkthrough process focuses on the best instructional practices, teachers are seeing fewer students failing their courses and being recycled. The look-fors and the debriefing sessions have helped them focus on and utilize the best practices. As the result of the Walkthroughs, principals and teachers stated that SAT scores and the graduation rate have both increased over the last four years.

This study also showed five high school principals working together to successfully implement the Walkthrough process. The five dedicated principals, by working closely together and with their faculty, were able to implement the Walkthrough process and the positive results attest to their success. Teachers in all of the high schools were told in advance about the plan to implement this initiative. To prepare, principals meet every month to discuss issues and strategies for successful implementation. They conducted Walkthroughs in each others' buildings and often invited central administrators to observe.

This study showed how the Walkthrough process has had an impact on instruction and student achievement in five high schools in the Newport News School District. It showed that the key indicators the Walkthrough process has impacted instruction were the look-fors permeating the school, teachers collaboration about best practices and observing the teachers using them, and more students engaged in the classroom. The key indicators that the Walkthrough process has impacted student achievement are fewer students failing courses, fewer students being recycled, increase in SOL scores, being fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education, increase in SAT scores, and the increase in the graduation rate.

Personal Reflections

As I reflect on my own journey through the doctorate process at the University of Pittsburgh and the writing of this dissertation, many changes have occurred throughout

the last two years. I started this journey as an assistant principal at a high school where my duties centered on discipline. During my first semester at the University of Pittsburgh, I left that high school to accept another assistant principal position at a high school where the focus was on instruction and curriculum. My comfort level was low in these new surroundings as most of my experiences had centered on discipline. It is the doctorate journey and the writing of this dissertation that has helped me become more of an instructional leader. Three months ago I accepted the building principal position and I am now forced to be the instructional leader of a high school that has 1800 students in grades nine through twelve and 108 teachers.

As I started to think about my dissertation topic, I knew that I needed to write about an educational topic that both interested me and presented an educational problem after having been a physics teacher for five years, a dean of students for one year, an assistant principal for three years, and currently a high school principal faced with improving instruction and student achievement. Unfortunately, very little research has been done on how walkthroughs impact student achievement at the high school level, so here was my challenge.

The intended purpose of this study was to identify the key indicators from five high school principals on how Walkthroughs impact student achievement. Highlights of what I have learned as a result of this study are specified in the following:

- I very surprised on how little research has been done on the implementation of Walkthroughs in schools.
- I was also surprised on how little research has been done on how Walkthroughs have improved instruction and student achievement.
- Spending two and half days in Newport News School District was an amazing trip. As a new building principal, I was able to talk with five high school principals and teachers in each of the five high schools. We had great discussions about improving instruction around Walkthroughs and look-fors and using lead teachers in the Walkthrough process.
- I learned first hand from all the teachers and principals that it is not about Walkthroughs; it is about the look-fors and the Walkthrough is the tool to gather the data around the look-fors.

- I was able to sit with the five high school principals and discuss things that they would have done differently when implementing the Walkthrough process. I was also able to gain some insights on any internal barriers that could arise when implementing the Walkthrough model. I could have never gotten the information from a book, from another study, or a survey. Sitting down and having the discussions with the principals and teachers with Walkthrough experience was experience.

- I was able to sit with the assistant superintendent and former high school principal that implemented the Walkthrough model. She helped me organize the Walkthrough process and to understand the process of converting department chairs into lead teachers and incorporating them into the Walkthrough process.

Recommendations for High School Principals

The following are recommendations that are offered to high school principals who going to implement to the Walkthrough tool in their schools.

- Depending on your district, try to get another high school in your district or the middle school(s) to implement the Walkthrough process together.

- Conduct an instructional audit of your school to collect base-line data. You could possibly invite other administrators and central administration to do the instructional audit.

- Educate your staff and explain the entire process of what a Walkthrough is and why you are going to implement this process. Set very clear expectations about Walkthroughs and the expected professional behaviors of those involved in the Walkthroughs.

- Collectively create the look-fors with your staff and model the look-fors to set clear expectations of what you expect.

- Whatever the staff comes up with for their look-fors, use them. After a semester or the next school year, create new look-fors around the weaknesses of the school.

- As the principal, schedule your Walkthroughs. This forces you out of the office and into the classrooms.

- Teachers want immediate feedback from the Walkthroughs. Creating round table discussions to debrief on what was observed throughout the Walkthroughs is very important. Make sure you talk about the school as a whole; do not talk about individual teachers.

- List the data gathered from the Walkthroughs in a weekly newsletter. Teachers start to buy into the process as a group.

- Make sure your teachers are ready for peer Walkthroughs. It is extremely important to revisit the professional behaviors when a teacher conducts Walkthroughs. Setting clear expectations of the professional behavior is a critical step.

- For the Walkthrough process to work, the principal must be highly visible in the school, must focus on the look-fors in each classroom, and must validate effective teaching and learning, thereby encouraging its continued use.

Recommendations for Further Research

- Replicate this study with elementary schools and/or middle schools that implemented the Walkthrough process together.

- Replicate this study with elementary and/or middle school principals that did not implement the Walkthrough process with another school in their district.

- Replicate this study with a smaller high school (less than a 1000 students) that is using the Walkthrough process.

- Replicate this study with a K-12 building.

- Replicate this study and analyze student achievement scores, SAT scores, and overall grades.

- Conduct a study that examines the leadership style of the principal when implementing the Walkthrough process.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Teacher Survey

Answer the following questions by checking the appropriate line beneath each question.

1. How often does a principal conduct walkthroughs in your classroom throughout a school year?
   _____ VERY OFTEN
   _____ SOMETIMES
   _____ RARELY
   _____ NEVER

2. How often do you receive principal feedback from a walkthrough?
   _____ ALWAYS
   _____ SOMETIMES
   _____ RARELY
   _____ NEVER

3. Does the principal's feedback from walkthroughs impact your instruction?
   _____ ALWAYS
   _____ SOMETIMES
   _____ RARELY
   _____ NEVER

4. Does the principal's feedback from walkthroughs impact student achievement?
   _____ ALWAYS
   _____ SOMETIMES
   _____ RARELY
   _____ NEVER

5. How is the walkthrough impacting you as a teacher?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Thank you for your help!

APPENDIX B

1 Keruskin Lane
Fredericktown, PA 15333
(724)-377-1913 – Home
(412)-885-7500– Work
tkeruskin@bwschools.net

Principal Name
Principal Address

Dear Principal,

This is a formal invitation to participate in my doctoral dissertation study through the University of Pittsburgh. The study is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Susan Goodwin. The study focuses on the perceptions of high school principals on how walkthroughs impact student achievement. Your school is one of five schools selected to participate in the study. Selection criteria consisted of schools that have implemented the Western Pennsylvania Principals Academy Walkthrough Tool.

The study will consist of two distinct steps. The first involves the review of the literature on clinical supervision, differentiated supervision, the history of walkthroughs, and several different models of walkthroughs. The second step would entail an interview with you sometime during the next month. Interviews would last no longer than one hour and be scheduled solely on convenience to your schedule.

I would also like to stress to you the high level of confidentiality that will be used throughout the study. Administrators would never be identified by name or school.

In return for your investment, I will share the findings of the interviews with you. I am confident that this information will be particularly valuable to you as high schools continue to attempt to meet the accountability demands of the current educational legislation. Should you elect to participate, please complete the bottom portion of this letter and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the above phone number or e-mail address.

Sincerely,

Todd E. Keruskin

_____

_____ Yes, I accept the invitation to participate in the study.

Name: _____

School: _____

Contact Information

Phone Number: _____   E-mail: _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, R., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational Leadership, 44*(6), 9-11.

Annunziata, J. (1997). Linking teacher evaluation and professional development. In J. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (pp. 288-301). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York: Longman.

Badiali, B., & Levin, J. (April 1984). *Supervisors' Response to the Survey.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Blase, J. (1987). Dimensiona of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. *American Educational Research Journal, 24*, 589-610.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1998). *Handbook of instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Burden, P. R. (1990). Teacher Development. In W. E. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 311-328). New York: Macmillan.

Cauette. (1995). *The phenomenon of flow as experienced by classroom teachers: Implications for leadership practice.* Unpublished Doctoral Disseratation, University of San Diego, San Diego.

Celso, N., III. (1997). How does the law affect educational supervision. In *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Chester, M., & Beaudin, B. (1996). Efficacy beliefs of newly hired teachers in urban schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*, 233-257.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical Superivison*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., et al. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Cooper, G. R. (1983). *Collegial supervision: The feasibility of implementation and particular effectiveness on teacher attitudes and job satisfaction.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Culbertson, J. (1996). *Building bridges: The mission and principles of professional development*. Retrieved Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 404 322, 1996

Davidson-Taylor, C. M. (November 2000). Is Instruction Working? Students Have the Answer. *Principal Leadership*, 30-34.

Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K. (2004). *Three-Minute Classroom Walk-Through*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Duke, D. (1995). Speculations on the future of teacher evaluation and educational accountability. In D. Duke (Ed.), *Teacher evaluation policy: From accountability to professional development*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Eichelberger, R.T. (1989). *Disciplined Inquiry*. New York: Longman.

Elmore, R. F. (1996). *Restructuring in the classroom: teaching, learning, and school organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.

English, F. W. (1993). *Deciding what to teach and test*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Fink, E., & Resnick, L. B. (2001). Developing principals as instructional leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(8), 598-606.

Frase, L. E. (1998a). *An examination of teachers' flow experiences, efficacy, and instructional leadership in large inner-city and urban school district.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Frase, L. E. (1998b). *An examination of the relationships among principal classroom visits, teacher flow experiences, efficacy, and student cognitive engagement in two inner city school districts.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Frase, L. E. (2001). *A confirming study of the predictive power of principal classroom visits on efficacy and teacher flow experiences.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Frase, L. E., & Hetzel, R. (1990). *School Management by Wandering Around*. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technomic Publication.

Frase, L. E., & Streshly, W. (1994). Lack of accuracy, feedback, and commitment in teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 8*(1), 47-57.

Frase, L. E., & Streshly, W. (2000). *The top ten myths in education: Fantasies Americans love to believe*. Landham, MD: Scarecrow.

Freedman, B., & LaFleur, C. (2002). *Making leadership visible and practical: Walking for improvement.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, New Orleans, LA.

Freedman, B., & LaFleur, C. (2003, January). *Principal visibility and classroom walk-throughs: Supporting instructional leadership and school improvement.* Paper presented at the International Congress of School Effectiveness and School Improvement, Sydney, Australia.

Galloway, F., & Frase, L. E. (2003). *A methodological primer for estimating the effects of flow in the classroom.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.

Gallthorn, A. (1997). *Differentiated Supervision*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Garman, N. B. (1997). Is clinical supervision a viable model for use in the public schools? In *Educational supervision: Prospectives, issues, and controversies*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Glickman, C. D. (1991). Pretending not to know what we know. *Educational Leadership, 48*(4), 4-10.

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., & Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 479-508.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers*: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Graf, O., Fisher, J., & Werlinich, J. (Winter, 2002). Observation frustrations...is there another way? The Walkthrough Observation Tool. Pittsburgh, PA: The Principals Academy. University of Pittsburgh.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers work and culture in the postmodern age*. London: Cassell.

Harris, B. M. (1997). *Is collegial relationship possible between supervisors and teachers?* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McKenna, J. (1993). Close encounters of the executive kind: Regrettably, for boss and subordinates alike, they're few in number. *Industry Week, 242*(17), 13-18.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Yee, S. M. (1988). *"School as Place to Have a Career." In Building a Professional Culture in Schools*. New York: Teachers College Oress.

Mosher, R. L., & Purpel, D. E. (1972). *Supervision: The reluctant profession*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Pajak, E. (1993). *Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. J. (1984). *In search of excellence: Lessons from American's best-run companies*. New York: Warner.

Reavis, C. A. (1978). Research in review/clinical supervision: A review of the research. *Educational Leadership, 35*, 580-584.

Sanders, W. L., & Horn, S. P. (1994). The Tennesse value--added assessment system (TVAAS): Mixed-model methodology in educational assessment. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 8*, 299-311.

Scholastic, I. (2000). *Scholastic/CCSSO teacher voices 2000 survey*. Washington, DC: Author.

Scriven, M. (1981). Summative teacher evaluation. In S. R. (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Smith, J., & Blase, J. (1991). From empiricism to hermeneutics: Educational leadership as a practical and moral activity. *Journal of Educational Administration, 29*(1), 6-21.

Smyth, J. (1991). Instructional supervision and the redefinition of who does it in schools. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 7*, 90-99.

Smyth, J. (1997). Is supervision more than the surveillance of instruction? In *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Steinberg, J. (1998, April 5, 1998). The changing face of America's teachers. *New York Times*.

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap*. New York: The Free Press.

Sullivan, C. G. (1980). *Clinical Supervision: A state of the art review*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Teddlie, C., Kirby, P., & Stringfield, S. (1989). Effective versus ineffective schools: Observable difference in the classroom. *American Journal of Education, 42*, 221-236.

Trueman, W. (1991). CEO isolation and how to fight it. *Canadian, 64*(7), 28-32.

Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McRel).

Wright, S. P., Horn, S. P., & Sanders, W. L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 11*, 57-67.