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This qualitative multi-case study examined the relationship between professional development (Teacher Leader Endorsement Program) and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs about a deliberative curricular platform (teacher leadership) after professional development.

Participants in the study consisted of four volunteers that felt that they had undergone change as a result of the TLEP. Data collection for the class, were the teacher leader narrative, the leadership plan, and two individual interviews that were conducted six months after the professional development took place.

Three research questions guided this study: (1) What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership? (2) What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs? (3) After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

Collectively, all of the participants in this study stated that the qualities in the definition for meaningful professional development were important in changing their beliefs about teacher leadership and they, and their colleagues, had made a sustained
change into a new non-reflective state as a result of the TLEP. The main supports for re-presenting ideas about teacher leadership to their colleagues were continued professional reading, collegiality, timeliness of the core content standards, and seeing change in their students and colleagues. Hindrances were budget cuts, lack of administrative support, lack of time, and pre-existing climate in the school.
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

“Teachers exercise their rights to demand and fight for permanent and on-going teacher preparation—a preparation that is based in the experience of living the dialectical tensions between theory and practice” (Freire, 1998, p. 7).

Introduction

Every year, school districts spend thousands of dollars on professional development with the intent being that some type of change, be it attitudinal or instructional, will occur with the teacher and that teacher’s change in the classroom will improve student achievement and state report card outcomes. While much research exists on professional development (Harwayne, 1999; Henderson & Gornik, 2007; Meier, 1995, 2002; Rodgers & Pinnell, 2002), there is a limited body of research (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Vacc, Bright, & Bowman, 1998) on the relationship between professional development activities and sustained teacher change in beliefs. Research on sustained change exists (Bain, 2010; Gersten, Chard, & Baker, 2000; Lovett & Gilmore, 2003) but is rare and calls for more research (Richards & Skolits, 2009). One problem associated with professional development is that we try to link the outcome only to standardized student assessment measurements (Cochran-Smith, 2005). If we base meaningful professional development solely upon student test results, students’ social and emotional development—as well as other significant long-term learning such as sustained changes in teachers’ beliefs—are ignored. This dissertation investigates professional development that purposefully promotes enduring, holistic instructional practices (Richards & Skolits,
2009). A starting assumption of this dissertation is that professional development must be directed toward teacher beliefs and dispositions if sustainability in instructional practice is to occur (Maxwell, 2004). The present measurement of short-term impact in standardized testing is not enough to warrant the expense, the labor, and the time of professional development that has very limited research in sustainability.

Another starting assumption of this dissertation is that it is imperative that conditions are created so that teachers can find their voices and feel empowered as professionals who can move society forward through holistic education (Dewey, 1938; Greene, 1988; Hargreaves, 2000, 2001). With this magnitude of responsibility on teachers comes the charge of investigating theoretical ideas that promote a favorable effect upon the future (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003; Dewey, 1938). This type of “emancipatory education” (Greene, 1998, p. 56), where teachers take “responsibility for themselves and for each other” (p. 56), becomes practice through a lead-learning study agenda based on the concept of collegial reflective inquiry (CRI); a particular interpretation of this emancipatory education as applied to teachers and their students (Henderson & Gornik, 2007). When people believe in social responsibility for themselves and for each other (Nancy, 2010), there is a commitment to values and principles, not state mandated assessment objectives (Walker & Soltis, 2009). This encapsulates democracy in its truest sense. “For democracy means not only the ends,” “it signifies also primary emphasis upon the means by which these ends are to be fulfilled” (Dewey, 1937, p. 338). The journey of democracy—the ‘means’ for actualizing democratic ends-in-view—resonates from “a living faith in our common human nature
and in the power of voluntary action based upon public collective intelligence” (Dewey, 1937, p. 339). Freire acknowledged with change and a commitment to this sense of democracy there may be a “fear of experiencing new things, of exposing ourselves to mistakes” but that it “takes time to begin to risk [and that we] have to believe that it is possible” (Horton & Freire, as cited in Bell, Gaventa, & Peters, 1990, p. 220).

**Significance of the Study**

Through nine years of conducting professional development, I began to notice a pattern of short-term change in practice that was directly tied to and evaluated by standardized measurement. The frustration of this limited, short-term change in practice prompted me to begin a quest to find the key characteristics of what constitutes meaningful professional development that is sustained, one that is replicated on a regular and continual basis—in a word, a transformation. Looking further into the research, a pattern of three main areas was identified in professional development: time for participants to develop trust (Korthagen, 2004), the importance of administrative support in developing adult learning (DuFour, 2001), and developing a climate of collegiality (Darling-Hammond & Ifill-Lynch, 2006). I adhered to these objectives when I conducted the following professional development initiative that took place at a northeastern suburban middle school during the 2004-2005 school year.

Low scores on the standardized Ohio Achievement Tests in short answer and extended response items prompted an initiative in professional development entitled “Writing about Math.” The focus began with math teachers in 5th and 6th grade (12 teachers) and over the next year grew to include all math and language arts teachers in
5th through 8th grade. Two middle schools (50 teachers) and four elementary buildings (21 intervention tutors) participated over the next two years. Initially, dialogue meetings were scheduled that focused on creating a mission statement, setting goals, and looking for overall direction for the school year. All data from both the district and the individual school’s Ohio Report Card, demographic comparison test data, and proficiency strands were reviewed and discussed at length in breakout sessions that included all 71 teachers. The county liaison from the Educational Service Center and I worked with all of the participating teachers to discuss direction, focus, and a professional development plan for the year. During these work sessions, classroom assessments were literally broken down and cut into strips which prompted discussions over how to increase the quality of student responses on short answer and extended response items on quizzes and tests. Susan O’Connell, a nationally known instructional specialist, author and seminar leader from the Bureau of Education Research, was hired to present innovative strategies for helping students explain math thinking and justify answers verbally and in writing. She returned four times over the next two years providing small group activities in a collaborative learning environment to expand teachers’ repertoire of techniques to increase success in writing short answer and extended response questions. Three additional in-service opportunities were offered after school as question and answer sessions and were supervised by the county liaison and me. The same teachers participated in these sessions.

In 2004 and 2005, there were 12 short answer and extended response questions on the 6th grade Ohio Achievement Test in math. In the 2003-2004 school year, the middle
schools scored above the state average on three questions, at the state average on one question, and below state average on eight questions. One year after the in-service initiative took place, the same middle schools were above state average on six questions, at the state average on three, and only below on three of the questions. As evidenced in Table 1, the results after only one year were outstanding.

Table 1

Middle School Math Proficiency Results Grade 6 Short Answer/Extended Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions Above State Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions At State Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions Below State Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2003-2004, students scored at or above the state average on only 33.3% of the problems ($N = 12$), whereas this number increased to 75% of the problems in 2004-2005. Furthermore, the percent of problems ($N = 12$) that students scored below the state average dropped from 66.7% in 2003-2004 to 33.3% in 2004-2005. The initiative was considered a success; practice was assumed to have changed which in turn, raised test scores.

Four years after this professional development initiative, the middle school results resorted back to below the state average. This turn of events prompted our curriculum director to distribute a short narrative survey to teachers and ascertain topics that could be
addressed in future professional development initiatives. Surprisingly, the teachers responded by stating that there was a need for professional development in extended response and short answer questions on math achievement tests and that this topic had not been addressed prior. Even though most of the teachers had participated in the original in-service, they all stated on the survey that they had not received prior training on this topic. Not only was the professional development initiative to increase scores on short answer and extended response reversed, it was forgotten all together. The repeated decline in standardized test scores combined with the fact that teachers forgot attending professional development on the subject suggests that teachers changed practice in the short term but eventually resorted back to prior behaviors. Teachers changed their practice short term and even though they achieved the goal of the professional development, they did not sustain their practice. Underlying personal habits and dispositions, as well as micro-cultural customs, were not changed. Achieving the goal of improved standardized test scores was not enough to sustain (or even remember) ‘reformed’ practices. Kesson and Henderson (2010) agreed that curriculum prescriptions may not be sufficient to take on the “contemporary challenges of teaching in a democratic society, or more to the point, a society with democratic aspirations” (p. 216). Something was missing.

I began to look at the importance of meaningful professional development to support sustained change in the teachers’ beliefs (Guskey, 2002, 2003); meaningful professional development which provides a continuity of experience (Dewey, 1938) that alters teachers’ curricular platform (Walker, 1971).
Providing a continuity of experience (Dewey, 1938) in meaningful professional development requires discrimination between what is educative and what is not. An experience that is mis-educative does not support further growth or additional experiences. It can be enjoyable but cause a person to be stagnant, thus preventing further growth. It is the “mature adult” that has the responsibility to shape the experience by setting up the conditions that lead to his or her growth. The participants of the professional development create a desire to seek out more information mutually through consultation and through persuasion. The present and the future environment are always considered so the educative experience is sustained and replicated under conditions that are unlike the ones where the original experience was acquired. Meaningful professional development utilizes the principle of the continuity of experience by assuming the “responsibility for instituting the conditions for the kind of present experience that has a favorable effect upon the future” (Dewey, 1938, p. 50).

Meaningful professional development elicits a sustained change in participants’ curricular platform. Walker (1971) studied the way people work in groups, what they discuss, how they share their point of view or their thoughts on a subject, and how they move forward on topics. People spend time talking about their beliefs, laying the groundwork for their curricular platform. Through discussion, persuasion, problem solving, and by weighing all information presented, they deliberate to reach the best course of action, thus altering their original curricular platform. The alteration of a deliberate curricular platform is the sustained change in teachers’ beliefs that is explored in this study of meaningful professional development.
**Problem Statement**

This dissertation examines the ways in which meaningful professional development may occur when teachers take responsibility for the continuing study and practice of a specific collegial reflective inquiry agenda. Henderson and Hackney (2011) advanced this agenda through a “lead learner” frame of reference (Barth, 2008). A starting assumption of this dissertation is that when the focus for meaningful professional development is on an open-ended interplay of curriculum development which encompasses educational experiencing (curriculum designing), embodying educational experiencing (self-examining), and studying educational experiencing (peer transacting) (Henderson, 2012a); sustained change in teachers’ beliefs of a deliberate curricular platform is an emergent possibility.

The problem for this study is framed within Burke’s (1994) analysis of Dewey’s logic of inquiry (1938), particularly his diagram for the components of this logic. The diagram is organized around an indeterminate situation (stimulus) which elicits an identification of the problem leading to a possible solution, which ultimately determines the response to the problematic situation (response; Burke, 1994). Applying Burke’s diagram to this study: (a) The indeterminate situation is explained in the Significance of the Study; whereas participants of a systems-based problem-solving professional development initiative did not create sustained changes and, in fact, the teachers forgot about the initiative all together; (b) The identification of the problem is that we neglect to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs after professional development; (c) Determination of the solution is that
21st Century Learning may be better sustained through a particular interpretation of collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011) rather than the systems-based, problem-solving design that is currently in place; (d) The response to the solution is to elicit professional development that is meaningful; one that provides a continuity of experience (Dewey, 1938) that alters teachers’ curricular platform (Walker, 1971).

The area of research that substantiates the necessity of this study is the current call for research in the relationship between professional development and sustained change (Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Guskey, 2002; Richards & Skolits, 2009). In order to address the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs, it is important to define meaningful professional development. For the purpose of this study, meaningful professional development is defined as minimally consisting of the following criteria: allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik, 2007). The TLEP is designed, through an Ohio Board of Regents grant, “to build experienced teachers’ intellectual capacities so that they can function as 21st century professional leaders who can assist with creating and sustaining sophisticated professional and student learning communities” (Ohio Department of Education & Ohio Board of Regents, 2009).
This study examines four participants’ relationship between the TLEP and their self-admitted change in beliefs about teacher leadership. This situates the problem for this study.

The Ohio Board of Regents officially sanctioned the TLEP through a successful grant in 2009 for a university in Northeastern Ohio. The program consists of the following four courses: *Curriculum Leadership, Instructional Leadership, Principles and Techniques of Supervision and Advanced Practicum*, and *Internship in Curriculum and Instruction*. Ohio is one of five states that formed a consortium on teacher leadership where teacher leaders serve as mentors, facilitate professional development, and lead school improvement efforts. The current study was undertaken at one of the four universities in Ohio that wrote a grant to support this initiative.

Lasting change is one goal of the TLEP at this university. In the quest to pursue a deliberative curriculum (Null, 2011), Henderson and Gornik (2007) argued for a curriculum leadership interpretation that challenges educators to advance a problem solving approach that integrates Subject understandings with democratic Self and Social understandings, summarized as a 3S Curriculum Design. A main focus of the TLEP is to facilitate currere narratives (Pinar, 2004) that are based on the application of seven reflective inquiries (Henderson & Hackney, 2011) to Ryan’s (2011) “circuit of valuation” and on the application of the 3S curriculum design to the Leader Standards (Ohio Department of Education [ODE], 2009). As lead learners (Barth, 2008), the TLEP participants invoke study as curriculum development (Henderson, 2012b) to become consumers of knowledge and be “active participants in conversations that they
themselves will lead” (Pinar, 2004, p. 33). Through a leadership model of inquiry that expects conflict and embraces change (Dewey, 1938), this qualitative case study examines the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership after professional development. Hargreaves and Fullan (2009) believed that “educational change must rest on the basic principles of sustainability” (p. 22) and if we do not investigate sustained change in our professional development, then we should not bother with the professional development.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this qualitative multi-case study is to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. In general terms, the study describes the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program (TLEP) and explores the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Specifically, this study examines the possibility of facilitating changed teacher-beliefs on the topic of teacher leadership into the school environment six months after meaningful professional development.

I remain mindful that the four teacher leaders who have volunteered to be a part of this study may have been exposed to conflict implementing collegial reflective inquiry into their schools. With the pressures of standardized testing barely completed, I interviewed participants that believe standardized management of schools is not the best philosophy for 21st century curriculum theory. They know it has to be part of the curriculum through federally mandated requirements, but it should not be the only
driving force behind curriculum. Just as these participants feel strongly about this philosophy, they have administrators and colleagues that feel just as strongly about the checks and balances system of standardized management. Ryan (2011) would agree that, “the bright central star in one system may be a marginal white dwarf in another” (p. 61). The conflict that the volunteers experienced implementing changes and sustaining these changes is reflected in Chapter 4 and discussed in Chapter 5.

Research Questions

The research questions address by this study are as follows:

1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

2. What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs?

3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

Theoretical Base

Creswell (2003) described paradigm as a worldview or simply the deep beliefs that we have that guide our actions. This qualitative study reflects my worldview to attempt to make sense of the meanings that people apply to their settings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Merriam (1998) described qualitative researchers as showing a deep interest in learning about and truly understanding the perspectives of the participants’
point of view—in this study, four participants. Qualitative researchers go on to build hypotheses or a theory with an emphasis on discovery.

My beliefs stem from a constructivist point of view but I write with a radical constructivist epistemology. Lincoln and Guba (2005) wrote that constructivists support knowing as a means to social emancipation and believe that it has value to support empowerment. Radical constructivists believe that knowledge is not transformed simply by words but by creating opportunity to “reconceptualize their experiences thereby constructing their own knowledge” (Joldersma, 2011, p. 277). People are constantly re-presenting (von Glasersfeld, 1995) their experience, taking a chunk of past, and communicating this with others. When people re-present their ideas, it may not be the original occurrence, but it is the truth as known to the presenter—assimilated truth shared with others. This study looks at the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs, resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. The idea of sustaining change in beliefs by re-presenting collegial reflective inquiry through the 3S design to colleagues after the professional development ends is explored in this multi-case study. More about the methodology of this study is presented in Chapter 3.

**Definitions**

3S *curriculum design*. Henderson and Gornik’s (2007) definition of the 3S design, very simply put, is “integration of subject matter understanding with democratic self and social understanding” (p. 8). Thus combining subject matter with self and social understanding creates enduring values that are sustained in specific instructional contexts.
Henderson and Gornik embraced a problem-solving wisdom and invited educators to take this journey of understanding.

**Change.** Ryan’s (2011) analysis and interpretation of Dewey and Bentley’s Theory of Inquiry (Dewey, 1938) stated that change is a cycle we all go through when confronted with a problem. When a habit is disrupted by a problem, we must develop a hypothesis, gather the tools and data to solve the problem, experiment and reach the objective of inquiry; that leads back to a slightly altered nonreflective experience. “Once a solution is achieved, thought has served its purpose and a state of habituated belief is restored. It is not the original belief, however, but belief informed by what we have learned through the function of inquiry” (Ryan, 2011, pp. 21-22). This theory of change in beliefs was presented in the TLEP in June 2011 and supported throughout the four courses. The TLEP participants were encouraged to understand the model to support their change and to support the change others may experience.

**Collegial reflective inquiry.** Collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011) is defined as a complex practice that is holistic where reflective thinking is informed by both curriculum and collaborative inquiry by all participants involved (Henderson & Hackney, 2011). In contrast to a systems-based problem-solving model that is presently in place, 21st Century Learning may be better situated through a particular interpretation of collegial reflective inquiry.

**Currere.** Pinar (2004) defined currere as “complicated conversation with oneself (as a private intellectual), an ongoing project of self-understanding in which one becomes mobilized for engaged pedagogical action” (p. 37). Specifically for teachers, currere
offers the opportunity to embark upon a journey of change, for themselves and their colleagues with the possibility of changing society in the process. In order to undertake this intellectual leap, participants on this journey must question their place in the bigger picture. This TLEP program strongly supported this transformative type of change to take place. In order for the type of sustained change in teachers’ beliefs to occur, currere must take place. Finding this deep moral, ethical, and intellectual meaning is “fundamentally related to whether teachers are likely to find the considerable energy required to transform the status quo” (Fullan, 2007, p. 39).

Curricular platform. Walker (1971) studied people who worked in groups and found that people brought their beliefs to the table and spent a great deal of time presenting those beliefs. It is these fundamental beliefs that comprise a curricular platform. A person’s platform can be altered through compromise and persuasion.

Lead learner. “The moral authority of the educational leader comes first and foremost from being a learner” (Barth, 2008, p. x). Engaging and inviting other “curriculum stakeholders to join in these studies as voluntary, collaborative partners” (Henderson, 2012a, p. 4) is a goal of the TLEP and a continual challenge for lead learners.

Meaningful professional development. Meaningful professional development provides a continuity of experience (Dewey, 1938) that alters teachers’ curricular platform (Walker, 1971). For the purpose of this study, meaningful professional development is defined as minimally consisting of the following criteria: allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood et al.,
2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry
(Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through
self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic
values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik,
2007).

**Ohio teacher leader standards.** The Ohio Department of Education has classified
five standards as Ohio Teacher Leader Standards (ODE, 2009) with a varying number of
elements that support each of the standards (Appendix A). A working knowledge of
these standards while utilizing the 3S design was a prerequisite of the grant that was
written.

**Re-presentation.** This term is attributed to the work of Ernst von Glasersfeld
(1995) as he defined the term as “a mental act that brings a prior experience to an
individual’s consciousness” (p. 67). It is a collection of material from the original
experience as interpreted by the individual, re-presented at a different time as a present
experience. It is not the original experience, but a re-presentation of that experience.

**Seven reflective inquiries.** The seven reflective inquires which inform the 3S
design are critiquing, envisioning, deliberating, negotiating, self-examining, collegial
learning, and public inspiring. It is through these inquires that the members of the TLEP
aspire to become lead learners (Barth, 2008). Curriculum and teaching problems are
framed through Standardized Management (SM), Constructivist Best Practice (CBM),
and Curriculum Wisdom (CW). For the purposes of this study, the focus remains on the
overall 3S design.
Study as curriculum development. To embrace study as curriculum development is to move past systems-based management and embrace the challenge of the reconstruction of education followed by curriculum development after this reconceptualization. Teachers become the curriculum theorists that lead their own currere. Pinar (2004) supported a method for “students of curriculum to study the relations between academic knowledge and life history in the interest of self-understanding and social reconstruction” (p. 35). With this process as a guide, the TLEP supports this love of wisdom while encouraging deep learning with deliberative conversations for true democratic practice (Henderson, 2012b).

Sustained change in beliefs. Guskey (1985, 2002) was an advocate of sustained change and his model of professional development and teacher change ties change in beliefs to change in practices. Change in teacher beliefs is tied into teaching and learning and will ultimately be tied into classroom practice (Edwards & Hensien, 1999). Kegan (1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009) fully explored the concept of adult change that endures. Kegan’s definition of sustained change is to maintain a different mindset than previously embraced through disciplined self-inquiry. For purposes of this study, sustained change by an individual means to replace a previous belief or mindset with one that is accepted and is replicated on a regular and continual basis, a transformation.

Teacher leader. A teacher leader advocates for change, leads people where they themselves are willing to go, motivates, provides feedback, and seeks evidence of their impact (Donaldson, 2008). They themselves are on the same journey as those they lead, one of growth and learning alongside their colleagues.
**Tool.** The term tool, referred to in the second question of this study, is defined by Ryan (2011) as the physical instrument needed (tools and data) to “diagnose a problem and formulate a hypothesis to resolve it” (p. 29). The leadership plan, a requirement of the TLEP, was an action research project that served as the tool for implementing teacher leadership plans into the school environment.

**Wiggle room.** There are times in a leader’s journey when a road block occurs, where colleagues disagree and communication is at a standstill. Wiggle room (Donaldson, 2008) is the direction you can take when you step back, reflect, and rework an idea together to move forward in a constructive manner. It is a place that is created through desire to lead and follow, to learn and to grow, but most importantly, to move forward together.

**Summary**

The necessity of this study is the current call for research in the relationship between professional development and sustained change (Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 2002; Richards & Skolits, 2009). In order to address this relationship, it is important to define meaningful professional development that elicits a change in beliefs and how that change may be sustained. The specific research questions that this study attempted to address are:

1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?
2. What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs?

3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. In general terms, the study describes the TLEP (Teacher Leader Endorsement Program) and explores the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Specifically, this study examines the possibility of facilitating changed teacher-beliefs on the topic of teacher leadership into the school environment six months after the professional development.

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 presented the introduction, significance of the study, problem statement, purpose, research questions, theoretical base, definitions, and summary. Chapter 2 is a review of the literature of practices in research in professional development, meaningful professional development, and the TLEP. Chapter 3 outlines the research design and methodology used in this study. All information is outlined in detail including data-gathering techniques, sorting, and all procedures that followed, as well as determination of sample selected for this study. Chapter 4 is an analysis of the data and Chapter 5 consists of an in-depth cross-case
analysis, discussion of the findings, conclusions, implications, and future recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. In general terms, the study describes the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program (TLEP) and explores the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Specifically, this study examines the possibility of facilitating changed teacher-beliefs on the topic of teacher leadership into the school environment six months after the professional development. The area of research that substantiates the necessity of this study is the current call for research in the relationship between professional development and sustained change (Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 2002; Richards & Skolits, 2009). In order to address this relationship, it is important to define meaningful professional development that elicits a change in beliefs about a deliberative curricular platform and how that change may be sustained.

Fullan (2007) shared, “Teachers need to increase their capacity for dealing with change because if they don’t, they are going to continue to be victimized by the relentless intrusion of external change forces” (p. 138). If participants of meaningful professional development have started on the path of currere, “complicated conversation with oneself (as a private intellectual), an ongoing project of self-understanding in which one becomes mobilized for engaged pedagogical action” (Pinar, 2004, p. 37), then there is opportunity
for sustained change, not only for themselves and their colleagues, but for society. Brookfield (1995) believed in setting the circumstances for creating this powerful change;

People who are empowered—teachers in this case—are those who are able to act in accordance with what they know and believe. They are empowered to draw from the center of their own knowing and act as critics and creators of the world rather than solely respondents to it, or worse, victims of it. (p. 47)

It is through creating conditions for an open dialogue, an avenue for communication that people can come together to support a democratic society in its truest sense (Nancy, 2010). This can be accomplished through professional development and educational leaders that are active citizens in a democratic society (Noddings, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2009). Eisner (1998) reminded us to remember the “rewards of taking the journey itself” (p. 43) and that we are to find satisfaction in the ride and not just the destination. It is the possibility of sustained change in beliefs of the participants in the TLEP that are explored in this qualitative multi-case study. This literature review is organized into three areas of research: professional development, meaningful professional development, and the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program.

Professional Development

Research Supporting This Study

Providing eclectic professional development that is theory-based (Schwab, 1978) while supporting a transformative change (Ryan, 2011) reinforced through re-presentation of experiences (von Glasersfeld, 1995) is discussed below.
Schwab (1978) presented an eclectic curriculum that “recognizes the usefulness of theory to curriculum decision, takes account of certain weaknesses of theory as grounds for decision, and provides some degree of repair of these weaknesses” (p. 295). When we combine theories and explore meaningful professional development adjusting the theory along our journey, we can then support the intended change in the beliefs of the participants, a change that we need to strive for and expect.

Dewey/Bentley’s Theory of Inquiry (1949) as presented through Ryan’s (2011) interpretation helps us to understand change and the process of inquiry that we go through as we change. When our non-reflective experience is disrupted by a problem and habit cannot supply the solution, a hypothesis is developed. Determining the problem and the solution with the support of tools and data leads to an experiment to reach the objective of inquiry and to return to a non-reflective state. This new non-reflective experience is not the original belief but one that is changed and has become habit. This is sustained unless a problem disrupts the habit and the cycle repeats. The starting assumption of this study is based on the Dewey/Bentley’s Theory of Inquiry (1949) as interpreted by Ryan (2011), that the habit of everyday teaching is disrupted by meaningful professional development, which promotes creating a hypothesis and seeking the tools and data required to go through transformative change; new habits are formed, and a non-reflective state is sustained.

This constant, continual reflection of experience is a cyclical process also supported by von Glasersfeld’s (1995) re-presentational epistemology. As a radical constructivist, von Glasersfeld not only believed people construct their own knowledge
but also that the “only way to exert mutual influence, aside from physical harm or pleasure, is through mutual interpretation” (Thompson, 2000, p. 417). We are constantly structuring our world by organizing our experiences (Saldanha, 2004). Clearly our construction of reality, as we believe it to be, is not the direct experience. In other words, reflecting upon our experiences is not the same as having the experience.

I know of no better description of the mysterious capability that allows us to step out of the stream of direct experience, to re-present a hunk of it, and to look at it as though it were direct experience, while remaining aware of the fact that it is not. I call it mysterious, because, although we can all do it as easily as flipping a switch, we have not even the beginnings of a model (least of all an information processing model) that would suggest how it might be achieved. “To grasp what was just presented” is to cut it out of the continuous experiential flow. In a literal sense of the term, this is a kind of abstraction—namely the simplest kind.
Focused attention picks a chunk of experience, isolates it from what came before and from what follows, and treats it as a closed entity. For the mind, then, “to post it as object against itself”, is to re-present it. (von Glasersfeld, 1995, pp. 64-65)

The word representation is derived from two German words meaning original and idea or conception (Streefland, 1985). By adding a hyphen, it would indicate the repetition of an experience, not in a literal sense but re-shaped through interpretation and re-presented. A re-play, if you will, of something that happened in the past and is being communicated in the present in a way that the individual has assimilated that experience
and shares it with others. Sometimes it is recalled and communicated out of context but the original occurrence is known only to the individual (von Glasersfeld, 1995). This experience may be re-shaped, re-played, and re-presented, but ultimately is shared out and real-ized (Ryan, 2011, p. 29). The experience is made true by reflection of the original experience. Dewey discouraged us from getting lost in analyzing the truth but encouraged us to value the notion that whatever truth we have come to know by reflection and judgment, and is worked out through society, is our own reflective truth (Ryan, 2011).

When we reflect on our experiences, there may be a disturbance that causes a state of unsettledness. Dewey (as cited in Hickman & Alexander, 1998) believed this human experience called perturbation is found in the transition from a nonreflective state to one of coming to terms with and dealing with a problem. Emotions are heightened and senses are attentive to the problem. Hackenberg (2005) referred to this as a “disturbed state of affairs” (p. 45); when emotion is at a heightened state, this disturbance elicits the possibility to connect learning to deeply caring about the point of view of others. Piaget referred to this transformation as decentering (Montagero & Maurice-Naville, 1997); when a teacher moves from his or her own perspective and attempts to see things from the student’s point of view; a starting point in helping them realize their own ideas (Silverman & Thompson, 2008). This interaction can become the foundation for renewed interest and an increase in the well-being of both the teacher and the student (Hackenberg, 2010); the key to a caring relationship that elicits citizenship in a

**Present Day Professional Development**

No Child Left Behind (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) has mandated High Quality Professional Development into two grants, Title IIa for innovative ideas and Title I for all teachers to become highly qualified. Stimulus money funneled through Title I and Special Education (2009-11) required the same professional development guidelines. Although there may be some negative effects of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), one very positive benefit of this law has been the mandated financial support for professional development. The mandated financial support of NCLB (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) has shown positive effects on teachers (Overbaugh & Lu, 2008) and students (Trachtman, 2007) thus encouraging further research in professional development.

The Secretary’s Third Annual Report on Teacher Quality (U.S. Department of Education, 2004) supports and encourages further research on professional development and encourages states to take on this task. The Ohio Standards for Professional Development (2008) was created with the intent of outlining steps for providing quality professional development. It targets six areas to meet the definition of high quality professional development; it is a purposeful, structured, and continuous process that occurs over time; it is informed by multiple sources of data; it is collaborative; it includes varied learning experiences that accommodate individual educator’s knowledge and skills; it is evaluated by short- and long-term impact on professional practice and
achievement of all students; and it results in the acquisition, enhancement, or refinement of skills and knowledge. It is unfortunate that the definition does not mention sustainability because, as Stipek, Givvin, Salmon and MacGyvers (2001) would agree, without linking professional development to sustained change in beliefs and practices, it is not likely to be meaningful.

**Meaningful Professional Development**

From my perspective, meaningful professional development provides a continuity of experience (Dewey, 1938) that alters teachers’ curricular platform (Walker, 1971). For the purpose of this study, meaningful professional development is defined as minimally consisting of the following criteria: allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood et al., 2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik, 2007). Each area is discussed.

**Time to Develop Trust**

It is necessary to provide time for teachers to work together but that alone is not enough. Fullan (2008) supported professional learning communities as a viable model of professional development. In his book *What’s Worth Fighting for in the Principalship* (2008), he supported two conditions that are a necessity for success in professional development. One ingredient is structural, taking the time to meet and to communicate.
The second need is social, a culture that must exist in trust and respect. There is a great deal of research on the importance of social culture but Lumpe (2007) in particular supports this type of research-based professional development encouraging time and trust to engage in meaningful collaboration. Burbank and Kauchak (2003) also felt people need time to develop trust for meaningful dialogue and reflective inquiry; “collaboration requires trust and sharing” (p. 512).

Building a sense of trust that is necessary in order for people to share their ideas and opinions is not an easy task. Brookfield (1995) held that in adult education, “breaking chains of silence is not easy” (p. 145) and in order to accomplish this there must be an “emphasis on honoring” (p. 222). An atmosphere of trust needs to exist for people to publicly disclose their private thoughts. Maslow (1943) contended that only breathing, food, water, sleep, and excretion come before physical and emotional safety as a need. “Feelings always affect reasoning and memory”; “they can help us remember and make us forget” (Zull, 2002, p. 87).

Administrative Support

For professional development to be meaningful there must be administrative support to enable teachers to feel free to create an atmosphere of learning (Perrone, 1997). It is the task of the person in authority to set the conditions that enable teachers to make the necessary adjustments to stay progressive in our ever changing profession. So administrators not only have the authority to support meaningful professional development, they have the obligation to do so; “Our job is to try to figure out ways to help people take over their own lives” (Horton & Freire, as cited in Bell et al., 1990, p.
“Leadership not only matters, it is second only to teaching among school-related factors in its impact on student learning” (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004, p. 3). In order for initiatives to take hold and be retained, principals must believe in and support the efforts of the teachers. “The most significant contribution a principal can make to developing others is creating an appropriate context for adult learning” (DuFour, 2001, p. 14), therefore, if administrative support does not exist, the professional development will not be successful (Sandholtz & Scribner, 2006).

**Collegiality**

Brookfield (1995) believed that teachers who have time to build collegiality are therefore empowered to create new information and to act upon implementation of that new information. Setting the stage for a climate of trust (King & Newman, 2001) and the importance of collegiality is stressed in research (Clement & Vandenberghhe, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 1996; DuFour, 2001; Engstrom & Danielson, 2006; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Lumpe, 2007; D. Sparks & Hirsh, 2000). Professional learning communities support this initiative (DuFour, 2004).

Both administration and teachers must work together to create a climate that is conducive for “straining toward what ought to be” (Greene, 1995, p. 71). This takes time and people need to be assured that they will not be put in a position of conflict that causes embarrassment. Instead that conflict is supported, expected, and known to provide new options that move everyone forward. Zull (2002) was clear in pointing out that our emotions directly influence our thinking. It is difficult to make decisions if we are afraid.
This further supports the need to set conditions for an atmosphere of trust to increase the likelihood that an atmosphere of collegiality will develop.

Greene (1988) agreed that, “conditions must be deliberately created to enable the mass of people to act on their power to choose” (p. 18). When people come together and conditions are set for trust to develop, then freedom will follow. Freedom happens “when individuals come together in a particular way, when they are authentically present to one another (without masks, pretenses, badges of office), when they have a project they can mutually pursue” (pp. 16-17). When the groundwork is laid for open communication, the goal is set for “emancipatory education conducted by and for those willing to take responsibility for themselves and for each other” (Greene, 1988, p. 56).

**Collegial Reflective Inquiry**

Three paradigms are integrated into TLEP program: standardized management, constructivist best practice, and curriculum wisdom. Collegial reflective practice encapsulates these three paradigms. Standardized management is focused on the problem of standardized test scores and the continual battle to add value to the prior year. Constructivist best practice is linked to a performance of understanding in academic subject area and/or vocational disciplines. Curriculum wisdom is focused on democracy as a moral way of living. It is in this paradigm that the proposed study focuses upon the 3S design (Henderson & Gornik, 2007) but all three combine to challenge and inspire participants to be lead learners (Donaldson, 2008). Henderson and Gornik’s (2007) definition of the 3S design is the “integration of subject matter understanding with democratic self and social understanding” (p. 8).
Subject. The TLEP is designed to meet the needs of the national and state mandates through the OTLS (Ohio Teacher Leader Standards, ODE, 2009) and through the 3S design, a model that supports educators “on their own personal and professional inquiry journey” (Henderson & Gornik, 2007, p. 54). The OTLS consist of 5 standards with 26 elements that further support the standards.

Self. The internal challenge of a standardized curriculum is to take the standards and cultivate a reflective inquiry. Pinar called a particular method of self-reflection currere—“the Latin infinitive form of curriculum means to run the course” which “provides a history in the interest of self-understanding and social reconstruction” (Pinar, 2004, p. 25). The journey of the lead learner and their colleagues are linked and both are informed by Pinar’s work on currere (Henderson & Gornik, 2007).

Social. A constant question lies in the heart of teachers: Can I meet the demands of the federal and state mandates while still pursuing the ideals with which I entered this profession? Noddings (2006) wrote that teachers are caring educational leaders because they, along with their colleagues, struggle with this question. It is said that those who embrace democratic education “embrace human artistry” and “whenever possible, they establish critical distance from the incessant pressures to conform and standardize” (Henderson & Slattery, 2008, p. 2). Teachers have a moral obligation in a democratic society to teach in a way that their students can participate intelligently as adults in the political processes that shape their society (Zeichner, 1993). Just as “all students deserve rich educational experiences that will enable them to become active citizens in a democratic society,” adults too deserve these experiences (Noddings, 2005, p. 5).
Teachers are invited to be transformative and utilize the 3S design both in their teaching of students and in their new role as teacher leaders. Barth celebrated lead learners in the forward of Donaldson’s (2008) book *How Leaders Learn*:

The world has begun to recognize that if schools are to significantly improve, it will be the resident practitioners who will improve them. And we have learned that most teachers and administrators have the capacity to develop and provide capable leadership to improve their schools—if the conditions are right. It remains for us to discover those conditions under which school practitioners become voracious, lifelong learners and accomplished leaders. (p. ix)

Collegial reflective inquiry is the focus of the TLEP, the journey that the participants undertake and eventually practice themselves and initiate with others. It is informed by Dewey’s transactional knowing, more of a reflective inquiry where individual expression, empathy, and understanding, collegial celebration, and self-affirmation are welcome and expected (Henderson, 2012a).

**Promotes Change**

With continual educational reforms, research demands that we look at the process by which teachers change (Edwards & Hensien, 1999). It is imperative that we understand the psychology of change in order to investigate the goal of sustained change. Therefore, if the goal of professional development is to support teachers’ sustained change, we must realize that sustained change in classroom practice is directly linked to change in beliefs (Guskey, 2002, 2003). If there is only a change in practice and not in beliefs, there will not be sustained change. Professional development needs to include
the background knowledge of how people change so they understand the theory—the stages that they go through and that others go through as they change. Teacher leaders are better able to guide others through change when they have been through change themselves and know the process. One well known theory for change in education is Lewin’s Change Theory. Schein (1995) described Lewin’s Change Theory as:

The key to effective change management, then, becomes the ability to balance the amount of threat produced by discomforting data with enough psychological safety to allow the change target to accept the information, feel the survival anxiety, and become motivated to change. (Schein, 1995, p. 5)

Kurt Lewin (1890-1947) had great impact on education through his Change Theory and action research (Lewin, 1997). His research was intended and designed to inform theory and affect educational practice and his life goal was the pursuit of a perfect combination of theoretical and applied psychology (Maruyama, 1992). Lewin knew that theory must look at the entire view, all angles of research in order to gain a proper perspective. He believed that even if people in a group have many different dispositions, if they share a common objective, they can come together as a group (M. K. Smith, 2001). The three stages to Lewin’s Change Theory are as follows.

Unfreezing—There would exist dissatisfaction or frustration in something. During this stage, it is necessary to overcome individual resistance and group conformity. There is much discussion where all views must be shared and experienced and people can begin to adopt their own view. There must exist an element of trust in order for people to
brainstorm ideas and actively participate in acknowledging the problems thereby recognizing the need for change. Trust for informed dialogue is vital (Schein, 1995).

Changing—There must be an inner personal tension in order to prompt change. There are two assumptions: (a) that the intention to reach a goal corresponds to the tension within the person, and (b) the tension is released if the person reaches the goal. Changing takes time so those providing professional development must be mindful of all aspects of the learning environment. Otherwise, the change will not be sustained because the whole picture was not taken into account (Schein, 1995).

Refreezing—Behavior is a function of the person and the environment; they are intertwined. If beliefs change and are not supported, behavior may change but will the person promote that change to others? Will it be hidden for fear of embarrassment or conflicting viewpoints? In order to sustain change, consideration must be given to the person when they re-enter the work environment. According to Schein (1995), “it is best to train the entire group that holds the norms that support the old behavior” (p. 11) for refreezing to be successful.

Lewin’s Change Theory looks at how people change, mainly how to create change in targeted groups. Some studies question Lewin’s theory and support looking at a new theory of change. Dionne Cross (2009) studied mathematic teachers and their change in belief patterns and questioned Lewin’s theory on the grounds that changing beliefs is not enough for lasting change. Cross believed that “providing evidence that contradicts teachers’ current beliefs is an important component of the process but alone will not lead to any real or sustained change” (p. 342).
A call for change. Guskey (1985, 2002) looked for enduring change in teacher attitude and encouraged research in change. He believed our current models of professional development follow the Lewin model of change and he questioned the validity of this model. Guskey stated our perspective on teacher change evolved largely from models developed by early change theorists who derived many ideas about affecting change from psychotherapeutic models. An alternative model that re-examines the process of teacher change is needed to guide the creation of more effective professional development programs (Guskey, 1985).

Guskey (1985) called for a model that may look at professional development that promotes change in classroom practice, change in learning outcomes, and ultimately change in teachers’ beliefs. In other words, change in practices, followed by change in student outcome, promotes change in teacher beliefs. Guskey (2002) later suggested that his model is cyclical; beliefs and attitude spur practice that may or may not cause change in student learning that cause change in practice. When I conducted a pilot study on a professional development model (Carothers, 2007), I came to understand the depth to which change in beliefs affects practice. The pilot study investigated the possible change in beliefs and practices of the teachers involved. In the study, there was a noticeable disparity between what the teachers said in the interview (their beliefs) from what took place in the classroom observation (their practices). The pilot study did not provide, and was not designed to investigate the disparity between beliefs and practices, but does support the inquiry that both of these ingredients constitute teacher change (Guskey, 1985, 2002). I believe that if only practice changes without a change in teachers’ beliefs,
that the practice will not be sustained. It will be short-term change in practice and when the external force is removed, practice will go back to its original state. Consequently, there must be a change in beliefs for practice to be sustained. This study explores a theoretical connection between a change theory that values change in beliefs and behavior that may lead to a transformation by participants.

**Dewey/Bentley (1938) Circuit of Inquiry.** Ryan (2011) has provided us with an interpretation of transaction that begins with Charles S. Peirce’s (1839-1914) Circle of Doubt-Belief. In his model of Circle of Doubt-Belief, Peirce began with a habit that is in place but is interrupted by doubt, which initiates inquiry leading to a cognitive solution.

Dewey (1938) takes this philosophy further by adding greater detail to Peirce’s model especially in delineating the dynamic hypothesis to object via experiment, a distinction that leads to his Circuit of Inquiry (see Figure 1). This model is interpreted in a practical sense and applied to professional development. It is important to remember that Dewey valued the involvement of a community of learners in this model from beginning to end (Ryan, 2011).

![Figure 1. Circuit of Inquiry](image)
Nonreflective Experience—Normal classroom practices; routines that have been developed by going through the process of problem-solving previously and are now acted upon without thought, the habits of a nonreflective experience.

Habit—Something causes a disruption in my nonreflective experience and one of two things can happen: habit will prompt me to act in a certain way, given the stimulus of the problem and I will continue on with my nonreflective experience or the disruption will become a problem.

Problem—When there is a problem: (a) diagnose the problem (this may involve a hypothesis, tools, and testing); (b) develop a hypothesis or a plan for resolving the problem; or (c) determine and obtain the data and tools needed for testing the hypothesis.

Experiment—Take the hypotheses or tools and data back to the work environment.

Object—The Object of the entire process is the satisfactory resolution of the problem which prompts a return to a new and enriched nonreflectivity. When a solution is achieved, we have succeeded in sustained change of our practice and of our belief system. “Once a solution is achieved, thought has served its purpose and a state of habituated belief is restored. It is not the original belief, however, but belief informed by what we have learned through the function of inquiry” (Ryan, 2011, pp. 21, 22).

If we apply this Circuit of Inquiry as a model of problem solving in professional development, in order for sustained change to exist, teachers must be allotted the time to develop their currere (Pinar, 2004), recognize that there is a problem, and realize that a habituated response is not the best avenue for solving this problem. A safe climate is a
necessary ingredient to develop a hypotheses and a plan to solve the problem. Time is necessary to determine the tools and data to support the hypotheses. Taking this hypothesis back to the classroom, it must be tested and the new objective must be evaluated. When the new objective becomes integrated with ongoing practices, a new nonreflective (habituated) state is experienced.

Ryan (2011) stated:

Although each non-reflective pattern is built upon a succession of preceding patterns, if everything is working well, it is not necessary to compare this to them. However when the nature of the problem demands such a comparison, the comparison is itself the subject of a hypothesis and test. (p. 30)

Ryan (2011) pointed out that there are two distinct components to re-presenting a problematic practice: (a) When the practice becomes a problem, we examine it reflectively to determine what went wrong and how it might be rectified; (b) In doing so, we should also pay attention to the influence competing theories (such as collegial reflective inquiry and the current systems-based standardized management model) have on what will constitute a “successful” change in practice. In other words, these background theories are as much a part of the problem as the practices they evaluate, and as such should be re-presented along with them.

This theory lends itself to the smooth transition into Glasersfeld’s theory of re-presentation. We take our nonreflective experience, re-present it through communication to others and then integrate it into ongoing practices. When we have changed in a sustained manner, the nonreflective experience is extracted and pulled out at
a later time: re-presented. We need models of meaningful professional development that support re-presentation in order to expect sustained change in beliefs.

**Challenge of change.** It is a challenge to create a culture of change. In order for change to move past habit, there must be a problem that cannot be solved with existing tools and a change must take place. Many times, a by-product of this change is conflict, unsettling discomfort that is inevitable when many educated people gather to brainstorm higher level thinking goals. The best managers of top companies suggest ways to embrace conflict in order to find mutual resolution. Collins (2001) in his book *Good to Great* has this to say about commonalities in the top companies:

All the good-to-great companies had a penchant for intense dialogue. Phrases like “loud debate,” “heated discussions,” and “healthy conflict” peppered the articles and interview transcripts from all the companies. They didn’t use discussion as a sham process to let people “have their say” so that they could “buy in” to a predetermined decision. The process was more like a heated scientific debate, with people engaged in a search for the best answers. (p. 77)

The top companies value opinion and do not hide from heated discussion between colleagues. They hold true that in order to make good decisions, you must first gather the data and together create new information. Businesses that are the most effective in their chosen field do not shy away from conflict, but consider this a byproduct of smart people in search of the best answers. Buckingham and Coffman (1999) insisted that the best leaders are those who possess skills for leadership; they gravitate to those positions. The leaders in the top positions support and encourage colleagues to change through mutual
resolution, they change together. Although the argument could be made that people do not innately possess employability skills, even the objections of business theory and educational theory are worth exploring. It is my opinion that we should consider some facets of business change models that have had proven success with adult learning. Conflict should be expected and embraced and looked at as an opportunity for discussion (Feiman-Nemser, 2001) and in my nine years of experience in a central office position, I do not believe this is taking place.

**Sustained Change in Beliefs**

“Not only is the long-term sustainability of effective practices unknown, even research regarding how best to initiate change is still in a relatively formative stage” (Gersten et al., 2000, p. 445). Effective, lasting professional development must be well organized, structured, and directed (Guskey, 2003). In order for there to be sustained change in beliefs, the kind we should be seeking, there must be a deep understanding of what change you want and how that change will endure (Guskey, 2002).

The idea of sustained change in teachers’ beliefs is fully explored in the work of Kegan (1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009) through human development, application of this theory to the demands of life, and a management theory for adult change in the workplace. In his first book, *The Evolving Self*, Kegan found alignment to his theory and the work of Piaget (1896–1980) who believed people adapt to the world by “a process of adaptation shaped by the tension between the assimilation of new experience to the old ‘grammar’ and the accommodation of the old grammar to the new experience” (Kegan, 1982, pp. 43-44). Kegan detailed about how we organize ourselves
as the organism to the world; we (the subject) and the world (the object) are always at issue to find a truce or a new balance. The struggle to find this balance is ongoing throughout our lives and, to some extent, involves a “killing off of the old self” (p. 232) when the subject evolves. This growth is very costly and frightening as it involves leaving behind a piece of our old self and evolving into a new place of knowing.

In Kegan’s second book, *In Over our Heads* (1994), his theory is interwoven into the demands of the present day. The demands of the day apply a constant pressure to change our set of skills without the time that is necessary to do so. What is needed to allow for the gradual transformation of the mind is a “blend of support and challenge” (Kegan, 1994, p. 42). Professional development that elicits sustained change requires time and support. “If a program can fail to provide the necessary evolutionary support by neglecting to build a bridge out of and beyond the old world, it can also fail by expecting its charges to take up immediate residence in the new world” (p. 46). Kegan acknowledged that when conflict occurs, the focus should not be on solving the problem. Instead, focus should be on ways to let the conflict transform the participants through resolution of (or attempts to resolve) the problem. The main goal is not to solve the problem; the goal is to transform the participants while they discover together a mutual resolution.

In his last book, *Immunity to Change* (Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), a look at the growth of adult mental complexity is examined. This theory of change, as introduced and explored in his first two books, is applied in a management theory and targets supporting the development of mind not following a hidden curriculum of forcing a new
set of skills but instead, that a “new threshold of consciousness be reached” (Kegan, 1994, p. 164). Kegan and Laskow-Lahey (2009) stated that in order to create a change that is sustained, we must have change in the way we think and feel. In order to accomplish this, we must change our mindset. In adult learning, we must change the meaning making system, the mindset, and behavior rather than changing only behavior because “neither change in mindset or change in behavior alone leads to transformation, but that each must be employed to bring about the other” (p. 309). Therefore, sustained change is a change in one’s mindset. The person knows when they have changed their belief system and they are a different person, on a different level, because of this change. They are aware and they know they have changed.

**Democratic Values**

Walker and Soltis (2009) recognized that lasting change is challenging and that previous reform efforts have failed. We set high standards in education but maybe they are not “objectives to be met as much as they are commitments to certain values and procedures for education” (pp. 13-14): a sense of democracy in its truest meaning. Ryan (2011) interpreted Dewey’s definition of democracy as a way of life, fostering conjoined behavior in pursuit of human flourishing, putting our minds and actions together in order to transform our world, and ourselves.

Nancy (2010) defined democracy as:

If democracy has a sense, it would be that of having available to it no identifiable authority proceeding from a place or impetus other than those of desire—of a will,
an awaiting, a thought—where what is expressed and recognized is a true possibility of being all together, all and each one among all. (p. 14)

It seems as though our educational institutions have lost sight of these definitions and have forgotten to question, to challenge ourselves and each other to a higher place. As educators, have we completely accepted the fact that standards are what we teach and democracy is not in the standards book? Dewey (1938) fought so hard against accepting a mentality of either/or but it seems as though we have forgotten this fight. “For in spite of itself any movement that thinks and acts in terms of an 'ism becomes so involved in reaction against other 'isms that it is unwittingly controlled by them” (Dewey, 1938, p. 6). There is a fear of truly questioning curriculum, subject, organization, and many other important educational concerns—truly questioning our deepest values.

Maxine Greene (1988) believed conditions must be deliberately created for freedom to take place. Setting conditions for a sense of security that is only achieved through the development of trust is imperative. “Crucial is the recognition that conditions must be deliberately created to enable the mass of people to act on their power to choose” (Greene, 1988, p. 18). If the stage is not set, people do not take the initiative to dialogue and silence is perpetuated. It is through creating conditions for freedom and dialogue that people can come together and fully advance society. Praxis or “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (Freire, 1997, p. 33) must be sought with true democracy as the goal. People working together to achieve praxis will move our society forward. The leader, in this case the lead learner, cannot dictate theory but instead, grows with his or her colleagues. The lead learner sees this forging “not in terms
of explaining to, but rather dialoguing with the people” (Freire, 1997, p. 35). With true
democracy, a different form of education can exist.

Curriculum Wisdom

Although the bigger picture of the TLEP is collegial reflective inquiry, for the
purposes of this study, the focus is on the 3S design found in the curriculum wisdom
paradigm, one of three paradigms of collegial reflective inquiry. The three paradigms
presented in the TLEP program (standardized management, constructivist best practice,
and curriculum wisdom) are described in the TLEP section of this chapter. The 3S
design (Henderson & Gornik, 2007) encapsulates the curriculum wisdom paradigm. It
challenges educators to transition and embrace curriculum wisdom while utilizing
problem solving techniques through subject matter and with a democratic self and social
understanding. Transformative curriculum leadership is the goal of this design, to
embrace wisdom for problem solving and reflective inquiry.

Real world examples. Some examples of schools that have succeeded in utilizing
teachers for adult learning initiatives are highlighted below.

The Power of Their Ideas (Meier, 1995) and In Schools We Trust (Meier, 2002)
provide two examples of a principal working with teachers as equals in collaboration,
using volunteers as teacher leaders. These proved to be successful ingredients for
democracy in a school in Harlem, New York. Central Park East experimented with
teacher lead schools by “recognizing the power of each other’s ideas” (1995, p. 11) and
organizing the schools around “collective decision making among teachers” (2002, p. 4).
This school created an atmosphere that celebrated diversity, challenges, and opinions, and
empowered teachers to become a community of lead learners. They moved forward in praxis and created a school that encapsulated democracy.

Harwayne (1999) outlined the creation of her school and how she and her teachers transformed their school into one of theory to practice. She shared a list of what she believed were the necessary ingredients to the success of this inner city school in New York: choose colleagues carefully, start small, value everyone’s work, take adult learning seriously, walk a mile in one another’s shoes, believe in something, challenge the givens, and get political.

Irene Gaskins of Pennsylvania began her school in a Sunday school classroom with 17 children for a two hour reading session. She now is principal of a beautiful campus in Media, PA, called The Benchmark School. She has studied what she believed to be the theory to practice models of professional development and incorporated these into her school. “The rich opportunities for professional development tend to be one of the primary reasons teachers join the Benchmark staff” (Gaskins & Elliot, 1991, p. 13). Meaningful professional development is valued at this school.

**Teacher Leader Endorsement Program**

This study specifically looks at the TLEP (Teacher Leader Endorsement Program) which is designed to “build experienced teachers’ intellectual capacities so they can function as 21st century professional leaders who can assist with creating and sustaining sophisticated professional and student learning communities” (ODE, 2009). There is a great deal of research on the importance of teacher leaders (Danielson, 2007; Hinchey, 1997; Ingersoll, 2003; York-Barr & Duke, 2004) and using these teacher leaders to
develop leadership programs (Beasley & Butler, 2002; Yale National Initiative, 2007). This particular study is run through a grant at a university in Northeastern Ohio and is designed to prepare teacher leaders. The program involves a four course sequence that is designed to investigate the application of the Ohio Teacher Leader Standards (ODE, 2009) while delving into seven inquiries: critiquing, envisioning, deliberating, negotiating, self-examining, collegial learning, and public inspiring (Henderson & Hackney, 2011) that are a part of the program design for collegial reflective inquiry.

**Seven inquiries.** The seven reflective inquiries which inform the 3S design are critiquing, envisioning, deliberating, negotiating, self-examining, collegial learning, and public inspiring. It is through these inquiries that the members of the TLEP dug into the 3S design to develop a deep understanding of the model. For the purposes of this study, I define each of these inquiries in this section but the focus of the program remains on the overall 3S design.

**Critiquing:** How curriculum and teaching problems are framed (SM—standardized management), CBM (constructivist best practice), and CW (curriculum wisdom).

**Envisioning:** Educate for deep democracy; the personal and social joys of a democratic way of life.

**Deliberating:** Collaborative decision making that is informed by awareness of oneself and of others.

**Negotiating:** Professional fluidity—awareness of political and structural obstacles.
Self-Examining: Personal journey of self, is there a change that is taking place internally.

Collegial Learning: Encourage, organize, and nurture others and take the role of the “lead learner.”

Public Inspiring: Explaining and celebrating, sharing beyond your circle.

Underlying Logic

The TLEP embraces the notion of ethical fidelity (Badiou, 2005) in the deep sense of true dialectic tension for an emancipatory education (Greene, 1988). Walker and Soltis (2009) took us through the stages of curriculum aims, setting high goals for where we need to address lasting change in reform efforts. In their book *Curriculum and Aims*, Walker and Soltis (2009) outlined the various curriculum reform efforts that have each left an imprint on our curriculum: Plato’s belief of training people according to their strengths to “ensure a just state” (p.14); Rousseau and his belief that training people to conform to society was “robbing individuals of their true identity” (p. 15); Dewey who thought schools could meet both the needs of individuals and society “people living and working together that provided for freedom of interaction among groups” (p. 17); Tyler who concentrated on the “how” of curriculum “which claimed objectivity and impartiality” (p. 60); and Freire whose purpose was to “stimulate and sustain critical consciousness in people” (p. 64). But have any of these reforms been sustained? Do the incremental changes that evolved as a result of these theories re-present themselves in today’s struggle with a totally standardized curriculum push? It is unfortunate that, “most
reform since the progressive era has failed to bring about the lasting and substantial changes caused by the reformers” (Walker & Soltis, 2009, p. 82). Why?

**Barriers**

Teachers “will not adopt new instructional strategies unless professional development provides them with the tools and experiences necessary to overcome barriers to instructional change” (Richards & Skolits, 2009, p. 51). There are many reasons why professional development is not sustained (Filho, 2010) and limited research on models that sustain learning through professional development (Lovett & Gilmore, 2003). There is specific research on the barriers to professional development for teacher leaders (Boyd & McGree, 1995; Johnson & Donaldson, 2007; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Some of the barriers include already overburdened teachers, not enough time for the leaders and/or the teaching staff, colleagues are not receptive to fellow teachers taking on a leadership role, and teachers are already focused on testing not leadership responsibilities (Barth, 2001).

Although research presents these barriers, research also supports that developing quality professional development opportunities with programs designed specifically to develop teacher leaders would be beneficial (WestEd, 2003). The TLEP program encourages a lead learner (Donaldson, 2008) approach to reform, one that overcomes the inertia of habit (Greene, 1995) to problem solving (Ryan, 2011) and has the potential to become “one of the most fulfilling experiences in a teaching career” (Walker & Soltis, 2009, p. 88).
It is my opinion that the TLEP follows the definition of meaningful professional development; allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood et al., 2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik, 2007). This study describes the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program (TLEP) and explores the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership.

**Summary**

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. In general terms, the study describes the TLEP (Teacher Leader Endorsement Program) and explores the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Specifically, this study examines the possibility of facilitating changed teacher-beliefs on the topic of teacher leadership into the school environment six months after the professional development. The area of research that substantiates the necessity of this study is the current call for research in the relationship between professional development and sustained change (Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 2002; Richards & Skolits, 2009). In order to address this relationship, it is important to define meaningful professional development that
elicits a change in beliefs and how that change may be sustained. The specific research questions that this study attempts to address are:

1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

2. What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs?

3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

Methodology is now introduced to further explore this qualitative multi-case study through theoretical framework of the study, research design, participants, role of the researcher, data collection, data analysis, and trustworthiness and credibility.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, the research methods and the design of this qualitative case study are described. The purpose of this qualitative case study is to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. Professional development focuses on developing lead learner capacities for a study-based curriculum development and the relationship to sustained change in teachers’ beliefs about personal-professional growth. Outlined in this chapter includes the theoretical framework, research design, participants, role of the researcher, data collection, data analysis, and trustworthiness and credibility.

Theoretical Framework

Qualitative

Qualitative research denotes an attempt to study, analyze, and interpret a phenomenon in terms of the meanings that people re-present (von Glasersfeld, 1995) to the researcher (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In order to dig into the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs, for me there can be no other method than qualitative research. Investigation of change in beliefs is apparent in the “Writing about Math” professional development example (discussed earlier in the section entitled Significance of the Study) whereas practices changed, short term, but resorted back to the original practice. My passion is to investigate sustained change in
beliefs to support meaningful professional development. In this qualitative study, people re-present their change in beliefs about teacher leadership to their colleagues and then share that experience with me. In this study, I co-create this experience, using one form of member checking, to re-present their change in beliefs about teacher leadership in this study.

Qualitative research explores the natural setting where the study unfolds (Creswell, 2003). This enables the researcher to capture a sense of detail of the actual experience of the participant. It uses multiple forms of data that may involve active participation by the volunteers in the study. Data can include interviews, observations, and/or documents. The data in this study include two documents collected from each participant after the professional development and two interviews conducted six months after the TLEP ended. A qualitative study is emergent and the researcher is responsible for interpreting and drawing conclusions about personal meaning drawn from the multiple data sources. I was mindful of my responsibility throughout this process. Creswell (2003) reminded the researcher to “reflect on who he or she is in the inquiry and is sensitive to his or her personal biography and how it shapes the study” (p. 182). There is a cyclical process of reporting the information using multiple forms of data, then analysis, and formulating conclusions.

My approach is transactional: not a quest for quantitative certainty or truth, but a qualitative “collection of useful yet fallible human practices open to ongoing modification” (Ryan, 2011, p. 39). Transaction (Dewey & Bentley, 1949) involves looking at things as they are experienced, all things that comprise the whole experience.
Dewey (Ryan, 2011) defined transaction seeing together things that are generally thought of as opposites in other philosophies. It is an ongoing process that progresses with collective inquiry (Ryan, 2011). Explored in their book, *Knowing and the Known*, Dewey and Bentley (1949) stated that science tends to explain phenomena in terms of a single theory or cause. Transaction is flexible—willing to configure evidence in a variety of ways depending upon needs and contexts (Dewey & Bentley, 1949). This inquiry suggests looking at the full picture when making an observation.

**Constructivist**

Looking at research within the constructivist paradigm, special attention to “relativism—local and specific constructed realities” (Lincoln & Guba, 2005, p. 256) with emphasis on “understanding; reconstruction” (p. 257) is targeted. Creswell (2003) knew that it is our deep beliefs that guide our actions. It is my belief that striving to see all entities (including my own influence) is a means that contributes to the construction of a theory toward a bigger end. I believe discovering these transactions can lead to empowerment and “transactional knowing is instrumentally valuable as a means to social emancipation, which as an end in itself, is intrinsically valuable” (Lincoln & Guba, 2005, p. 261). This is an ongoing process that progresses with collective inquiry, thus demanding the full participation and enfranchisement of everyone involved (Ryan, 2011). Freire (1997) so eloquently put this social emancipation as “faith in mankind, faith in their power to make and remake, to create and recreate, faith in their vocation to be more fully human (which is not the privilege of the elite, but the birthright of all)” (p. 71).

Although constructivist paradigm is applicable to this study, a radical constructivist view
is a deeper sense of constructivism and I have come to embrace this paradigm. This multi-case study is not only written from a radical constructivist point of view, I believe it provides an example (through the TLEP) of professional development that embodies this view as well.

**Radical Constructivist**

A radical constructivist will always ask how to interpret the understanding of others. What is commonplace for one person may not be for another person. As people encounter problems that make them rethink their beliefs and values, they re-present (Streefland, 1985) accepted practices so as to critically examine them (Ryan, 2011). We re-present our non-reflective experience through communication to others and then integrate beneficial modifications into ongoing practices. When we have changed in a sustained manner, the new non-reflective experience is routine. Not only have the four participants in this study volunteered because they believe they have changed their beliefs, they believe it is a direct result of the TLEP and they have set out to elicit the change in beliefs about teacher leadership in their colleagues.

Radical constructivist epistemology applied to professional development includes a deliberate “conscious construction of the cognitive structures by which the experiencing subject understands” (Joldersma, 2011, p. 278). Piaget would call this reflected abstraction, deliberate and conscious (Campbell, 2001). We must provide professional development that consistently attempts to decenter from our own perspective; professional development that attempts to see things from the participant’s point of view (Silverman & Thompson, 2008). A radical constructivist view of knowledge rests upon
credibility and how it fits into an already existing experience (Dykstra, 2010). Radical constructivism “puts the construction of understanding as central to making sense of phenomena and places this construction process in the “hands” of the students” (Dykstra, 2010, p. 124). The TLEP attempts to empower participants with their own understanding of teacher leadership through meaningful professional development that is sustained. The members of this study struggle to take and apply meaning of the TLEP in their work environment as I struggle to understand their journey and apply meaning to it.

**Research Design**

**Multi-Case Study**

Drawing upon several experts in the field of case studies, Hatch (2002) stated that case studies investigate contemporary phenomenon, Creswell (2003) suggested the researcher explores a program or individuals in depth and uses a varied collection of data, and Merriam (1998) described a case as “a person such as a student, a teacher, a principal; a program; a group such as a class, a school, a community; a specific policy; and so on” (p. 27). They agree that a case study has bounds and there are limits to the number of people, the amount of time, and the collection of data that is being studied. Merriam (1998) talked about using a multi-case study approach if one is collecting and analyzing data from several cases. She then suggested conducting a cross-case analysis, which adds a more compelling interpretation. In this multi-case study, there is an interest in the process, that being the curriculum composition of the TLEP and a particular interest in the four volunteers’ reactions to that process. The four participants are each considered a case. The set-up of the study is a detailed description of the TLEP so the
reader can have insight into the four individual participants’ reactions to this professional development and their self-admitted change in beliefs as a result of the TLEP. The importance of this study is the discovery of the implementation of this program and the effect that it may have had on its four volunteer participants, their journey of change as a result of the TLEP.

Conducting a multi-case study helps the researcher to present an argument that is more informed (Barone, 2004) and in this particular multi-case study, I felt it was the best way to examine four individual teachers’ relationships between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Knowing that “insights gleaned from case studies can directly influence policy, practice and future research,” this multi-case study is designed to “gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved” (Merriam, 1998, p. 19). Because the examination of the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs relies heavily upon the initial set-up of the professional development, rich description is presented to describe the TLEP. In Chapter 4, the multi-case study explores what the teachers believe about sustainability of their change in beliefs about teacher leadership six months after the program ended.

According to Merriam (1998), there are two ways to denote process: (a) describing the context of the study, “the extent to which the treatment or program have been implemented” (p. 194); and (b) causal explanation, to discover whether the process had the effect that it did. I believe we need to dig deep to discover the relationship between qualitative studies and the explanation behind the cause and effect of these
studies. If thoughts and actions are not explored and connected, effectiveness of professional development can be misleading.

**Context of This Study**

A grant (ODE, 2009) was submitted to the Ohio Department of Education as an attempt to be one of the universities chosen to begin a Teacher Leader Endorsement Program. The Ohio Board of Regents officially sanctioned a new TLEP through this grant.

Teacher leader (limited to a professional teaching license or professional or permanent teaching certificate), valid for mentoring and coaching teachers, providing staff development, and assisting the building principal in developing and supporting a shared vision and clear goals for the school. Candidates for the endorsement shall hold a master’s degree and have at least four years of successful teaching experience. The program of preparation shall include a practicum experience during which the candidate shall be required to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions, at the distinguished level that are described in the Ohio standards for the teaching profession. (Licensure Rule 3301-24-05)

The teacher leader endorsement is a current topic in the news (Sawchuk, 2011; S. D. Sparks, 2011) and adds to the push for a 21st Century Curriculum (Jacobs, 2010) that ties teacher evaluation to student growth. This major paradigm shift is based on teacher effectiveness rather than on teacher quality (Stumbo & McWalters, 2011). Past practice has been to measure degrees or time on the job for advancement and pay structure. The present push supports measuring teacher effectiveness with student achievement.
presented as a way to gain professional standing but not always perceived in a positive manner by teachers who fear this evaluation process (Coggins, Zuckerman & McKelvey, 2010). Controversial as this topic may be, the federal government and the Gates foundation are spurring sizable grants that support using value-added data to be part of an evaluation process for teachers (Duffrin, 2011). Another component of this proposed evaluation process is to utilize teachers as leaders in the mentoring process and as a component in teacher measurement. This would require redefining teachers as leaders which in research is supported as an essential element in a healthy school (Barth, 2001; Smylie, Conley, & Marks, 2002) but also includes many barriers to implementation (Boyd & McGree, 1995; Johnson & Donaldson, 2007; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). One of the barriers is the pre-existing climate of the school (Task Force on Teacher Leadership, 2001). Changing this climate from one of resistance to one of acceptance is one of the barriers the teacher leaders will face as a result of this proposed evaluation process.

Ohio chose to be one of five states that have formed a consortium on teacher leadership that would create a licensure system for teachers who want to serve in a leadership role. The Ohio Leadership Advisory Council’s suggested framework for leadership supports a team-based approach when redefining school leadership (Shelton, 2009). The current legislative push prompted a northeastern Ohio university to write a successful grant that prepares 21st century professional leaders utilizing a transformative approach to disciplinary learning. There is a dual purpose to the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program grant: (a) to meet the requirements of the Ohio Teacher Leader
Standards (ODE, 2009) and (b) to incorporate a deep understanding of collegial reflective inquiry through a 3S design (Henderson & Gornik, 2007).

**Teacher Leader Endorsement Program (TLEP)**

The TLEP participants were required to participate in four courses (Appendix B) that ran over a six-month period: June 2011 to December 2011. The first two courses ran simultaneously: *Curriculum Leadership* and *Instructional Leadership* June 2011 to July 2011. The third class, *Principles and Techniques of Supervision*, began in September 2011, and the last class, *Advanced Practicum and Internship in Curriculum and Instruction* began in November 2011. Two of the courses are in Curriculum and Instruction and two are in Educational Administration. The four classes utilized the book *Transformative Curriculum Leadership* (Henderson & Gornik, 2007) to challenge the participants to learn and seek ways to invite others to encourage professional growth. Several evaluations were required for the completion of this endorsement but for the purposes of this study, the TLN (teacher leader narrative) and the leadership plan were required to document their journey of understanding for the participants in the cohort. I utilized both of these documents as part of the data collection for this study. Initial interviews and follow-up interviews of the four participants were conducted six months after the TLEP ended.

**Participants**

On November 23, 2011, one of the TLEP professors sent an email to the 13 participants in the TLEP cohort to extend an offer to participate in a study. The email was specifically looking for volunteers who realized “potential for changes in core beliefs
you may have undergone as a result of your participation in this program” (Appendix C). Four people responded to the call (see Table 2). These participants agreed to be part of this multi-case study to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. According to Kegan (1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), people know when they have changed their belief system. They admittedly are aware and know they are different because of the change in their beliefs. The participants in this study volunteered because they were aware they had changed as a result of the TLEP. The background of the four volunteer participants is listed in Table 2 and a demographic narrative of each participant is presented.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Grade Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Middle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Middle and high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linda is an art teacher for third, fourth, and fifth grades but her license is a K–12 endorsement. She also teaches graduate art seminars for a local community college. She is in her 10th year of teaching at the school she is presently employed and she had one
additional year of experience at a university school where she taught all grade levels of art. Interestingly, before Linda was a teacher, she was a professional artist for 14 years. Linda spends a great deal of time and energy supporting all subjects through art curriculum. She has a well-established relationship with her colleagues and an open, but not strong, relationship with her administrator. She has a high level of technology experience.

Courtney works in a local school district that has taken the initiative to hire her as a full-time teacher leader. Her position in the Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR) is one of evaluating data, assisting to set personal goals, and mentoring participants as they work through their goals. She is considered to be an instructor, facilitator, coach, and assessor. Prior to being hired into this position, Courtney had 12 years of experience teaching middle school science (11 years) and math/reading (1 year). She is the only volunteer participant that works full time as a teacher leader.

Jamie is a music teacher in a local high school. She has 13 years of experience in her district. Currently, she is teaching music theory, music history, adaptive appreciation, and class piano. Additionally she teaches a year-long ensemble (freshmen band) as well as fifth grade band lessons in three of the six elementary buildings. Jamie was the only participant who was assigned duties, and her original administrator who she worked with resigned so she had to work with an administrator who was not familiar with the TLEP.

Carina is a high school language arts teacher who, during this interview, was teaching honors and AP English, speech, and journalism. Most of her students are high school juniors but she has experience teaching sophomores, juniors, and seniors. She
taught seven years in a Catholic high school and was a research assistant and taught composition at a university for six years. This is her 15th year at her present position. Carina is a very self-reflective individual. Her goal was to improve morale through the Collegial Planning group.

**Role of the Researcher**

I have been a central office coordinator for nine years, and an assistant principal for two years, which has enabled me working closely with many teachers. In my own district, I have worked very hard to set up a role as a colleague and mentor, not one of supervisor, and I believe I have developed a deep sense of trust with those with whom I work over the years. I believe strongly in democracy in the original sense. Nancy (2010) delved into the truest sense of democracy with value in all people playing a role and taking responsibility for bringing information to light: praxis “whereby what is produced is transformed subject rather than a preformed product” (p. 31). Every subject has value and nothing is political. The duty of democracy is to invent politics; in other words, democracy drives the path for politics, not the other way around. Today, we seem to have forgotten that democracy is difficult but necessary. If we do not recognize the importance of going through the difficult process of separating politics and democracy, it is a very dangerous time in which we live because we have stopped thinking.

Politics is not responsible for the identity and destiny of the common, but only for the regulation—even if it is infinite—of justice. (It thus has to do with power.)

The common, however, puts existence in play. (It thus has to do with sense.)

What is at stake here is a separation between sense and power. One certainly does
not exclude the other, but one cannot replace the other either. (Nancy, 2010, p. 41)

I share this because my strong belief in democracy has impact upon this project; “one’s subjectivity is like a garment that cannot be removed” (Peshkin, 1988, p. 17). I wholeheartedly believe in democracy for each and every person; in pertaining to professional development, not the thrust of power over participants, but the common struggle for collegial reflective inquiry. I believe in the existence of justice and the right of each person to pursue knowledge, contribute their opinion, and grow in their own journey of understanding. Even though it is my intent not to impose my own views, I know that my authority is ever present (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006) and simply because I was involved in the cohort, I may have influence upon this study.

Data Collection

Merriam (1998) supported triangulation by using multiple sources of data or multiple methods to confirm any findings and to increase the credibility of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1984). Data for this study were collected through three means: the teacher leader narrative, the leadership plan, and two individual interviews. The first piece of data was the TLN (teacher leader narrative): a personal journal or written reflection of the participant’s currere. The narrative was a six-month reflection written during the TLEP that expressed the journey of the participants. The second source for data was the leadership plan. The leadership plan was created with the principal and with expectation that the plan, or a variation of that plan, was to be initiated into the school environment. Third, two individual interviews were conducted with each participant.
The TLN and the leadership plan were written during the six months that the participants went through the TLEP. The individual interviews were conducted over six months after the TLEP ended.

The first two months (June 2011–July 2011) the participants were given the opportunity to envision and create their leadership plan. Building administrators were a part of this process so the plans were co-created and approved as they were drawn-up together. Initially, they could dream of the possibilities and write their narrative and create their plan accordingly with the knowledge that they had administrative backing. Over the next four months (September 2011–December 2011), the participants were immersed in the work environment with continual support by their cohort as they continued in the TLEP. They forged ahead with their action research plan with the support of their professional development colleagues. The support, or lack of support, by administration in the respective buildings, was reflected upon in each participant’s TLN.

The interviews for this study were conducted six months after the TLEP ended. The initial interviews were conducted in June 2012 and the follow-up interviews in August 2012. This allowed for triangulation (Merriam, 1998) of the data. There are advantages (face to face created a deeper sense of trust and I could hear voice inflection and see body language) and disadvantages (unlike when you write, there is a time constraint in meeting personally) to interviews (Creswell, 2003), but by also collecting the leadership plan and the TLN, weaknesses may be limited that would exist in any one source.
Leadership Plan

The leadership plan was discussed and created over the course of the first two classes during the TLEP. The candidates were to choose a leadership challenge and conduct an action research project. The project was to build upon the Ohio Teacher Leader Standards (ODE, 2009) while moving to “assist and inspire others to start their own personal journeys of understanding by demonstrating at least an emergent understanding of teacher leadership through disciplinary mentoring, peer coaching, instructional leadership and other relevant skills and practices” (Teacher Leader Endorsement, Ohio Program Standards, ODE, 2009). The participants were instructed to work with their district administrator to develop an action research project on teacher leadership in their prospective district. They did an analysis of the project, created it, and shared it in a face-to-face meeting with their administrator. There was to be a shared vision of some type of school reform project based on 21st century teaching and learning skills. The project was intended to be a working document over the course of the four classes in order to deeply imbed all of the TLEP required reading. It was known that the written plan would change and was, in fact, expected to evolve. The leadership plan was to include:

1. Research Problem or Issue of Inquiry
   a. Concern with Quality Instruction

2. Background of the Problem and Literature Review
   a. What does the research say about the issue and proposed solutions?

3. Proposed Strategy(ies) to Address the Research Problem of Issue of Inquiry
a. Rationalization for proposed strategy(ies) or hypotheses

4. Methodology
   a. Participants
   b. Context
   c. Data to be collected
   d. How to collect the data
   e. When the data will be collected
   f. Analysis or protocol for collaborative inquiry
   g. Reflective practice and coaching conversations

5. Findings and Conclusions
   a. What do the data indicate about the problem and proposed strategy?

6. Next Steps
   a. How do I use this process and resulting data to influence continuous improvement for colleagues in their practice and continuous improvement for student learning? (p. 19).

**Teacher Leader Narrative**

The TLN was intended to be a journey of understanding that the teacher leaders (Donaldson, 2008) were required to document over the span of this six-month TLEP. They had to write in a journal to denote the process by which they had undertaken this opportunity for change and document this journey in a narrative manner. It was not a graded document but rather an outline of their currere (Pinar, 2004) traveled through the venue of this program. The TLN included four possible signposts that outlined the
understanding of the participants as they move along their journey: (a) Customary understanding which may be limited to simple responsibilities and not a deep critical awareness of a multidisciplinary inquiry or deliberation with management or colleagues; (b) Emergent understanding which may indicate that they are still acquiring a deeper understanding of transformative leadership and are still contemplating the possibilities of using this as a way of living; (c) Engaged understanding which shows a sincere commitment to personal changes in transformative leadership and all that follows because of this change to “establish a critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline while developing an ‘inner’ problem solving discipline;” and (d) Deliberative understanding which indicates the participant who has changed and is a teacher leader who is inspiring to and supportive of their peers and others who venture to join this transformative discipline (ODE, 2009). The TLN was collected after the TLEP ended.

**Individual Interviews**

Interviews of the four volunteers were conducted after the TLEP ended and the teachers had been in their school environment for six months. The location of the interview was left up to the individual. I initially thought that some people could possibly be uncomfortable interviewing in their work environment because there may be some negativity towards their efforts to become a teacher leader (Donaldson, 2008). Three participants chose to meet at the university setting during the initial interview and one asked to meet at a public library close to her home. For the follow-up interviews, two participants chose to meet at the university, one at the library, and one at a pool near
her home for childcare reasons. I believe I did everything in my power to create a relaxed, safe, and trusting environment.

I used three types of questions outlined in Rubin and Rubin (2005) while structuring the interview questions: Main, Follow-up, and Probes. As noted in the IRB #0275309875, I have listed three questions that led the interview but broke those main questions into several simpler questions to assist the participants’ understanding. The questions and sub-questions are listed in Chapter 4. The first two main questions and the breakdown of those questions were asked during the first interview and the last main question was the focus of the follow-up interview. The questions try to delve into the relationship between the professional development and possible sustained change in beliefs that each volunteer felt had transpired in their own experience and in the experience of others. Deep description was sought. The follow-up questions enabled me to clear up anything that was puzzling or confusing or needed clarification for my research. Probes were used to elicit more detail but not to change the focus of any of the questions. Some examples include: Then what happened? Can you give me an example? Can you tell me step by step? (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). As noted, I completed a pilot study (Carothers, 2007) so I have had some experience with these interviewing techniques.

A tape recorder was used to conduct a semi-structured, open-ended interview that was audio taped and later transcribed (Creswell, 2003). When discussing concerns about supports or hindrances (Question #3), it was easy to see that some “strain” existed when
re-presenting ideas on teacher leadership to their colleagues. This might have gone unnoticed had a physical presence of the data collection not been included.

**Data Analysis**

Seidel (1998) used a specific method called jigsaw to conduct qualitative data analysis. This method entails noticing interesting phenomenon, collecting and putting things into an arrangement, and sifting through the various emerging categories to see what strands develop. Using a process of noticing, collecting, and thinking in a cyclical pattern, the researcher is able to continuously analyze, rethink, and evaluate the data during this important process.

I became a Baldrige (2002) trainer though the Ohio Department of Education in 2003 and gained experience in gathering and organizing data for large groups of people. Through data collection techniques such as tests, surveys, and conversations, I learned how to gather information. By developing and creating charts and graphs to organize the data into strands, I learned to simplify and share information with groups of people. This training was very beneficial in my previous job, which required regular data collection and analysis and did prove to be extremely helpful in the analysis process for this study. I believe the experiences I have had in my professional career were very helpful in collecting and organizing ideas in this study. Erickson (2004) highlighted two lessons when conducting data analysis: Data must be found; “they do not simply appear,” and “patterns or themes in the data also must be found—they do not simply emerge” (p. 486). I elicited the advice of Bogdan and Biklen (2003) that promoted using a “free style,
informal language, and let the ideas flow” (p. 163) when I conducted the cross-case analysis in Chapter 5.

The study attempted to address the following questions:

1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?
2. What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs?
3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

The first two questions were addressed at length using the TLN, leadership plan, and the first interview. Mindful consideration was placed on careful analysis of the information from the TLN and the leadership plan so that quality interviews would take place. These two documents were utilized to dig deep into reality of implementation of their action research initiatives (the leadership plan) six months after the class ended.

The third question, which was the focus of the follow-up interview, delves into sustained change in beliefs and the re-presentation of teacher leadership in the work environment.

**Leadership Plan**

The leadership plan was created with the building principal as an action research project to be conducted during the duration of the TLEP. This six-month action research plan was then the basis for discussion of change during the interviews conducted six
month later. The leadership plans varied in length and design by each participant but all addressed the same information: a plan for action to implement teacher leadership into their district. Initially several strands developed when analyzed: problem (that was present in the district that the teacher leader and principal thought should be addressed), goal (specific sentence that addressed the problem), action steps (steps leading to solving the problem and meeting the goal), participants (who would be helping with the action steps), success (how would they know when they reached the goal), possible obstacles (brainstorming what may be problematic), and next step (future ideas). All of these smaller strands were then further reduced and categorized into two main strands: problem and hypothesis. All of the smaller initial strands were again categorized into these two strands and printed on a specific color of paper, not be confused with the TLN or the interviews. The original leadership plan was kept intact to refer to if there was any confusion. The individual quotes were cut and taped under the main data points (problem or hypothesis) and placed on color-coordinated boards that represented each individual participant. An overall outline was created to help organize a format that could be presented to the participants to allow for member checking. This outline containing the data gleaned from the leadership plan was given to each participant during the interview. After careful analysis, the results were presented (see Chapter 4, Table 4).

Teacher Leader Narrative

The original TLN was kept and another copy was run on colored paper. Strands began to emerge and several categories began to present themselves. Initial strands were teacher leader endorsement program standards (the actual quoted standards as referenced
to the Ohio Teacher Leader Standards), colleagues change (evidence presented as examples), self change (evidence presented as examples), feelings (using words that describe feelings not evidence), limitations and challenges (various unexpected problems that arouse as the plan was implemented), and participants (comments about specific participants). These six initial strands were later reduced to four strands: self change, colleague change, limitations and challenges, and feelings. An outline was created using the above four strands and the data from the TLN was cut up into strips according to the strand. Careful attention was paid to keeping participants separate as well as information gleaned from the leadership plan, the TLN, and the interviews. Labels were created and placed on four separate color coordinated boards, each representing an individual participant. Strips from the TLN were placed on the color-coordinated board for each participant under the strand that best described the quote. An overall outline was created to help organize a format that could be presented to the participants to allow for member checking during the first interview. The four strands are presented in Chapter 4 as follows: self change (Table 8), colleague change (Table 15), limitations and challenges (Table 5), and feelings (Table 6).

**Individual Interviews**

The interviews that were conducted were recorded and later transcribed and printed on a select color of paper to keep the leadership plan, the TLN, and the two individual interviews separate. During the interview, the three research questions presented in this study were broken down into several sub-questions that helped to simplify the three main research questions. I felt that breaking down the questions into
sub-questions would elicit answers that were easier to understand than the initial research questions. The research questions and sub-questions are presented below:

1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?
   a. What qualities of the TLEP were meaningful? *Meaningful professional development.* Meaningful professional development is defined as minimally consisting of the following criteria: allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood et al., 2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik, 2007).
   b. What about the TLEP made you feel you had changed your beliefs?

2. What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs? Tools as defined earlier as the physical instrument needed (tools and data) to “diagnose a problem and formulate a hypothesis to resolve it” (Ryan, 2011, p. 29).
   a. Was the hypothesis on target?
   b. Did you have to adjust the hypotheses?
c. Were you able to implement any of the hypotheses?

d. How did you support your colleagues?

e. How did they receive the leadership plan?

f. Did you feel they were able to change their beliefs?

3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

a. What has supported your ability to re-present your ideas about teacher leadership to your colleagues?

b. What has hindered your ability to re-present your ideas about teacher leadership to your colleagues?

c. What has supported sustaining your beliefs about teacher leadership six months after the TLEP ended?

d. What has hindered your beliefs about teacher leadership six months after the TLEP ended?

e. How would you rate yourself at this point (Customary, Emergent, Engaged, or Deliberative)? (a) Customary understanding which may be limited to simple responsibilities and not a deep critical awareness of a multidisciplinary inquiry or deliberation with management or colleagues; (b) Emergent understanding which may indicate that they are still acquiring a deeper understanding of transformative leadership and are still contemplating the possibilities of using this as a way of living; (c)
Engaged understanding which shows a sincere commitment to personal changes in transformative leadership and all that follows because of this change to “establish a critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline while developing an ‘inner’ problem solving discipline;” and (d) Deliberative understanding which indicates the participant who has changed and is a teacher leader who is inspiring to and supportive of their peers and others who venture to join this transformative discipline (ODE, 2009).

As the quotes that supported the sub-questions began to emerge, they were cut up and placed on the color-coordinated board for each participant under the correlating question. The initial transcript was kept intact so that I could refer to it for any questions about the original intent.

Patterns developed of both consistent and conflicting information. Sipe and Ghiso (2004) gave outstanding advice on breaking down data into categories, subcategories, and then using codes to further classify information. The coding process is complicated and can be confusing when trying to put information into categories. For instance Rubin and Rubin (2005, pp. 216-217) went through several questions to create the labeling: What am I going to call it? How am I defining it? How am I going to recognize it in the interviews? What do I want to exclude? The process became more complicated as the themes produce subthemes and the relationship. An overall outline was created to help organize a format that was presented to each participant allowing for
member checking. This outline containing the data gleaned from the TLN and the leadership plan was given to each participant during the interview.

Through continual and repeated interaction with the data, I was able to gain insight into the strands that developed, hidden as well as obvious, of the teachers’ meanings. Sorting, ranking, and analysis took place. I looked at my questions: what I was asking before and after, the climate and school environment of the individual, what are their leadership roles, were they supported by administration, were their colleagues on board, and many other variables that go into analyzing information. When themes began to emerge, I was ready to look for evidence of a relationship between my research information and big ideas. Again, Rubin and Rubin (2005) assisted on suggestions for connecting this data:

Are they examples of the same larger process or concept? Are they opposites or in tension? Does one cause or influence one or more of the others? Do several influence each other? Are some of them causes or consequences of some third theme or concept? (p. 236)

This analysis was utilized in the cross-case analysis in Chapter 5.

**Trustworthiness and Credibility**

**Trustworthiness**

One barrier to my role in this study may be the possibility that the participants in this cohort may not have developed a sense of trust in me. Because I hoped to develop an atmosphere of true democracy where opinions are expressed in an open manner, it was extremely important that I established trust with this cohort (Lincoln & Guba, 1984). I
have tried to develop this sense of trust by attending multiple classes with the participants. As an observer, I attended the *Curriculum Leadership* class four times and the *Instructional Leadership* class three times over a five-week period. I was introduced at the beginning of the class as a doctoral candidate and was included in various informal conversations in the classroom. I taught one class on Ryan’s (2011) interpretation of Dewey/Bentley’s Circuit of Inquiry (1938) and I believe it was well received by the members of the cohort. I attended the *Principles and Techniques of Supervision* on the last class to hear their presentations and I attended the *Advanced Practicum* and *Internship in Curriculum and Instruction* on two of the last classes to hear their final presentations. I have had individual conversations with several members of the class (including the four volunteers) and they seemed to accept my presence in the class as natural. Table 3 represents a timeline of my contact with the participants to assist in developing a sense of trust.

I believe the issue of trust was established by my presence in the classes but I know that “trust is not a matter of personal characteristics of the investigator: a ‘nice guy’ to whom respondents will instinctively confide their innermost secrets. Rather, it is a ‘developmental process’” (Lincoln & Guba, 1984, p. 303). It takes time to build an element of trust but if it can be developed, it “takes the place of truth” (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006, p. 66).
Table 3

*Trustworthiness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2011</td>
<td>Curriculum Leadership</td>
<td>Initial introduction to the participants in the class. To become more familiar with the syllabus and assignments that the participants were to complete</td>
<td>Observation and collection of syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2011</td>
<td>Curriculum Leadership</td>
<td>To become a familiar face with the participants in the TLEP</td>
<td>Visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2011</td>
<td>Curriculum Leadership</td>
<td>To become a familiar face with the participants in the TLEP</td>
<td>Visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2011</td>
<td>Curriculum Leadership</td>
<td>To see the closing projects that the participants were presenting to the professor and the class</td>
<td>Visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2011</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Initial introduction to the participants in the class. To become more familiar with the syllabus and assignments that the participants were to complete</td>
<td>Observation and collection of syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2011</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>To teach a lesson on Change using Ryan’s (2011) design. Build trust and acceptance with the cohort</td>
<td>Presenting a lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2011</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>To see the closing projects that the participants were presenting to the professor and the class</td>
<td>Visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-December, 2011</td>
<td>Principles and Techniques of Supervision</td>
<td>To see the closing projects that the participants were presenting to the professor and the class. Continue to build trust</td>
<td>Visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-December, 2011</td>
<td>Advanced Practicum and Internship in curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>To see the closing projects that the participants were presenting to the professor and the class. Continue to build trust</td>
<td>Visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-December, 2011</td>
<td>Advanced Practicum and Internship in curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>To see the closing projects that the participants were presenting to the professor and the class. Continue to build trust</td>
<td>Visible presence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credibility

Lincoln and Guba (1984) encouraged ways to increase the probability that the findings in your study will be found credible and that you want to demonstrate that the findings have been “approved by the constructors of the multiple realities being studied” (p. 296). Merriam (1998) suggested member checks as an opportunity to diminish misunderstanding of any meaning that may have been misinterpreted by the researcher. I conducted one particular type of member checking with all participants during both interviews. As I read through the TLN and the leadership plan, strands began to develop. As they developed, I typed quotes that supported the strands. During the initial interview, I gave a copy of these strands and the comments made to support the strand to each individual participant. They looked them over and commented on any changes or adjustments they felt needed to be clarified and it was also a reminder of things that took place the first six months of the TLEP. This information helped to guide the interviews. During the follow-up interviews, the transcripts from the first interview were distributed to the individual participants (along with another copy of the strands that had developed from the TLN and leadership plan) so members had a second opportunity to make comments or changes.

Another means for credibility was inter-rater reliability. One outside professor was selected to validate the findings of this qualitative study and provide critique and comments throughout this process.

Merriam (1988) encouraged those that choose to conduct a qualitative case study to define the edge of what will be studied. I think it was important to outline my study
using Schram’s (2006) definition of focus and locus. The focus of my study is reflected in my purpose statement, to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. The locus of my study described the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program (TLEP) and explored the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership.

**Summary**

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. In general terms, the study describes the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program (TLEP) and explores the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Specifically, this study examines the possibility of facilitating changed teacher-beliefs on the topic of teacher leadership into the school environment six months after the professional development has taken place. The necessity of this study is the current call for research in the relationship between professional development and sustained change (Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 2002; Richards & Skolits, 2009). In order to address this relationship, it is important to define meaningful professional development that elicits a change in beliefs and how that change may be sustained. The specific research questions that this study attempted to address are:
1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

2. What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs?

3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

This chapter described research questions, theoretical framework, research design, participants, role of the researcher, data collection, data analysis, and trustworthiness and credibility. Chapter 4 illuminates the data analysis and presents those findings.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYZING AND PRESENTING THE RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. In general terms, the study described the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program (TLEP) and explored the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Specifically, this study examined the possibility of facilitating changed teacher-beliefs on the topic of teacher leadership into the school environment six months after the professional development has taken place. Findings in this chapter were presented clearly and objectively, without speculation or bias. This chapter was organized in terms of the three main research questions presented in Chapter 1 (labeled below as 1, 2, and 3) with several sub-questions (found under the main questions and labeled with lower case letters). These sub-questions were created to further break down the three main research questions and asked during the interviews to assist the participants’ understanding. The four participants’ responses to the sub-questions are analyzed and presented in this chapter.

1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?
   a. What qualities of the TLEP were meaningful? Meaningful professional development.

   Meaningful professional development is defined as
minimally consisting of the following criteria: allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood et al., 2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik, 2007).

b. What about the TLEP made you feel you had changed your beliefs?

2. What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs? Tools as defined earlier as the physical instrument needed (tools and data) to “diagnose a problem and formulate a hypothesis to resolve it” (Ryan, 2011, p. 29).

a. Was the hypothesis on target?

b. Did you have to adjust the hypotheses?

c. Were you able to implement any of the hypotheses?

d. How did you support your colleagues?

e. How did they receive the leadership plan?

f. Did you feel they were able to change their beliefs?
3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?
   
a. What has supported your ability to re-present your ideas about teacher leadership to your colleagues?
   
b. What has hindered your ability to re-present your ideas about teacher leadership to your colleagues?
   
c. What has supported sustaining your beliefs about teacher leadership six months after the TLEP ended?
   
d. What has hindered your beliefs about teacher leadership six months after the TLEP ended?
   
e. How would you rate yourself at this point (Customary, Emergent, Engaged or Deliberative)? (a) Customary understanding which may be limited to simple responsibilities and not a deep critical awareness of a multidisciplinary inquiry or deliberation with management or colleagues; (b) Emergent understanding which may indicate that they are still acquiring a deeper understanding of transformative leadership and are still contemplating the possibilities of using this as a way of living; (c) Engaged understanding which shows a sincere commitment to personal changes in transformative leadership and all that follows because of this change to “establish a critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline while developing an ‘inner’ problem solving
discipline;” and (d) Deliberative understanding which indicates the participant who has changed and is a teacher leader who is inspiring to and supportive of their peers and others who venture to join this transformative discipline (ODE, 2009).

Three data sources are utilized for the basis of this study: the TLN (teacher leader narrative), the leadership plan, and two individual interviews. The leadership plan and the TLN were analyzed before the first interview took place and helped guide the initial interview. Table 4 represents information that was analyzed and categorized into strands that developed from the leadership plan. Each participant created this action plan, in cooperation with the principal, and it was the tool used to present the leadership plan into the buildings. This information gathered from the plan was used as a basis for the initial interview. Table 5 presents some of the information found in the TLN that does not “fit” appropriately under any questions that were specifically asked during the interviews. This information was used as a basis to understand the feelings, limitations, and challenges that participants revealed in their TLN. The information from all data sources—the first interview, the follow-up interview, the leadership plan, and the TLN—are all categorized by participant response under the sub-questions that they appropriately address.

**Leadership Plan**

During the TLEP, teacher leaders were required to choose a leadership challenge and in cooperation with an administrator, create a plan to introduce and support teacher leadership initiatives into their buildings. The action research project was the shared
vision of the administrator and was to be based on 21st century teaching skills. The requirements for the leadership plan are listed in Chapter 3 and when I read through the plans, two common themes emerged: the problem and the hypothesis. These two big ideas, problem and hypothesis, were the basis for the second question: What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and supporting the change of others? The terms tools was defined earlier as the physical instrument needed (tools and data) to “diagnose a problem and formulate a hypothesis to resolve it” (Ryan, 2011, p. 29). Using this definition, the problem and hypothesis outlined in each leadership plan were used as the tools to facilitate changed teacher beliefs on teachers’ leadership in the school environment. There was an expectation that the plan would grow and evolve when the participants returned to the school environment. This information is presented in Table 4.

**Teacher Leader Narrative**

The intent of the TLN was to denote the process for change (the internal change of the volunteers and that of their colleagues) and then document this journey in a narrative manner. After careful analysis, several main strands developed: self change, colleagues change, limitations and challenges, and feelings. The category of self change is reported in Table 8 and colleagues change in Table 15 because these topics lend themselves to the appropriate sub-questions. The categories of limitations and challenges, and feelings did not appropriately fit into any sub-question set but I felt that the information discovered in these strands helped to guide the interview and give me
### Table 4

**Leadership Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Although the school has high expectations for test-driven data (standardized assessments), there needs to be improvement on nurturing components.</td>
<td>The focus to become more centered on self and society of the 3S design. Do this through technology and face-to-face contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>ODE completely revamped the laws that structured how to evaluate and develop new and veteran teachers that need to make substantial changes.</td>
<td>The district created a program entitled Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR). The purpose of PAR is to cultivate sustained change in both new teachers and veteran teachers, ultimately to change from a standardized management to a curriculum wisdom paradigm. Courtney wanted to focus on several areas: building trust with the teachers, becoming a generative leader, acting as a change agent and helping to facilitate change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Jamie       | ODE instituted changes in licensure and mentoring changing policy that was in place. Complete restructuring of the evaluation process for teachers needs to be addressed. | To comply with ODE, action steps were put into place. Jamie was required to put several action steps into place.  
1. Complete training of year one Resident Educator Program  
2. Serve as a mentor to two resident educators  
3. Serve on district mentor committee  
4. Recruit current teachers to become part of the mentor program |
| Carina      | ODE (TLE) changed the way evaluation was conducted and tools would be outdated. Current language in the bargaining agreement read:                  | To work on improving the morale of the departmental Collegial Planning group with an eventual goal of working together more effectively as a Professional Learning Community.                                        |

"The evaluation of an employee shall be conducted by the employee’s immediate supervisor…The evaluator shall not be a bargaining unit member.” (p. 1)
some perspective as to the mind-set of the participants. Limitations and challenges are shown in Table 5 and feelings are represented in Table 6.

Table 5

Limitations and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Switching from a subject oriented curriculum to a society centered one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tested by challenges of becoming a teacher leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balancing an essential understanding and authentic task design (consultant and mentor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Having to utilize cross paradigm eclecticism, standardized management paradigm is strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging existing relationship with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding the courage to put professional relationships on the line for sake of ethical fidelity and professional integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The power struggle with administration to do the right thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Limited faculty and administrators trained in the new program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative administrative attitude, refusal to attend meetings, non-commitment to the overall mentor program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Negativity from colleagues about principal and the prospect of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linda felt that her limitations and challenges were going to be transferring what she learned and how she had changed to her colleagues. She was challenged by the change in her relationships she previously had before becoming a mentor, sharing information without confrontation or apathy.

Courtney, because she was the only participant that was a full time teacher leader, felt her limitations and challenges were two fold, one with her colleagues accepting her as a mentor and one with the power struggle that was apparent between the
Table 6

*Feelings*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>“vulnerable” “exposed” “susceptible” “competing pressures” “time” “excitement” (p. 9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Courtney | Awareness that not everyone is self-motivated to change  
Support and guidance is difficult and although “I have a deep personal connection with 3S understanding” that is “life altering,” that is not easily transferred  
Eagerness to pursue challenge for a grander purpose  
Defeated at times, hopeful at other times |
| Jamie | Assigned to this duty out of need not want  
Forced to comply with ODE regulations  
Humbled by the leaning experience |
| Carina | Uncovered her own “deep-seated private pessimism about how much people can really change” (p. 7)  
Frustrated at times, hopeful at other times |

administration and herself. She was constantly battling the internal battle of her “deep personal connection with teaching for 3S understanding” and sharing that without jeopardizing rapport with teachers and her “firm belief in democracy.” This struggle repeatedly placed her in a power struggle with administration with whom she also had a good rapport.

Jamie had very limited administrative support so her biggest challenge was to find “wiggle room” to make any changes with colleagues. Her limitations and challenges were all directly related to lack of administrative support.

Carina felt her challenges were centered on her colleagues accepting change. There was a great deal of complaining and talking about problems rather than solving
them. She saw this in herself and in her colleagues and it was difficult to pull away from this tendency that was ingrained in all of them.

The feelings of the participants consistently ranged from frustrated to hopeful for all four volunteers. Linda had consistent quotes of internal struggles that she felt as she progressed through the year. She talked many times of the inner turmoil that she felt, constant changes and adjustments that she made to try to find space to keep with her initial goal of her leadership plan of changing from a standardized management to one that values societal and nurturing components.

Courtney struggled with internal feelings to balance the struggle between colleagues and administration. She had her own battles of democracy and how to implement any ideas with people who are forced to be a part of a program as well as with administration who want fast results now. The feeling of defeat was sometimes evident but always with a rejuvenating spirit of reflection and change and moving forward.

Jamie was the only volunteer who was assigned to several duties and told what her responsibilities would be. She used the word forced several times. She was passionate about finding different solutions to every problem that presents itself but only in working with her colleagues who were interested in her teaching and in the mentors with whom she was assigned, never working outside of her assigned area of implementation.

Carina struggled with feelings of a “deep-seated private pessimism about how much people can really change” so her feelings were of an internal struggle as well as one
to share out with others. She felt frustrated and her feelings were evident of this internal struggle.

Questions

Research Question #1

1. What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

1.a. What qualities of the TLEP were meaningful? During the interview, participants were given the definition of meaningful professional development as used in this study. Meaningful professional development is defined as minimally consisting of the following criteria: allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood et al., 2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik, 2007). Table 7 contains quotes the participants felt were meaningful qualities of the program. I purposely used exact quotes in the table to be transparent as this information is analyzed and conclusions drawn in the findings section of Chapter 5, Table 23.
Table 7

Meaningful Professional Development

Linda

Collegiality: “When it first started I think that it was just very encouraging at this point in my career to see that there were other teachers that felt as passionate about making change and being proactive in making the career meaningful and bringing new insights to the educational practice.” (p. 1)

Administrative Support: “For whatever reason by doing this program I get more administrative support which I have had in the past but not in the way I wanted” “I think they were starting to understand that I was doing more than just art.” (p. 2)

Change: “Absolutely that’s what we do until it becomes a problem. I’m thinking about where we were with the habit and the problem, you know the problem to your point, was they were starting to think. But then that other problem is the house payment became a big problem. It’s kind of sad, I liked that Dr. Ryan’s little thing it helps me to understand change in people that there is a lot going on between that habit and problem and that we always want to get back to the habit. That’s where we lost them, that other problem, that other problem became, they went back to have them. Because it’s safe and it’s something they understood and were comfortable with.” (p. 7)

Democratic values: “My leadership plan helped me find the wiggle room which was something that was I didn’t really think I needed to do and then once I started doing it and saw how the students were responding I realized I needed to do it.” (p. 3)

Courtney

Time: “They allowed sufficient time to self-reflect and defined where those pieces fit into who you are and then share that with other people.” “I think the most meaningful part was the self-reflective piece that they included.” (p. 2)

Change: “I think my habit is being stuck in that standardized management or best practices, or not know what curriculum wisdom was” “recognizing that there is a problem.” (p. 3)

Jamie

Curriculum wisdom: “I felt kind of ill equipped, kind of deficient in my pedagogy in term so of my education.” “I mean I have a philosophy of music education and what I think arts place is in schools and in society but in terms of like education and what the purpose is that we’re here for, I don’t know that I ever thought about is because I never did as an undergrad.” (p. 1)

Curriculum wisdom: “I was drawn to the assessment piece” “What is the goal? I was very drawn to that.” “I walked away with a huge reading list you know beyond what we read in class.” “So I’d say that’s what drew me to it. That was was what meaningful.” (p. 2)

Curriculum wisdom: “Understanding by design” “Conversations, especially with Dr. Henderson” “I get up every day and I work two hours to really make my music history class a class with no technology and no text books. I was like can I make some units using that! To make it more meaningful?” “That has been a challenge.” (p. 2)

(table continues)
Table 7 (continued)

**Meaningful Professional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carina</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality: “I did value the cohort and the developing relationships with people in the class. I have actually missed that a lot.”</td>
<td>(p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality: “Although they were in different teaching areas just since and even teaching different levels and there was a sense of trust. Maybe part of that trust was that we really didn’t know each other outside of the cohorts there was a lot more freedom to say what you think.”</td>
<td>(p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality: “You have to trust me that I know what I’m doing and I have a bigger goal in mind and you don’t really have to worry about the details if the trust is there.”</td>
<td>(p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support: “We had a new administrator this year. It gave me a way to deal with him but he was no one in the beginning because he didn’t even start work until August. He was totally supportive of what I did as in meeting for meetings and getting interviewed together and talking about the teacher leadership program.”</td>
<td>(p. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: “Change sneaks up on you too, we don’t know what people’s starting points are, what might look to me, listening to someone else, it might still have been change for them because it’s steps upon the way.”</td>
<td>(p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained change: “Another person can’t hurry you along, another person can’t tell you.”</td>
<td>(p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: “Listening helps them get to a stronger place.” Administration “the biggest criticism that someone has about administrators, they don’t make decisions, what’s happening, what’s been decided and if you’re not given time to listen, you will rise to a quick decision” then “they don’t have ownership of it.”</td>
<td>(p. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Linda, collegiality, administrative support, change, and democratic values were qualities of the TLEP that were meaningful to her. She was excited that her colleagues were excited about making changes. She felt supported by her administrators who began to understand and support the program, not just test scores as had been highly valued in the past. She valued the change she was seeing which was hard for her colleagues to jump from the safety of habit to accept that there even was a problem. Linda deeply valued democratic values when she saw how her students were responding to the changes she was making.

Courtney valued time and change as qualities of the TLEP that were meaningful. She felt self-reflection and the time to share meaning with others was very meaningful to her colleagues and to herself. How people change and what she learned about change from the TLEP was a necessary ingredient for the difficult switch from standardized management to curriculum wisdom. She felt it was the most difficult part to have people understand that a problem even existed to move forward from habit.

Jamie valued curriculum as a quality meaningful professional development in the TLEP. She had five separate quotes that supported her thoughts as the meaningful quality of the TLEP. The feeling of a deficiency in just teaching for subject and the realization that there was a bigger picture was “previously missing” in her background. She felt that the rigor involved in understanding and changing to a curriculum wisdom paradigm provided purpose and provided professional development with “immediate results.”
Carina looked at collegiality, administrative support, change, and time as the qualities of the TLEP that she valued. The cohort that was formed and time to develop trust with her colleagues, support, and relationships formed were invaluable. The new administrator that was hired at the beginning of the year was supportive which allowed the change in people, even if it was small steps. She felt time to listen to each other, in class, in the workplace, and with administrators was necessary to get people to move to a stronger place, both in the TLEP and in the workplace.

1.b. What about the TLEP made you feel you had changed your beliefs? Table 8 represents the comments that were listed in the TLN that addressed self change. Although the participants were not directly asked the question, “What about the TLEP made you feel you had changed your beliefs,” the comments in Table 8 represent comments from the TLN that were made about self change, one of the four big ideas. Table 9 represents self change in beliefs that were gathered from the initial interview.

Linda felt the TLEP had changed her beliefs in her own classroom and with her colleagues. Her postings on-line were drastically different and now centered on democratic views not just lesson plans to meet the subject goals. She found herself “walking the talk” and really changing her curriculum so she could show colleagues that she was honest in her changes.

Courtney felt the program changed her preconceived notions of leadership and taught her to be patient, understanding, and persistent when becoming an agent of change. She had to change to an approach of active listening and stop entering a situation
Table 8

Self Change Strand From the TLN

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Fruitful and rewarding collaborative inquires into curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A critical difference in sharing democratic views, more societal centered with student driven options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now deliberative about curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking collaborative moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing curriculum on the fly and being honest about what to integrate and what does not make sense anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Adjustments made to provide colleagues with new experiences in non-threatening environments where they can make mistakes and not feel threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging every preconceived notion of leadership, education curricular aims and philosophies of education and reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Become an agent of change by being patient, an active listener, understanding the difficulty of change and being persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial mistakes of unreasonable expectations for people beginning to change had to be immediately reflected upon and adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Renewed faith in the capacity to influence a corner of the world in a positive way, work collaboratively toward a common goal and reflect upon the successes and failures of the journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular reflection and astonishment at the existence of power relations that are constantly at play in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining aware at the opportunities for sharing are always challenging and that these opportunities are often disguised as problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular reflection of personal growth when working with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovering that acting as an expert, considering yourself to be an expert, prevents you from being a good listener and thus inhibits learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The realization that potential leadership lies within all of us, including our students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal growth that is invigorating and shear excitement at the change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 8 (continued)

**Self Change Strand From the TLN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carina</th>
<th>After tape recording a meeting to “analyze my role in the session with some objectivity,” a distinct change occurred. Realization that journal entries did not match audio tape.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeing upon a common goal rather than preselected ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role as a teacher leader requires constant flexibility, constant listening, and even seeking out opportunities to support colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active engagement in reflective inquiry especially with administration and colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with colleagues, not report on colleagues, a change in leadership thinking and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for leadership are complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humbling experience to serve peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

**Change in Beliefs From TLEP—Initial Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linda</th>
<th>The TLEP gave the tools for leadership; tools that you do not get out of “standard professional development”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The realization that administrators are just like students, they needed support too specifically in collecting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A very big personal change in seeing things from another person’s perspective, becoming a team player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big changes in essential understandings, making 3S a deciding factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely adjusted all curriculum and posted the blog for others before the school year ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Support to change beliefs, “other people felt that way too”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustaining change is critical. Supporting people through this process and even so far as helping them to recognize change was necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 9 (continued)

*Change in Beliefs From TLEP—Initial Interview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal change taking place and then going back into the same environment when you are different is difficult. Others are the same and you are different.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Because of the TLEP, there was an understanding about wiggle room. It may have prevented her from going into her classroom and just closing the door and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Something bigger than herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>The TLEP offered a new awareness that a teacher leader is a guide and a coach and a mentor and must come up with ways to do that effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make a point to show your colleagues you are doing more than preaching, model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monumental change in working with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete change in approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching to foster a sense of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowing people to see the possibilities they may not know exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with people as they change so that it is sustained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with preconceived notions on how to fix a situation. She discussed change theory with colleagues and saw her own change as well as others as they went through the cycle.

Jamie thought the curriculum connection in the TLEP made the biggest changes in her. She believed when curriculum was connected to the lives of her students, there was unlimited potential for leadership. She changed how she perceived herself as an expert to an active listener and the change helped her to realize how she influenced the world in corner of the world.

Carina felt change through participation in the TLEP as coming into the program “arrogantly, thinking I would complete necessary coursework and gain knowledge that
would validate what I had already learned from year of classroom experience” and left the program thinking, “I never imagined how much I had yet to learn.” She felt humbled to work as a leader to her peers.

During the interview, Linda felt that the TLEP gave her the tools she needed to develop a strong leadership style. She grew to understand her administrators and likened their needs to those of her students; you must meet them where they are, be a team player, and assist them to grow. Her biggest change in her classroom was that essential understanding became a deciding factor in curriculum and she shared this information with her colleagues.

Courtney felt the support of her colleagues and the trust that developed during the TLEP supported her change. She felt that everyone was struggling to change and so all people were working together to help growth. She felt the idea of sustaining change critical, especially helping people understand that a change needed to be made.

Jamie had a difficult time with making personal change and then returning to the same environment. Because her administration was not cooperative, she felt alone in this change but was sure that her personal change was not wavering. She credited the TLEP with strength to find wiggle room in her situation to find ways to see opportunity for growth.

Carina had a new awareness about leadership, leading as a guide, and a participant not as a boss. She felt she had fundamentally changed her classroom and how she worked with her colleagues. She felt the TLEP helped her to see people from where
they are now, which in turn helped her promote growth: working with people through change and seeing results that were being sustained.

**Research Question #2**

2. *What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs?*

Two ideas are addressed in this question. The first idea focuses on the tool that was used to support sustained change. Tool is defined as “to diagnose a problem and formulate a hypothesis to resolve it” (Ryan, 2011). The leadership plan outlined a problem that each participant perceived as a current issue in her district. Working closely with the principal, the participants had to formulate a hypothesis that would address this problem. (Participant’s problem and hypothesis are shown in Table 4.) Three sub-questions addressed the first part of question 2: Was the hypothesis on target? Did you have to adjust the hypothesis? Were you able to implement any of the hypothesis?

The second focus question two addresses supporting colleagues’ change in beliefs through the hypothesis and is represented in the last three sub-questions: How did you support your colleagues? How did they receive the leadership plan? Did you feel they were able to change their beliefs? During the initial interview, the four participants were asked the sub-questions and each response is reflected in the tables below. If they did not respond or they wanted to adjust their answers, the transcripts were given back to them during the second interview and adjustment were made to their response and reflected in the tables.
2.a. *Was the hypothesis on target?* All four of the participants agreed that their original hypothesis (their leadership plan) was on target. They all also agreed that adjustments had to be made to the plan. (See Table 10.)

Table 10

*Was the Hypothesis on Target?*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>On target because of the need for societal and nurturing changes as evidenced by teachers asking for information and sharing it out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>On target because of the necessity for improving morale as evidenced by teachers refusing to participate. By year end, instead of arms folded, there were contributions to the discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>On target but had to adjust because of new personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>On target but adjustments had to be made periodically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.b. *Did you have to adjust the hypotheses?* All of the participants reported that they had to adjust the hypothesis in various ways.

   Linda had to make adjustments based on the reaction of her colleagues. She felt the concept of backward design and incorporating the societal (3S) concept fit together and had a hard time sharing this insight with her colleagues. Ultimately she felt wiggle room was the key to get a hard concept introduced rather than presenting all the information at one time. This adjustment to her hypothesis was over the year because it took her some time to figure it out. (See Table 11.)
### Adjustments to the Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Had to become more patient with colleagues and meet them where they were, not where she was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slow down on the 3S societal as colleagues were having a hard time grasping the concept. Set up mini-meetings just to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using wiggle room rather than addressing 3S all at one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Fear of change and fear of the unknown created difficulty so adjustment had to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustments include creating an atmosphere that is positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intentional marketing to share success stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Uncooperative administration did not follow through on adjustments that needed to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustments that were put into place were reactive not proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Suggestions from participants for the following year were put in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas for sustaining the change that they were seeing were put in place for the following year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtney showed concern about a negative atmosphere that had developed as a result of a few veteran teachers who had a bad experience. She also felt this could be caused by fear of change. The adjustments were to make more of an attempt to market the program in a positive direction and highlight all the many success stories, not the one or two negative ones.

Jamie had trouble implementing any adjustments as they required administrative assistance and there was no follow through. Comments such as “that’s too much work” or “I don’t think that’s necessary” prohibited open conversation.
Carina had positive things to say about ideas that she thought would carry through to the following year. She was excited about the suggested adjustments and proud that they had moved past most of the negativity and could make some gains.

2.c. Were you able to implement any of the hypotheses? All of the participants responded that they were able to implement at least some of the hypothesis with adjustments. Linda was especially excited about the 3S design in her own classroom and people were becoming increasingly interested in this idea. People were seeking her out for information and examples of this in their subject area. (See Table 12.)

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>3S design was implemented and shared out successfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Able to implement the cultivating change but can’t tell yet if it is sustained, next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard to implement standardized management to curriculum best practice in veteran teachers, no foundation. With new teachers it’s easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Frustration because only a small part of the plan could be implemented was always present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration unwillingness to cooperate or participate was detrimental to success of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Slow process because of the change in culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing a negative attitude that pre-exists is difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtney felt she had been more successful in implementing her hypothesis with new teachers than with veteran teachers. She thought this was because of the lack of
foundation about curriculum wisdom or unwillingness to accept anything other than standardized management.

Jamie continuously ran into the administrative problem when trying to implement any part of the program. She, however, remained very positive about the changes it had made in her own classroom and continued to grow and improve her own curriculum.

Carina made gains that were evident in her dialogue meetings. She stressed continually that change in a culture happens much slower than she imagined and she was frustrated with the time that it took to move forward. She felt there was implementation of the plan, just at a slower pace than she expected.

2.d. How did you support your colleagues? The initial interview provided much support for helping colleagues to implement teacher leadership into their buildings. (See Table 13.)

Linda felt there was room for curriculum wisdom especially at the elementary level but the hindrances were test scores and major financial cutbacks in her district. Many people were interested in resources for 3S but they were always concerned about their job.

Courtney concentrated on creating a safe environment where people could take risks and analyze their work without judgment of any sort. She felt people were more willing to take risks if there was no judgment. She established a rapport with people by recognizing their strengths and finding resources to support these strengths. She used change theory to support an internal desire to change in her mentor teachers.
**Table 13**

*Support of Colleagues*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Strategy/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Understand that they have to be mindful of the test scores, as well as financial cuts that are being made, but finding space to dialogue about a bigger picture. Have resources available for any colleagues that were interested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Building partnerships that have a shared visionEstablishing trust that created a safe environment so people could take risks and self-analyze their work. No judgment as to establish the rapport needed to gain trust. Recognize strengths and make suggestions to support those strengths. Utilize change theory to set up “aha” moments for people to move forward and see success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Only support the mentees that were assigned to her. One mentee was always receptive to curriculum wisdom and support was easy. The other mentor was not in a good placement, hired at the beginning of the year and was not able to handle the discipline in the classroom. Unable to implement any support outside of the assigned entry level teachers because of negative administrative feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Use of the appreciative inquiry to help battle the negative attitudes at the onset of the dialogue committee. Positive attitude, listening more, talking less. Encouraging strong teachers in the building to become teacher leaders. By becoming a better teacher leader through continual self reflection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jamie felt that bad decisions were being made “above her pay grade” and that the program was not following the intent of the resident educator program. She felt that the only thing in her control was working with her two mentor teachers and improving her own classroom.

Carina’s main objectives to support her colleagues were to have a positive attitude, listen more, and talk less. She began to look at strong teachers in her building and encourage them to become a teacher leader. She continuously worked on improving her leadership skills, which in turn supported her colleagues to make progress in their own path.

2.e. How did they receive the leadership plan? Linda had success at the onset of colleagues receiving the leadership plan. There was excitement and interest until there was an announcement that cuts were going to be made and then people backed off. Her thought was the problem of not using curriculum wisdom in your content was replaced with a bigger problem, survival. (See Table 14.)

Courtney felt that things may have gotten off to a negative start which caused some reservation and even resentment at the onset. However, they were working through this and things were becoming much more accepted by the end of the school year. The veteran teachers had additional reservations with people coming into the classroom and one older veteran teacher had problems with Courtney being so much younger than he was. She did not have as many “issues” with the younger teachers.
Table 14

*Colleagues Receive Leadership Plan*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>At first there was a great deal of excitement but then there was an announcement that there would be financial cuts and progress slowed. There was habit that was very established but some people got excited over 3S and started to realize there was a problem with their curriculum. However when cuts were announced, survival became the bigger problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Some resentment at first because people were told what they had to do. Some people with anger, some with acceptance, some with fear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Spirited conversations with the first mentor. Challenging but positive, great relationship. Second mentor was hired late, not able to be successful in the classroom because of discipline issues. The placement in this school was not successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Some with resentment. This showed in a physical way (seating in the room where the dialogue committee met) as well as through lack of participation. By the end of the year (with many self changes Carina made), things were improving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jamie was unable to work with any other colleagues except for her two mentor teachers; one was very receptive to new ideas and willing to try different things; the other mentor was not as successful. The second mentor was hired very late and there was a lack of candidates so initial placement in the school was questioned. She did feel, however, that even though placement in this alternative school setting was not appropriate for the teacher, she was receptive to the 3S design. Unfortunately, when she tried to implement any of the ideas, behavior always became an issue. The second mentor did not come back for the following school year.
Carina experienced a lack of effort, negative attitude, and complacency at the onset of the leadership plan. During the dialogue sessions, there was a noticeable lack of acceptance and even resentment of the program. Through some changes made by Carina to adjust how she was acting as a teacher leader and through a great deal of time, the climate was changing.

2. Did you feel they were able to change their beliefs? This section is divided into two tables to reflect the comments made in the TLN (Table 15) and the responses from the interviews (Table 16). Although the responses in the TLN were not directly answering the question, “Did you feel they were able to change their beliefs,” I believe the comments written in the TLN add to the original question of change in the beliefs of their colleagues.

Linda felt there were many changes happening. The time and effort that went into looking things up and providing support for people in the beginning was overwhelming. However she felt at the end of the year, people were beginning to dig things up for themselves and share back with her and with each other. She said she felt the principal began to see changes in people and mentioned this to her. The principal met with Linda to gather information about 3S and was going to present this information at the kick off meeting this school year. Although the timeline for this change was much slower than she expected (caused some frustration), the overall change in people was happening.
Table 15

*Change in Beliefs of Colleagues—TLN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Multiple inquiries by colleagues as to 3S The leadership plan was taking hold and multiple staff members were taking on leadership roles as they became more confident in their own practice. Teachers and administrators began to make real-world connections Principal was seeking Linda’s opinion One third grade teacher came up with her own plan for increasing collegiality in the building People began to do their own curriculum wisdom inquiries Trust and collegiality started to take hold, new ideas emerged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Initially, overwhelming feelings of betrayal from colleagues, administration and the school district. The change was required of them to keep their positions, “they had to make life-altering decisions.” One mentor teacher embraced the program. She began listening, modeling and changing Another mentor changed but slowly and after much reservation. He eventually made substantial efforts to facilitate guided practice into his classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Both the mentor and mentee changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Possibility of people saying things she wanted to hear Initial meetings of Collegial Planning; “not being appreciated” (p. 10) “negative” “stall the discussion” “complained” “questioning and criticizing” (p. 9) “complaining” “criticism” “questioning” (p. 10) “nominal effort” “did not bring anything to share” “getting the group off topic” (12) October things began to change; collaboration began. Change was slow but steady</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16

*Change in Beliefs of Colleagues—Initial Interview and Follow-Up Interview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Linda | Teachers began to seek information about 3S  
Slow process, much slower than expected but changes were coming  
Principal asked for more information because he was presenting some of the information about 3S on opening day |
| Courtney | Definite breakthrough and a turning point for change when a veteran teacher accepted that he had a problem and needed to change  
Two people quit at year end and two people were “successfully realized” |
| Jamie | Heated conversations with the one mentor because she needed to dig deeper  
One teacher knew she would leave at the end of the year because she couldn’t handle the discipline. She changed her beliefs but could not adjust to the classroom behavior  
Lively discussions over a long period of time |
| Carina | Hard to tell how much change because everyone has a different starting point  
It was slow  
People were bringing ideas to the table to share with the group as opposed to asking for help and just sitting quietly |

The best example that Courtney gave (although there were many) was one veteran teacher was “going through the motions” of the program until the principal informed Courtney that another student was dropping his class. The principal was not going to share the letter with the teacher, instead have guidance share the letter. Courtney had to make a hard decision to confront the principal because she wanted to talk to the teacher. The principal reluctantly agreed after a power struggle. The veteran teacher read the letter and cried. She felt this was a definite changing point for this teacher and instead of
the problem being Courtney trying to implement change, for this teacher the problem became he had to change because kids were leaving his class. He became receptive to ideas and began implementing them. He later did slip back into old habits but when Courtney talked to him, he confessed that this was a very difficult concept and he only knew how to present the topic one way. After a few weeks of support, he made major gains and was back on track with the 3S design.

One mentor teacher that Jamie worked with did leave at the end of the school year because she was unable to control her classroom. However, Jamie felt that she did believe in the 3S design and did make changes. She felt she would take these changes with her to the next job she would get. The other mentor did make changes and they had many heated discussions where they both grew. “Both of us experienced growth, as she caught a glimpse of the possibility of creating a deeper understanding in her students and I worked to be a guide rather than a director.”

Carina felt that there was a hostile environment at first because things had been done in such a negative manner for so long. She saw changes as time went on but it was through many changes she had to make herself and it was a very slow process. Her one example was with a coach who was very derogatory throughout the process but Carina made the decision to work with the coach rather than confronting him. This opened an avenue for great discussions and sharing ideas. It turned into a good working relationship and she quoted him as saying, “I hate the Collegial Planning. But I don’t hate it this year as much as I did last year.” “It feels different. We are getting things done.”
Research Question #3

3. After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

The third question was the focus for the follow-up interview and the results are presented in Table 17. Five sub-questions were addressed in this interview.

3.a. What has supported your ability to re-present your ideas about teacher leadership to your colleagues? There were two main points that Linda thought supported the re-presentation of teacher leadership. Linda was confident that the timeliness of the core standards being introduced was an opportunity for wiggle room to re-present 3S design. She knew with the implementation of inquiry based learning, there was a good lead for introducing some of the ideas of Society into the unit plans. The other major factor that Linda talked about was the fact that when budget cuts were made, her position as lead teacher was cut. When they brought the position back right at the end of the school year, she was forced to interview for a position she had previously held. Whereas usually she would have just “free-lanced” the discussion, she prepared specific examples where she had closed a gap for students in math using the 3S design. The superintendent was going to use some of her information for his opening day presentation.
### Table 17

**Support for Re-Presenting Ideas**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>The timeliness of the core standards. They are inquiry based so she can also introduce backwards design and 3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With cuts, the position of lead teacher was terminated and then reinstated so Linda had to re-interview for her position. This presented an opportunity to talk to the superintendent about 3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The superintendent was to present some ideas in his opening day speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Continued connections with people in the class; collegial conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to continuing to read professional books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Finding people who are like-minded, having more vocabulary and knowledge to feel confident to “chime in on different discussions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People who are open to new ideas, who are alike in mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowing the model for change, how people change, much slower than expected (but gradual progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Collegial planning once a week and four half days of in-service where the teacher come up with the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carina believes sustaining change is supported by her modeling what she is saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenting the core content standards, backward design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New evaluation system, people scared so they may change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtney said that her continued relationship with several members of the TLEP was a supporting factor for her to re-present her ideas to colleagues at work. She valued their support and their opinions. She also thought her commitment to reading (re-reading material for class as well as seeking different material that supported big ideas from TLEP) was a support for her re-presenting ideas to her colleagues. She mentioned that
there was so much reading in class she felt rushed so she went back to all the books and re-read them so she could process the information.

Jamie thought support for re-presentation of ideas was confidence in herself because of her increase in knowledge about curriculum. She had not been to school in some time so the vocabulary and overall knowledge gave her confidence to join in conversations that she previously would not have done. She found people who were like-minded a great support for re-presentation of ideas. When assisting people in change, Jamie felt that what she learned about the way people change was very helpful. “I learned the most about change and just people change” although she found herself having expectations that were too high. “I have high expectations for myself and I assume that everybody has those expectations.”

Carina knew that the once a week collegial planning that was in place and the four half day in-services a year were a definite support for her re-presenting her ideas. She presented in one of the half-day sessions about using the core content standards for big ideas and backward design. She was a very big advocate for modeling what she was saying in her own classroom and believes that sustained change is supported by her showing her colleagues by practicing what she knows in her own classroom. Carina thought the new evaluation system was a support for re-presenting TLEP ideas. She did, however, question whether people were asking because they were scared and possibly going through the motions, using buzz words but not really understanding the big ideas.

3.b. What has hindered your ability to re-present your ideas about teacher leadership to your colleagues? Linda knew that last year, many people were not
interested in 3S because they were worried about keeping their jobs (herself included). She felt it was difficult to present adding a societal or nurturing component to teacher’s lesson plans as a “problem” when the real problem was their livelihood. She felt that because her job was also a possible cut, she really tried to support the teachers no matter what. She was pulled from her content, disrupted her plans, and went above and beyond to support the teachers in adding a societal component into their content. However, in the reverse, her unconditional support caused people to go to the principal and say good things about Linda and the 3S design. (See Table 18.)

Courtney was keenly aware of the standardized management and the control that it has on teacher practice. She was always trying to find the wiggle room between what had to be done for regulations and what needed to be done for best practice. She was in a battle for these two paradigms most of the time. She felt a hindrance was speed at which she was able to make gains. She was truly disappointed in what she was able to accomplish this year and said, “I felt like I let myself and the program down” because she was only able to implement “bits and pieces, here and there.”

Jamie’s frustration and the main hindrance for her re-presentation of teacher leadership to her colleagues was the lack of support and confrontational atmosphere in her work environment. She felt the intent of the program, shared power with administration, to observe and evaluate teachers was being manipulated and she was being forced to “tell on” her co-workers. There was also a total disregard for any input that was made by the teachers, which made it very difficult to stay motivated to share any information at all during meetings.
Table 18

**Hindered Re-Presenting Ideas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Last year with the possibility of budget cuts, Linda’s position was a possible target. This and the fact that many people were nervous about their jobs was a hindrance. Because of the cuts, Linda did not “want to be pushy” and have “teachers go complaining to the principal that I was being pushy or that I was, you know bugging them” so she supported them completely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Standardized management and best practice are hurdles. Trying to find wiggle room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Oppositional authority, power struggles and the inability to express your point of view. When your voice is ignored by authority figures, there is no value in expression, it is difficult to keep trying. Felt as though there was a manipulation of the intent of the program by the principal. Total lack of trust by administration. The principal feels threatened by loss of power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>The collegial planning meetings are only ½ hour sessions—not enough time to get deep. People thinking it’s just another new idea that will go away, “you took a class and yeah yeah yeah” School levy failed, laying off 20 teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Carina listed the collegial planning sessions as a support for re-presenting her ideas, in the same sentence she said the half hour time frame for these sessions was a hindrance. She felt they just started and it was time to end, there wasn’t enough time to get deep into the conversation. Her fear that because there wasn’t enough time to get deep, people would just take away the “buzz” words and not truly understand the concepts; that they were just going through the motions but not gaining an understanding of the meaning. The biggest hindrance was the failure of the levy and the
realization that 20 teachers would be laid off. People were afraid and that was the problem at hand.

3.c. What has supported sustaining your beliefs about teacher leadership six months after the TLEP ended? Linda felt that the main support for sustaining her beliefs was the online art education support that she had tapped into. She would blog daily and share ideas that were supported by people in other countries that were doing the same thing and it was successful. The lack of support at work (primarily due to budget cuts and people were worried about their jobs not content of their class) caused her to feel defeated whereas the support she got online, gave her courage and hope. (See Table 19.)

Courtney was very excited that she was able to see change in kids and with teachers while working in the classroom. Teachers were excited when they saw growth in students and had a sense that there was something bigger in their lives. It seemed that they were not just learning to pass the OAAs but that there was a bigger picture in mind.

Jamie took time to re-read the material that was required and suggested in the TLEP. She felt it was too much to absorb all of it during the class so this time to really think about the content was empowering for her. She felt sustained in her beliefs and was growing even more. She also felt that knowing that there was always wiggle room helped sustain her frustration with the administration in her building. Rather than give up, which she wanted to a times, it gave her hope looking for wiggle room. Lastly she valued people that were like-minded and they helped her sustain her beliefs. The ability to talk about things she read gave her a sense of professionalism she had not felt before.
### Table 19

**Support for Sustaining Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>A “personal learning network” of people all over the world online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This school year, no known cuts will be made so people are more relaxed and focused on content and curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Because it works in the classroom. She saw a change in kids and in teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeing a change in teachers that it is not just about the OAA’s but that there is an alternative goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>The program offered support by the extensive reading. There wasn’t time during the program to take it all in so Jamie re-read each of the reading assignments again and continues to read professional books with related topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowing that there is wiggle room. Although the “framework isn’t always conducive to making that happen” she felt knowing there was opportunity helped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The other people who have similar views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>She was seeing quantitative differences in her own AP classes using the 3S design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheer stubbornness (because there is very little administrative support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A personal resolution to read something professional everyday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“It made me think of myself more as a professional, truly. That, you know, that there’s an art to this.”

Carina mentioned throughout the interview the power that teachers have in their own classrooms. That teachers have no control over the media, over school levies, or external factors but that inside of their classrooms is where all the power lies. She believed the best way to sustain her beliefs was through example and she was seeing quantitative results in her classes based on the 3S design. Unfortunately she had no administrative support (new principal, not the original one with whom she developed the
plan) so she believed that she was sustaining her beliefs through stubbornness and a personal resolution that she made to continue her growth through reading a professional material daily. She listed these two factors as the reasons she was sustaining her beliefs.

3.d. What has hindered sustaining your beliefs about teacher leadership six months after the TLEP ended? Linda felt hindrances to sustaining beliefs were two-fold; one was the very small constant reminders to everyone that budget cuts could be made at any time. She was trying to make “monumental changes” but would be reminded about “silly small stuff” such as lack of supplies or over use of office items and it would create a constant pull to the actual problem, budget cuts. The second hindrance was a constant battle to keep the kids that need the most help in class. The standardized management’s pull of removing kids from elective class for test prep was a battle that went on daily. She felt this was a real struggle for her and for her kids. (See Table 20.)

Courtney believed that her relationship with administration could be improved. She felt that the few times she felt she needed to take a stand may have caused some communication issues with some administrators. She also wanted to set goals because there were new administrators who were not familiar with the teacher leadership program goals so she thought that was a present hindrance that needed to be addressed. Courtney also said the simple fact that it was so difficult to be a teacher leader was a hindrance. “Nobody told me. It’s so hard. It is so hard. The belief is there, the drive is there but it’s just the follow through you know.”
Table 20

**Hindered Sustaining Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hindrances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Cutbacks that made everyone on edge. Especially noted were the small, insignificant reminders of budget cuts (sticky note allowance, no more pens, etc.) Pull-outs of students that are in need of intervention. Most are pulled from elective classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>The relationship with administration; lack of deep communication Finding wiggle room in standardized management, political hold is strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Lack of administrative support Scripted curriculum district wide in the elementary buildings. Math scores were initially elevated and now leveled out. Teacher are not permitted to deviate from the script The fact that everyone is teaching exactly the same way, the same thing, at the same time. Teacher evaluation exactly the same score for everyone since no one can deviate from the content provided so where is the need for a teacher leader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>People are not open to the new ideas Lack of trust in administration That the program was supposed to create new positions in leadership but her district is probably not going to create teacher leadership positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Along with administrative problems, Jamie’s school used a scripted curriculum district wide in the elementary schools. Initially there was improvement in math scores with the scripted program but now it has leveled off. Teachers wanted to try different things but were not permitted to deviate from the script. One teacher questioned her evaluation to be anything but perfect in all areas because she was following the script exactly as she was being told. The hindrance to sustaining her belief in teacher leadership is the sheer fact that there is not much to lead if the program is scripted. “All
of the kids are going to learn the same and be tested the same at the same time in the same way and teachers are now heading that way."

Carina felt that people who were resistant to new ideas were a hindrance to sustaining her beliefs, because of the lack of trust in her administration that they were not following through with initiatives so there was no support. The big factor was that the district was supposed to create new positions in leadership but that her district (with cuts) was not going to create these teacher leadership positions.

3.e. How would you rate yourself at this point (Customary, Emergent, Engaged or Deliberative)? (a) Customary understanding which may be limited to simple responsibilities and not a deep critical awareness of a multidisciplinary inquiry or deliberation with management or colleagues; (b) Emergent understanding which may indicate that they are still acquiring a deeper understanding of transformative leadership and are still contemplating the possibilities of using this as a way of living; (c) Engaged understanding which shows a sincere commitment to personal changes in transformative leadership and all that follows because of this change to “establish a critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline while developing an ‘inner’ problem solving discipline;” and (d) Deliberative understanding which indicates the participant who has changed and is a teacher leader who is inspiring to and supportive of their peers and others who venture to join this transformative discipline (ODE, 2009). I use actual quotes in Table 21 to give a true picture of how each participant self-rated and how they rated themselves with others. Interestingly, I did not ask any of them where they would rate themselves with others; they all volunteered the information. (See Table 21.)
Table 21

*Rating Yourself (Customary, Emergent, Engaged, Deliberative)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>“Well I definitely have changed so I do feel like I’m being deliberative and definitely supportive.”</td>
<td>“I’m on the fence between engaged and deliberative because I’m still not having as many folks understanding how transformative this is.” “When you tell somebody this changed me as a teacher” “I’m losing my faith” “I was going to be quitting” “I feel very unhappy and they don’t understand that” “I haven’t been able to get past that so in that part I’m engaged” “Hopefully it will be more generative. I don’t know how much generating I’ve actually done”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>“I’m somewhere in between engaged and deliberative. I do have a sincere commitment and I have made a personal change.”</td>
<td>“I definitely need to work on the deliberative part and just being able to intentionally find places, almost anticipate where I can place things instead of just letting it fall into my lap.” “I think I need to intentionally seek out those places and purposefully plan for those interactions with others.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>“I would say that I’m definitely engaged.”</td>
<td>“I think the deliberative, I think that’s hard just because” “I think this is something that evolves over time. I have a hard time feeling like I’m capable of that because I’m just a teacher. Because I am not in a position where I can make policy change. And I think in my own little corner of the world I would say—in a classroom—I would say I’m definitely deliberative. In the big teacher scheme of things, I think it’s hard because I don’t possess the authority and the position to make that drastic of a change in a place”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>“I think I’m engaged, possibly deliberative”</td>
<td>“I think I’m engaged, possibly deliberative. That’s dependent on, you know, the principal telling me that I should or not”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the relationship between professional development and sustained change in teachers’ beliefs resulting in the possible emergence of a deliberative curricular platform after professional development. This study described the TLEP (Teacher Leader Endorsement Program) and explored the relationship between the TLEP and the sustainability of change in teachers’ beliefs about teacher leadership. Specifically, this qualitative multi-case study examined the possibility of facilitating changed teacher-beliefs on the topic of teacher leadership into the school environment six months after the professional development. Four teachers volunteered for this study who felt they had changed as a result of the TLEP. The leadership plan and the teacher leader narrative were two data sources that were collected at the conclusion of the six-month TLEP in December 2011. Individual interviews were conducted in June and August 2012, six months and eight months after the TLEP ended.

This chapter is organized around the three questions that guided this study, a cross-case analysis and the findings that were formulated, conclusions of this study and implications for conducting professional development as well as for future research in professional development.
Cross-Case Analysis and Findings

Question 1: What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?

1. Each of the areas listed in the definition of meaningful professional development was indicated by at least one study participant as a quality of the TLEP that supported change in their beliefs about teacher leadership. As described in Chapter II, these six qualities consist of: allowing time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), seeking administrative support (Leithwood et al., 2004), extending collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011), promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained through self-insight (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009), instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010), and inviting wise curriculum judgments (Henderson & Gornik, 2007).

Although this definition was not meant to be all inclusive or static, it was created to help guide the volunteers. Table 22 displays the frequency with which participants indicated each of the following as being significant: time to develop trust, administrative support, collegiality, change that is sustained through self-insight, democratic values, and curriculum wisdom. The information was taken from direct quotes listed in Table 7. Although Curriculum Wisdom was indicated most frequently (in Table 7), all five indications were made by one participant (Jamie). In addition, Carina made three of the four indications of Collegiality. If we factor out these multiple indicators, and look only at the number of participants indicating any one TLEP category, then most participants
identified Sustained Change. Table 22 displays the TLEP categories identified by each participant.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Collegiality</th>
<th>Administrative Support</th>
<th>Sustained Change</th>
<th>Democratic Values</th>
<th>Curriculum Wisdom</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 22, four of the six TLEP categories (Collegiality, Administrative Support, Sustained Change, and Time) were indicated by at least two participants (Carina and Linda). In addition, three of the four participants (Carina, Courtney, and Linda) indicated that at least two of the categories were significant qualities of the TLEP. Finally, half of the participants (Carina and Linda) indicated the three categories (Collegiality, Administrative Support and Sustained Change) were significant qualities of the TLEP (Linda also included Democratic Values). In terms of summary statistics, the average number of participants indicating any particular TLEP category as being significant was 1.83 ($n = 4$) with standard deviation of 0.75; whereas, the average number of categories chosen by any particular participant was 2.74 with standard deviation of 1.5.
Comparisons of participant responses with the definition of meaningful professional development described earlier (Table 22) indicate that each of the definition’s component parts was viewed to be significant to at least one of the participants.

**Incorporates Collegiality**

Although two of the teachers (Carina and Linda) specifically stated that the quality of the TLEP that incorporates collegiality was important, all four of the participating teachers stressed the importance of collegiality multiple times throughout their interviews, both as a support during the TLEP and/or a support after it ended. Participants indicated they valued the time that they had with each other in the program because they felt they were all learning together and there was a support system that was created. They used phrases like “valued the cohort and the developing relationships” (Carina, Table 7), and “connections with people in the class” (Courtney, Table 18), throughout their interviews. The collegiality participants indicated as having been created during the class (Linda and Carina, Table 7) was sustained as a support system when they were away from the class (Courtney and Jamie, Table 18). Using The National Staff Developments Council’s set of guidelines for staff development, D. Sparks and Hirsh (2000) listed several suggestions for transforming professional development. One suggestion is change the mindset of an entire school by focusing on learning collaboratively, supporting each other to provide embedded professional development into every day activities. Darling-Hammond (1996, 2003, 2006, 2009) consistently supported investing time to develop teacher collegiality and giving teachers control over
their own learning. Greene (1988) advocated that in order to support the development of collegiality, conditions must be deliberatively set. Dewey (1938) went further and stated that it is the moral responsibility of those who have achieved maturity to do so.

**Seeks Administrative Support**

Two of the participants (Linda and Carina) indicated that administrative support was an important quality of the TLEP, both stating that the support of their principal was a positive outcome of the TLEP. Linda felt that through her work as a teacher leader in the building, her principal had discovered that she was doing much more than just teaching in her content area. Carina’s principal was new so she spent time working with him to explain the initiative and felt her ideas were supported through implementation by administration. Through the interviews it was apparent that if the principal was supportive, there was a higher transfer of information to more people in the building and more of a freedom to meet and support details when they met with their colleagues. For instance, Linda’s principal was going to include an introduction to 3S and curriculum wisdom on opening day the following school year. All four of the participating teachers talked about their administrators throughout the transcripts either in a positive manner that was supportive (Carina, Courtney, Linda) or in a negative manner that made it hard for them to achieve their goals (Jamie and Courtney).

One teacher, Courtney, recognized a constant power struggle that was ongoing between herself and her administrator. One example of this struggle was a teacher that refused to consider a change in his teaching practice (few examples, no individualization, directly from the book) and kids were dropping his class. A letter was received from a
parent explaining why they wanted their student to drop the class and it was explicit about the teacher’s lack of best practice. Courtney felt strongly that she should be the one to share this letter with the teacher—that it could be a developmental opportunity for the teacher; however the principal felt the guidance counselor should share the letter with the teacher, which was past practice. Courtney struggled to know how much authority she had over decisions or making changes if there was a difference of opinion in past practice. “I think that’s the hardest part about this job, is that nobody could prepare you for the power struggles and how to negotiate.” “I finally got her [the principal] to give me permission to go ahead and share with him [the teacher]” but she was very apprehensive to “jeopardize that relationship” with the principal.

Jamie had multiple examples of lack of administrative support and was explicit about how this hindered the success of her leadership plan. According to Jamie, the administration had turnover in the midst of her plan and there was little or no support. Examples of such a lack of support included not attending meetings, minimizing the importance of requirements of the teacher evaluation system by statements such as “do we really have to do all of this,” and no interest of learning about the plan. Jamie was frustrated with her principal and perceived him as a hindrance in the program. “I was speechless at his comments and irritated by his callous attitude towards our efforts.” According to Jamie, this lack of administrative support did not permit her to do as much as she thought she could have done, but did inspire her to find wiggle room to do what she could.
Administrative support is necessary in implementing initiatives and influencing practice (Perrone, 1997). If administrators are overbearing, there is an emphasis on control and oppression is a by-product of that control (Sandholtz & Scribner, 2006). The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (2007) reported on teacher leadership and listed that the principal must share power or it will be a barrier to the success of the program. Principals may have a problem with relinquishing this power over to teacher leaders as it may be perceived as a loss of control. Freire referred to this conflict of relinquished power in terms of oppressor and oppressed whereas “the oppressor knows full well that this intervention would not be to his best interest” (Freire, 1997, p. 34). Therefore, if administrative support for ways to productively share authority is not in place, the teacher leader initiative will be hindered.

**Promoting Sustained Change**

Three of the teachers (Carina, Courtney, and Linda) talked about promoting sustained change in themselves and carrying this back into the school environment as important qualities of the TLEP, but again, change was mentioned repeatedly throughout the transcripts of all the participants’ interviews. The teachers talked about a variety of problems that either they experienced or one of their colleagues experienced in breaking the habit of standardized methods of teaching and move to a change model. One participant (Courtney) shared her internal struggle with standardized management and how difficult it was to even recognize that there was a problem. Two teachers (Carina and Linda) talked about the struggle with guiding colleagues to recognize that a problem in standardized management even existed. Many teachers in the school environment did
not recognize that there was a problem in standardized management. According to Ryan (2011):

The default mode of getting along when all seems well with our world remains the undifferentiated unity of nonreflective habit. But life’s first lesson is that things can, and often do, go wrong. This shock, this disruption of habit, marks the onset of a problematic situation—an initial cognitive awareness that something is wrong and something must be done about it. When the answer is easy and readily available, the return to nonreflective experience is quick and uneventful. But when the problem is obstinate, the solution is not obvious, genuine inquiry is necessary. (Ryan, 2011, p. 28)

Some of the hesitance to recognize that there was a problem was based on no prior knowledge of the curriculum wisdom model. The TLEP participants had the task of getting people to recognize that a problem existed and sharing information to support inquiry into that paradigm. This was very stressful for the participants and Linda stated she spent a lot of time “banging my head against the wall” to find the wiggle room (Donaldson, 2008) to present these ideas.

Two of the participants (Linda and Carina) referred to a change model (Ryan, 2011) and knew the steps of the model. They were going through budget cuts, including the possibility of staff cuts. They referred to “habit” and “problem” (Table 7) and felt that when a bigger problem took place (cuts), people resorted back to the habit of standardized management. Linda stated, “Because it’s safe and it’s something they understood and were comfortable with.” The bigger problem was losing their jobs, safety
needs (Maslow, 1943), which take precedence over belonging, esteem, and self-actualization.

Presenting the model of change gave the participants a tangible model to help them understand the change they were going through and a support for understanding the change of their colleagues. All of the participants in this study volunteered because they felt they had experienced change as a result of the TLEP and there is much evidence to support such claims of personal change. Such evidence is presented later in this chapter. The challenge to these teacher leaders was to create change through their leadership plans, in their colleagues, and in their school environment. It seemed that this challenge (to promote change in their colleagues and school environment) actually served as a support to constantly question and strengthen their own personal change. Kegan (1994) said that “people grow best when they continuously experience an ingenious blend of support and challenge” (p. 42) and such enhanced growth became apparent in the journey of these teachers.

Instilling Democratic Values

One participant, Linda, valued the quality of democratic values promoted in the TLEP. She felt she discovered a new commitment to education that contained values she had not previously known, or at least recognized. Although only one participant answered this as a quality of the TLEP, all participants spoke about democratic values throughout their interviews. Words such as “honored,” “value opinions,” and “team” are mentioned throughout the interviews and Linda eloquently stated when talking about re-working curriculum with her colleagues: “I see it all as all together, like a big giant
web of togetherness that makes sense.” Nancy (2010) would agree with this illustration of democracy, a true expression of everyone, together committed to the values and procedures of education.

Possibly, the concept of instilling democratic values is difficult to express and the participants did not realize they themselves were going through this transformation but they valued it in the way they approached their colleagues in the workplace. Participants did not state democratic wisdom as a quality in the TLEP but they were all implementing these values through action as evidenced in their interviews. Carina stated she was “teaching to foster a sense of democracy” and “allowing people to see the possibilities they may not know exist” (Table 10). It was a struggle and frustration to set the conditions for meaningful professional development to enable their colleagues to dialogue and be free to voice their opinions. Freire (1997) acknowledged the difficulty of setting these conditions but a leader cannot dictate conditions; they must be created with people, not created for people. TLEP supported presenting democratic values through the content of the courses, as well as modeled this in the environment that was created. Multiple times in the transcripts, the participants struggled with creating this environment in the workplace. Carina stated this frustration in creating the environment for change so there would not be the generalization of “people thinking it’s just another new idea that will go away, you took a class and yeah, yeah, yeah.” Greene (1988) understood this struggle to create an environment that is conducive to change but stresses that it must be created in order to set the stage for trust to be developed.
Time to Develop Trust

Two participants (Carina and Courtney) deeply valued the time to reflect and share out with the other participants; Courtney mentioned time for self-reflection and Carina talked about time to listen to others. Perhaps Carina suggested a degree of trust that others were willing to share out with the hope their thoughts would be recognized. Although time to develop trust was not recognized as a quality by all participants during the TLEP, all participants stated it repeatedly as an important quality in presenting their leadership plans into the work environment. Time for implementing their leadership plans was highly valued and sought after by all four teachers. Carina stated that they needed time to let their colleagues know that curriculum wisdom (3S) was not just another “flavor of the month” and that it was worth their time to understand the concept. All teachers had a set time that they met with their colleagues, either through collegial planning or weekly team meetings. Although different agendas existed, all wished they had more time but learned to use wiggle room (Donaldson, 2008) as a valuable tool for creating more time with teachers. Linda talked about this in her first interview.

The problem was what Dr. Gornick and Henderson referred to as finding the wiggle room. I actually didn’t see any wiggle room and that’s where I was losing faith. My leadership plan helped me find the wiggle room which was something that was I didn’t really think I needed to do and then once I started doing it and saw how the students were responding I realized I needed to do it.

Wiggle room involves taking the time to step back from a situation that is not progressing and re-thinking your approach to the problem; coming back at a later time
from a different angle. The limited amount of time that the participants were allotted forced them to become more creative with their time using the concept of wiggle room. Words like “sneaky” and “cra...y” were used to illustrate creating time with colleagues to implement and present ideas varying from assessment to 3S to curriculum wisdom.

Carina stated, “Once I started doing it, [wiggle room] I realized I needed to do it.” All participants utilized the wiggle room concept and recognized the importance of using it.

In his quest for the qualities of a good teacher, Korthagen (2004) discovered three qualities of teachers who made significant contributions: a strong sense of self-worth, deep feelings of respect for others, and a hunger for knowledge. These qualities take time to develop and to share. Burbank and Kauchak (2003) presented their paper to the American Educational Research Association that supported and called for a model of professional development that includes time to develop trust to promote reflective inquiry and dialogue. Fullan (2008) wrote to encourage principals to take the time to develop trust for professional learning. He went so far as to state, “So the heart of what’s worth fighting for within the school is creating deep cultures that work daily on purposeful, continuous learning” (p. 19). These initiatives do not work if we do not take the time to develop a climate of trust. Zull (2002) made it clear if we do not trust the people we are with, we will not share intimate details about our feelings. There will be no gains in developing a climate of trust without implementing and supporting the time to do so.

**Instilling Curriculum Wisdom**

Only Jamie listed curriculum wisdom as an important quality of the TLEP but she cited five examples of this and listed nothing else as an important quality. She used
phrases such as “drawn to the assessment piece,” “I got up two hours early every day to implement Understanding by Design (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998), “I was really missing this in my background” to describe how she felt about this concept during the TLEP. Although no other teacher participant stated that instilling curriculum wisdom was of top importance to them in the TLEP, they all were either using the 3S design in their classroom or sharing the concept with other teachers in their work environment. They each, at one time or another, self-reported using solving techniques and reflective inquiry to present, explain, and discuss the 3S design in their buildings. Just as the concept of democracy was not recognized as important in the TLEP but was utilized as a guide for implementation of the leadership plan, so too was the wide use of curriculum wisdom in the school environment. Participants all talked about curriculum wisdom, but they did not recognize it as an important quality of the TLEP.

2. The teachers who volunteered thought they had changed because of the TLEP and numerous quotes exist to support this notion.

The first question (What were the qualities of the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program that supported teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?) implies that the beliefs of the participants had changed because of the TLEP. Throughout the teacher leader narrative, numerous references of how and why the participants changed occurred. Jamie stated, “The personal growth that I have experienced has been invigorating and I am excited to practice the tools that I have gained.” Courtney said, “The TLEP challenged my every preconceived notion of leadership, educational curricular aims and philosophies of both education and sustained educational reform.” Linda admitted, “I
was walking the talk of being deliberative and seeking collaborative moments.” Probably
the strongest statement of change came from Carina:

I began this process arrogantly, thinking that I would complete necessary
coursework and gain knowledge that would validate what I had already learned
for years of classroom experience. I never imagined how much I had yet to learn
and I am now humbled at the prospect of serving as a leader for my peers.

The change that these four teacher leaders felt that they had undergone as a result
of the TLEP can certainly be substantiated with quotes throughout all three evidence
sources with multiple statements and examples to support those statements. The TLEP
presented the Circuit of Inquiry (Dewey & Bentley, 1949) through Ryan’s (2011) model
to give the cohort a visual of successfully managing problems with change. Self change
is not easy. When people go through change, it is a struggle because a part of you is left
behind. You are not the same as you were prior, so there is a sense of loss. “All growth
is costly. It involves the leaving behind of an old way of being in the world” (Kegan,
1982, p. 215). You almost have to self-surrender to a new way which involves a deep
vulnerability; a “killing off of the old self” (p. 232). The participants of this study went
through this process, exposed themselves to this vulnerability, and changed as a result.
They felt the TLEP had, although through varied qualities of the program, provided the
avenue for this deep change.

**Question 2: What tools did teachers employ to support sustained change in their
beliefs about teacher leadership and to support such change in their colleagues’ beliefs?**
1. The tools that teachers used, their created leadership plan, were implemented by all four participants but with changes and adjustments that had to be made.

All participants felt they had successfully initiated their leadership plans into the school but each stated they had to make adjustments to their plans. Some reasons were lack of administrative support, some time constraints, but all teachers stated unanimously that they did not expect the length of time it took to implement the plan. Jamie had such a problem with central office support that it was difficult for her to implement much of the original plan. The new central office employee (hired in the summer) was not familiar with the TLEP or with Jamie’s leadership plan. It was a constant struggle and in her initial interview she was frustrated, saying:

Bad decisions being made above our pay grade and we’re just going to have to go with it and make it the best we can for our resident educators when they come out because the program is not, in our district is not what it should be.

Schwab (1978) explained with any theory, we always need to be mindful of the weakness and be ready to make changes accordingly. The participants were aware that changes to the original plan were possible but none of them seemed to expect the amount of time it would take to implement the plan. Courtney was in the classroom with one veteran teacher 36 times and met with him 40 times. Time to implement their leadership plan seemed to be the biggest adjustment that had to be made. Lois admitted to not valuing time at all prior to the TLEP but through her self change, she realized that time was a valuable component to making changes. She previously had not collected any data but began through her leadership plan because she knew the principal valued the
information. This substantial change in her had a positive effect upon her relationship with the principal as he valued the information in a quantitative format. Linda complained, “When I think that there’s something really great and other people aren’t understanding it and I’ve had to literally force myself to be patient with that kind of stuff.” When creating a climate of change, time and direction are necessary ingredients. Fullan (2007) studied educational change and agreed that “when standards of practice and cultural change are working together, we will create powerful mutually connected forces of change” (p. 929). Both structure and culture must be present to achieve this cultural change. It is evident that time (or lack of time) was a hindrance in implementing the leadership plans to their fullest but the participants made adjustments and learned to find wiggle room to implement their adjusted plans.

2. Supporting change in the beliefs of colleagues is a much harder process than the four participants anticipated.

All four participants reported that establishing trust, gaining support, developing trust, and supporting collegiality were very difficult to establish in the work environment. They had time during the TLEP to fully develop as a cohort, learning and growing together with their cohort. When returning to the school environment to initiate their leadership plans, this cohort was not in place. Instead, there was an agenda that was at odds with their leadership plan, limited time, and in two instances, little or no support from the administrator. There was some initial resentment about the leadership plans for two main reasons: federal mandates for the evaluation system, and in two of the schools, pending budget cuts.
When federal mandates enter into the school atmosphere, they are usually met with some anxiety and resistance until full disclosure of information is received. The new evaluation system is currently meeting with some of this resistance (Sawchuk, 2011) with teacher unions, not to mention the strain on local school boards to change board policy to include multiple mandatory walk-through observations, as well as re-creating evaluation tools. The new system will go into effect for all schools during the 2014–2015 school year. Professional development to receive certification for administrators and selected teachers is taking place in the current school year (2012–2013). The new evaluation system is more stringent and the labels of “effective, proficient, progressing and below proficient” will be used to classify all teachers after observation process. Because of the lack of information that has reached the teachers, there is hesitation on their part to embrace this process. Boldly put by Courtney when referring to teachers who are labeled in a below proficient category: “They feel an overwhelming amount of betrayal from colleagues, administration, the school district, and from the very teaching profession in which why had invested themselves. Now more than ever they need to make a life-altering decision.” This was one battle that the teacher leaders had to face when supporting the change of their colleagues.

Another major challenge was two of the school districts were facing major budget cuts, including letting go of personnel. The conflict of presenting the importance of curriculum wisdom in the schools was surpassed by the importance of survival in many homes. The two teacher leaders that were in these schools were constantly conflicted with getting the attention of teachers in their building, and then losing them to
announcements of additional cuts. They felt pulled as to the importance of the “problem” as people considered their livelihood over the leadership program.

Gomez, Black, and Allen (2007) know of the conflicts that teachers battle. The practice of teaching is riddled with tension and continual conflict but should be expected in the profession. The teacher leaders in these schools recognized and acknowledged the battle over the conflict of mandated change, job security and the leadership plans that were being initiated into their school system. Constant communication, building an environment of trust, and encouraging people with a positive attitude were some attributes that were utilized to support this transformation.

3. All of the teachers felt that they were able to see changes in their colleagues although all of them stated it was not as fast as they had hoped.

Although the above stated concerns plagued the implementation of the leadership plans, unanimously the teacher leaders felt they saw change in their colleagues. Evidenced in statements made in the leadership plan and in both sets of interviews, the volunteers in this study all agreed that they thought changes were being made. Linda was excited that people began listening to each other and one colleague actually came up with her own plan for increasing trust and collegiality into the building. Carina thought the most exciting change was the collaboration within her department and across the buildings. One of her colleagues who had the most difficult time with the changes softened to the point where he said, “I hate the collegial planning but I don’t hate it as much as I did last year. It feels different. We are getting things done.” Courtney changed to active listening and she was overwhelmed with the results. She relayed one
example of a colleagues change: “The ramification of this one incidence of leadership was shocking. I spoke to her the following day and she told me how she had changed her lesson plans for the rest of the week.” Jamie stated about her mentee, “both of us experienced growth, as she caught a glimpse of the possibility of creating a deeper understanding in her students and I worked to be a guide rather than a director.”

The amount of time that it took to make small advances, see small incremental changes, was frustrating and surprising to the teacher leaders but not inconsistent with Kegan’s (1994) research who acknowledged in studying change that it is a gradual process. As people go through a transformative change, they struggle to find their place in the bigger picture. Ryan (2011) stated the external and internal struggle that takes place when we rethink our ideas. When looking at core questions that confront our own reality, it is any wonder that this process would take time. The teacher leaders are re-presenting (von Glasersfeld, 1995) their newly nonreflective experiences and learning themselves along with their colleagues. They themselves had the support of professors, colleagues, and research material to support their growth; their colleagues did not have the time or support built into their day. The transfer of information may have been slower than anticipated, but is consistent with research and understandable with the existing environmental constraints.

Can it be stated that a transformative change where habits are disrupted and teachers seek the tools necessary to form new habits was established in the colleagues of the teacher leaders? Transformative curriculum leadership is the design of the TLEP; for teachers to embrace wisdom for problem solving and reflective inquiry, not only for them
but also to guide their colleagues. Consistently the participants felt that their colleagues had changed, but does it then follow that it would be sustained? It would seem that the behaviors of the colleagues in the work environment were changed evidenced in the multiple examples in the data collected. However, change in their mindset is not conclusively evidenced. That does not mean it does not exist, only that it is not possible to tell from this exploratory study. In order for transformative change to be sustained, both mindset and change in behavior must be employed (Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009).

*Question 3: After the Teacher Leader Endorsement Program ended, what factors supported or hindered the re-presentation of teachers’ change in beliefs about teacher leadership?*

1. Support for re-presenting ideas about teacher leadership to their colleagues was continued professional reading, collegiality and the timeliness of the Ohio Core Curriculum Standards (2007).

When teachers returned to their buildings during the TLEP and after it ended, they felt that they needed to go back through the assigned reading material from the class. They felt they needed to go back and read both to support their colleagues, as well as to dig deeper into what they remembered reading about leadership ideals. The participants felt they had not gained all the knowledge they needed because of time constraints during the TLEP; however as they re-presented the information to their colleagues, they all went back to the resources from class. They either re-read information that they had initially gleaned, or they shared the books with those with whom they worked. Either way, they
all referenced that they returned to various books from the TLEP as support for re-presenting their ideas to colleagues.

They all relied upon relationships that had been created while in the TLEP and created new collegial support groups in their school environment. As evidenced in the transcripts, the teacher leaders voiced that they needed and valued support from people who were trying to accomplish the same goals. The truth for one person is not the same for another (Kegan, 1982) so in order to look at different angles, the teacher leaders turned to the cohort from the TLEP or newly created support groups in their schools. Linda was especially excited about her on-line support groups and felt that her support was electronic more than local.

Interestingly two of the participants (Linda and Carina) thought the timeliness of the Ohio Core Curriculum Standards (2007) is a support for re-presenting ideas because the 3S design could be incorporated into the content. The fact that the Core Standards must be fully implemented by the 2014–2015 school year are being assimilated into the school culture at the same time the teacher leaders are introducing 3S design, proved to be a good fit. Many people were opening their minds to the curriculum wisdom concept (especially subject and self) because they could see the connection into the new standards.

2. Hindrances for re-presenting ideas about teacher leadership to their colleagues were budget cuts, lack of administrative support, lack of time, and pre-existing climate in the school. Hindrances for sustaining participant’s own change were also budget cuts and lack of administrative support.
Budget cuts that are taking place in schools were a constant struggle for two (Linda and Carina) of the participants in this study. Both Linda and Carina felt they were making gains with people, asking questions about curriculum, how they could implement lessons using 3S and then additional cuts were announced and their school colleagues literally retreated into their classrooms. School colleagues resorted back to a non-reflective state in the area of curriculum because the problem of job safety became a bigger problem. Maslow (1943) acknowledged that the need of safety (employment) is a need that is more prevalent than that of self-actualization. Exploring the 3S design in the curriculum wisdom paradigm quickly became secondary to the job security in both Linda and Carina’s buildings. These two teacher leaders had no known way to combat the pressure of these cuts; however they both used wiggle room to add curriculum suggestions when the opportunity presented itself. They were aware of the problem of the budget cuts, but instead of denying the problem existed, they recognized it and used small opportunities as they presented themselves to infuse classroom suggestions for 3S design. It took longer, but they looked at the cuts as a hindrance, not an impenetrable obstruction.

Administrative support (or lack of administrative support) was considered a deciding factor on opportunities to share information about the 3S design. Supportive administrators were considered allies, a sounding board for ideas, a resource for more time, and a support system for sharing information about curriculum wisdom paradigm to more people. Both Linda and Carina felt they had the support of their administrators and used this relationship to support growth in their buildings. Courtney felt supported at
times but other times apprehensive about the power struggle that she felt was an unresolved, underlying factor in being a teacher leader in her district. Jamie was not supported, and in fact, many times felt undermined by the administration in her district.

Research has demonstrated (Barth, 2001; Task Force on Teacher Leadership, 2001) that the success or failure of any school reform initiative is directly tied to leadership in the building. The Institute for Education Leadership (2001) reported and went into detail about the impact that the administrator has on building initiatives. Although the building’s leader (principal) plays a central role in the realization of change, there are some barriers that may interfere with the principal’s ability to participate fully in change. There may be a lack of control in their building (central office control) which would hinder any building based decisions that need to be made. There may be a lack of knowledge on the practice of leading people that is a genuine void in principal training. The consistent lack of support that Jamie received was a result in change over central office administrators that had not participated in the initiation of the leadership plan through the TLEP. As a result, there was a power struggle with the building administrator and central office to support any initiatives implemented by the leadership team. Kegan (1994) stated that in order for change to be successful, there must be administrative support from the old ways to the new changes: a supportive bridge from the old world to the new. Results from this study indicate that a number of faculty impacted by the leadership plans and the teachers’ frustration levels were directly related to administrative support.
The lack of time available for colleagues to meet and share information was a consistent strain. Even those participants that had built time into their schedule to meet with colleagues complained that it was not enough time. Consistently they felt if there was more time with their colleagues, there would be more gains. Lead learners are asked to have the courage to let go of their ego, to become an example of a person who embraces the challenge of discovering something bigger than themselves and sharing this experience with colleagues (Kesson & Henderson, 2010) but they felt there was not enough time to do so.

The pre-existing climate of the school was of concern for implementation of teachers as leaders (Task Force on Teacher Leadership, 2001). Eisner (1998) devoted a chapter of his book to school reform. He made it clear that it is easier to change and enforce school policy than to actually make change in the function of a school. Eisner noted that teaching is the only occupation that we are socialized into from the age of five. Anyone who has attended school is acclimated to how the climate is from kindergarten through high school. A lighthearted look at school culture is illustrated in analysis of drawings of children depicting their teachers (Weber & Mitchell, 1998), which supports the notion of how deeply embedded the socialization of schooling from a young age. In their book, student teachers were asked to draw themselves but had a very hard time because they had to “forge new identities by modifying images that they have held all their lives” (p. 31). Changing self-image of teachers to forge an atmosphere of democratic leadership and empowering students to do the same encompasses curriculum wisdom and must start with the teachers themselves.
3. Support for sustaining the personal change of the participating teacher involved ongoing observation of change within their own students or within the adults they worked with; along with continuing professional reading promoted in the TLEP.

Along with support of colleagues and professional reading, which were both mentioned as qualities for sustaining the change of their colleagues, one additional support for self change was seeing change in other people, both students and colleagues. This was a motivating factor for all participants. Studies that look at professional development and teacher change show that if teachers feel learning is taking place for their students when they make curricular changes, they are more likely to sustain that change (Guskey, 2002). There is a relationship between teachers seeing the success of implementing a new concept for their students and sustaining that practice. In a national sample of teachers, Garet et al. (2001) found that professional development that allowed teachers to go back into the classroom and obtain feedback on the curricular changes from their students had more intrinsic value for the teachers. The reports gathered on feedback after the professional development in this study showed a higher level for self change by the participating teachers. Three of the four participants (Jamie, Carina, and Linda) in this study talked about changes in their students and all four talked about valuing the change in colleagues as a support of their self -change.

Interestingly, in the Rationale for this Study, my personal findings showed an initial increase in the test scores of students by the teachers that participated in the writing about math professional development. This would certainly indicate a change in teachers
practice, but the scores were not sustained. The teachers saw change in their students’ test scores but that was not enough to sustain their change. Similar to the study by Garet et al. (2001), initial feedback was a higher level of self change in practice but in the writing about math initiative, it was not sustained. Unfortunately, there was no follow-up to the Garet et al. study for sustained change.

The teacher leaders in this study admitted personal change and one component of sustaining this change was supported by change they saw in their students and their colleagues. The teacher leaders came in with a plan to encourage their colleagues to become students of curriculum wisdom. Supporting this transition in their fellow teachers, encouraging them to embrace this wisdom is democratic leadership (Horton & Freire, as cited in Bell et al., 1990) and a motivational force for sustaining their own personal growth.

The underlying problem posed in this study begs the necessity to look at how we provide professional development as well as the need for further research into sustaining the change in teachers’ beliefs after professional development. This is discussed later in this chapter.

**Conclusions**

All of the participants in this study stated that the qualities in this study’s definition for meaningful professional development were important in changing their beliefs about teacher leadership. Even though each participant failed to indicate that all qualities were of high importance, when asked “What qualities of the TLEP were meaningful?” they repeatedly talked about the importance of each quality in their
leadership plan, their teacher leader narrative and/or the interviews. It is interesting to note that instilling democratic values and instilling curriculum wisdom were the two areas that were selected least frequently when asked the direct question of meaningful qualities, but were the two actually used the most when implementing the action plan into their school environment. This suggests that participants did not value the qualities during the TLEP, or even recognize that it was a part of the curriculum, yet they did value these qualities enough to encourage their use and model their messages.

All of the participants felt they had made a sustained change into a new non-reflective state as a result of the TLEP. There were multiple examples of this change throughout the transcribed interviews. All of the participants felt as though they were seeing changes in their colleagues as a result of the leadership plan that they had created in conjunction with the administration, although they all agreed it was a slower process than they had anticipated. There were multiple examples to support individual examples of changes in both the study participants and in their colleagues.

The main supports for participants to re-present ideas regarding teacher leadership to their colleagues were continued professional reading, collegiality, and the timeliness of the core content standards. The only difference in supports listed for their own personal change was the addition of seeing change in their students and in their colleagues. Hindrances were budget cuts, lack of administrative support, lack of time, and pre-existing climate in the school for supporting collegial change and budget cuts and administrative supports for their own person change.
Implications

Professional Development

There exists an abundance of research (Engstrom & Danielson, 2006; Korthagen, 2004) that suggests specific qualities to incorporate into professional development but limited research (Guskey, 2003; Lovett & Gilmore, 2003) that delves into the importance of sustaining the objective of that professional development. Most outcome based objectives measure student achievement which is not always the focus of the professional development. Outcomes of professional development need to be measured by the continual growth of the teacher, the possibility of a sustained change in beliefs of the attendees of the professional development, and the correlation that has on student achievement.

Presently, most schools hire providers of professional development that present a specific topic for a specific time. Schools need to take more of the responsibility to develop and sustain a pre-existing venue for presenting professional development, a venue for the dissemination of curricular objectives among the school community. The school would be the long-term provider of the platform of professional development and the content of the professional development (subject if you will) would be provided by the outside providers and considered secondary to the pre-existing venue for its dissemination.

We have the responsibility for providing eclectic professional development that is theory-based (Schwab, 1978) that provides for a continuity of experience (Dewey, 1938) where the participants seek out their own information through transformative change.
(Ryan, 2011) that is reinforced through re-presentation of experiences (von Glasersfeld, 1995). That participant’s curricular platform (Walker, 1971) is altered by pursuing their own change, by discussing their beliefs and views at the onset before the subject of the professional development is addressed. This platform supporting deep change needs to be created in the building and sustained so discussion of new concepts (new curricular changes) are offered in a pre-existing professional development platform. The participants in this study believed they had changed their beliefs about teacher leadership because the TLEP set the stage for this type of collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011) to come to fruition.

A recent article specifically on sustainable professional development mentions most of the elements in the above definition of meaningful professional development but considers sustaining professional development in a literal sense. McLester (2012) defined sustained professional development as occurring several times per week with teams that include teachers and administrators. Henderson and Gornik (2007) referred to this as district platform committee, the idea being to have a professional development platform in the school that is continuously in place. This then provides the platform for any initiatives that are incorporated into the school system. The platform for this professional development may include, but is not limited to: allows time to develop trust (Fullan, 2007, 2008), encourages administrative support (Horton & Freire, as cited in Bell et al., 1990), and incorporated collegiality (Brookfield, 1995) into collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011) while promoting change (Ryan, 2011) that is sustained (Kegan, 1982, 1994; Kegan & Laskow-Lahey, 2009) and is grounded in
instilling democratic values (Nancy, 2010) and curriculum wisdom (Henderson & Gornik, 2007). We need to elicit professional development that is meaningful; one that provides a continuity of experience (Dewey, 1938) that alters teachers’ curricular platform (Walker, 1971).

The participants in this study had a collegial planning team of some type but had not been exposed to the TLEP. Some of the schools were in the process of sending other people to the TLEP; some of the teacher leaders had to work on sharing out all information themselves. It would behoove the districts to have a team in place that understands the collegial reflective inquiry agenda. However, the teacher leaders who set out to share this inquiry with their building were undertaking the responsibility themselves using the TLEP cohort and professional reading as a support system. The change that the teacher leaders expected to see in their colleagues was happening but at a very slow (and frustrating) pace.

**Administrative Support**

Strong implications from this study support the absolute need for administrative support to maintain sustainability in professional development. All four participants saw repeated success because of the support of their administration or repeated failure due to the lack of support. There was increased stress on the part of one participant (Jamie) that had no administrative support and very little transfer of information to other colleagues. She knew she had changed, but in being permitted to work with only two additional colleagues, she felt she would not make much gain in implementing any further changes
to any other colleagues. She valued her self change and sustainability was supported by the motivation of change in the interest of her students.

One might ask, why would there exist a lack of administrative support? Freire (1997) would say that the administrator knows that giving up control would not be in his best interest. A fear of giving up the power could only be displaced by a struggle for liberation. Of course this may be an exaggeration in many instances but realistically, many people in positions of authority are genuinely conflicted about how much power they want to give up (Kegan, 1994). In relinquishing authority, there is an internal struggle for supporting the amount of initiating; correcting or evaluating principals want teachers to have. It is some of the same struggle that was evidenced by the participants in this study when they looked at leadership as a journey with their colleagues, a currere (Pinar, 2004) that encompassed collegial reflective inquiry (Henderson & Hackney, 2011) as its focal point. The authority of the principal over the teacher leader and the teacher leader over the teachers was a recognized struggle in this process.

**Using Teachers as Leaders**

There is a very difficult path that lies ahead in order to see teachers as leaders to support the implementation of the new evaluation system by the year 2014–2015. The schools that have opted to participate in the TLEP are very much ahead of positive implementation than those schools that choose not to participate. The concept of using teachers as leaders is primarily new and so there is little research that exists. What does exist supports the philosophy of using teachers as leaders (Walker & Soltis, 2009; WestEd, 2003) but also supports the above stated hindrances and hurdles to the success
of the program (Boyd & McGree, 1995; Johnson & Donaldson, 2007; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). The teacher leaders in this study ran into conflict (both by colleagues and by administrative staff) of time constraints, a pre-existing climate, and budget cuts.

Deep concerns for the schools that are not providing any quality professional development to support teachers that will be leaders in the school are a concern. Those teachers will not be equipped with the knowledge or the support system in place to make any significant, let alone sustained changes. If the teacher leader endorsement is to become a successful reality, we need to have a consistent form of professional development in place that prepares participants for the responsibilities that lie before them. The format utilized in the TLEP, one that focuses on a continuity of experience, the journey of understanding, and good judgment interplay, has seen success for these teacher leaders.

**Future Research**

Although there has been a consistent call for more research in professional development (Little, 1994; C. Smith & Gillespie, 2007) we need to look at the research that we have and develop a workable theory for curriculum development (McCutcheon, 1982) and incorporate that theory into practice. There exists a great deal of research on professional development and the connection between changing teachers’ beliefs and changing practice. This is commonly reflected in standardized measurement of test scores. In my many years of working with professional development, I believe it is a mistake to measure a qualitative result (change in beliefs) with quantitative measures
(student test scores). Research must be conducted into the professional development platform that is (or most likely is) not in place in our current educational setting.

Additional research needs to be conducted into sustained change in teachers’ beliefs as a result of meaningful professional development. There is currently such a limited amount of information on sustainability of professional development, it warrants questioning the amount of money that is spent by the federal government with very little research to support any lasting success. Specific research needs to be conducted on setting up, supporting, and sustaining professional development that is meaningful. The participants in this study believed that TLEP agenda was one that was meaningful. Research needs to be conducted into creating a climate that is conducive for a collegial reflective inquiry agenda. This exploratory study is only an initial look into what this platform might encompass. More questions than answers are produced because of this study. What makes professional development meaningful? How do we create an environment conducive to a deliberate curricular platform? How much time do we spend on creating the atmosphere for trust necessary for the group to contribute openly? Do all participants change because of the professional development or only some of the participants? If so, why?

A viable extension to the current study would be a longitudinal study done with the participants of this study to look at the collegial reflective inquiry agenda, specifically, to study the connections between the continuity of study experiences, the currere of the participants, and the elevation of the democratic pedagogy. Revisiting the participants at the end of an additional year, asking the same questions that were
addressed in the original study to further investigate sustainability of the collegial reflective inquiry agenda, would further support the conclusions presented here. This sample of participants who were self-selected all felt they had changed their beliefs as a result of the TLEP. The study took place over one year, six months of classes and six months after the classes ended, so allowing additional time to pass and then conducting similar interviews could only strengthen the findings of this study. Furthermore, research on the colleagues who the participants in the TLEP thought had changed as a result of their influence would be a viable study in transfer of information, along with how that transfer is taking place. The success or failure of re-presenting information from one colleague to another would be valuable information for future professional development agendas in communication from various platform committees.

Further research into utilizing teachers as leaders needs to be conducted. The topic is primarily new so very little research exists and there are many questions that need to be addressed. How do you choose the leaders? Do they volunteer? Does that make a difference? How are they building relationships with their colleagues? Does administrative support, or lack of support, affect the success of the program? If so, how and to what extent? What is the difference between teacher leaders who participate in the TLEP as compared to teachers who participate in other types of professional development (on-line, in-house, etc.)? Does one see more success than the other? Why? The questions appear endless.

Lastly, research needs to be conducted into how to best support administrators to make the transition from authority (standardized management) to more of a lead learner
focus. We are beginning the journey of assisting teachers to undergo this process of collegial reflective inquiry, but have neglected to incorporate the support for the administrators that must give up some of this authority in order for this initiative to be successful. The four participants who were a part of this study felt they saw more success or experienced more frustration in initiating and sustaining changes in their colleagues as directly related to administrative support, or lack of it.

**Concluding Remarks**

I thank the participants in this study for allowing me to read, analyze, and interpret their leadership plan and their teacher leader narrative. I further thank them for taking time out of their busy lives, with family obligations, professional commitments, and personal time constraints, to commit to the interviews that were conducted. I believe that these participants made sustained change as a result of the TLEP and their commitment (with no incentives except to pay information forward) is an excellent example of that change. They are outstanding examples of teacher professionalism in our current educational setting.

It is my hope that this study inspires additional research to support the platform of collegial reflective inquiry into our current professional development agenda. If there is one thing I have come to know, we need to provide a sustained platform of professional development that exists in our educational settings; one that is meaningful and provides a continuity of experience (Dewey) that alters teachers’ curricular platform (Walker, 1971). These are not just words to me now; they are my beliefs that have deeply changed as a result of this experience.
This is an initial, exploratory study on a sample of people who believe they experienced a sustained change in their beliefs about teacher leadership as a result of the TLEP. Collegial reflective inquiry is continuously undergoing theoretical refinements. If this study inspires additional research, either through examination of the findings or to investigate its faults, I will be satisfied. We need to be inspired to discover, scrutinize, and re-examine the deliberate curriculum platform that we desire to contribute and recognize the transformative powers in collegial reflective inquiry.
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Ohio Teacher Leader Standards

Teacher Leader Endorsement

Ohio Program Standards 2009
Grades P-12

The Teacher Leader Endorsement shall be issued to an individual who has successfully completed four years of teaching experience, holds a master's degree, and has met the program standards; who is deemed to be of good moral character; and who has been recommended by the dean or head of teacher education at an institution approved to prepare teachers in Ohio. The endorsement may be added to a professional teacher license.
Ohio Program Standards for Teacher Leader Endorsement

Performance-based standards
Ohio requires performance-based programs and program reports which must include candidate performance assessments. Performance-based assessments should be appropriate for the standards including multiple forms of measurement, and measurement at multiple points over a candidate’s progression through a program.

Licensure Rule 3301-24-05 (E) (19)
(19) Teacher leader (limited to a professional teaching license or professional or permanent teaching certificate), valid for mentoring and coaching teachers, providing staff development, and assisting the building principal in developing and supporting a shared vision and clear goals for the school. Candidates for the endorsement shall hold a master’s degree and have at least four years of successful teaching experience. The program of preparation shall include a practicum experience during which the candidate shall be required to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions at the distinguished level that are described in the Ohio standards for the teaching profession (available on the educator standards board’s website at http://esb.ode.state.oh.us).
## TEACHER LEADER ENDORSEMENT STANDARDS

**Standard 1. Candidates know and demonstrate skill in evidenced-based principles of effective leadership and teacher learning.**

1.1 Candidates articulate their knowledge of effective leadership to encourage high levels of performance for educators and students.

1.2 Candidates demonstrate skill in managing the change process by assisting and supporting teacher learning through professional development.

1.3 Candidates understand and apply strategies that assist adult learning and development.

1.4 Candidates respect the diversity of the school staff, teachers, administrators, and other personnel.

1.5 Candidates engage in reflective practice concerning leadership roles and responsibilities, and encourage reflective practice in others.

1.6 Candidates assume leadership roles at the school, district, state or national levels and in professional organizations.

1.7 Candidates facilitate the development of efficacy among other teachers in their school and district.

**Standard 2. Candidates promote the use of data-based decisions and evidence-based practice.**

2.1 Candidates serve as building leaders in the development, implementation, and continuous improvement of a comprehensive, cohesive, and integrated school assessment plan grounded in multiple measures and data sources.

2.2 Candidates collaboratively analyze assessment data to plan and implement differentiated instruction to meet student needs.

2.3 Candidates lead collaborative efforts to develop high quality classroom assessments among grade-level and content-area teachers.

2.4 Candidates support teachers in responding to the intervention process by designing, implementing, and gathering appropriate data and evidence.

2.5 Candidates identify resources (including instructional technology) and research-based strategies to support the assess-plan-teach-reassess cycle.
### Standard 3. Candidates facilitate a collaborative learning culture.

3.1 Candidates coach and model collaborative efforts to share knowledge and demonstrate interdisciplinary instruction among teachers.

3.2 Candidates nurture open and effective lines of communication with students, parents, other educators, administrators, and the community through professional learning communities.

3.3 Candidates work with stakeholders to identify appropriate resources for enhancing collaboration.

3.4 Candidates facilitate collaborative professional learning activities for educators, families, and the community.

### Standard 4. Candidates participate in developing and supporting a shared vision and clear goals for their schools.

4.1 Candidates participate in developing a shared vision for short-term and long term goals for ongoing school reform, and continuous improvement.

4.2 Candidates advocate for and initiate increased opportunities for teamwork to promote and support student achievement and other school goals.

4.3 Candidates participate in designing practices and structures that create and maintain an effective learning culture.

4.4 Candidates support other school leadership team members in advocating and communicating the school’s vision and goals.

### Standard 5. Candidates promote and model ongoing professional learning and improved practice within a learning community.

5.1 Candidates use their knowledge of professional standards, including the Standards for Ohio Educators to support teachers’ professional growth.

5.2 Candidates work effectively with individuals and groups of teachers by demonstrating the skills and competencies needed to teach adult learners.

5.3 Candidates demonstrate skills in serving as mentors and coaches to others.

5.4 Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate professional development activities for teachers.

5.5 Candidates engage in activities that promote reflective practices in others.

5.6 Candidates model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others.
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Syllabus for TLEP

EDAD 6/76531
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP
TEACHER LEADERSHIP ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM (TLEP)

This course is being adapted from a current course on instructional leadership. It is being repurposed for the Teacher Leadership Endorsement Program Cohorts.

Course Description
This course focuses on having teacher leader candidates develop skills in the leadership, management, and evaluation of quality and effective school and classroom instruction with colleagues. Teacher leaders are responsible for providing resources for effective instruction, which result in student learning. This course is designed to provide the tools that teacher leaders need to engage in the development, production, monitoring and evaluation of instructional methods and strategies. Teacher Leader candidates’ disciplinary learning will be monitored through a qualitative/quantitative formative evaluation instrument and a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN). As much as possible, course studies and experiences will be situated within an ongoing, cohort-based DPLC.

Purpose
The Teacher Leader candidates will develop knowledge and skills that will assist them to recognize, assess and support quality instructional practices with colleagues. The Teacher Leader candidates will demonstrate knowledge and skills in supporting effective instructional practices through a variety tools/interventions using reflective dialogue in the process. The candidates will also demonstrate their continuing engagement with the transformative curriculum leadership (TCL) discipline.

Course Objectives
- Identify and understand scientifically-based research and learning strategies to improve instruction and student learning.
- Assess quality instructional practices that result in student learning.
- Support effective instructional practices through a variety tools/interventions using reflective dialogue in the process.
- Cultivate an engaged understanding of the TCL discipline.
- Incorporate this disciplined study into the composition of a SPN that is due at the end of the course.
- Work with a critical friend on the ongoing composition of the SPN.
- Conduct a mid-course instructor and peer review of the ongoing SPN work.
Complete a qualitative/quantitative formative evaluation instrument focusing on disciplinary learning progress.

**Aligned OTL Standards**

- Candidates articulate their knowledge of effective leadership to encourage high levels of performance for educators and students. OTL 1.1
- Candidates engage in reflective practice concerning leadership roles and responsibilities, and encourage reflective practice in others. OTL 1.5
- Candidates collaboratively analyze assessment data to plan and implement differentiated instruction to meet student needs. OTL 2.2
- Candidates identify resources (including instructional technology) and research-based strategies to support the assess-plan-teach-reassess cycle. OTL 2.5
- Participate in designing practices and structures that create and maintain an effective learning culture. OTL 4.3
- Candidates use their knowledge of professional standards, including the Standards for Ohio Educators to support teachers' professional growth. OTL 5.1
- Candidates model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others. OTL 5.6

**Course Modules:**

- **Module 1 - Understanding and Recognizing Quality Instruction.** In this module, the Teacher Leader candidates will gather empirical research on effective teaching practices. Using this research, the candidates will develop a repertoire of quality instructional practices and be able to identify effective use of those practices in the classroom.
- **Module 2 – Use of Methodologies for Monitoring and Assessing Quality of Instruction.** In this module the Teacher Leader candidates will be able to identify protocols, routines, practices, and methodologies for observing, monitoring, and assessing quality instruction. Additionally, they will be able to use those methodologies (along with their repertoire of quality instructional practices) to identify strategies for improvement that will positively affect student learning.
- **Module 3 – Supporting Quality Instruction.** In this module the Teacher Leader candidates will be able to identify protocols, routines, practices, and methodologies for observing, monitoring, and assessing quality instruction. Additionally, they will be able to use those methodologies (along with their repertoire of quality instructional practices) to identify strategies for improvement that will positively affect student learning.

**Methodology:** Hybrid of classroom and online sessions to include lecture, discussions, case studies/scenarios, group work, writing activities, research, class presentations, field work.
Course Evaluation
- Class participation & application of module activities in-class, online, and on-site.
- End of module activities.
- Monitor disciplinary learning through formative evaluation instrument and a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN).
- Capstone assessment: Instructional Leadership Action Research Project.

Continuing Assessments: Completing a “Snapshot of your Journey of Understanding” and Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN).

A Snapshot of Your Journey of Understanding

Part I

With reference to your customary understanding of curriculum work and your interpretations of the three phases of understanding associated with transformative curriculum leadership, you are being asked to describe where you feel you are positioned on your professional development journey at this point in time. As you complete this snapshot, keep in mind that there are two general patterns of customary understanding: (1) a custom/habit of not making a distinction between educational management and leadership and (2) a custom/habit of not making a distinction between semi-professional and professional teaching.

1 – MY CUSTOMARY UNDERSTANDING (REVIEW YOUR BASELINE ESSAY) – summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

2 – MY EMERGENT UNDERSTANDING - summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

3 – MY ENGAGED UNDERSTANDING - summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

4 – MY GENERATIVE UNDERSTANDING - summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

Part II

Read each of the four questions below and mark on the line the point that captures your current ‘journey of understanding’ positioning.

Question #1 - I still feel immersed in my Customary Understanding
Not at All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question #2 – With reference to my interpretation of Emergent Understanding, I position myself in
An Early Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Intermediate Stage</th>
<th>An Advanced Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Question #3 – With reference to my interpretation of Engaged Understanding, I position myself in
An Early Stage       An Intermediate Stage       An Advanced Stage

Question #4 – With reference to my interpretation of Generative Understanding, I position myself in
An Early Stage       An Intermediate Stage       An Advanced Stage

Part III

Imagine that you will be a teacher leader for at least one project-based DPLC in a school or school district setting over the next three years and envision the resulting continuing growth of your understanding of 21st century professional leadership. How do you see yourself positioned with respect to your customary, emergent, engaged, and/or generative understanding at the end of that three-year period? As you respond to this question, keep in mind that your growth is a highly personalized process potentially involving a complex mix of customary, emergent, engaged, and/or generative understandings.

************************************************************************

Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN)

General Guidance

Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN) is a requirement in all four TLEP courses; however, keep in mind that this assignment is not tied to a grade. You are being asked to reflect on your journey of understanding. Where do you stand with reference to the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning? Please keep in mind that the goal is to engage in a personalized self-assessment through authentic, honest reflection.

Keep in mind the overall professional standard for Kent State’s TLEP, as well as the TCL discipline’s six problem solving components with its four qualitative outcomes and its three phases. There is a summary of these TCL features in the final section of this guidance.

Read the select pages in Nash’s “Tentative Guidelines for Writing Scholarly Personal Narratives.” Apply his advice as you see fit. Also review Rosie Gornik’s “Farewell Currere and Advice” in Henderson and Gornik (2007), which provides an overview of how she constructed her ‘journey’ narratives. Apply her advice as you see fit. A continuous self-monitoring of your ‘disciplinary’ professional development between now and the end of the course could be helpful when composing your SPN. To assist you with this monitoring, review the illustrative journey ‘signposts’ and use as you see fit. You may also want to review the
Specific Guidelines
You decide the appropriate length for your scholarly personal narrative. Use the following specific ‘currere’ questions to guide your SPN:

- What is in my past that works for and/or against making a commitment to this journey of understanding at the present moment?
- Can I envision a professional future where I, and hopefully other educational colleagues, practice this disciplined problem solving?
- In light of my present circumstances and with reference to current supports and obstacles, am I interested in initiating a personalized ‘journey of understanding’ through all three phases as I pursue my teacher leader endorsement? If so, what might I do to sustain this journey? Am I open to possible ‘transformations’ of my personal-professional identity? Am I determined not to give up or be deterred in some way?
- Considering feedback from a ‘critical friend’ in this class who has read a draft of my SPN, how do I see myself ‘positioned’ with reference to the illustrative signposts and/or any additional signpost(s) that I have added to the list?
- Am I satisfied with how I am positioned with reference to the professional standard for the TLEP Program:

  Teacher Leader Candidates Will Demonstrate that They Can Work as 21st Century Professional Leaders.

Illustrative Signposts
The following illustrative ‘signposts’ have been created to assist inspired, motivated educators in the instructor/self/peer-monitoring of their personalized journeys of understanding. These signposts are tied to the professional standard for the TLEP Program. They are a limited list, and more personally relevant signposts (pertaining to each teacher leader’s individualized journey of understanding) could be added to this list. In effect, these signposts are part of an ‘open set’ of possibilities.

  Illustrative Signposts: Customary Understanding

- My SPN indicates that I base my curriculum actions on the policy directives of external authorities. I don’t clearly distinguish educational management and leadership, nor between semi-professional and professional teaching.
- My SPN indicates that I don’t have a critical awareness of how standardized management may work against building teachers’ intellectual capacities.
- My SPN indicates that technical workshops are my ‘horizon of understanding’ for professional development.
- My SPN is limited to a discussion of my occupational responsibilities as a skilled technician.
- My SPN indicates no awareness of, nor interest in, specific applications of critical thinking, multidisciplinary inquiry, systemic deliberation and disciplinary evaluation.
Illustrative Signposts: Emergent Understanding

- My SPN indicates that I understand that instruction is situated in a larger educational ‘ecology.’
- My SPN indicates that I am still acquiring a critical distance from customary curriculum/instructional practices.
- My SPN incorporates a clear explanation of the transformative curriculum leadership ‘activity set’ with its four qualitative outcomes.
- My SPN expresses my personal ambivalences about transformative curriculum leadership.
- My SPN suggests that I am not sure that this interpretation of professional leadership is part of my vocational calling.
- My SPN notes that I am still contemplating possibilities for engaging in this disciplined way of living.

Illustrative Signposts: Engaged Understanding

- My SPN expresses my commitment to cultivate the personal discipline that transformative curriculum leadership requires. I indicate that I establish a critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline while developing an ‘inner’ problem solving discipline.
- My SPN makes reference to personal changes in my problem solving habits, which can be generally characterized as “habits of hope.” Shade (2001) explains this concept:
  
  Habits of hope are those habits by which we pursue—that is, seek and nurture—the realization of hope’s ends. They are vital and integral dynamics in developing hope, particularly in maintaining our commitment to its ends. …These habits either build connections between hope’s end and our current agency or, when agency is limited, expand it generally. (p. 77)
- My SPN clearly demonstrates that I understand the difference between a professional learning community (PLC) and a disciplined professional learning community (DPLC).
- My SPN contains evidence of my commitment to join and actively participate in a DPLC.
- My SPN contains evidence that I have initiated a more solitary practice of some or all of the elements of the transformative curriculum leadership activity set.
- My SPN contains personal expressions of moral imagination, transactional aesthetics, deliberative artistry and ethical fidelity.

Illustrative Signposts: Generative Understanding

- My SPN indicates that I am developing an identity as a teacher leader who can inspire and support my professional peers and other curriculum stakeholders.
- My SPN contains evidence that I am comfortable serving as an inspirational role model for the ‘habits of hope’ associated with transformative curriculum leadership.
● My SPN includes discussions of how I transact other educators as a teacher leader.
● My SPN contains evidence of “wiggle room” deliberations (Cuban, 2003) and resourceful negotiations (Walker & Soltis, 2004) with reference to working as a 21st century professional leader.

These illustrative ‘signposts’ are part of an open set of personally relevant ways to monitor the ‘journey of understanding’ component of this curriculum leadership. There, certainly, could be other ways that this could be accomplished. Furthermore, monitoring is part of a larger set of evaluative activities. There are many other ways that educators could evaluate their professional development progress in embodying and enacting this curriculum leadership.
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## SPN Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTL Category</th>
<th>Distinguished SPN</th>
<th>Accomplished SPN</th>
<th>Proficient SPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Candidates articulate their knowledge of effective leadership to encourage high levels of performance for educators and students.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is an exceptionally thorough, personally insightful and coherent narrative.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is a thorough, personally insightful and coherent narrative.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is adequate but lacks in thoroughness, person insights and narrative coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Candidates engage in reflective practice concerning leadership roles and responsibilities, and encourage reflective practice in others.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is exceptionally thorough and honest.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is thorough and honest.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is adequate but lacks in thoroughness, personal insights and narrative coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Candidates model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others.</td>
<td>The SPN is a highly inspirational model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
<td>The SPN is a good model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
<td>The SPN is an adequate model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The professional standard for KSU’s TLEP:

*Teacher Leader Candidates Will Demonstrate that They Can Work as 21st Century Professional Leaders.*

This is not a state-mandated standard tied to an external, accountability system. It is an invitational standard grounded in personal inspiration and guided by an internal sense of discipline.

Transformative curriculum leadership, which is introduced, explained and illustrated at a “Curriculum Leadership” website created by Kent State University, contains a set of six interrelated problem solving activities, which are presented in Henderson and Gornik (2007): critically thinking about educational standards from a democracy-in-education perspective, inquiring into the implications for facilitating student understanding, practicing the necessary systemic deliberations, establishing disciplinary professional learning communities, undertaking a continuous self- and peer-evaluation of the disciplinary learning, and initiating appropriate public education events.

There are four qualitative outcomes associated with the practice of this set of problem solving activities: *moral imagination*—envisioning education in a deep democracy; *transactional aesthetics*—gracefully affirming power-with and power-within dynamics in teacher-student transactions, teacher-teacher transactions, and other relevant educational stakeholder transactions; *deliberative artistry*—practicing a caring, case-based, far-reaching and eclectic decision-making; and *ethical fidelity*—embodying democratic values in educational transactions.

In general, educators who are interested in transformative professional leadership begin their personal ‘journeys of understanding’ from a customary and habitual perspective on what constitutes ‘good’ professional work. For shorthand purposes, this will be described as:

- **Customary understanding**...the journey of understanding has not yet been initiated; explanations are dictated by local customs and/or personal habits.

As inspired, motivated educators undertake their individual journeys of understanding, they will most likely go through three overlapping and interrelated phases: emergent, engaged and generative. These phases can be briefly described as follows:

- **Emergent understanding**... acquiring a basic comprehension of the critical thinking, multidisciplinary inquiry, systemic deliberation and disciplinary evaluation applications.

- **Engaged understanding**... acquiring deepening insights into this disciplinary learning through daily practice.

- **Generative understanding**... acquiring deepening insights into how to inspire and support professional peers’ (and other relevant educational stakeholders’) disciplinary learning in the context of specific teacher leadership projects.
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Capstone Assessment: Conducting an Instructional Leadership, Action Research and Field-Based Project

General Instructions for Candidates
This course requires your participation in and completion of an action research project for a local school or school system. You will choose an instructional leadership challenge supported by their principal and conduct an action research project. You are expected to apply readings and class discussions/activities to the successful completion of the action research project. The action research project will require reading, research, and demonstration (video and/or audio recordings or written narratives), as well as a written document comprised of the proposed problem or issue, a literature review, a collection of research-based quality teaching practices, methodology (including a collection of observation and monitoring tools), data collected, data analysis and reflection. Keep in mind that, as much as possible, course studies and experiences will be situated within an ongoing, cohort-based DPLC.

Action Research: Project Outline
1. Research Problem or Issue of Inquiry
   a. Concern with Quality Instruction
2. Background of the Problem and Literature Review
   a. What does the research say about the issue and proposed solutions?
3. Proposed Strategy(ies) to Address the Research Problem of Issue of Inquiry
   a. Rationalization for proposed strategy(ies) or hypothesis
4. Methodology
   a. Participants
   b. Context
   c. Data to be collected
   d. How to collect the data
e. When the data will be collected  
f. Analysis or protocol for collaborative inquiry  
g. Reflective practice and coaching conversations  

5. Findings and Conclusions  
a. What do the data indicate about the problem and proposed strategy?  

6. Next Steps  
a. How do I use this process and resulting data to influence continuous improvement for colleagues in their practice and continuous improvement for student learning?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTL Category</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Candidates collaboratively analyze assessment data to plan and implement differentiated instruction to meet student needs.</td>
<td>Models strategies for how to use of student data to inform and to implement targeted strategies for instruction.</td>
<td>Leads teachers to examine classroom assessment results to reveal trends and patterns in individual and group progress and to anticipate potential learning obstacles.</td>
<td>Assists teachers in the monitoring of student progress toward achievement of school and district curriculum priorities and the Ohio academic content standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Candidates identify resources (including instructional technology) and research-based strategies to support the assess-plan-teach-reassess cycle.</td>
<td>Works with principals and teachers to identify and use a variety of materials, strategies, and resources (including technology) to enhance instruction and improve student performance.</td>
<td>Assists teachers in the selection of appropriate instructional resources to support student and staff learning.</td>
<td>Identifies resources to support student and staff learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Candidates participate in designing practices and structures that create and maintain an effective learning culture.</td>
<td>Works with principals and staff to analyze, select and communicate institutional policies, procedures and practices that result in collaborative learning culture focused on improved student performance.</td>
<td>Actively supports and promotes institutional policies, procedures and practices that result in a collaborative learning culture.</td>
<td>Reinforces rules, guidelines and operational procedures that enable staff to focus on learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Candidates use their knowledge of professional standards, including the Standards for Ohio Educators to support teachers’ professional growth.</td>
<td>Synthesizes, analyzes and evaluates thoughtfully selected aspects of ideas or issues from the class discussion as they relate to mentoring and coaching.</td>
<td>Synthesizes clearly some directly appropriate ideas or issues from the class discussion as they relate to mentoring and coaching.</td>
<td>Restates some general ideas or issues from the class discussion as they relate to mentoring and coaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Texts, Reading Materials, and Other Resources

Primary Materials


Additional Resources

Leadership Literature


Data Collection, Analysis, and Decision-Making


Differentiation of Instruction and Tiered Interventions

Monitoring/Observational Tools

Engaging Students in Learning

Reflective Practice and Professional Learning
Course Overview

This graduate course is organized around two inquiry learning goals:

- To provide you with guidance on critically examining educational courses of action from the perspective of a cross-paradigm eclecticism.
- To provide you with guidance on how to extend this critical examination by functioning as a lead learner committed to the study and practice of a set of seven interrelated curriculum inquiries. These inquiries will be introduced to you in the following order: critiquing, self-examining, lead-learner initiating, envisioning, deliberating, negotiating, and public inspiring. The course’s definition of curriculum leadership is working as a lead learner for these seven inquiries.

Initial research indicates that there are three phases of understanding generally associated with the course’s two inquiry learning goals:

- **Emergent understanding**…there is a growing awareness of the vital importance of the seven curriculum inquiries.
- **Engaged understanding**…the cultivation and refinement of the seven curriculum inquiries is underway.
- **Generative understanding**…educators are gaining experience in how to work as a lead learners who initiate and facilitate the study and practice of the seven curriculum inquiries.

In most educational settings, these curriculum inquiries must be studied and practiced in work contexts infused with a 20th century operational ideology that can be characterized as behavioral proceduralism. Though standardized management applications dominate in these work environments, there are varying degrees of latitude for constructivist best practices and democratic ‘love of wisdom’ enactments. Consequently, it is difficult (though not impossible) to introduce, encourage and sustain the seven curriculum inquiries. In succinct terms, there is ‘wiggle room’ for embodying the democratic ‘love of wisdom’ that organizational mission statements promise.

What’s the ‘problem’ that is being addressed by ‘wisdom’ problem solving? John Dewey writes: “We have advanced far enough to say that democracy is a way of life. We have yet to realize that it is a way of personal life and one which provides a moral standard for personal conduct.” In general, educational organizations have mission statements that are based on democratic values; however, these institutions do not provide support for the daily curriculum inquiries that these statements require. Consequently, most educators are not ‘walking their talk.’ Why? Edmund Burke writes, “Hypocrisy can afford to be magnificent in its promises, for never intending to go beyond promise, it costs nothing.” Is this inconsistency between rhetoric and reality due to moral hypocrisy, to bad habits, to authoritarian customs, to a narrow technical rationality, to a
lack of understanding, or to some combination of these factors? Are other factors involved in this historical circumstance?

Why be concerned about this inconsistency? What are the consequences of this state of affairs? More to the point, how can educators facilitate 21st century learning when their curriculum and teaching work is embedded in a 20th century operational ideology? One response to such questions is to courageously, imaginatively and assertively practice a curriculum leadership that is guided by a commitment to democratic integrity. The rationale for studying and practicing this understanding of curriculum leadership can be stated as follows:

All nations on the planet are currently confronting and, hopefully, addressing information age conditions in a context of global and ecological interdependence; and many of these societies have democratic social contracts. Hence, it is vitally important that students cultivate an understanding of academic and/or vocational ‘subject matter’ that is embedded in an understanding of responsible democratic living.

**Course Design**

You will begin your study of the seven curriculum inquiries with a critical examination of three interrelated curriculum problem solving paradigms:

- **standardized management (SM)** with its focus on the problem of standardized outcomes. These outcomes are most likely standardized test performances that are enforced by state accountability mandates.

- **constructivist best practice (CBP)** with its focus on the problem of performances of understanding guided by one or more academic or vocational disciplines/traditions. This student learning orientation is, generally, the referent for ‘best practices’ in professional educational associations.

- **curriculum wisdom (CW)** with its focus on the problem of performances of understanding guided by one or more of the academic or vocational disciplines/traditions and by interpretations of democratic freedoms and responsibilities. These interpretations, which generally inform the mission statements of educational organizations, are part of an open, pluralistic set of possibilities. The focus of the curriculum wisdom paradigm can be succinctly summarized as integrating academic or vocational Subject matter understanding with a Self and Social understanding of responsible democratic living. For shorthand purposes, this will be called **3S understanding**.

Each paradigm is grounded in particular interpretations of such curriculum terms as “educational standards,” “student learning,” and “professional accountability.” Stated another way, the fundamentals of curriculum work are applied in different ways depending on the guiding problem solving paradigm. Collectively, the three paradigms can help you consider ways to constructively address the discrepancies and inconsistencies between the ideals and the realities of curriculum and teaching work.

There are complicated developmental and political tensions enveloping the three problem-solving paradigms, and you will read personal narratives that explore
these tensions. All three paradigms require disciplined learning through study and practice; however, this professional development commitment increases across the three paradigms. Educators who are inspired to cultivate a cross-paradigm critical awareness open the door to the possibility of working as lead learners with their professional colleagues and with a wide range of curriculum stakeholders including students, parents, school board members, and local community leaders.

There will be a discussion of an excellent illustration of this critiquing (critical curriculum inquiry) in our second class (June 15). This discussion will be followed by initial classroom experiences with the other six curriculum inquiries: self-examining, lead-learner initiating, envisioning, deliberating, negotiating, and public inspiring. You will complete this preliminary inquiry work by organizing a practitioner inquiry team that will provide each member the opportunity to practice working as a lead learner for one or more of the seven curriculum inquiries. You will have time for this organizational work at the third class (June 16), and your team will be asked to create a formal Inquiry Discussion Contract totaling 17.5 hours. The contract must be submitted by email no later than June 21st. If necessary, you and/or your team will be provided with tutoring support on June 21, June 28, July 7 and July 12. There will be class sessions focusing on team progress reports and required text readings on June 22, June 29 and July 6. Finally, there will be team presentations of your inquiry studies on the course’s two final days: July 13-14.

You will be asked to keep a journal of your ‘journey of understanding’ the course definition of curriculum leadership—working as a lead learner for seven curriculum inquiries—which not only serves as the organizer for this course but for the entire TLEP four-course sequence. In other words, this definition of professional leadership is the signature feature of Kent State University’s TLEP. You will be expected to compose a currere narrative that will be based on your journal reflections. Your narrative does not have a required length and will not be formally evaluated; however, you will be provided with ‘signposts’ to assist with this self-examining of your journey of understanding in this class.

Your currere narrative must include a documentation of your out-of-class learning commitment. This commitment counts as 100% of your course grade in accordance with the following guidelines: good work (B) = 50-75 hours, very good work (B+) = 76-99 hours, and exceptional work (A) = 100+ hours. Your currere narrative is due at the last class (July 14). There will be a discussion of the guiding parameters for this narrative self-examination at the first class (June 14).

You will also be asked to complete a self-examining form. Completing this form is a formal OBR requirement for Kent State University’s TLEP, so keep in mind that what you write on this form is a public document. Brief peer (critical friend) and instructor evaluations will be attached to your form. Your form with the peer evaluation is due at the last class (July 14). The instructor’s evaluation
will be completed by July 19 and emailed to you. Your completed form has no bearing on your course grade.

**Required Course Texts**


**Required E-Reserve Readings**


Julie’s currere narrative. (J)


## Course Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Background Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>Course overview; an introduction to the three paradigms and the course assignments; baseline statement.</td>
<td>H; HG: Preface-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15</td>
<td>Review of the three paradigms and course assignments; classroom work on the seven curriculum inquiries.</td>
<td>pp. 256-8; G; J; NA; Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16</td>
<td>Classroom work on the seven curriculum inquiries and team contracts.</td>
<td>B; LF; NO2; KO; RE; HG: 4, 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21</td>
<td>Team and individual tutoring sessions.</td>
<td>Team contracts due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>Team progress reports; class discussion of Henderson &amp; Gornik’s and Ryan’s texts and the self-examining form.</td>
<td>HG: 5-7; RY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28</td>
<td>Team and individual tutoring sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29</td>
<td>Team progress reports; class discussion of Noddings’s text.</td>
<td>NO1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>Team progress reports; class discussion of Klimek et al.’s text.</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Team and individual tutoring sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>Team and individual tutoring sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>Team presentations of inquiry studies.</td>
<td>Currere narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>Team presentations of inquiry studies.</td>
<td>&amp; self-exam form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Composing a Currere Narrative

#### General Guidance
Review Rosie Gornik’s “Farewell Currere and Advice” in Henderson & Gornik (2007), which provides an overview of how she constructed her ‘journey of understanding’ narratives. Apply her advice as you see fit. A continuous self-examining of your disciplined professional development between now and the end of the course will help you compose your narrative. Perhaps you’ll want to keep a journal. The signposts below may assist you self-examining. You decide the appropriate length for your personal narrative. Use the following specific ‘currere’ questions as a general guide:

- What is in my past that works for and/or against my journey of understanding the interplay of the three curriculum problem solving paradigms?
- Can I envision a professional future where I, and hopefully other educational colleagues, would collaboratively study and practice curriculum critiquing and the related six curriculum inquiries?
- Considering feedback from a ‘critical friend’ in this class who has read a draft of my currere narrative, how do I see myself ‘positioned’ with reference to the illustrative signposts below and/or any other signpost(s) that I have added to the lists?
Your Journey’s Pre-Phase and Three Phases

In general, educators who are interested in transformative curriculum leadership begin their personal ‘journeys of understanding’ from a customary and habitual perspective on what constitutes ‘good’ curriculum work. For shorthand purposes, this will be described as:

- **Customary understanding**…the journey of understanding has not yet been initiated.

As inspired, motivated educators undertake their individual journeys of understanding, they will most likely go through three overlapping and interrelated phases: emergent, engaged and generative. These phases can be briefly described as follows:

- **Emergent understanding**…there is a growing awareness of the vital importance of the seven curriculum inquiries.
- **Engaged understanding**…the cultivation and refinement of the seven curriculum inquiries is underway.
- **Generative understanding**…educators are gaining experience in how to work as a lead learners who initiate and facilitate the study and practice of the seven curriculum inquiries.

Illustrative Signposts of the Pre-Phase and Three Phases

The following illustrative ‘signposts’ have been created to assist inspired, motivated educators in the self- and peer-monitoring of their personalized journeys of understanding. These signposts are tied to the content in CI 6/7700, “Curriculum Leadership” and to the narrative assignment in this course. They are a limited list, and more personally relevant signposts (pertaining to each educator’s personal journey of understanding) could be added to this list. In effect, these signposts are part of an ‘open set’ of possibilities.

**Illustrative Signposts: Customary Understanding**

- My currere narrative indicates that I base my curriculum actions on the policy directives of external authorities and/or on the ‘constructivist best practice’ guidelines advanced by professional organizations. I don’t clearly distinguish curriculum leadership from curriculum management and/or instructional leadership.
- My currere narrative indicates that my referent for ‘good’ curriculum work is some form of curriculum management (SM paradigm) and/or instructional leadership (CBP paradigm).
- My currere narrative indicates that I don’t understand the distinction between the **standardized management** and **constructivist best practice** problem solving paradigms, particularly how these paradigms can be applied to Tyler’s (1949) “rationale.”
My currere narrative indicates that I am not aware of the dominance of the reductionist, efficiency logic of the Tyler rationale, nor do I have knowledge of critiques of this dominant logic that are part of the curriculum studies literature.

- My currere narrative indicates that technical workshops are my ‘horizon of understanding’ for professional development.
- My currere narrative is limited to a discussion of my occupational responsibilities as a skilled technician.
- My currere narrative indicates no interest, or perhaps a very limited interest, in curriculum study.

**Illustrative Signposts: Emergent Understanding**

- My currere narrative indicates that I understand that instruction is situated in a larger curriculum framework.
- My currere narrative contains evidence that I am aware of the pros and cons of the Tyler rationale.
- My currere narrative indicates that I am still acquiring a critical distance from customary curriculum/instructional practices.
- My currere narrative notes that I am still contemplating possibilities of studying and practicing the seven curriculum inquiries.

**Illustrative Signposts: Engaged Understanding**

- My currere narrative incorporates a clear explanation of the importance of the seven curriculum inquiries.
- My currere narrative expresses my personal commitment to study and practice these seven curriculum inquiries.
- My currere narrative expresses my commitment to establish critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline and, in its place, to cultivate an ‘inner’ inquiry discipline.
- My currere narrative makes reference to personal changes in my curriculum inquiry habits, which can be generally characterized as “habits of hope.” Shade (2001) explains this concept:
  
  Habits of hope are those habits by which we pursue—that is, seek and nurture—the realization of hope’s ends. They are vital and integral dynamics in developing hope, particularly in maintaining our commitment to its ends. …These habits either build connections between hope’s end and our current agency or, when agency is limited, expand it generally. (p.77)

- My currere narrative contains evidence of my commitment to join a practitioner inquiry community focusing on the seven curriculum inquiries.
- My currere narrative contains evidence that I am studying and practicing the seven curriculum inquiries.
Illustrative Signposts: Generative Understanding

- My currere narrative indicates that I am developing an identity as a lead learner who invites professional peers, and possibly other curriculum stakeholders, to join me in the study and practice of the seven curriculum inquiries.
- My currere narrative contains evidence of “wiggle room” deliberations and negotiations (Cuban, 2003) with reference to initiating and sustaining practitioner inquiry communities.
- My currere narrative contains evidence that I am comfortable serving as an inspirational role model for the ‘habits of hope’ that sustain curriculum inquiries.
- My currere narrative includes a site-specific lead learner plan of action that would be enacted in the context of my anticipated teacher leadership responsibilities (peer coaching, peer mentoring, etc.)
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EDAD 6/76542
PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES OF MENTORING
TEACHER LEADERSHIP ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM (TLEP)

This course is being adapted from a current course on supervision. It is being repurposed for the Teacher Leadership Endorsement Program Cohorts.

Course Description
This course focuses on developing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for Teacher Leaders to provide high levels of effective coaching and mentoring for improving teaching practices and learning for all students. Specific behaviors and approaches related to the tasks of mentoring, coaching and peer assistance will be examined such as direct assistance to teachers, group development, differentiation, observation skills, and knowledge of adult and teacher learning. Teacher Leader candidates’ disciplinary learning will be monitored through a qualitative/quantitative formative evaluation instrument and a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN). As much as possible, course studies and experiences will be situated within an ongoing, cohort-based DPLC.

Purpose
Effective coaches and mentors must possess the requisite knowledge base, interpersonal skills, and technical skills that will facilitate the merging of individual needs with organizational goals that place school improvement within a community and societal context. The candidates will demonstrate their continuing engagement with the transformative curriculum leadership (TCL) discipline.

Course Objectives
- Demonstrate how coaching practices relate to school mission/vision.
- Describe the coaching continuum and implications for its application during preservice, induction, and professional development.
- Demonstrate an understanding of coaching and mentoring protocols.
- Demonstrate the application of strategies used in various coaching roles.
- Engage in collaborative inquiry.
- Design and implement appropriate coaching and mentoring according to various scenarios.
- Understand the research base for high quality coaching and mentoring.
- Explain how knowledge and skills of teachers increase developmentally during transfer of training.
- Explain different skills associated with coaching, mentoring, and collaboration.
- Identify personal strength and growth areas of mentoring against professional mentoring standards.
- Understand the learning needs of diverse adult learners.
Reflect the characteristics of effective coaches and mentors, including listening, reflecting, providing constructive feedback, and collaborating.

Demonstrate efficacy during the coaching and mentoring process.

Conduct coaching processes in a manner that treats teachers and students fairly, equitably, and respectfully.

Cultivate an engaged understanding of the TCL discipline.

Incorporate this disciplined study into the composition of a SPN that is due at the end of the course.

Work with a critical friend on the ongoing composition of the SPN.

Conduct a mid-course instructor and peer review of the ongoing SPN work.

**Aligned OTL Standards**

- Candidates articulate their knowledge of effective leadership to encourage high levels of performance for educators and students. OTL 1.1
- Candidates demonstrate skill in managing the change process by assisting and supporting teacher learning through professional development. OTL 1.2
- Candidates understand and apply strategies that assist adult learning and development. OTL 1.3
- Candidates respect the diversity of the school staff; teachers, administrators, and other personnel. OTL 1.4
- Candidates engage in reflective practice concerning leadership roles and responsibilities, and encourage reflective practice in others. OTL 1.5
- Candidates support teachers in responding to the intervention process by designing, implementing, and gathering appropriate data and evidence. OLT 2.4
- Candidates coach and model collaborative efforts to share knowledge and demonstrate interdisciplinary instruction among teachers. OTL 3.1
- Candidates facilitate collaborative professional learning activities for educators, families, and the community. OTL 3.4
- Candidates use their knowledge of professional standards, including the Standards for Ohio Educators to support teachers' professional growth. OTL 5.1
- Candidates work effectively with individuals and groups of teachers by demonstrating the skills and competencies needed to teach adult learners. OTL 5.2
- Candidates demonstrate skills in serving as mentors and coaches to others. OTL 5.3
- Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate professional development activities for teachers. OTL 5.4
- Candidates engage in activities that promote reflective practices in others. OTL 5.5
- Candidates model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others. OTL 5.6
Course Modules:

- **Module 1 - Understanding the Research Base for High Quality Coaching and Mentoring:** This module explores how research on coaching and mentoring informs the work of Teacher Leaders who engage in these efforts. Teacher Leader candidates will investigate and use a range of coaching activities and strategies and develop expertise in identifying the needs of a coaching situation, applying differentiated coaching strategies, and using formative assessments to judge the impact of coaching on changes in teacher practice and student learning.

- **Module 2 - Designing, Implementing and Sustaining High Quality Coaching and Mentoring:** This module focuses on essential characteristics of effective coaches and mentors. Teacher Leader candidates will conduct self-assessments to identify areas of strength and opportunities for growth as well as participate in mock coaching scenarios to refine coaching and mentoring strategies and practice collaborative inquiry.

- **Module 3 - Protocols of Effective Practices:** This module focuses on effective practices of coaching. Led by the instructor, Teacher Leader candidates will participate in the process of “gradual release of responsibility” by observing various coaching scenarios and strategies; interacting and collaborating with other Teacher Leader candidates to practice strategies; and applying their new learning and problem-solving skills to a real coaching and mentoring situation.

**Methodology:** Hybrid of classroom and online sessions to include lecture, discussions, case studies/scenarios, group work, writing activities, research, class presentations, field work

**Course Evaluation**

- Class Participation & application of module activities in-class, online, and on-site.
- End of module activities.
- Monitor disciplinary learning through formative evaluation instrument and a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN).
- Capstone Assessment: Peer Developmental Supervision.

**Continuing Assessments:** Completing a “Snapshot of your Journey of Understanding” and Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN)

### A Snapshot of Your Journey of Understanding

**Part I**

With reference to your customary understanding of curriculum work and your interpretations of the three *phases of understanding* associated with transformative curriculum leadership, you are being asked to describe where you feel you are *positioned* on your professional development journey at this point in time. As you complete this
snapshot, keep in mind that there are two general patterns of customary understanding: (1) a custom/habit of not making a distinction between educational management and leadership and (2) a custom/habit of not making a distinction between semi-professional and professional teaching.

1—MY CUSTOMARY UNDERSTANDING (REVIEW YOUR BASELINE ESSAY)—summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

2—MY EMERGENT UNDERSTANDING - summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

3—MY ENGAGED UNDERSTANDING - summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

4—MY GENERATIVE UNDERSTANDING - summarize in 1 to 2 sentences.

Part II
Read each of the four questions below and mark on the line the point that captures your current ‘journey of understanding’ positioning.

Question #1 - I still feel immersed in my Customary Understanding
Not at All Somewhat A Lot

Question #2—With reference to my interpretation of Emergent Understanding, I position myself in
An Early Stage An Intermediate Stage An Advanced Stage

Question #3—With reference to my interpretation of Engaged Understanding, I position myself in
An Early Stage An Intermediate Stage An Advanced Stage

Question #4—With reference to my interpretation of Generative Understanding, I position myself in
An Early Stage An Intermediate Stage An Advanced Stage

Part III
Imagine that you will be a teacher leader for at least one project-based DPLC in a school or school district setting over the next three years and envision the resulting continuing growth of your understanding of 21st century professional leadership. How do you see yourself positioned with respect to your customary, emergent, engaged, and/or generative understanding at the end of that three-year period? As you respond to this question, keep
in mind that your growth is a highly personalized process potentially involving a complex mix of customary, emergent, engaged, and/or generative understandings.

**********************************************************************************************

Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN)

General Guidance

Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN) is a requirement in all four TLEP courses; however, keep in mind that this assignment is not tied to a grade. You are being asked to reflect on your journey of understanding. Where do you stand with reference to the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning? Please keep in mind that the goal is to engage in a personalized self-assessment through authentic, honest reflection.

Keep in mind the overall professional standard for Kent State’s TLEP, as well as the TCL discipline’s six problem solving components with its four qualitative outcomes and its three phases. There is a summary of these TCL features in the final section of this guidance.

Read the select pages in Nash’s “Tentative Guidelines for Writing Scholarly Personal Narratives.” Apply his advice as you see fit. Also review Rosie Gornik’s “Farewell Currere and Advice” in Henderson and Gornik (2007), which provides an overview of how she constructed her ‘journey’ narratives. Apply her advice as you see fit. A continuous self-monitoring of your ‘disciplinary’ professional development between now and the end of the course could be helpful when composing your SPN. To assist you with this monitoring, review the illustrative journey ‘signposts’ and use as you see fit. You may also want to review the

Specific Guidelines

You decide the appropriate length for your scholarly personal narrative. Use the following specific ‘currere’ questions to guide your SPN:

- What is in my past that works for and/or against making a commitment to this journey of understanding at the present moment?
- Can I envision a professional future where I, and hopefully other educational colleagues, practice this disciplined problem solving?
- In light of my present circumstances and with reference to current supports and obstacles, am I interested in initiating a personalized ‘journey of understanding’ through all three phases as I pursue my teacher leader endorsement? If so, what might I do to sustain this journey? Am I open to possible ‘transformations’ of my personal-professional identity? Am I determined not to give up or be deterred in some way?
- Considering feedback from a ‘critical friend’ in this class who has read a draft of my SPN, how do I see myself ‘positioned’ with reference to the illustrative signposts and/or any additional signpost(s) that I have added to the list?
- Am I satisfied with how I am positioned with reference to the professional standard for the TLEP Program:
Teacher Leader Candidates Will Demonstrate that They Can Work as 21st Century Professional Leaders.

Illustrative Signposts
The following illustrative ‘signposts’ have been created to assist inspired, motivated educators in the instructor/self/peer-monitoring of their personalized journeys of understanding. These signposts are tied to the professional standard for the TLEP Program. They are a limited list, and more personally relevant signposts (pertaining to each teacher leader’s individualized journey of understanding) could be added to this list. In effect, these signposts are part of an ‘open set’ of possibilities.

Illustrative Signposts: Customary Understanding
- My SPN indicates that I base my curriculum actions on the policy directives of external authorities. I don’t clearly distinguish educational management and leadership, nor between semi-professional and professional teaching.
- My SPN indicates that I don’t have a critical awareness of how *standardized management* may work against building teachers’ intellectual capacities.
- My SPN indicates that technical workshops are my ‘horizon of understanding’ for professional development.
- My SPN is limited to a discussion of my occupational responsibilities as a skilled technician.
- My SPN indicates no awareness of, nor interest in, specific applications of critical thinking, multidisciplinary inquiry, systemic deliberation and disciplinary evaluation.

Illustrative Signposts: Emergent Understanding
- My SPN indicates that I understand that instruction is situated in a larger educational ‘ecology.’
- My SPN indicates that I am still acquiring a critical distance from customary curriculum/instructional practices.
- My SPN incorporates a clear explanation of the transformative curriculum leadership ‘activity set’ with its four qualitative outcomes.
- My SPN expresses my personal ambivalences about transformative curriculum leadership.
- My SPN suggests that I am not sure that this interpretation of professional leadership is part of my vocational calling.
- My SPN notes that I am still contemplating possibilities for engaging in this disciplined way of living.

Illustrative Signposts: Engaged Understanding
- My SPN expresses my commitment to cultivate the personal discipline that transformative curriculum leadership requires. I indicate that I establish a critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline while developing an ‘inner’ problem solving discipline.
My SPN makes reference to personal changes in my problem solving habits, which can be generally characterized as “habits of hope.” Shade (2001) explains this concept:

Habits of hope are those habits by which we pursue—that is, seek and nurture—the realization of hope’s ends. They are vital and integral dynamics in developing hope, particularly in maintaining our commitment to its ends. …These habits either build connections between hope’s end and our current agency or, when agency is limited, expand it generally. (p.77)

My SPN clearly demonstrates that I understand the difference between a professional learning community (PLC) and a disciplined professional learning community (DPLC).

My SPN contains evidence of my commitment to join and actively participate in a DPLC.

My SPN contains evidence that I have initiated a more solitary practice of some or all of the elements of the transformative curriculum leadership activity set.

My SPN contains personal expressions of moral imagination, transactional aesthetics, deliberative artistry and ethical fidelity.

Illustrative Signposts: Generative Understanding

My SPN indicates that I am developing an identity as a teacher leader who can inspire and support my professional peers and other curriculum stakeholders.

My SPN contains evidence that I am comfortable serving as an inspirational role model for the ‘habits of hope’ associated with transformative curriculum leadership.

My SPN includes discussions of how I transact other educators as a teacher leader.

My SPN contains evidence of “wiggle room” deliberations (Cuban, 2003) and resourceful negotiations (Walker & Soltis, 2004) with reference to working as a 21st century professional leader.

These illustrative ‘signposts’ are part of an open set of personally relevant ways to monitor the ‘journey of understanding’ component of this curriculum leadership. There, certainly, could be other ways that this could be accomplished. Furthermore, monitoring is part of a larger set of evaluative activities. There are many other ways that educators could evaluate their professional development progress in embodying and enacting this curriculum leadership.
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### SPN Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTL Category</th>
<th>Distinguished SPN</th>
<th>Accomplished SPN</th>
<th>Proficient SPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Candidates articulate their knowledge of effective leadership to encourage high levels of performance for educators and students.</td>
<td>With reference to 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is an exceptionally thorough, personally insightful and coherent narrative.</td>
<td>With reference to 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is thorough, personally insightful and coherent narrative.</td>
<td>With reference to 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is adequate but lacks in thoroughness, personal insights and narrative coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Candidates engage in reflective practice concerning leadership roles and responsibilities, and encourage reflective practice in others.</td>
<td>With reference to 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is exceptionally thorough and honest.</td>
<td>With reference to 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is thorough and honest.</td>
<td>With reference to 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is adequate but lacks in thoroughness, personal insights and narrative coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Candidates model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others.</td>
<td>The SPN is a highly inspirational model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
<td>The SPN is good model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
<td>The SPN is an adequate model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The professional standard for KSU’s TLEP:

Teacher Leader Candidates Will Demonstrate that They Can Work as 21st Century Professional Leaders.

This is not a state-mandated standard tied to an external, accountability system. It is an invitational standard grounded in personal inspiration and guided by an internal sense of discipline.

Transformative curriculum leadership, which is introduced, explained and illustrated at a “Curriculum Leadership” website created by Kent State University, contains a set of six interrelated problem solving activities, which are presented in Henderson and Gornik (2007): critically thinking about educational standards from a democracy-in-education perspective, inquiring into the implications for facilitating student understanding, practicing the necessary systemic deliberations, establishing disciplinary professional learning communities, undertaking a continuous self- and peer-evaluation of the disciplinary learning, and initiating appropriate public education events.

There are four qualitative outcomes associated with the practice of this set of problem solving activities: moral imagination—envisioning education in a deep democracy; transactional aesthetics—gracefully affirming power-with and power-within dynamics in teacher-student transactions, teacher-teacher transactions, and other relevant educational stakeholder transactions; deliberative artistry—practicing a caring, case-based, far-reaching and eclectic decision-making; and ethical fidelity—embodying democratic values in educational transactions.

In general, educators who are interested in transformative professional leadership begin their personal ‘journeys of understanding’ from a customary and habitual perspective on what constitutes ‘good’ professional work. For shorthand purposes, this will be described as:

- **Customary understanding**...the journey of understanding has not yet been initiated; explanations are dictated by local customs and/or personal habits.

  As inspired, motivated educators undertake their individual journeys of understanding, they will most likely go through three overlapping and interrelated phases: emergent, engaged and generative. These phases can be briefly described as follows:

  - **Emergent understanding**... acquiring a basic comprehension of the critical thinking, multidisciplinary inquiry, systemic deliberation and disciplinary evaluation applications.

  - **Engaged understanding**... acquiring deepening insights into this disciplinary learning through daily practice.

  - **Generative understanding**... acquiring deepening insights into how to inspire and support professional peers’ (and other relevant educational stakeholders’) disciplinary learning in the context of specific teacher leadership projects.
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**Capstone Assessment:** Candidates observe a new/young teacher in their building to apply collaborative coaching skills.

**General Instructions for Candidates**
This assessment requires you to conduct a pre-conference, classroom observation, and a post-conference as a means to better understand and apply dimensions of coaching and mentoring. You will be using the process and format discussed in class. Keep in mind that, as much as possible, course studies and experiences will be situated within an ongoing, cohort-based DPLC.

**Pre-Conference, Classroom Observation, Post-Conference: Project Outline**

**Instructions for Pre-Conference:** Conduct a pre-conference using guidelines from class and components for professional practice. Must address:
- Domains & Components of a Framework for Professional Practice, especially Domain 1: Planning for Instruction.
- Extensive teacher commentary pertaining to the observation setting.
- Collaborative chosen observational focus and why.

**Instructions for Classroom Observation:** Based on the focus of the lesson, which is a collaborated result of the pre-conference, use an appropriate observation technique to gather the pertinent data. Analyze and make inferences from the data to use in the post conferences. Must address:
- How the chosen observation technique was applied.

**Instructions for Post-Conference:** Write-up how you would conduct a post-conference using appropriate supervisory approaches and behaviors. Provide recommendations for professional growth. Must address:
• Post-observation form provides the appropriate recommendations for professional growth with correct utilization of supervisory behaviors and approaches.

Instructions for Writing a Reflective Essay (as correlated with the Standards): Write a 3-page, double-spaced reflective essay that describes:
• How you articulated the district/school mission, vision, and goals throughout the supervisory process.
• How your use of developmental supervision is aimed at enhancing student learning.
• How you applied coaching frameworks of developmental and differentiated supervision in this activity.
• Your process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information and data throughout the coaching process to promote professional growth.
• How you demonstrated fair, equitable, and ethical principles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OTL Category</strong></th>
<th><strong>Distinguished</strong></th>
<th><strong>Accomplished</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proficient</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Candidates demonstrate skill in managing the change process by assisting and supporting teacher learning through professional development.</td>
<td>Collaboratively assess the impact of professional development on multiple levels including participant satisfaction and knowledge, organizational impact and changes in student achievement.</td>
<td>Uses data to determine if professional development activities strengthen teachers’ instructional skills to enhance student learning.</td>
<td>Facilitates professional development opportunities that support classroom instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Candidates understand and apply strategies that assist adult learning and development.</td>
<td>Provides teachers a variety of opportunities for professional growth that address their appropriate developmental level and is based in effective practices I adult learning.</td>
<td>Builds on staff’s skills and interests to advance the teaching capacity of all.</td>
<td>Mentors and coaches teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Candidates respect the diversity of the school staff; teachers, administrators, and other personnel.</td>
<td>Candidate, in collaboration with staff, integrates culturally responsive practices into all practices.</td>
<td>Models proactive strategies to promote tolerance and addresses incidents of intolerance.</td>
<td>Models appreciation and respect for the cultures of the school and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Candidates support teachers in responding to the intervention process by designing, implementing, and gathering appropriate data and evidence.</td>
<td>Develops and generates tools to systematically collect, analyze, and synthesize multiple sources of data to improve instructional practices.</td>
<td>Collects, analyzes, interprets and uses data to assist teachers to improve instruction.</td>
<td>Uses data to inform and make decisions about instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Candidates coach and model</td>
<td>Makes systematic and frequent classroom visits</td>
<td>Guides teachers in the implementation</td>
<td>Analyzes and recommends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative efforts to share knowledge and demonstrate interdisciplinary instruction among teachers.</td>
<td>and provide feedback on classroom instruction that includes modeling the use of varied instructional methods and formats to make learning experiences relevant and responsive to the needs of students with different abilities and from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>of research-based instructional practices.</td>
<td>Instructional practices that result in improved student performance system-wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4 Candidates</strong> facilitate collaborative professional learning activities for educators, families, and the community.</td>
<td>Works with principal to create a system that allows staff, students, parents and community members increasing levels of autonomy in decision making about effective instructional practices.</td>
<td>Works with principal to involve staff, students, parents and community members in school governance, curricular and instructional decisions.</td>
<td>Seeks input from staff, students, parents and community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Candidates</strong> use their knowledge of professional standards, including the Standards for Ohio Educators to support teachers’ professional growth.</td>
<td>Designs and develops aligned systems of curriculum, instruction and assessment at the building level.</td>
<td>Leads staff in the analysis and revision of standards, curriculum and instructional alignment.</td>
<td>Monitors the integration and implementation of academic standards in curriculum and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2 Candidates</strong> work effectively with individuals and groups of teachers by demonstrating the skills and competencies</td>
<td>Designs, develops, and models personalized opportunities for professional development to enhance individual and group content knowledge and pedagogical skills.</td>
<td>Leads opportunities for professional development to improve individual and group content knowledge and pedagogical skills.</td>
<td>Encourages and suggests strategies for teachers to participate in professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Candidates demonstrate skills in serving as mentors and coaches to others.</td>
<td>Monitors the use of varied instructional methods and formats to make learning experiences relevant and responsive to the needs of students with different abilities and from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>Guides staff in the implementation of research-based instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Candidates</td>
<td>develop, implement, and evaluate professional development activities for teachers.</td>
<td>Works collaboratively with principal and teachers to assess the impact of professional development on multiple levels including participant satisfaction and knowledge, organizational impact and changes in student achievement.</td>
<td>Uses data to determine if professional development activities strengthen teachers’ instructional skills to enhance student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Candidates</td>
<td>engage in activities that promote reflective practices in others.</td>
<td>Models and assists teachers to make thoughtful and accurate assessments of instructional and the extent to which it achieved its goals.</td>
<td>Asks questions that facilitates teacher examination of instructional practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Candidates</td>
<td>model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others.</td>
<td>Applies personal and professional code of ethics that is reflected in behaviors and values of staff in the teaching and learning process.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics in all dealings with staff and students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Texts, Reading Materials, and Other Resources

Required


References (also source materials for modules):


Course Description

This practicum/internship serves as the capstone experience in a sequence of the four advanced, school-site, project-based, hybrid courses that constitute Kent State University’s Teacher Leadership Endorsement Program (TLEP). The TLEP has the overall goal of preparing experienced teachers to work as professional leaders who can thoughtfully address the challenges of facilitating twenty-first century learning. Teacher leader candidates will learn ways to assist school principals in developing and supporting a shared educational vision and clear curriculum goals that result in appropriate instructional leadership, action research, staff development, peer mentoring and peer coaching practices. In sum, the TLEP will facilitate support of Ohio’s Teacher Residency and Master Teacher programs by preparing dedicated, experienced educators to serve as teacher leaders who can facilitate the emergence of 21st century learning communities, manage paradigm conflict, and support professional peers at all stages of their careers.

Teacher leader candidates will begin by reviewing the key foundational concepts in the prior three TLEP courses and reflecting on their disciplinary learning progress. The candidates will then design and enact a teacher leadership plan in a local setting; and as part of this specific application of the knowledge, skills and practices they have acquired, they will be challenged to address the generative phase of the transformative curriculum leadership (TCL) discipline. As was the case with the other three courses, their continued work on this value-added approach to teacher leadership will be monitored through the ‘snapshot’ evaluation instrument and the Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN).

Purpose

Facilitate support of Ohio’s Teacher Residency and Master Teacher programs by preparing teachers to serve as disciplinary professional leaders focusing on 21st century learning; provide the necessary disciplined study, capacity-building and project-based experiences to master this challenging professional standard; employ the skills of working with adult learners, managing conflict, and coaching and mentoring teachers at all stages of their careers; facilitate and lead change by assisting school principals in developing a shared vision, clear goals and appropriate staff development. The Teacher Leader candidates will demonstrate their continuing engagement with the four components of TCL disciplinary learning.
Course Objectives

- Demonstrate a deep understanding of teachers working as 21st century professional leaders through the development and enactment of a teacher leadership project.
- Resourcefully solicit the support of the faculty, the building/district administration, students’ parents and community representatives in the development and enactment of the teacher leadership project.
- Engage in negotiation strategies that achieve working agreement, provide principled decisions, work constructively with teachers, seek substantial lasting improvement, face conflict constructively, and combine curriculum with other initiatives.
- Conduct self-assessments to help monitor a personalized journey of understanding as a teacher leader.
- Coach and mentor teachers at all stages of their careers to at least an emergent level of understanding of 21st century professional leadership.
- Assist and inspire others to start on their own personal journeys of understanding through disciplinary mentoring, peer coaching and instructional leadership.
- Conduct a peer-assessment of teachers, targeting at least an emergent level of understanding of 21st century professional leadership.
- Cultivate the personal discipline that this professional leadership requires.
- Inspire in others the personal discipline this professional leadership requires.
- Incorporate this disciplined study into the composition of a SPN that is due at the end of the course.
- Work with a critical friend on the ongoing composition of the SPN.
- Conduct a mid-course instructor and peer review of the ongoing SPN work.
- Complete a qualitative/quantitative formative evaluation instrument focusing on disciplinary learning progress.

Aligned to OTL Standards

- Candidates articulate their knowledge of effective leadership to encourage high levels of performance for educators and students. OTL 1.1
- Candidates demonstrate skill in managing the change process by assisting and supporting teacher learning through professional development. OTL 1.2
- Candidates understand and apply strategies that assist adult learning and development. OTL 1.3
- Candidates respect the diversity of the school staff; teachers, administrators, and other personnel. OTL 1.4
- Candidates engage in reflective practice concerning leadership roles and responsibilities, and encourage reflective practice in others. OTL 1.5
- Candidates assume leadership roles at the school, district, state or national levels and in professional organizations. OTL 1.6
Candidates facilitate the development of efficacy among other teachers in their school and district. OTL 1.7
Candidates serve as building leaders in the development, implementation, and continuous improvement of a comprehensive, cohesive, and integrated school assessment plan grounded in multiple measures and data sources. OTL 2.1
Candidates support teachers in responding to the intervention process by designing, implementing, and gathering appropriate data and evidence. OTL 2.4
Candidates coach and model collaborative efforts to share knowledge and demonstrate interdisciplinary instruction among teachers. OTL 3.1
Candidates nurture open and effective lines of communication with students, parents, other educators, administrators, and the community through professional learning communities. OTL 3.2
Candidates work with stakeholders to identify appropriate resources for enhancing collaboration. OTL 3.3
Candidates facilitate collaborative professional learning activities for educators, families, and the community. OTL 3.4
Candidates participate in developing a shared vision for short-term and long term goals for ongoing school reform, and continuous improvement. OTL 4.1
Candidates advocate for and initiate increased opportunities for teamwork to promote and support student achievement and other school goals. OTL 4.2
Candidates participate in designing practices and structures that create and maintain an effective learning culture. OTL 4.3
Candidates support other school leadership team members in advocating and communicating the school's vision and goals. OTL 4.4
Candidates use their knowledge of professional standards, including the Standards for Ohio Educators to support teachers' professional growth. OTL 5.1
Candidates work effectively with individuals and groups of teachers by demonstrating the skills and competencies needed to teach adult learners. OTL 5.2
Candidates demonstrate skills in serving as mentors and coaches to others. OTL 5.3
Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate professional development activities for teachers. OTL 5.4
Candidates engage in activities that promote reflective practices in others. OTL 5.5
Candidates model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others. OTL 5.6

Course Modules:
- **Module 1—Review Teacher Leadership Skills and Practices and Reflect on Disciplinary Learning.** The overall goal of KSU’s TLEP program is to prepare Teacher Leader candidates to work as professional leaders who can thoughtfully
address the challenges of facilitating students’ twenty-first century learning. The previous three courses in the TLEP sequence: Curriculum Leadership, Instructional Leadership and Principles and Techniques of Supervision have introduced a particular interpretation of teacher leadership and have addressed the key skills and practices associated with this interpretation. In this module, candidates will review these teacher leader skills and practices and reflect back on their disciplinary learning in the first three courses.

- **Module 2—Design and Enact a Teacher Leadership Plan.** Fortified with a deep understanding of what it means to work as a 21st century professional leader, candidates will design and enact a teacher leadership project in their local setting. This project will incorporate the key teacher leadership skills and practices that they have studied and will, to the degree possible, embody the engaged and generative phases of understanding TCL disciplinary learning.

- **Module 3—Anticipate Future Teacher Leadership Growth.** Candidates will present and discuss their final work on their qualitative/quantitative formative evaluation and their SPN with reference to their continuing education and growth (beyond the TLEP four-course sequence) as 21st century professional leaders. Possibilities of maintaining informal networking will be discussed.

**Methodology:** Hybrid of classroom and online sessions to include lecture, discussions, case studies/scenarios, group work, writing activities, research, class presentations, field work.

**Course Evaluation**
- Class participation & application of module activities in-class, online, and onsite.
- End of module activities.
- Monitor disciplinary learning through formative evaluation instrument and a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN).
- Capstone assessment: Teacher Leadership Plan.

**Continuing Assessments:** Completing a “Snapshot of your Journey of Understanding” and Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN)

**A Snapshot of Your Journey of Understanding**

**Part I**

With reference to your customary understanding of curriculum work and your interpretations of the three phases of understanding associated with transformative curriculum leadership, you are being asked to describe where you feel you are positioned on your professional development journey at this point in time. As you complete this snapshot, keep in mind that there are two general patterns of customary understanding: (1) a custom/habit of not making a distinction between educational management and
leadership and (2) a custom/habit of not making a distinction between semi-professional and professional teaching.

1—**My Customary Understanding (Review Your Baseline Essay)**—

**SUMMARIZE IN 1 TO 2 SENTENCES.**

2—**My Emergent Understanding** - **SUMMARIZE IN 1 TO 2 SENTENCES.**

3—**My Engaged Understanding** - **SUMMARIZE IN 1 TO 2 SENTENCES.**

4—**My Generative Understanding** - **SUMMARIZE IN 1 TO 2 SENTENCES.**

**Part II**
Read each of the four questions below and mark on the line the point that captures your current ‘journey of understanding’ positioning.

**Question #1** - I still feel immersed in my *Customary Understanding*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question #2**—With reference to my interpretation of *Emergent Understanding*, I position myself in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Early Stage</th>
<th>An Intermediate Stage</th>
<th>An Advanced Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question #3**—With reference to my interpretation of *Engaged Understanding*, I position myself in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Early Stage</th>
<th>An Intermediate Stage</th>
<th>An Advanced Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question #4**—With reference to my interpretation of *Generative Understanding*, I position myself in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Early Stage</th>
<th>An Intermediate Stage</th>
<th>An Advanced Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Part III**
Imagine that you will be a teacher leader for at least one project-based DPLC in a school or school district setting over the next three years and envision the resulting continuing growth of your understanding of 21st century professional leadership. How do you see yourself positioned with respect to your customary, emergent, engaged, and/or generative...
understanding at the end of that three-year period? As you respond to this question, keep in mind that your growth is a highly personalized process potentially involving a complex mix of customary, emergent, engaged, and/or generative understandings.

************************************************************************

Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN)

General Guidance

Composing a Scholarly Personal Narrative (SPN) is a requirement in all four TLEP courses; however, keep in mind that this assignment is not tied to a grade. You are being asked to reflect on your journey of understanding. Where do you stand with reference to the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning? Please keep in mind that the goal is to engage in a personalized self-assessment through authentic, honest reflection.

Keep in mind the overall professional standard for Kent State’s TLEP, as well as the TCL discipline’s six problem solving components with its four qualitative outcomes and its three phases. There is a summary of these TCL features in the final section of this guidance.

Read the select pages in Nash’s “Tentative Guidelines for Writing Scholarly Personal Narratives.” Apply his advice as you see fit. Also review Rosie Gornik’s “Farewell Currere and Advice” in Henderson and Gornik (2007), which provides an overview of how she constructed her ‘journey’ narratives. Apply her advice as you see fit. A continuous self-monitoring of your ‘disciplinary’ professional development between now and the end of the course could be helpful when composing your SPN. To assist you with this monitoring, review the illustrative journey ‘signposts’ and use as you see fit. You may also want to review the

Specific Guidelines

You decide the appropriate length for your scholarly personal narrative. Use the following specific ‘currere’ questions to guide your SPN:

- What is in my past that works for and/or against making a commitment to this journey of understanding at the present moment?
- Can I envision a professional future where I, and hopefully other educational colleagues, practice this disciplined problem solving?
- In light of my present circumstances and with reference to current supports and obstacles, am I interested in initiating a personalized ‘journey of understanding’ through all three phases as I pursue my teacher leader endorsement? If so, what might I do to sustain this journey? Am I open to possible ‘transformations’ of my personal-professional identity? Am I determined not to give up or be deterred in some way?
- Considering feedback from a ‘critical friend’ in this class who has read a draft of my SPN, how do I see myself ‘positioned’ with reference to the illustrative signposts and/or any additional signpost(s) that I have added to the list?
Am I satisfied with how I am positioned with reference to the professional standard for the TLEP Program:

_Teacher Leader Candidates Will Demonstrate that They Can Work as 21st Century Professional Leaders._

**Illustrative Signposts**

The following illustrative ‘signposts’ have been created to assist inspired, motivated educators in the instructor/self/peer-monitoring of their personalized journeys of understanding. These signposts are tied to the professional standard for the TLEP Program. They are a limited list, and more personally relevant signposts (pertaining to each teacher leader’s individualized journey of understanding) could be added to this list. In effect, these signposts are part of an ‘open set’ of possibilities.

**Illustrative Signposts: Customary Understanding**

- My SPN indicates that I base my curriculum actions on the policy directives of external authorities. I don’t clearly distinguish educational management and leadership, nor between semi-professional and professional teaching.
- My SPN indicates that I don’t have a critical awareness of how _standardized management_ may work against building teachers’ intellectual capacities.
- My SPN indicates that technical workshops are my ‘horizon of understanding’ for professional development.
- My SPN is limited to a discussion of my occupational responsibilities as a skilled technician.
- My SPN indicates no awareness of, nor interest in, specific applications of critical thinking, multidisciplinary inquiry, systemic deliberation and disciplinary evaluation.

**Illustrative Signposts: Emergent Understanding**

- My SPN indicates that I understand that instruction is situated in a larger educational ‘ecology.’
- My SPN indicates that I am still acquiring a critical distance from customary curriculum/instructional practices.
- My SPN incorporates a clear explanation of the transformative curriculum leadership ‘activity set’ with its four qualitative outcomes.
- My SPN expresses my personal ambivalences about transformative curriculum leadership.
- My SPN suggests that I am not sure that this interpretation of professional leadership is part of my vocational calling.
- My SPN notes that I am still contemplating possibilities for engaging in this disciplined way of living.
Illustrative Signposts: Engaged Understanding

- My SPN expresses my commitment to cultivate the personal discipline that transformative curriculum leadership requires. I indicate that I establish a critical distance from the limitations of ‘external’ management discipline while developing an ‘inner’ problem solving discipline.
- My SPN makes reference to personal changes in my problem solving habits, which can be generally characterized as “habits of hope.” Shade (2001) explains this concept:
  Habits of hope are those habits by which we pursue—that is, seek and nurture—the realization of hope’s ends. They are vital and integral dynamics in developing hope, particularly in maintaining our commitment to its ends. …These habits either build connections between hope’s end and our current agency or, when agency is limited, expand it generally. (p.77)
- My SPN clearly demonstrates that I understand the difference between a professional learning community (PLC) and a disciplined professional learning community (DPLC).
- My SPN contains evidence of my commitment to join and actively participate in a DPLC.
- My SPN contains evidence that I have initiated a more solitary practice of some or all of the elements of the transformative curriculum leadership activity set.
- My SPN contains personal expressions of moral imagination, transactional aesthetics, deliberative artistry and ethical fidelity.

Illustrative Signposts: Generative Understanding

- My SPN indicates that I am developing an identity as a teacher leader who can inspire and support my professional peers and other curriculum stakeholders.
- My SPN contains evidence that I am comfortable serving as an inspirational role model for the ‘habits of hope’ associated with transformative curriculum leadership.
- My SPN includes discussions of how I transact other educators as a teacher leader.
- My SPN contains evidence of “wiggle room” deliberations (Cuban, 2003) and resourceful negotiations (Walker & Soltis, 2004) with reference to working as a 21st century professional leader.

These illustrative ‘signposts’ are part of an open set of personally relevant ways to monitor the ‘journey of understanding’ component of this curriculum leadership. There, certainly, could be other ways that this could be accomplished. Furthermore, monitoring is part of a larger set of evaluative activities. There are many other ways that educators could evaluate their professional development progress in embodying and enacting this curriculum leadership.
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### SPN Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTL Category</th>
<th>Distinguished SPN</th>
<th>Accomplished SPN</th>
<th>Proficient SPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Candidates articulate their knowledge of effective leadership to encourage high levels of performance for educators and students.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is an exceptionally thorough, personally insightful and coherent narrative.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership and the required course reading, the scholarly discussion of the three phases of TCL disciplinary learning is adequate but lacks in thoroughness, personal insights and narrative coherence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Candidates engage in reflective practice concerning leadership roles and responsibilities, and encourage reflective practice in others.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is exceptionally thorough and honest.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is thorough and honest.</td>
<td>With reference to 21st century professional leadership, the discussion of relevant past/present circumstances and future generative possibilities is adequate but lacks in thoroughness, personal insights and narrative coherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Candidates model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others.</td>
<td>The SPN is a highly inspirational model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
<td>The SPN is good model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
<td>The SPN is an adequate model for other educators who are willing to undertake the TCL journey of understanding with its three phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The professional standard for KSU’s TLEP:

**Teacher Leader Candidates Will Demonstrate that They Can Work as 21st Century Professional Leaders.**

This is not a state-mandated standard tied to an external, accountability system. It is an invitational standard grounded in personal inspiration and guided by an internal sense of discipline.

Transformative curriculum leadership, which is introduced, explained and illustrated at a “Curriculum Leadership” website created by Kent State University, contains a set of six interrelated problem solving activities, which are presented in Henderson and Gornik (2007): critically thinking about educational standards from a democracy-in-education perspective, inquiring into the implications for facilitating student understanding, practicing the necessary systemic deliberations, establishing disciplinary professional learning communities, undertaking a continuous self- and peer-evaluation of the disciplinary learning, and initiating appropriate public education events.

There are four qualitative outcomes associated with the practice of this set of problem solving activities: **moral imagination**—envisioning education in a deep democracy; **transactional aesthetics**—gracefully affirming power-with and power-within dynamics in teacher-student transactions, teacher-teacher transactions, and other relevant educational stakeholder transactions; **deliberative artistry**—practicing a caring, case-based, far-reaching and eclectic decision-making; and **ethical fidelity**—embodying democratic values in educational transactions.

In general, educators who are interested in transformative professional leadership begin their personal ‘journeys of understanding’ from a customary and habitual perspective on what constitutes ‘good’ professional work. For shorthand purposes, this will be described as:

- **Customary understanding**…the journey of understanding has not yet been initiated; explanations are dictated by local customs and/or personal habits.

As inspired, motivated educators undertake their individual journeys of understanding, they will most likely go through three overlapping and interrelated phases: emergent, engaged and generative. These phases can be briefly described as follows:

- **Emergent understanding**… acquiring a basic comprehension of the critical thinking, multidisciplinary inquiry, systemic deliberation and disciplinary evaluation applications.

- **Engaged understanding**… acquiring deepening insights into this disciplinary learning through daily practice.

- **Generative understanding**… acquiring deepening insights into how to inspire and support professional peers’ (and other relevant educational stakeholders’) disciplinary learning in the context of specific teacher leadership projects.
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Capstone Assessment: Developing and Enacting a Teacher Leadership Project in a School Setting.
Teacher Leadership Project Overview
Your plan and its enactment is a demonstration of your deepening understanding of teachers as 21st century professional leaders. This leadership work can only take place within the “wiggle room” that exists in specific educational settings with reference to context-specific developmental and political realities (cutting across the standardized management, constructivist best practice and curriculum wisdom paradigms). In the first course of this sequence, you considered who you might invite into this complicated curriculum conversation? Who is already engaged in this tension-filled educational drama, though perhaps more intuitively, tacitly?

Project Outline
- Continue to build your Ohio Teacher Leader (OTL) capacities in facilitating students’ twenty-first century learning, engaging in multi-paradigmatic curriculum critiques, practicing curriculum deliberation (arts of the practical and arts of the eclectic) and philosophical questioning, undertaking cognitive adult development (qualitative shifts in ways of knowing) and developing and monitoring disciplined professional learning communities.
- Assist and inspire others to start on their own personal journeys of understanding by demonstrating at least an emergent understanding of teacher leadership through disciplinary mentoring, peer coaching, instructional leadership and other relevant skills and practices.

Application Activity
As a Teacher Leader candidate, you have been given the opportunity by your district authority (principal or other educational authority/authorities) to develop and enact project-based teacher leadership in your district. You will begin by doing a thorough analysis of the initiative using the knowledge and skills you learned in the previous three
courses. Specifically, you will complete the Paradigm Worksheet on your leadership plan topic. Once you have done a thorough analysis of the initiative using the guidance provided in the readings from all four courses in the sequence, you will share this analysis with your district authority/authorities in a face-to-face meeting. At this meeting, you will participate in developing a shared vision for short-term and long term goals for ongoing school reform, and continuous improvement based on 21st century teaching/learning. As necessary, you will gather the stakeholders involved in the project (preferably members of your DPLC) and begin with a curriculum “platform” conversation guided by the following questions.

- Are the educational beliefs that underpin this initiative congruent with 21st century teaching/learning? If so, how? If not, why not?
- Why and/or how is this initiative a good way to improve education?
- Does this educational vision benefit all people equally?
- What kind of good life does this initiative envision?
- Will this decision foster generosity, compassion and benevolence?
- What will be the effect of this decision seven generations from now?
- Can we imagine ourselves engaged in these 21st century practices, given its professional development demands?

You will need to discuss these questions with the recognition that 21st century teaching/learning is not a new, faddish educational “model.” It is a disciplined way of working/living inspired by a deep sense of fidelity to a particular “mission statement” or other sources of inspiration that advance the vital relationship between democracy and education. In conjunction with your site authority, you will develop project-based goals, timeline, and action steps to monitor your curriculum leadership progress.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTL Standard Categories</th>
<th>Qualitative Outcomes</th>
<th>Distinguished (Generative)</th>
<th>Accomplished (Engaged)</th>
<th>Proficient (Emergent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1-1.7 Facilitate evidenced-based effective leadership and teacher learning.</td>
<td>Moral Imagination</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to demonstrate and apply strategies of adult learning across teacher leadership activities that demonstrate the connection between democracy and education.</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to apply strategies of adult learning across teacher leadership activities that demonstrate the connection between democracy and education.</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to explain strategies of adult learning across teacher leadership activities that point to the connection between democracy and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional Aesthetics</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to advance the professional skills of colleagues by demonstrating and applying expertise in observational skills and in providing feedback in order to support reflective practice focused on improving curriculum, instruction, and assessment for 21st century skill development.</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to guide the professional skills of colleagues by demonstrating and applying knowledge in observational skills and in providing feedback in order to support reflective practice focused on improving curriculum, instruction, and assessment for 21st century skill development.</td>
<td>The teacher leader understands the professional skills of colleagues and provides sufficient feedback in order to support reflective practice focused on improving curriculum, instruction, and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliberative Artistry</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to effectively develop and support collaborative teams</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to develop and support collaborative teams and promote</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to support collaborative teams and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Fidelity</td>
<td>The teacher leader encourages robust innovation and risk taking among program participants that is grounded in practice, emphasizing authentic learning experiences for 21st century skills.</td>
<td>The teacher leader encourages innovation and some risk taking among program participants that is grounded in practice, emphasizing effective learning experiences for 21st century skills.</td>
<td>The teacher leader encourages some innovation and minimal risk taking among program participants that is grounded in practice, emphasizing adequate learning experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Imagination</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to initiate and facilitate colleagues’ design of action research for individual and group decision making grounded in the connection between democracy and education.</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to initiate colleagues’ design of action research for individual and group decision making grounded in the connection between democracy and education.</td>
<td>The teacher leader is able to explain a design of action research for individual and group decision making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Aesthetics</td>
<td>The teacher leader understands and applies educational research to create</td>
<td>The teacher leader understands how educational research is used to</td>
<td>The teacher leader can explain how educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1, 2.2 & 2.4 Using data-based decisions and evidence-based practice with multiple sources of data used to inform intervention process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliberative Artistry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher leader has a deep understanding of current research on assessment methods, designing and/or selecting effective formative and summative assessment practices and use of assessment data to make informed decisions that improve student’s 3S understanding; and models this knowledge to create new knowledge, promote specific policies and practices, improve instructional practice, and makes inquiry a critical component in teacher learning and school redesign; and uses this knowledge to support colleagues’ use of appropriate research-based strategies and data-driven action plans with critical and imaginative insights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher leader is knowledgeable about current research on assessment methods, designing and/or selecting effective formative and summative assessment practices and use of assessment data to make informed decisions that improve student’s 3S learning; and uses this knowledge to support colleagues’ use of appropriate research-based strategies and data-driven action plans with some insights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher leader has some knowledge of current research on assessment methods, designing and/or selecting effective formative and summative assessment practices and use of assessment data to make informed decisions that improve student’s 3S learning; and uses this knowledge to support colleagues’ use of appropriate research-based strategies and data-driven action plans with some insights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-3.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating in a Disciplined Professional Learning Community (DPLC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliberative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artistry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fidelity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-4.4 Developing and supporting a shared vision and clear goals with team work for an effective learning culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-4.4 Developing and supporting a shared vision and clear goals with team work for an effective learning culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Artistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-5.6 Modeling professional learning and professionalism within a Disciplined Professional Learning Community (DPLC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Deliberative Artistry

The teacher leader successfully and effectively supports colleagues’ individual and collective professional growth by serving in roles such as a mentor, coach, content facilitator, critical friend or peer evaluator, providing appropriate feedback to colleagues to strengthen teaching practice and improve student 21st century learning. The teacher leader supports colleagues’ individual and collective professional growth by serving in roles such as a mentor, coach, content facilitator, critical friend or peer evaluator, providing appropriate feedback to colleagues to strengthen teaching practice and improve student 21st century learning. The teacher leader makes attempts to support colleagues’ individual and collective professional growth by offering to serve in roles such as a mentor, coach, content facilitator, critical friend, or peer evaluator to strengthen teaching practice and improve student learning.

### Ethical Fidelity

The teacher leader successfully and effectively advocates for sufficient time for colleagues to work in teams to engage in job-embedded professional learning that promotes instructional strategies that address issues of diversity and The teacher leader advocates for sufficient time for colleagues to work in teams to engage in job-embedded professional learning that promotes instructional strategies that address issues of diversity and The teacher leader makes attempts to promote for sufficient time for colleagues to work in teams to engage in job-embedded professional learning that promotes instructional
address issues of diversity and equity in the classroom and ensures that individual student 21st century learning needs remain the central focus of instruction.

strategies that address issues of diversity and equity in the classroom and asserts that individual student 21st century learning needs remain the central focus of instruction.

---

Course Texts and Reading Materials

**Required Texts**

**Additional Reading Resources**


APPENDIX C

EMAIL
Good Evening,
I hope this email finds you doing well on the eve of Thanksgiving 2011!
I would like to offer you the opportunity to participate in a study conducted by Wendy Samford. You may remember meeting Wendy in our class this past summer during the first two TLEP courses in June. Wendy is working on her dissertation at KSU and is very interested in chronicling the growth of participants in our TLEP cohort. She is conducting a qualitative case study that explores sustained change in teachers' beliefs after professional development. She is specifically interested in our cohort because of the potential for changes in core beliefs you may have undergone as a result of your participation in this program. Her interests are two-fold

1. What are the qualities of the TLEP that support change in teacher's beliefs (time, administrative support, collegiality, understanding change, democratic wisdom, 3S design)?
2. What factors support or hinder sustaining change in teacher’s beliefs after the TLEP has ended?

The commitment on your part as an educator who may consider volunteering is three fold:

1. An interview shortly after the TLEP ends. (location of your choice)
2. An interview at the end of this school year...sometime in June. (location of your choice)
3. Allowing Wendy accessibility to your Teacher Leadership Narrative and your Leadership Plan.

Wendy is looking forward to working with our participants and appreciates the opportunity to explore any changes you may have undergone. Wendy is casting a broad net and hopes to focus on at least three educators. If the world were perfect, she would engage at least one representative from the elementary, middle and high school in her study. If you agree to participate in Wendy's study, please respond to Wendy directly at Wendy.Samford@BoardmanSchools.org. She will follow up with you shortly thereafter once she has determined her needs.

Thanks so much for considering this opportunity. It is a wonderful way to stay connected to this visionary work. I hope you will consider participating. Just so you are aware, neither Dr. Fishman or I will have any knowledge of who has agreed to participate until well after the final TLEP course has ended, if at all. Happy Thanksgiving!
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