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ABSTRACT

Current research has focused primarily on prescriptive models of professional
development (PD), yet few have focused on teachers’ experiences of mandatory PD.
Furthermore, researchers (Adams, 2014; Elmore, 2002; Hargreaves, 2011) have shown
numerous points of disconnection between the prescribed policies for teacher PD and the de
facto policies reflected in teachers’ experiences of PD, leaving teachers’ accounts of
mandatory PD largely underexplored. The purpose of this study was to examine the
institution of mandatory PD in New Mexico, exploring the characteristics of mandatory PD
and full-time public high school teachers’ perceptions of their PD experiences at one high
school and in one school district.

In using Institutional Ethnography (IE) as both theory and method, I was able to
conceptualize the “institution” of mandatory PD as coordinated and intersecting work
processes within a system of social relations focused on compliance. In my institutional
ethnographic account of mandatory PD in New Mexico, I used three data sources: 1)
institutional texts (n = 13), 2) one-on-one interviews with high school teachers (n = 3) and
educational stakeholders \( (n = 12) \), and 3) the 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Teacher Background Questionnaire \( (n = 3,440) \).

To generalize districtwide and statewide, I conducted statistical analyses of the SASS data and described: the format, topic, and duration of high school teachers’ participation in PD; high school teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of PD; institutional support high school teachers’ received for PD; and high school teachers’ perceptions of their influence on PD and teacher evaluation school policies. Analyses of interview and institutional text data revealed that the effects of state power, or ruling relations, within the institution of mandatory PD are achieved through moments of text activation that join together teachers and educational stakeholders in diverse, yet coordinated sequences of action. Findings from this study indicate that, at the state level, mandatory PD focuses on external compliance mandates, rather than teachers’ needs and input. This study is part of a growing body of research that provides empirical evidence of K-12 teachers’ mandatory PD experiences in specific school, district, and state contexts.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Policymakers, researchers, and various educational stakeholders laud professional development as the impetus for improving teaching, student learning, and student achievement. The term professional development refers to two related, but slightly different notions informing strategies to improve teachers’ content knowledge and instructional practices that best meet the learning needs of their students (Beavers, 2009; Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009; Foster & Peele, 2001; Fullan, 2014; Guskey, 2000; Hammerness et al., 2005; Hirsch, 2009; Horn & Little, 2010; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Knapp, 2003; Little, 2006; Richardson, 1994). First, the idea of professional learning construes teachers as learners, meaning that teachers always engage in formal and informal change processes. This idea informs the bulk of the research prescribing how PD should be for teachers. In public schools and school districts across the country, research-based prescriptive models for high quality PD supposedly happens, continually and collaboratively in job-embedded ways, such as regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers or impromptu peer observation. Second, the idea of development, construes teachers as public employees who must maintain their knowledge and skills by participating in continuing education in job-embedded and in traditional, formalized ways, such as in university courses related to teaching.

The clarification of the subtle difference between these two terms is important in this study because most reform efforts in education typically conflate professional learning and professional development into a generalized aspect of teacher development. Importantly, this conflation does not take into account the potentially limiting constraints of teachers’ choices for their professional learning, ignoring the absence of teacher choice and its potentially
demotivating affect on teacher commitment to stay in the education profession (Beltman, 2009; Flowerday, & Schraw, 2000; Ingersoll, 2001; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013).

Prescribed and mandated professional development, hereafter referred to as PD, is a means of ensuring the continuous alignment of changes in teachers’ dispositions, knowledge, and skills with practices that promote student learning and student achievement, which vary according to specific state, district, and school levels. Even though researchers have not identified common PD activities or designs that affect student achievement (Baker, Barton et al., 2010; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Kirby, McCombs, Barney, & Naftel, 2006; Mayer, Mullens, & Moore, 2000; Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004; Wang, Odell, Klecka, Spalding & Lin, 2010), it is widely assumed that mandating teachers’ participation in PD activities will improve teachers; and thereby, enhance student learning and student achievement. Underlying this assumption is a body of research that demonstrates evidence of connections between PD and student learning and student achievement (Biancarosa, Bryk, & Dexter, 2010; Blank & de las Alas, 2009; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Hirsh & Killion, 2007; Hanushek, 2009; Ho & Kane, 2013; Huffman, Thomas, & Lawrenz, 2003; Kane, McCaffrey, Miller, & Staiger, 2013; Marzano, 2000; Mihaly, McCaffrey, Staiger, & Lockwood, 2013; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain 2005; Saunders, Goldenberg, & Gallimore, 2009; Wenglinsky, 2000). In a meta-analysis of studies related to student achievement, Hattie (2009) found that of the factors impacting the variation in student achievement: 50% attributed to student ability, 30% to the teacher, 5% to home life, 5% to school environment, 5% to peers, and 5% to the principal. The point here is that many other factors, not just teachers, contribute to change in student learning and student achievement. Furthermore, there is a growing body of research within the field indicating that distributed leadership is the catalyst for systemic
organizational change at school and district levels (Blasé & Anderson, 1995; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Spillane, 2005).

Educational policies dictate the form PD should take at state, district, and school levels. However, research shows numerous points of disconnection between the prescribed policies for teacher PD and the de facto policies reflected in teachers’ experiences of PD (Adams, 2014; Elmore, 2002; Hargreaves, 2011). As used here, experience refers to what teachers know, live, and report about their participation in PD activities. This disjuncture between policies and teachers’ front-line experiences has implications for teacher turnover, PD expenses, and ultimately for its utility and relevance to teachers as learning professionals.

In this study, I examine mandatory professional development (PD) for high school teachers in New Mexico as an institutional phenomenon, exploring the characteristics of mandatory PD prescribed in educational policies as well as high school teachers’ perceptions of their PD experiences. Additionally, I explicate how PD becomes mandatory for teachers within a specific high school and school district context in the State of New Mexico in order to identify and interrogate taken-for-granted assumptions about the implementation and effectiveness of PD, particularly from high school teachers’ perspectives. I conclude the study with policy implications and suggestions for future research.

**Statement of the Problem**

Professional development refers to a broad group of practices, with no single definitive approach being applied universally across the approximately 17,000 school districts in the United States (Choy, Chen, & Bugarin, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Jaquith, Mindich, Wei, & Darling-Hammond, 2010; Porter, Garet, Desimone, Yoon, & Birman, 2000; Schotchmer, McGrath, & Coder, 2005; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson,
However, many stakeholders in education have all made prescriptions for high quality PD, including:

- federal and state policymakers (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2003); New Mexico Administrative Code [NMAC]; New Mexico Statutes Annotated [NMSA], 1978).
- education researchers (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Guskey, 2000; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, & Shulman, 2002; Hargreaves, 2011; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Heibert, Gallimore, & Stigler, 2002; Little, 1999; Mahn, McMann, & Musanti, 2005; Musanti & Pence, 2010; Schnellert, Butler, & Higginson, 2008; Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006; Van Veen, Zwart, & Meirink, 2011; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007);
- unions (Bernstein, 2003; Kerchner, Koppich, & Weeres, 1997);
- professional teaching associations (Hirsch, 2009); and

The most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 prescribes that implementation of PD be “high quality,” meaning that teachers’ PD activities are meant to be more than “one-day or short-term workshops or conferences,” involve both administrators and teachers, move all teachers to highly-qualified status, and improve student achievement on standardized tests (NCLB, 2003). Yet, in a previous study (Adams, 2014) I found notable discrepancies between PD as it “should be” according to these high quality PD provisions and the common
practice of PD as teachers experience it. Several issues underlie the disjuncture of prescribed PD and the PD that is experienced by teachers. Researchers have long noted these discrepancies, describing them as “the ideal” compared to “the real” (Elmore, 2002, p. 6).

More recently, Hargreaves (2011) asserts

> Models of professional development for teachers are of two kinds: first, a descriptive model which reports, on the basis of empirical findings, the forms and processes of professional development as they in fact occur; and secondly a prescriptive model which states how professional development ought to be. The two are closely related since a prescriptive model implies changes to the descriptive model and a descriptive model provides some of the constraints on the practicality of the prescriptive model.

(p. 88)

Current research has shown that nationwide, the majority of teachers’ PD experiences consist of short-term, one-day workshops, and thus, directly contradict the patterns that federal law identify as markers of high quality PD (Adams, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Hill, 2009; Wei et al., 2010). Federal law also stipulates that high quality PD be driven by teacher needs for training and development. This is corroborated by research that argues for PD based on teacher needs assessment, specific school demographics, and actual teacher practice that leads to improvements in student learning (Clandinin & Conneley, 1995; Desimone, 2009; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 2000; Mahn et al., 2005; Musanti & Pence, 2010; Schnellert et al., 2008; Sparks, 2002; Van Veen et al., 2011; Yoon et al., 2007).

Furthermore, findings from my previous work indicate that PD is a “nested construct, differing in meaning, depending on top-down mandates, and formal and informal opportunities to learn at the school, district, and individual teacher levels” (Adams, 2014, p.
In my previous study, I found that being “professionally developed” was articulated as something teachers receive as an external mandate, whereas teachers’ understandings of what “PD should be” was driven by teacher-created goals based on the needs of their students and of their own identified gaps in pedagogical knowledge. These findings corroborate Hargreaves (2011) assertion that models of teacher PD are descriptive, based on empirical findings, and/or prescriptive, “which states how PD ought to be” (p. 88).

The work of Hawley and Valli (1999), Garet et al. (2001), and Hargreaves & Fullan (2012) confirm that there is consensus in peer-reviewed literature on prescriptive PD. Hargreaves & Fullan (2012) note that much of the consensus on prescriptive models of high quality or effective PD stems from the standards for PD adopted in 1995 by the National Staff Development Council (NSDC), which is now known as Learning Forward, a non-profit organization that focuses on PD, defined as a comprehensive, sustained, and job-embedded approach to increasing teachers’ effectiveness and impact on student learning outcomes. In their seminal review of the PD peer-reviewed literature, Hawley & Valli (1999) identified the following nine principles for the design of effective PD:

1. The content of PD focuses on what students are to learn and how to address the different problems students may have in learning the material;
2. PD should be based on analyses of the differences between actual student performance and goals and standards for student learning;
3. PD should involve teachers in the identification of what they need to learn and in the development of the learning experiences in which they will be involved;
4. PD should be primarily school-based and built into the day-to-day work of teaching;
5. PD should be organized around collaborative problem solving;
6. PD should be continuous and on-going, involving follow-up and support to further learning – including support from sources external to the school that can provide necessary resources and new perspectives;

7. PD should incorporate evaluation of multiple sources of information on outcomes for students and the instruction and other processes that are involved in implementing the lessons learned through PD;

8. PD should provide opportunities to gain an understanding of the theory underlying the knowledge and skills being learned; and

9. PD should be connected to a comprehensive change process focused on improving student learning.

The consensus in the research (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Birman et al., 2000; Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Huffman et al., 2003; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007; Richter, Kunter, Klusmann, Lüdtke, & Baumert, 2014; Scotchmer et al., 2005; Torff & Sessions, 2008; Wei et al., 2010) presents six characteristics of PD activities that contribute to improvements in teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge, including, but not limited to:

1. **PD Formats** that are integrated into the daily work of teachers (i.e., job-embedded PD), rather than removed from the context of teaching as in traditional workshops (i.e., traditional/formal PD);

2. **PD Topics** areas focused on teachers’ subject matter content, using computers for instruction, reading instruction, discipline and classroom management, how to teach students with disabilities, how to teach English language learners (ELLs), and “other” PD as specified by teachers;
3. **Duration** in terms of the number of hours teachers spent on these PD activities;

4. **Usefulness** of PD;

5. **Institutional Support provided for PD activities**, such as release time from teaching, scheduled time in contract year for PD, stipends for PD activities that took place outside regular work hours, full or partial reimbursement of college tuition, reimbursement for conference or workshop fees, reimbursement for travel and/or daily expenses; and

6. **Teachers’ Perceptions** regarding their influence over school policy, collaboration among colleagues, their school’s climate, and job satisfaction.

Despite a longstanding body of research noting how PD “should” be, Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) claim that there “there is little evidence that this consensus has had a large-scale effect on the practices of schools and schools systems” (p. 99). In order to examine large-scale effects of effective PD policy implementation, research by Adelle and Weiland (2012), Anyon (2005), Ball (1990), Honig (2006), Knapp (1997, 2003) and McLaughlin and Talbert (1990, 1994) confirms that assessments of what actually occurs after the policy is written must be conducted in order to strengthen the body of education research.

Notably, assessments of the impacts on changes in educational policies, particularly related to mandatory PD, have been lacking in the body of research on education policy implementation (Ball, 2012; Bell & Stevenson, 2006; McLaughlin, 1991, 1993, 2006; Honig, 2006; Howie & Stevick, 2014). There are, however, a number of models and theories of organizational change, which can be used in assessing policy impacts, known as theories of action and logic models (Kellogg Foundation, 2004; Weiss, 1997). Theories of action are statements of how activities and actions are supposed to lead to desired changes, expressing
the causal links between an intervention and its outcomes, such as a tiered teacher licensure system designed to recruit and retain teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2012; Kerchner et al., 1997). A logic model is a visual representation of a particular theory of change that shows how program inputs (design features, resources) enable actions (activities) that lead to outputs contributing to outcomes on program goals (Kellogg Foundation, 2004). The focus in a logic model is on change beyond localized organizational contexts into an interconnected system of social relations among and between multiple contexts. Social relations is a term that describes sequences of interdependent actions that shape people’s practices within and across multiple organizational settings (Bisaillon, 2012; Smith 2005). Logic models chart key assumptions of how change, according to a theory of action, is supposed to work and provides a framework for interventions, policy implementation research, and evaluations of the policy. Importantly, theories of action and logic models require an articulation of underlying assumptions that can measured and tested. Investigating such underlying assumptions requires a theoretically informed research approach that seeks to make visible the socially coordinated character and organization of people’s lives (Bisaillon, 2012; Campbell & Gregor, 2004).

In this body of research, change in interconnected systems of social relations occur as a result of people, or change agents, collectively involved to enhance the overall performance of the system (Weick & Quinn, 1999). Winograd (2012) argues that change is best precipitated by asking three types of killer questions in order to identify underlying assumptions: 1) data questions, that generate data for accountability for advocacy and accountability; 2) policy questions, which are related to statute, regulations, standards, frameworks, and budgets; and 3) political questions, which address diverse perspectives,
power groups, practices and behaviors, and hopes and fears. Additionally, a key component of asking killer questions is identifying consequential validity, or intended and unintended consequences of change initiatives that are implemented to answer those questions (Messick, 1989; Moss, 1998; Shepard, 1997). One of the most important measures of large-scale innovations and change efforts is ensuring that organizations at multiple levels work together to create large-scale sustainable impact. Kania & Kramer (2011) argue that too many large-scale innovations fail because participants follow their own individual (organizational) agenda rather than commit to a common agenda aimed at solving a specific social problem. As it relates to education, change happens when adults move beyond pathological, partisan polarization, and give up the need to be right, in order to focus on what is best for kids.

One organizational change model that deliberately works beyond adult dysfunction is called Collective Impact, where a group of important actors from multiple levels in a system of social relations come together, committed to a common agenda solving a specific social problem (Harland & Kinder, 2014). Kania and Kramer (2011) identify five conditions of collective success: 1) common agenda, 2) shared measurement, 3) continuous communication, 4) mutually reinforcing activities among all participants, and 5) backbone support organizations. Importantly, the Collective Impact organizational model emphasizes stakeholder involvement that seeks to bring about change in systemic ways. To that end, adaptive learning systems help institutional actors develop the infrastructure needed for multiple partners to engage in collaborative problem solving (Kramer, Parkhurst, & Vaidyanathan, 2009). The process of creating adaptive learning systems in the context of dynamic change relies on adaptive problem solving (Kania & Kramer, 2011; Kramer et al., 2009). Even though the solutions to complex problems are not known, change agents
involved in adaptive problem solving are committed to a constant evaluation and adaption of
behavior to achieve the goals set out in a common agenda. Rooted in the idea of collective
efficacy, or perception of mutual trust and willingness to work together (Bandura, 2000;
Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007), the Collective Impact organizational model
has been documented to successfully bring about change, particularly when initiatives
incorporate both “top-down” and “bottom-up” change agents who do not assume that one set
of individuals within a complex, interconnected system can singularly solve social problems
that overlap in increasingly complicated ways.

Despite the agreement of federal law, education researchers, and teachers themselves
on how PD should be, many studies have described the common practice of PD as a top-
down type of training commonly known as the “institutional model” (Colbert, Brown, Choi,
& Thomas, 2008; Fang, 2013; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Little, 1992; McLaughlin & Talbert,
2003). This type of PD, which typically occurs as mandatory workshops, courses, seminars,
and brief trainings by experts, is characteristically isolated from classroom practice (Darling-
Hammond, 1994; Desimone, Smith, Baker, & Ueno, 2005; Guskey, 2000, 2003; Hargreaves,
2011; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Phillips, Desimone, & Smith, 2011). Furthermore, several
researchers (Darling-Hammond, 2012; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009; Garet et al., 2001;
Oakes & Lipton, 2003; Sparks, 2002; Tarc, 2012; Van Veen et al., 2011) argue that
institutional models of PD are rarely applicable to teachers’ needs. Teachers themselves
concur, describing being professionally developed as something that is driven by an external
process that is mandatory and has nothing, or little, to do with what goes on in their
classroom (Adams, 2014).
In addition to the discrepancies between the prescriptions for how PD should be and the reality of teachers’ experiences as reflected in the existing body of research, important gaps and contradictions also exist in the research literature. The landmark study from Darling-Hammond et al. (2009) incorporated multiple survey instruments from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), the Met Life of the American Teacher, and the National Staff Development Council’s (NSDC) Standards Assessment Inventory and found that fewer than half of teachers reported that the PD they received was useful. These findings were starkly different from the first federal report published on PD in 2006. The federal report, which only incorporated 1999-2000 SASS data, found that more than half of the 52,400 teachers surveyed indicated that they received “very useful” PD, even though 95% of public school teachers participated in short-term workshops, conferences, or training (Choy et al., 2006). Findings from these reports, which rely heavily on the nationally-administered SASS, contradict both policy stipulations and peer-reviewed research on what effective PD ought to be. This contradiction presents a need for further inquiry into teachers’ PD to understand how various policies at state, district, and school levels affect teachers’ experiences of PD. Not only do policies at varying levels define and prescribe action, but they also contribute to the conditions that make policy enactment and implementation possible (Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2012; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; DeGroff & Cargo, 2009; Honig, 2006; Spillane, 1999).

Another underexplored area in the research is related to the cost of PD, particularly when it is mandated. For more than 30 years, most states and districts in the country have had little to no idea of what they are actually spending on PD (Odden, Archibald, Fermanich, & Gallagher, 2002). New Mexico is no exception. In the last publically available report on the
topic, Herman (2007) reveals the complexity of accounting for PD spending. For example, not only does the legislature appropriate funds to a Teacher Professional Development Fund, but there also funds for PD in the base of the State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) or funding formula and federal funds from the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) Title I (Part B, Reading First), Title II (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting), Title III (Language Instruction for ELLs), *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA), Part B, and the Carl A. Perkins Career and Technical Education. Additionally, PD is funded at state, district, and school levels with other federal funds and private foundation grants (Herman, 2007). The PED is required by law to evaluate the success of each PD program or project funding, and to annually report its findings to the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC), a bipartisan, bicameral committee that studies education issues. However, 2005 was the last year in which the Public Education Department (PED) provided a report on PD to the LESC (Herman, 2007). This absence of information begs teachers, taxpayers, and legislators to ask the question about the nature of PD and the exact costs associated with these activities over the last 10 years, showing spending aggregates at school, district, and state levels.

Underlying questions about funding are questions about the types of PD in which teachers are required to participate. While most teachers do receive some kind of PD each year, the State of New Mexico cannot estimate overall costs spent on PD that may be ineffective because these data are not being captured, and if they are, they are not being reported out by the PED to the LESC. It is also unknown if data structures exist throughout the state to capture much-need PD cost data or whether this capability is built into the state-funded Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System (STARS) data system. However, what is known is that the level of information about spending on PD is housed at the local
school board and school district level because the details of costs are specific to school districts’ budgets, which vary widely in New Mexico’s 89 traditional public school districts. What is taken-for-granted in this case, is that the money being used for PD and the PD teachers experience is actually the kind that research suggests (i.e., job-embedded, focused on professional learning rather than short-term workshops). Nationally, taxpayers spend more than $500 billion annually on elementary and secondary schools, making K-12 education the largest expenditure on state budgets, yet the costs for PD, the most important mechanism that allegedly makes teachers better, are largely unknown (Adams, 2010; Odden, Archibald, Fermanich, & Gallagher, 2002). PD spending is a “black box” that should incite various educational stakeholders to investigate the costs associated with PD and the conditions in which teachers are mandated to participate at specific school, district, and state levels.

Adams (2010) asserts that “states will never education all students to high standards unless they first fix the finance systems that support America’s schools” (p. 17). If PD is widely being provided to teachers at high costs and it is unknown exactly where these funds are going, should researchers not ask: What is the nature of PD? How do teachers report their experiences of PD? Which of these are mandatory and how do they become mandatory? I aim to answer these kinds of questions in this study. While costs are an integral part of accounting for the characteristics of PD and tracking how it becomes mandatory, due to its complexity, tracking the costs of PD at state, district, and school levels was beyond the scope of this study (see “Future Research” in Chapter 6).

To date, research studies of PD have mainly investigated national (Choy et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2010) or state patterns (Jaquith et al., 2010; Weil, 2011). These studies provide a broad picture of national issues and invaluable insights about
the unique policy contexts affecting PD in specific states. However, these studies do not
examine district or school level data, leaving teachers’ accounts of PD at specific district and
school levels underexplored (Spillane, 1996). Just as states have distinct strengths,
challenges, and unique policy contexts that shape PD requirements for teachers, so do public
school districts within the states. Accordingly, just as studies at specific state levels are
necessary to distinguish variations in PD policies and practices that exist across the United
States, so too must PD be studied using data disaggregated at the district level in order to
more fully understand how policies are interpreted and implemented by teachers and
educational stakeholders.

**Rationale**

It was my initial research (Mahn, Bruce, & Adams, 2010, 2014; Adams, 2014),
reflections on that research, and review of similar studies (Bosk & Devries, 2004; Cohen-
Vogel, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Flowerday & Schraw, 2000; Guskey, 2003; Jaquith
et al., 2010; Knapp, 2003; Little, 1999; Little & McLaughlin, 1993; McLaughlin & Pfeifer,
1988; McNeil, 2000; Meyer, 2007; Nichols & Griffith, 2009; Phillips et al., 2011;
Radoslovich et al., 2014; Shen, Gerard, Bowyer, 2010) that led me to question how teachers’
PD may differ depending on whether it was mandated by external requirements or driven by
their individual quests for opportunities to learn. If policies dictate the form PD should take
at state, district, and school levels, then it is important to explore the conditions that stipulate
teachers’ required participation. Furthermore, it is important to understand the various
contextual factors (Desimone, Smith, Hayes, & Frisvold, 2005; Phillips et al., 2011; Shipan
& Volden, 2008), that characterize teachers’ experiences of PD and how it becomes
mandatory in order to identify and interrogate taken-for-granted assumptions about how effectiveness of PD, particularly from teachers’ perspectives.

**Why New Mexico?** I initially became familiar with New Mexico in 2006, after teaching English in Santa Fe to rising seventh and eighth grade students in an educational enrichment program called the Breakthrough Collaborative (formerly Summerbridge founded in 1978), designed to prepare low-income students for success in college prep classes. A couple of years later, my interest in New Mexico grew after I read *Public Education in New Mexico*, while studying Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages at Teachers College, Columbia University. I remember being struck by the diversity of the state’s population demographics. Like every state, New Mexico is distinct because of its historical, political, and sociocultural contexts that brought it into being as a state. A state is a governmental entity modeled after the U.S. Constitution, a function of federalism that I, in drawing on the work of Cross (2004), Elazar (1984, 1995), Garcia, Hain, & St. Clair (2006), and Rosenthal (2009), explain in Chapter 2. Importantly, differences in governance structures are related to differences in the implementation of PD policies in state, district, and school levels.

One might ask, why choose New Mexico to conduct this study rather than another state? One reason is that teachers do not need to complete a certain number of PD hours to maintain their license, a practice that at first glance makes it seem like PD is not mandatory like it is in California, the District of Columbia, New York, and a number of other states (Education Commission of the States, Professional Development Database). The fact that New Mexico’s teachers do not need PD according to a number of hours relates to its three-tiered teacher licensure, a feature I found unique as a native Californian who has lived and
worked as an educator and researcher in California, New Mexico, New York, and the D.C. Metro Area, including the District of Columbia and the states of Maryland and Virginia. In the three-tiered licensure system, teachers’ PD is based on a Professional Development Plan (PDP) process that unfolds over the course of the school year, culminating in an evaluation of the teacher in New Mexico’s High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) system. Thus, mandatory PD is related to teacher evaluation in a way that is different from the states in which I previously lived and worked.

Another reason is that others, in reading my work, might find PD similar and different to how education works in their respective states, noting differences in the governance structures that affect the arrangement of how PD becomes mandatory in their respective states. People not from New Mexico might find it interesting that in 1973, New Mexico was the first state in the country to enact a bilingual multicultural education law. Interestingly, the people of New Mexico also elected the first Hispanic female governor in the history of the United States, in a state where Democrats have a 1.5 to 1 statewide advantage over Republicans in the number of registered voters who are party members (Garcia et al., 2006). The political composition of the legislative and executive branches of government affect educational policies at all levels, including but not limited to teachers’ licensure, salary minimums, PD expenditures, and teachers’ required participation in PD activities.

**The institution of mandatory PD: Teachers’ experiences and the implementation of mandatory PD.** “Institution,” as I am referring to it in this study means sets of relationships, interactions among and between multiple organizations within an interconnected, constantly changing, dynamic system. For example, the institution of mandatory PD consists of many different elements that come together, which affect how
teachers experience PD (Figure 1). The mandatory PD experiences of teachers and the implementation of mandatory PD, as I see it, are a unified phenomenon. The interface of these elements within TEIMPD may be interpreted in different or similar ways by various educational stakeholders at the state, district and school levels. Furthermore, I define a mandatory PD event as an aspect of a formalized PD experience that is: a) not optional for teachers, b) documented on paper or electronically, and c) an occurrence with a definite starting and ending point that may be short-time or sustained over time throughout a given school year. The different elements that may or may not come together in a mandatory PD event include: teachers’ individual prescriptive desires for how PD should be, their actual participation in mandatory PD, school board policies, school district/central office and school procedures related to mandatory PD, the School Personnel Act (22-10A New Mexico Statutes Annotated [NMSA], 1978) and the School Finance Act (22-8 NMSA, 1978), debates, discussions, and decisions made at the legislative level, the interpretation of legislation in PED-rule, and various educational stakeholders’ involvement in providing PD for teachers and holding them accountable for it. Each of these components affects the types of PD in which teachers participate at specific district and school levels. Figure 1 is a visual representation of how I conceptualized the institution of mandatory PD at the beginning of this study. At the time I created this diagram, I was unclear of the interaction among each of these entities. One challenge with this depiction is that it seems as though each level interacts equally, as indicated by the two-way arrows. I began my inquiry wondering, how do each of these entities interrelate in the enactment of high school teachers’ mandatory PD in New Mexico? (Figure 1)
Figure 1: My Initial Conception of the Institution of Mandatory PD

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the “institution” of mandatory PD in New Mexico, exploring the characteristics of mandatory PD prescribed in educational policies and high school teachers’ perceptions of their PD experiences at one high school in one school district. Mandatory PD is made distinct by each state’s statute, state education agency regulations, local school board policies, and local school policies, even though the requirements for high quality or effective PD are prescribed broadly in NCLB. These policies, or institutional texts, produce and are produced within and across settings that direct sequences of action in ways roughly depicted in Figure 1. To date, the available literature has focused primarily on prescriptive models of PD and best practices for how to design high quality PD for teachers, yet few have focused on PD as a mandatory phenomenon experienced by teachers in particular contexts at state, district, and school levels. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, I conducted an institutional ethnographic investigation of
teachers’ voluntary and mandatory PD within a specific high school and school district in New Mexico to understand how PD became mandatory for full-time public high school teachers at state, district, and school levels during School Year (SY) 2011-12.

**Research Questions**

Creswell (2007) describes overarching questions as the broadest questions that can be posed, as they do not limit the emerging data collected during a study. Sub-questions narrow the focus of the study without constraining the research. The data sources collected for this study span over the course of three school years: 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. In order to narrow my study, I concentrated on data from SY 2011-12 because that was the most recently available data from on the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). The findings presented in Chapters 4 and 5 focus only on SY 2011-12. The following overarching research questions and sub-questions guided my choice of research design:

1) What are the characteristics of PD for full-time public high school teachers in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and Rydell High School in New Mexico as teachers report their experiences?

2) What are the characteristics of mandatory PD for full-time public high school teachers as prescribed in state, district, and school level institutional texts?

3) How does PD become mandatory for full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico?

**Sub-questions**

1) What was the format, topic, and duration of full-time public high school teachers’ participation in PD activities?
2) How did full-time public high school teachers rate the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated?
   a. Was there a difference in how full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated?

3) What were the most common types of institutional support for PD that full-time public high school teachers received?

4) What percentage of full-time public high school teachers thought they had influence over school policies related to determining the content of their PD and teacher evaluation?

**Institutional Ethnographic Research Design Overview**

In asking questions about the institution of mandatory PD, it was best to draw on Institutional Ethnography (IE) as both a theory and method of inquiry. Developed by Dorothy Smith (1987) as a feminist methodology, IE is a tool designed to help researcher’s discover how “the everyday world of experience is put together by relations that extend vastly beyond the everyday” (Smith, 2005, p. 1). In IE, an institution is conceived of as a complex of social and ruling relations. As a research approach, IE is concerned with identifying how institutions determine people’s lived experiences (André-Bechely, 2005; Smith 1987, 1990, 2005, 2006, 2014). *Institutional* refers to coordinated and intersecting work processes and courses of action, meant to direct the researcher’s attention to interrelated and overlapping work processes taking place across multiple sites that are organized into a complex system of social relations (DeVault & McCoy, 2006; Smith, 2005). Unlike in anthropological studies (Spindler, 1997), ethnography in IE is not understood as a method for
studying culture *per se* (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; McCoy, 2008), though some may argue that culture is an essential part of our everyday and organizational social worlds (Apple, 2006; Stein, 2004; Yanow, 1996). In IE, *ethnography* refers to the term in its broadest sense and is considered both a process and a method for studying interconnected contexts, processes, and meanings (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; McCoy, 2008; Whitehead, 2002). As a critical project, IE shares a number of concerns with multi-sited ethnography (Marcus, 1995, 1998) and critical ethnography (Carspecken, 1996; Madison, 2011; McNeil, 1988, 2000), which explore the relation of localized experiences and the broader contradictions of race, class, and the de-valuing of the “public” in decentralized systems of public education.

In my institutional ethnographic account of mandatory PD in New Mexico, I used three data collection techniques: 1) 2011-12 SASS, 2) interviews, and 3) institutional texts. I define “institutional text” as an umbrella term in reference to statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures that are formalized in writing, replicated institutionally, and that “are essential to the standardizing of work activities of all kinds across time and translocally” (Smith, 2005, p. 166). Guided by my research and sub-questions, in analyzing these data, I focused on identifying how coordinated and intersecting work processes and courses of text-based action taken by teachers and educational stakeholders at multiple levels (i.e., the “institution” of mandatory PD) shape teachers’ PD experiences. The sequences of social action taken by teachers and educational stakeholders in local settings can be traced through institutional texts to the trans-local sites of power to which they extend (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; Smith, 2005).

Drawing on techniques ethnographers use (Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte, 1999), I incorporated numerical data from the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire
into an essential aspect of my design because the survey provided information about teachers’ voluntary and mandatory PD experiences at district and state levels. Further, my sub-questions required data sources focused on the characteristics of voluntary and mandatory teachers’ PD experiences, perceptions of the usefulness of PD, reports on common types of institutional support provided for PD, and teachers’ perceptions of their influence on school policies related to PD and teacher evaluation. Therefore, I selected the most recently available SASS, an in-depth, nationally representative survey of first through twelfth grade public and private school teachers, principals, schools, library media centers, and school districts, to answer my sub-research questions. From the SASS data, I was able to generalize about the mandatory PD experiences of all full-time high school teachers in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and all full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico (i.e., my target population).

The SASS is a set of nine questionnaires collected from teachers, principals, school districts, schools, and libraries in the public and private sectors by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), an office within the U.S. Department of Education’s (USDE) Institute of Education Sciences (IES). The goal of the SASS is to obtain valid and reliable estimates of responses on each questionnaire administered to public and private school participants. Not only can the SASS data be analyzed nationally, but the survey can also be analyzed at specific state levels, and at district levels within individual states. The SASS data:

- are gathered by NCES and Census Bureau researchers in a systematic manner using a standardized format;
reflect the entire population of teachers, principals, schools, and school districts because it is representative of all 50 states and the District of Columbia;

- are quantifiable because the data are expressible in numeric form; and

- provide a large sample size that allows for disaggregation of data at various levels.

By providing a snapshot of teachers’ PD experiences in TLSD and in New Mexico according to the 2011-12 SASS at the time PD was mandated, I connected the results from the interview and institutional text data sources, in order to discover and describe the social organization of mandatory PD embedded within the survey results. In other words, what teachers reported on the SASS reflects how PD was socially organized during SY 2011-12 within a multi-level, textually-mediated system of social relations. Textual mediation refers to Smith’s (2005, 2006) concept that texts coordinate sequences of action among people who interpret, respond to, and/or activate texts within interconnected institutional structures and practices (see Chapter 3). Teachers are often unaware of these structures that are shaping their local mandatory PD experiences, yet the actions they take to engage in mandatory PD is part of a system of social relations that extend beyond their local experiences. In presenting a social cartography that makes visible how PD becomes mandatory for teachers, largely without their input, I hope findings from my study function as an important tool for understanding its social organization and for developing strategies to bring about change.

**Significance**

My dissertation builds on previous investigations of teachers’ PD as reported on the SASS at the national (Choy et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Phillips, Desimone, & Smith, 2011; Wei et al., 2010) and state levels (Jaquith et al., 2010; Weil, 2011). Similar to
other studies that have used IE, my study interrogates taken-for-granted assumptions from
the standpoint of people whose knowledge and experiences have been devalued within a
textually-mediated system of social relations (André-Bechely, 2005; Bisaillon & Rankin,
2012; Campbell, 2008; Chen, 2012; Eastwood, 2005; Griffith & Smith, 2004; Jones,
Beddoes, Banerjee, & Pawley, 2014; Luken & Vaughn, 2005; McCoy, 2014; Nichols, 2014;
Nichols & Griffith, 2009; Smith, 2006; Turner, 2006; Zurawski, 2012).

My study is significant in that it contributes to the small, but growing body of
research that provides empirical evidence of K-12 teachers’ mandatory PD experiences in
specific school, district, and state contexts (Borko, Elliott & Uchiyama, 2002; Yamagata-
Lynch & Haudenschild, 2009). Additionally, by conducting an analysis of teachers’
voluntary and mandatory PD experiences at a specific high school and school district in New
Mexico and by mapping how it becomes mandatory for teachers at multiple levels, I hope my
study will contribute to educational research by providing an empirical account of PD – one
that is both contextualized in one high school in one school district and generalizable to all
full-time public high school teachers in the State of New Mexico. Having data on what
mandatory PD is, explicating how it becomes mandatory, and how it was made mandatory
for teachers during SY 2011-12, is an important first step in developing a blueprint for
change (Townsend, 1996).

**Contexts of the Study**

**Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) & Rydell High School.** Because this
study focuses on one school district and one school in New Mexico, the description of these
contexts will be vague in order to maintain anonymity. I selected the high school and school
district in which this study takes place, referred to by their pseudonyms Rydell High School
in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD), as focal sites for my research because trusting relationships had already been established through the ALA Project.

As mentioned earlier, my focus on mandatory PD in this work stems from my work on the Academic Literacy for All (ALA) Project and from previous research I have conducted on high school teachers’ PD. In my experience with the ALA Project, where I helped to lead a type of PD that was not required at the school, district, or state levels, I became grounded in what PD meant to the teachers with whom I worked. The ALA Project teacher educator participants, also known as ALATEs, voluntarily participated in the project and taught all subjects in grades 6-12 at approximately 25 different middle and high schools in two school districts, one of which was TLSD. The ALA Project was a five-year cooperative project between the University of New Mexico and two school districts, funded with a $1.5 million grant from the Office of English Language Acquisition in the U.S. Department of Education. The ALA Project’s main purpose was to help middle and high school teachers facilitate the language and literacy development of their ELLs while at the same time teaching content. This was accomplished through three initiatives: 1) graduate seminars for ALATEs; 2) summer institutes; and 3) on-going PD at the school sites lead by ALATEs.

**State of New Mexico.** In addition to the reasons mentioned previously, I chose the State of New Mexico as the focus of my dissertation because of the trends the State has set in three areas most relevant to my study: 1) having a three-tiered teacher licensure system as a career ladder connected to PD, 2) creating a statewide PD framework, and 3) connecting mandatory PD and teacher evaluation in its version of the federally required Highly, Objective, Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE).
Three-tiered teacher licensure system & career ladder connected to PD. In the 1980s, New Mexico was one of the first states to create a multi-tiered licensure system for teachers, with essential job competencies that were used in teachers’ and principals’ evaluations (Mondragon & Stapleton, 2005). Currently, New Mexico is one of at least 17 states\(^1\) to have a multi-tiered licensure system for teachers. While recognized as an exemplary model of change to effectively recruiting and retaining teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2012), New Mexico’s three-tiered licensure system is influenced by federal requirements for a HOUSSE system (see “HOUSSE system” section). Largely a product of the teachers’ union’s efforts, New Mexico’s three-tiered licensure system and career ladder including PD was designed as an effective way to recruit and retain teachers in the state.

Enacted in 2003, HB 212, Public School Reforms Act, became a landmark piece of legislation in New Mexico, significantly modifying and creating new sections of New Mexico’s Public School Code, instituting a three-tiered licensure system that was inextricably linked to PD and teacher evaluation in a HOUSSE system. When HB 212 was enacted, the existing three-tiered licensure system was tied to salary minimums to provide a career development pathway for teachers in New Mexico (see Figure 2). Specifically, HB 212 amended the School Personnel Act of New Mexico’s Public School Code to create a three-tiered teacher licensure system intended to align with the “highly qualified” teacher and teacher evaluation requirements of NCLB (2003). HB 212 also enacted the Assessment and Accountability Act and codified federal accountability requirements into state law.

---

\(^1\) The other 16 states with multi-tiered teacher licensure systems are: AK, CT, DE, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, ME, MI, MN, NE, OH, RI, UT and WI.
New Mexico’s three-tiered licensure system functions as a career ladder and form of licensure renewal for “highly qualified” teachers. State law requires all Level I teachers to advance in the system within five years, thereby making the Professional Development Dossier mandatory for Level I teachers. The School Personnel Act provides the option for teachers to remain at Level II for the remainder of their career and after three years of having a Level II license, teachers may pursue a Level III-A license (22-10A-7; 22-10A-11 NMSA 1978). After nine years, however, Level II teachers must apply for licensure renewal at the same level or fulfill the requirements for a Level III-A license. Unlike some states, no formal coursework or specific hours of PD are required to stay a teacher; however, teachers must receive satisfactory formative and summative performance evaluations from their supervisors in order to renew their teaching licenses. In their annual evaluations in the HOUSSE system, all teachers specify their PD in Professional Development Plans (PDPs) according to elements from the nine teaching competencies and indicators, which are differentiated by licensure level.

To advance in the three-tiered licensure system, teachers submit a Professional Development Dossier, modeled after the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (National Board) certification portfolio, in which they must provide evidence of performance in five strands: A) instruction; B) student learning; C) professional learning; D) verifications, such as of mentorship for Level I teachers, verification of leadership roles for Level II teachers, and verification of the authenticity of the Professional Development Dossier; and E) evaluations, including annual evaluations and the superintendent’s recommendation for advancement. As teachers advance in licensure levels, they receive minimum salary increases, shown in Figure 2.
As indicated in Figure 2, Level II teachers who possess National Board certification, complete at least three years of teaching at Level II, demonstrate instructional leader competence in the HOUSSE system, and meet “other qualifications” as determined by the PED will be eligible to advance to Level III-A without a master’s degree. In order for teachers to use their National Board certification in lieu of the Professional Development Dossier, they must meet the requirements for only the verification and evaluation strands because the National Board portfolio exceeds the requirements for Strands A, B, and C of the Professional Development Dossier.

Statewide Professional Development Framework. In 1999, the New Mexico State Legislature and Republican Governor Gary Johnson enacted legislation requiring the then-State Board of Education (SBE) to develop a PD framework that provided training to teachers and principals to improve and enhance student achievement (Ball, 2002). In HB 212,
the Legislature amended the provision for the PD framework to require increased specificity regarding guidelines for district PD activities to ensure that they

- improve teachers’ knowledge of the subjects they teach and the ability to teach those subjects to all of their students;
- are an integral part of plans for improving student achievement;
- provide teachers, administrators, and instructional support providers with the strategies, support, knowledge, and skills to help all students meet academic standards;
- are high-quality, sustained, intensive, and focused on the classroom; and
- are developed and evaluated regularly with participation of school employees and parents. (Herman, 2005, p. 3)

The PD Framework, created in conjunction with the Commission on Higher Education (now the Higher Education Department) and New Mexico’s Colleges of Education, is based entirely on research outlining prescriptive PD (Hawley & Valli, 1999; Garet et al., 2001; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). In updating its PD framework, the New Mexico Public Education Department (PED) adopted the National Staff Development Council Standards (NSDC) for Staff Development’s context, content, and process standards for PD as requirements for all statewide, PED, charter school, and public school district PD programs and activities. In the Guskey and Sparks’ (2004) model of PD, process, content, and context factors are theorized as impacting teacher knowledge and instructional practice to improve student learning. The NSDC professional development standards serve as a guide to aid stakeholders at all levels in New Mexico to implement PD for all teachers and leaders
that impacts teaching instruction to improve student learning (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009).

**High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) system.**

Since the 1980s, New Mexico has combined teacher PD and teacher evaluation in its licensure system. Even before teachers’ licensure levels were tied to salaries, teachers had to satisfactorily meet nine competencies and teach for a minimum number of years before moving from one level to the next (Ortiz-Cordova, 2000). New Mexico’s evaluation system for teachers, known as the High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) system, is differentiated by licensure level and comprised of three key components: 1) Professional Development Plans, 2) progressive documentation and evaluation of teacher performance, and 3) formative/summative evaluations. During SY 2011-12, aspects of a teacher’s PDP and annual performance evaluation in the HOUSSE system was based on nine teacher competencies and indicators.

HB 212 was the largest school reform law in New Mexico since 1986. HB 212 blended New Mexico’s three-tiered licensure system and NCLB’s (2003) “high quality” PD and “highly qualified” teacher requirements into a systematic approach to “elevate the teaching profession and help New Mexico expand the supply and improve the quality of New Mexico’s teachers” (NEA-New Mexico Professional Issues Committee, n.d., p. 2). In New Mexico, “highly-qualified” teachers are defined as teachers qualified to teach the core academic subjects; and, specifically are public school teachers who

1) meet all of the requirements for the license; and

2) have no licensure requirements waived on an emergency or temporary basis, or for any other reason; and
3) have demonstrated competency in the core academic subjects the teacher teaches by:

a. passing the content knowledge test(s) of the New Mexico teacher assessments or predecessor New Mexico teacher licensure examinations, or accepted comparable licensure tests from another state in each subject area the teacher teaches; or

b. successfully completing an undergraduate academic major (24-36 semester hours), or coursework equivalent to an undergraduate major, or a graduate degree in each subject area the teacher teaches; or

c. obtaining advanced credentials, which means certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards for the appropriate grade level and type; or

d. demonstrating competence in all of the core academic subjects the teacher teaches based on the state’s High Objective Uniform Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) for subject area competence as provided in [this rule]. (6.69.4 New Mexico Administrative Code [NMAC])

As explained by the University of New Mexico’s College of Education Teacher Preparation Study Group (2011), it is important to note that once teacher candidates enroll in approved alternative licensure programs in New Mexico, they are considered “highly qualified” even though they may have never taught before. Highly qualified alternative teachers may begin teaching with an internship license while they are completing requirements for their Alternative Level I license, a process I describe further in Chapter 2.

In NCLB, the HOUSSE system is one of two options for experienced teachers to become “highly qualified. If experienced teachers did not have a bachelor’s degree (i.e., BA) and competency in every core academic subject as demonstrated by passing a rigorous state academic subject test or successfully completing, in every core academic subject they taught,
a graduate degree or coursework equivalent to a BA major or advanced certification, then they had to meet the HOUSSE criteria (NCLB, 2003). While states could individually decide how they wanted to enact their HOUSSE systems, NCLB requires that a HOUSSE system

(I) is set by the State for both grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge and teaching skills;

(II) is aligned with challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and developed in consultation with core content specialists, teachers, principals, and school administrators;

(III) provides objective, coherent information about the teacher’s attainment of core content knowledge in the academic subjects in which a teacher teaches;

(IV) is applied uniformly to all teachers in the same academic subject and the same grade level throughout the State;

(V) takes into consideration, but not be based primarily on, the time the teacher has been teaching in the academic subject;

(VI) is made available to the public upon request; and

(VII) may involve multiple, objective measures of teacher competency. (20 U.S.C. § 7801)

Instead of applying the HOUSSE system as an alternative for experienced teachers, the New Mexico State Legislature and the PED decided to design the HOUSSE system for all teachers and differentiate the requirements according to their licensure levels. It is important to note that when HB 212 was enacted, the details of the system were not defined in law. Unspecific language detailing the HOUSSE system requirements in state law gives PED carte blanche to develop the details of the HOUSSE system in regulations or department
rule. Following the *State Rules Act*, the PED may modify the details of the HOUSSE system in department rule at any time.

**Researcher role.** While conducting this study, I had the unique opportunity to work full-time as a policy research analyst with the bi-partisan, bicameral Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC). In 1965, the LESC was created as a permanent committee of the New Mexico Legislature to conduct a continuing study of education and laws governing education in New Mexico, and to analyze policies and costs of the state’s educational system. The LESC is the only permanent committee of its kind in the United States. In the summer of 2012, I was selected as one of three interns as part of the six-month long New Mexico Legislative Internship Program. Within three months as an intern at the LESC, I advanced to doctoral candidacy status and accepted a full-time policy analyst position at the LESC.

During the interim, I worked to inform legislators on education-related issues related to my topic areas of expertise. During the legislative session, I primarily analyzed bills related to my topic areas, which included afterschool programs, bilingual education, early childhood literacy, K-3 Plus, professional development, state and national interim and formative assessments, and teacher and principal evaluation. As part of my work as an analyst with the LESC, I contributed to New Mexico’s policymaking process by “objectively” preparing heuristic devices, written reports, analyses, and presentations for legislators, legislative staff, PED, and the general public. As an analyst, I saw objectivity as a process that requires one to be open-minded and not to be limited by subjective orientations. We all have subjective orientations that we must acknowledge when (and if) we are asked. The point for me was to not be limited by my subjective orientations in research tasks at the
LESC. In other words, in being “objective, I was more concerned about balancing multiple perspectives than I was about constructing a single, or dominant, truth.

What was unique about my work at the LESC was that I was not required to publically identify or state my subjective orientations. In fact, the expectation was that subjective orientations in my work neither be acknowledged nor mentioned in any way, a practice that can be situated within a postpositivist paradigm (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). Within this paradigm, legislators on the LESC and the LESC Director, Ms. Frances Maestas emphasized that analyses integrated both qualitative and quantitative data, highlighting particular districts within the general statewide framework. Even though legislators are elected to represent their districts, on the LESC they come together to solve policy problems that are representative of multiple districts throughout the entire state. My use of the term “policy” refers to the decisions and rules enacted by the executive and legislative branches of government at the state level, local school boards of education at the school district level, and by principals and teachers at individual school levels.

In its organizational meeting each year, typically in May or June, to study educational issues that need to be addressed through policy changes, the LESC engages in a topics selection process, where various legislators on the LESC express interest in studying a number of different topics. The LESC Director compiles these topics into a work plan organized by month throughout the interim, which is then approved by the LESC Chair and Vice-Chair. Based on the LESC analysts’ interest and expertise on selected topics, the LESC Director assigns topics for analysts to study, write reports about, and become specialists on,

______________________________

2 To date, the LESC has had three staff directors: Dr. Placido Garcia Jr., Dr. Pauline Rendon, and Frances Maestas.
so that when legislators or members from the general public inquire about that topic, LESC analysts can knowledgably and quickly respond.

Topics discussed during the interim impact legislation introduced during the session and vice-versa. During the session, LESC analysts conduct bill analyses related to their topics of expertise and may be called as expert witnesses during debate on the Senate or House Floors. LESC analysts analyze bills during the legislative session and LESC bill analyses are treated as objective because they incorporate perspectives from “both sides of the aisle” (i.e., Democrats and Republicans) and contain unbiased information about the bill’s topic. Unbiased information means that products produced by analysts at the LESC do not have a partisan slant, contain clearly cited sources of information, include a background and historical context of the bill’s topic, and do not use inflammatory language to describe events and situations.

LESC analysts are told to be first and foremost, objective, which means “you have to honor both sides” (F. Maestas, personal communication, June 2012). As an LESC analyst, the bulk of the work I did focused on collecting and compiling information, analyzing existing statute and PED-rule, making policy recommendations, evaluating outcomes of existing policies, and sharing information with the legislators, government officials, and anyone from the general public that requested education-related information on my topic areas of expertise. LESC analysts concentrate on researching, evaluating, and shaping education-related public policy in New Mexico.

My affiliation with the LESC both positively and negatively impacted my ability to interview certain people and access certain information. For example, because of the tensions between the executive and legislative branches of New Mexico’s divided government, I was
unsuccessful in my attempts to interview current PED officials. At the time I conducted my research, New Mexico’s Republican Governor and state education agency, the PED, developed new rules to substantially change teachers’ annual evaluations, a process organized in New Mexico’s HOUSSSE system. These changes, enacted in PED-rule and effective during SY 2013-14, shifted the focus from evaluating teachers as meeting competency or not meeting competency based on the nine teaching competencies and indicators, to evaluating teachers based on multiple measures and rating them as exemplary, highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective (6.69.8 NMAC). The change to the HOUSSSE system that PED implemented, as part of the executive branch of government, upset several legislators on the LESC because many felt that the Governor’s changes extended the original intent of the law governing the HOUSSSE system, which was designed to not incorporate test scores or value-added modeling as part of teachers’ annual evaluations. My affiliation with the LESC may have inadvertently impacted my ability to recruit teachers because, like many of the legislators on the LESC, they may have had negative feelings about “the state’s” changes to the HOUSSSE system. Because I worked for “the state,” and produced analyses explaining the new teacher and principal evaluation system (Adams, 2013b), teachers may have negatively associated my dissertation research with the PED.

My LESC affiliation positively impacted my research when I requested information from educational stakeholders at the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) level. Because the LESC has a positive relationship with school districts and charter schools and regularly invites districts and charters to present to legislators during LESC hearings throughout the interim, most school districts are quite responsive to requests for information
from LESC analysts. As a research policy analyst at the LESC on school districts throughout the state, I benefited when requesting publicly available information that was not easily accessible on district’s websites. Particularly in TLSD when I asked for institutional texts, clarification of information in these texts, and demographic information of teachers and students in the district and the high school.

**Researcher bias.** The following are general principles underlying my dialectical worldview directly relate to how I began my inquiry into the institution of mandatory PD: the only constant is change, everything in the social world is constantly in motion, there are forces behind the motion that are contradictory, qualitative transformations occur over time, and everything has an end that leads to a new beginning (Greene & Caracelli, 1997; Mahn, 2012; McGuire, 1988; Seo & Creed, 2002). Dialectics is based on four principal features: 1) phenomena is interconnected, 2) the nature of things is in a constant change and flux, 3) the process of development is not a simple repetition of what has already occurred, but as an onward and upward movement, as a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, as a development from the simple to the complex, and, 4) in the struggle between opposites, there are inherent contradictions. The test of a dialectical approach is how useful it is in practice – in its goal to transform what is happening. Dialectics, as evidenced in materialist research approaches, recognizes the importance of both theoretical generalizations combined with the necessary empirical basis on which these theoretical generalizations stand (Greene, 2007; Greene & Caracelli, 1989; Mahn, 2010; Smith, 1987, 2005; Vygotsky, 1978).

---

3 Marx’s method is materialist because it proceeds from existence to consciousness, not the other way around. Marx’s method is dialectic because it regards nature and society as they evolve, and emphasizes that evolution is a constant struggle of conflicting forces.
Contrary to the position I was required to take as an analyst at the LESC, I fundamentally believe that knowledge is not objective: “knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (Freire, 2007, p. 72). Furthermore, I believe that knowledge culminates in power. In fact, knowledge is intimately intertwined with power; neither power nor knowledge is ever separate from the dynamic relationships between people and institutions (Foucault, 2000; Smith, 1987, 1999, 2005). And while knowledge is often thought to be “an acquaintance with facts,” it is not merely an accumulation of facts or perspectives – it is a “will to,” a drive to discuss, interact and change what is key to us and the societies we co-construct (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; Foucault, 1980; Smith, 1990). At the heart of all this knowledge-making is language, for it is “the means by which we construct and analyze what we call ‘reality’” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 20).

Even though I have a scholarly interest in developing a deeper understanding of the institution of mandatory PD, I am also motivated by a particular political interest in the transformation and improvement of public education. I am deeply concerned about power, politics, teacher development, and the language used to galvanize stakeholders in education reform through the public policymaking process. My research is motivated by what I see as a power imbalance in policy implementation, and I aim to engage important questions around what is best for teachers as defined by teachers.

In education research, the focus on improving teachers as the linchpin of large-scale organizational change in schools has evolved from a common sense notion that all learners experience the joys of learning as a result of having a “quality” teacher encouraging,
influencing, teaching students how to be lifelong self-directed learners, and seeing the possibilities of how they may chart the course for their life in positive, uplifting ways for themselves, their families, and their communities. The common sense experience from schooling is that good teachers are better than bad teachers. Personally, I know this to be true because in my lifetime as a student and as an educator, I have thrived with great teachers, like the ones I have acknowledged here (see “Acknowledgements”). However, teachers are not the cause of persistently “failing” schools. Ultimately, systemic non-response to teachers’ professional learning needs has devastating effects on teachers being able to truly meet the learning needs of their students. My conviction is that teachers as professionals have expert knowledge in assessing learning needs – of themselves and their students.

**Organization of the Study**

This chapter introduced the problem, and provided background to the research problem and research and sub-questions. In *Chapter 2: Education Policy & Politics in New Mexico*, I present a comprehensive description of the study’s state and district contexts for SY 2011-12, including demographics and population characteristics of teachers and students in these contexts. Because educational policies centralize control at the state and school district levels, I also describe the key components of education governance that affect policy mandates for PD in New Mexico at these levels. In *Chapter 3: Institutional Ethnographic Research Design*, I describe my study’s design, data collection process, analysis processes, and limitations. *Chapter 4: Descriptive Statistical Profile of New Mexico’s Full-Time Public High School Teachers’ PD Experiences* presents a snapshot of teachers’ PD experiences as reported on the most recently available 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey, providing a school district and state context in which to understand the mandatory PD experiences of
teachers. In *Chapter 5: A Textually-Mediated System of Social Relations & Compliance for Mandatory PD*, I share my findings of how PD becomes mandatory within a textually-mediated, hierarchical system of social relations between teachers and educational stakeholders focused on compliance at multiple levels. In *Chapter 6: Discussion/Conclusion*, I draw on the findings from Chapters 4 and 5 to discuss the ruling relations, or social organization of mandatory PD, concluding with policy implications, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2: Education Policy & Politics in New Mexico

“Federalism and the lack of national constitutional authority to directly impose school reform on the states have greatly complicated politics and policy making in American education, as they have forced the federal government to pursue its goals for school reform indirectly through the grant-in-aid system and state education agencies. This intergovernmental relationship in education is both cooperative and coercive making it complex and contingent on broader political forces.” (McGuinn, 2012, p. 152)

McGuinn’s (2012) quote is pertinent to my perspective of the federal government’s role in education and its ability to transform state public education policies. Even though state legislatures, state education agencies (SEAs), school districts or local education agencies (LEAs), and schools decide the details of most education policy decisions in the United States, the federal government plays an influential role in education at these levels. This influence often takes the form of requirements attached to the receipt of federal funds. For example, New Mexico, as the sixth largest recipient of money from the federal government, relies heavily on federal funding for education (Quigley, 2012). Government funding is coupled with government regulations, many of which require PD, directly affect the lives of students and their teachers in specific states, districts, and schools.

Federally mandated policies also advance notions of teacher development as part of state, district, and school plans to improve teaching, student learning, and student achievement, marked most notably by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001. Unlike previous versions of federal education policy, NCLB mandates all states to adopt a standards and testing regime, a High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE), academic standards to guide their curricula, and to adopt a testing and accountability system that is aligned with those standards (McGuinn, 2006; Meyer, 2007). Additionally, all states must conform to a federal timetable for achieving student proficiency on state-adopted
assessments and high school graduation (McGuinn, 2006). NCLB requires that schools make adequate yearly progress (AYP) to close student achievement gaps so that no child will be left behind in the progression toward 100% state proficiency by 2014 – unless they are granted a flexibility waiver the US Department of Education (USDE). If schools do not meet AYP, states must implement a number of corrective actions with consequences ranging from the loss of funding, the replacement of school staff, the adoption of new curricula, and reopening as a charter school (McGuinn, 2006).

Because “policies do not land in a vacuum; they land on top of other policies” (Darling-Hammond, 1990, p. 240), any discussion and analysis of how PD is mandated as a result of educational policies must be situated in the specific state, district, and school contexts under which they are created and implemented. To this end, I divide this chapter into two parts. First, I present a comprehensive description of the state and district contexts, including demographics and population characteristics of teachers and students, and historical background information about these contexts. Second, I provide a broad overview of the key components of education governance that affect policy mandates for PD in New Mexico and the textual forms of educational policies at state, district, and school levels.

**Description of the Contexts**

Popularly known as the “Land of Enchantment,” New Mexico has a population of approximately 2.1 million people, with a population density lower than all but five other states (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). With the exception of New Mexico’s three urban hubs in Albuquerque, Las Cruces, and Rio Rancho and the semi-urban area of Santa Fe, the state is very rural in nature. New Mexico’s economy depends primarily on oil and gas production, tourism, and federal government spending, including direct payments for Medicare benefits,
food assistance, unemployment benefits, student financial assistance, grants, defense purchases and procurement spending, and salaries and wages for military and civilian federal employees.

**Students’ & teachers’ demographics.** According to the 2010 Census, 47% of New Mexico’s population identifies with the Hispanic or Latino ethnicity category. Per the federal guidelines to treat Hispanic as an ethnicity that is a separate and distinct concept from race, the racial breakdown in New Mexico is 83.2% white, 10.2% American Indian, 2.4% black or African-American, 2.4% two or more races, 1.6% Asian, and 0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (U.S. Census Bureau). On the 2010 Census, 36% of New Mexico’s population reported speaking a language other than English at home.

New Mexico, as a “majority-minority” state with the highest percentage of Hispanics, has demographics that look similar to projections for other states in the future. Hispanics are the fastest growing racial/ethnic group in the United States, with a population that has reached over 50 million. While only the District of Columbia and three states (California, Texas, and Hawaii) were considered “majority-minority,” according to the 2010 Census, 114 million (37%) people in the United States were non-white, a number that is rapidly increasing. Public school teachers are a far less diverse group in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity than the students they teach, and the demographic characteristics of teachers have remained fairly constant over time. Forty-five percent of the nation’s public school students are children of color, while more than four-fifths of the nation’s teachers are white (Center on Education Policy, 2012). New Mexico is no exception. The majority (61.5%) of the approximately 22,000 full-time public school teachers in the state are white, while the majority of the 337,225 students are non-white (74.1%).
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During SY 2011-12, there were 21,957 full-time public school teachers and 337,225 students enrolled in grades Pre-K to 12 in 868 schools in New Mexico, as reported by the PED on the Common Core of Data (CCD) (Keaton, 2013). Twenty-nine percent of New Mexico’s public high school students were enrolled in grades 9-12 (see Appendix 1 for the 2011-12 New Mexico State Education Data Profile). In SY 2011-12, there were 84 charter schools (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, see Appendix 2 for NM Charter Schools Growth graph). Due to possible confidentiality breaches, I do not present the numbers of students and teachers in the school district and high school in which this study takes place. In Appendix 3, I present demographic information in the form of percentages for students and teachers in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and at Rydell High School.

![Figure 3: New Mexico’s Student & Teacher Demographics, SY 2011-12.](source)
As shown in Figure 3, the Public Education Department (PED), school districts, and schools in New Mexico are collapsing Hispanic into the five race categories in publicly available information, despite the U.S. Department of Education (USDE)’s Final Guidance on the issue. The Hispanic category represents an ethnicity, not a race, and refers to a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race. In the Final Guidance, SEAs, LEAs, and schools were also advised that if a student is currently identified as African-American for AYP purposes at the school level when the student has one African-American parent and one Hispanic parent, the school may continue to identify the student as African-American for AYP determinations. For all other aggregate Federal data collections, however, the school and State will be required to identify this student as Hispanic under this final guidance. (Federal Register, 2007)

The latest available information on demographics of students and teachers in New Mexico’s schools treats Hispanic as a racial category, even though USDE requires race and ethnicity (i.e., Hispanic origin) to be treated as separate and distinct concepts. In 1997, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) released Revisions to the Standards for Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity, which replaced those that had been in effect since 1977 (National Forum on Education Statistics, 2008). Three years later, when the decennial census was collected using these OMB standards, the Census Bureau provided individuals with the choice to self-identify with more than one race for the first time since the first census was conducted in 1790. The 1997 OMB standards specify:
two categories for data on ethnicity, including:

1) Hispanic or Latino; or
2) Not Hispanic or Latino;

five categories for data on race, including:

1) American Indian or Alaska Native
2) Asian
3) Black or African-American;
4) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander;
5) White; and

that race and Hispanic origin (i.e., ethnicity) are separate and distinct concepts and
that when collecting these data via self-identification, two different questions must be
used.

The USDE required states and LEAs to report aggregated data using OMB’s
standards because

the new standards are part of federal education reports that districts and states submit
to receive funds such as those provided through the ESEA. They are part of the
required USDE accountability reports collected through the EdFacts data collection
system. Within USDE, the Office for Civil Rights collects data at the school and
district levels to assist with its enforcement of laws prohibiting discrimination on the
basis of race and national origin, among other characteristics. (National Forum on
Education Statistics, 2008, p. 2)

**Historical background: Federal government data collection.** In this section, I
provide background on the origins of federal and state level data collection efforts informing
demographics and population characteristics of teachers and students. In 1867, when Congress passed legislation to establish the USDE, with Henry Barnard as its Commissioner, its main purpose was to

collect such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and other ways to promote the cause of education throughout the country. (as cited in Chisholm, 1919, p. 986)

For its first nine decades, the USDE was referred to as the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) and its research activities “were primarily restricted to the routine collection and dissemination of statistics,” which coincided with the federal government’s minimal investment in education research (Atkinson & Jackson, 1992, p. 55). USOE’s early data collection efforts quantified how many children were schooled and guided a focus on increasing numbers of enrollment and completion (Synder, 1993). USOE’s early reports included data from attendance records, building costs, the costs of textbooks and other supplies, along with extensive census records about the total population (Fraser, 2007; Synder, 1993).

Four years after President Carter’s (1977-1981) push for the expansion of the USOE into an executive cabinet-level agency in 1979, A Nation at Risk was published by the National Commission on Excellence in Education during President Reagan’s (1981-1989) tenure (Cross, 2004). Even though President Reagan initially campaigned on a platform that supported deregulation of public education by the federal government and encouraged the
elimination of the USDE, his administration supported a belief in the federal government’s role of “collecting data, statistics, and information about education generally” (National Commission on Excellence, 1983, p. 33).

In the first decade of the USDE as an executive cabinet-level agency, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) was focused on educational research and development (Atkinson & Jackson, 1992). After its reorganization in 1985, OERI’s work was structured into five offices: 1) the Office of Research, 2) the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 3) Programs for the Improvement of Practice, 4) Library Programs, and 5) Information Services. Because of issues with methodology and construct validity in government education survey data collection, NCES initiated a redesign of its elementary/secondary education surveys (Tourkin et al., 2007). Two years after A Nation at Risk, NCES reported the findings of their survey redesign evaluation under the heading of Excellence in Schools Surveys and Analysis Study, which has become a continuing series that is now named the Schools and Staffing Survey, or the SASS (Tourkin et al., 2007).

Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). The SASS examines aspects of PD that have been correlated with prescriptive models of change in teacher knowledge and instructional practices (see Chapter 1). Not limited to aspects of PD, the SASS also covers a wide range of education topics beyond the scope of this study. As part of its legislative mandate to report on the condition of education in the United States, NCES in conjunction with the Census Bureau, has conducted the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) seven times in 1987-88, 1990-91, 1993-94, 1999-00, 2003-04, 2007-08, and 2011-12 (Goldring, Taie, Rizzo, Colby, & Fraser, 2013a). In the first two administrations (1987–88 and 1990–91), the SASS had five components addressing five major policy issues: teacher supply and demand, characteristics
of elementary and secondary school teachers, teacher workplace conditions, characteristics of school principals, and school programs and policies (Gruber, Wiley, & Broughman, Strizek, & Burian-Fitzgerald, 2002). For the third administration (1993-94), the SASS addressed policy issues regarding student participation in school programs and services, resource allocations to library facilities, and qualifications of librarians. The fourth administration (1999-00) of the SASS was modified to keep track of education’s changing workforce in traditional public, public charter, private, and BIA schools.

During the six-year hiatus between the third and fourth administrations, NCES re-examined the purpose, direction, and use of the SASS (Mullens & Kasprzyk, 1996). As a result of this work, NCES completely redesigned the SASS for its fourth administration. Responding to data needs by policymakers, educators, and researchers, the 1999-00 SASS “measured critical aspects of teacher supply and demand, profiled the qualifications and working conditions of teachers and administrators, and described basic conditions in schools as workplaces and learning environments” (Rouk, Weiner, & Riley, 1999, p. 4). Rouk et al. (1999) argues that the 1999-00 SASS emphasis shifted “from teacher supply and demand issues to the measurement of teacher and school capacity,” with the expressed goals of informing educational policy and planning (p. 5).

Additionally, accounting for public charter schools was added to the SASS in 1999-00 to allow for comparisons between traditional and charter public schools. Rouk et al. (1999) claims that the revised 1999-00 SASS “helped shift the policy debate from teacher quantity – the numbers of vacant teaching positions – to teacher quality – the qualifications of teachers who were hired and retained” (p. 4). For each administration of SASS, NCES has reviewed the content to expand, retain, or eliminate topics covered in previous
administrations of the survey. In this way, the survey’s “capability for trend analysis is maintained, yet at the same time new topics are added to address current concerns” (Gruber et al., 2002, p. 196).

*Common Core of Data (CCD).* The public school sampling frame for the SASS is based on the Common Core of Data (CCD), a program within NCES’ Administrative Data Division in the USDE Institute of Education Sciences (IES) established as part of the Cooperative Education Statistics System in the *Education Sciences Reform Act* (ESRA, 2003, 20 U.S.C. § 9547). The ESRA (2003) created the IES, which replaced the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), and outlined the purpose of IES to provide national leadership in expanding fundamental knowledge and understanding of education from early childhood through postsecondary study, in order to provide parents, educators, students, researchers, policymakers, and the general public with reliable information about –

(A) the condition and progress of education in the United States, including early childhood education;

(B) educational practices that support learning and improve academic achievement and access to educational opportunities for all students; and

(C) the effectiveness of Federal and other education programs. (20 U.S.C. § 9511)

In addition to being a significant source of “scientifically based research” for compliance with NCLB, IES must “compile statistics, develop products, and conduct research, evaluations, and wide dissemination activities in areas of demonstrated national need (including in technology areas) that are supported by federal funds appropriated to [IES]” and ensure that such activities “conform to high standards of quality, integrity, and accuracy;
and are objective, secular, neutral, and nonideological and are free of partisan political influence and racial, cultural, gender, or regional bias” (20 U.S.C. § 9511). NCES is one of three IES National Education Centers. The other two are the National Center for Education Research and the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

Each year NCES uses the CCD program to collect fiscal and nonfiscal data about all public schools, public local education agencies (LEAs), and state education agencies (SEAs) in the United States. NCES organizes an annual EdFacts data collection system, which is where SEAs report on the CCD in three categories: 1) general descriptive information on schools and school districts, 2) data on students and staff, and 3) fiscal data on revenue and expenditures for public education (Keaton, 2013). EdFacts is also where states report information on the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). The CSPR, as a requirement of NCLB, requires SEAs to report on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report with two key parts. Part I of the CSPR requires information related to the state’s progress in the achievement of five performance goals of NCLB, including:

1. By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining AYP goals in ELA/reading and math;
2. All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining AYP goals in ELA/reading and math;
3. By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers;
4. All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning;
5. All students will graduate from high school. (Consolidated State Report [CSPR], 2012)

Part II of the CSPR requires SEAs to report information related to state activities and outcomes of specific programs relevant to NCLB. NCLB is a major legislative reform of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), originally established in 1965 to improve educational equity for students from low-income families by providing federal funds to states through the Title I program. In the federal program, Title I schools are defined as schools that have student body populations for which at least 40% of the students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (Jennings, 2001). Title I is the oldest and largest federally funded program in the United States, and its purpose is to narrow the achievement gap that exists between middle- and low-income children by providing extra resources to help improve instruction in high-poverty schools (Jennings, 2001). Most relevant to the details of this study, in the CSPR, PED reports focused on Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs, Operated by Local Educational Agencies, Title II, Part A, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, and Title III, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act.

For schools with Title I, Part A Programs, the USDE requires PED to report on student achievement in reading and math indicating the number and percent of all students proficient in reading and math according to the following eight population factors or “subgroups” of students: Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, ELLs or emergent bilinguals, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged. Notably, the USDE uses this information to account for NCLB requirements for AYP, which is based on three indicators: Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in ELA/reading and
math, 95% test participation rate, and cohort graduation rates. If any subgroup does not meet AYP in any one of these areas, then the school or district does not meet AYP expectations. In terms of the subgroup size, PED decided that the size of the subgroups for AYP calculation purposes was 25 students or more for AMOs and 40 students or more for 95% test participation rates. NCLB (2003) prohibits disaggregated reporting of data if the data “shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.” These data are then used by USDE and PED to hold districts and schools accountable, meaning punishments or rewards.

Because Title I school receive federal dollars, if they schools fail to make AYP, these schools must take a number of corrective actions with potential consequences that include the loss of funding, the replacement of school staff, the adoption of new curricula, reopening as a charter school, and/or intensive PD for teachers (McGuinn, 2006).

In sum, the CCD is a comprehensive, annual, national database of information concerning all public elementary, middle, and high schools, LEAs, and teachers that contains data designed to be compared across all states (https://nces.ed.gov/ccd). The CCD non-fiscal information is most relevant to this study because NCES uses data from the CCD to inform the sampling frame for SASS administrations. Additionally, anyone may access information from EdFacts, CSPR, NCES, NAEP and many other education-related data sources on the Ed Data Express website (http://eddataexpress.ed.gov/).

**Bilingual Multicultural Education Program participants.** In 1973, New Mexico became the first state to enact a bilingual multicultural education law. As part of the *Bilingual Multicultural Education Act*, the State Board of Education (SBE) at the time
created the New Mexico State Bilingual Advisory Committee (SBAC)\textsuperscript{4} to advise the SBE on matters related to the implementation of the Act (22-23 NMSA 1978). In 2004, legislation was enacted to amend the *Bilingual Multicultural Education Act* and to provide funds to local districts and charter schools to implement bilingual multicultural education programs for all students (NM Laws 2004, Chapter 32). In their annual report on the implementation of the *Bilingual Multicultural Education Act*, the PED reported that 62 (70\%) of the 89 traditional public school districts implemented state-funded bilingual multicultural education programs (see Appendix 4 for the state map of bilingual multicultural education and Title III programs by district). The school district in which this study takes place, TLSD, was one of the school districts implementing a bilingual multicultural education program funded by the state.

During SY 2011-12, approximately 16\% of these students classified as English Language Learners (ELLs) (see Appendix 1). To identify students as ELLs, all public schools are required by law to identify students in grades K-12 eligible for participation in an English language proficiency assessment to determine if they have limited proficiency in English so that states may have a data-driven decision-making process for identifying students who need language support services (20 U.S.C. § 7801). In New Mexico, a home language survey is administered to every student enrolled in a public school. At the elementary and middle school levels, students’ parents complete the home language survey and at the high school, students complete their home language survey. If there is at least one survey response confirming the influence of a language other than English, then the district must continue the identification process by administering the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English

\textsuperscript{4} In 2011, the SBAC was disbanded by the Secretary-designate of the Public Education Department. In 2013, the SBAC was reinstated.
State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS) Placement Test, or W-APT (Public Education Department, [PED], 2010). The W-APT is an NCLB-compliant assessment of English language proficiency, meaning that it meets separate measures of listening, speaking, reading, and writing and reporting requirements for a wide range of sub-scores, including comprehension and vocabulary (Meyer, 2007; Rebarber et al., 2007). Depending on how these students score on the W-APT, they are then identified as an “ELL” in the state of New Mexico. ELLs are also “emergent bilinguals” (Garcia, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008, p. 6).

During SY 2011-12, the top five languages spoken by ELLs in New Mexico were Spanish (n = 42,211), Navajo (n = 7,535), Nias5 (n = 1,165), Caucasian6 (n = 859) and Vietnamese (n = 321) during SY 2011-12. Of significant note in the practice of identifying ELLs according to federal and state policy guidelines, the PED suggests that if teachers observe students struggling with English language proficiency in their classes, then teachers may complete a Teacher Language Observation Form to recommend students to take the W-APT – even if the student’s survey did not indicate a home language other than English (PED, 2010).

**Historical background: Office for Civil Rights (OCR) violations in TLSD.** Within the USDE, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) collects data on demographics and population characteristics from districts and schools in its EdFacts data collection system to assist with its enforcement of laws prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race and national origin, among other characteristics. The OCR is responsible for ensuring that school systems do not engage in discriminatory actions that violate Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Lyons, 1990). Unfortunately, OCR cited the school district in which I conducted my research

---

5 A language spoken in Indonesia.
6 Languages spoken by people in and around the Caucasus Mountains, between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea.
because the TLSD engaged in civil rights violations of ELLs in the mid-1990s. To provide a 
bit of historical context to this violation, I briefly discuss federal policies related to OCR’s 
decision for TLSD.

In 1991, the OCR issued a memorandum (“Policy Update on Schools’ Obligations 
Toward National Origin Minority Students With Limited-English Proficiency”), which 
provided standards by which to determine where a school district’s program for ELLs 
complied with Title VI – which was based heavily on the Castañeda v. Pickard decision (U.S. 
are required to “take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal 
participation by its students in its instructional programs” (Crawford, 2004). Under this 
decision, a program for ELLs is considered acceptable by the OCR if

1. the district is pursuing a program informed by an educational theory recognized as 
sound by some experts in the field, or, at least, deemed a legitimate experimental 
strategy;
2. the programs and practices actually used by the district are reasonably calculated to 
implement effectively the educational theory adopted by the district; and
3. the district has taken action if the program, after a legitimate trial, fails to produce 
results indicating that the language barriers confronting students are actually being 
overcome. (Department of Justice, Investigation Procedures Manual, Tab 24)

Shortly after the OCR issued this memorandum, the OCR found the Thunder 
Lightning School District (TLSD) in violation of the rights of ELLs or emergent bilinguals, 
by not providing them with sufficient help to overcome their language barriers. Specifically, 
in a letter to TLSD, the OCR stated
To the extent that Native American LEP students, Asian LEP students, and other LEP students for whom Spanish and English are second languages receive alternative language services primarily through a Spanish-based bilingual program, these students are not served under a program model that is recognized as sound or considered a legitimate experimental strategy. Academic instruction in Spanish, using an approach that assumes that Spanish or English is the primary language, is functionally equivalent to submersion for students whose primary or home language is not Spanish or English. The primary objectives of bilingual education - transfer of academic and literacy skills from the primary language to a secondary language - is not a reasonable educational objective when the language of instruction is not the primary language. (Department of Justice)

As a result of this violation, the TLSD School Board created an USDE-approved agreement with the OCR. In establishing an USDE-approved agreement, TLSD was able to keep its federal funding by requiring all certified staff in the district to receive 48 hours of training to prepare them to meet the needs of ELLs. After meeting this requirement by passing a course in teaching ELLs, teachers and certified school personnel receive a certificate (TLSD Contract Teacher Interview). Part of the TLSD and OCR Agreement for Corrective Action includes this 48 hours of training at no cost to teachers, which may be considered institutional support for PD focused on how to teach ELLs.

In TLSD, this training is only required for teachers who do not have an endorsement in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) or Bilingual Education on their teaching licenses. As explained by Ms. Tesla Langston, a contract teacher in TLSD hired to teach a course called “Educating Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students” for
new teachers who do not have a TESOL or Bilingual endorsement on their teaching licenses or who have never taken “multicultural education, working with English Language Learners, sheltered instruction, if [they] don’t have any coursework in that” (TLSD Contract Teacher Interview). If teachers do not complete the training, then they will not be considered for reemployment by TLSD (TLSD Contract Teacher Interview). When teachers in the district successfully pass Ms. Langston’s course and “continue to get their TESOL or bilingual endorsement, [then] they will get reimbursed from the district” (TLSD Contract Teacher Interview). According to information I received from the TLSD’s central office while working as an analyst at the LESC, for SY 2011-12, TLSD spent $39,726.55 providing the “Educating Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students” course face-to-face or online to 352 certified staff (TLSD Central Office, personal communication, July 1, 2013).

“Highly Qualified” teachers & teachers’ licensure levels. As explained in Chapter 1, New Mexico’s three-tiered licensure system functions as a career ladder and form of licensure renewal for “highly qualified” teachers. In New Mexico’s SY 2011-12 Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), PED reported that 98.9% of core academic classes at the secondary school level were taught by highly qualified teachers, which is similar to the sample characteristics of teachers who responded to the 2011-12 SASS (see Chapter 3). Despite the Legislative Finance Committee’s claims that “Level III teachers comprise a larger and growing share of all teachers in the system” (Legislative Finance Committee [LFC], 2012, p. 5), for SY 2011-12, the majority (52.8%) of teachers in New Mexico held Level II teaching licenses (PED, personal communication, January 8, 2014). Teachers’ salary minimums increase as they advance in licensure levels, so the higher the level, the higher the cost (Figure 2). Based on the most recent publicly available data on
teachers’ licensure levels in New Mexico and the district and school in which this study took place, the majority of teachers held Level II licenses statewide (Figure 4). At Rydell High School, there were more teachers with internship licenses (7.4%) than teachers with Level I teaching licenses (5.3%). Additionally, Rydell’s average number of teachers with internship licenses (7.4%) was higher than the district’s (2.4%) and the state’s (2.8%) (Figure 4). Higher averages of teachers with internship licenses suggest that they entered teaching through alternative teaching certification programs (see “Sample Characteristics” section in Chapter 3).

Note: Statewide numbers includes public traditional and charter school teachers. TLSD only includes traditional public school teachers. These percentages reflect teachers who were in teaching staff assignments only. These numbers are also unduplicated numbers, which means that teachers are working in more than one school, or more than one district, they are only counted once. Source: SY 2012-13 PED Data Dashboard

![Figure 4: New Mexico Teacher Licensure Levels.](image)

**Alternative certification & teacher licensure.** In New Mexico, teachers seeking certification through a traditional route must complete
- 24-36 college credit hours in a content area (teaching field) and general education requirements that include: 12 college credit hours of English, 12 college credit hours of history, 6 college credit hours of math, 6 college credit hours of government, economics, or sociology, 12 college credit hours of science, and 6 college credit hours of Fine Arts. Generally, these requirements must be met in order to obtain admission to an approved teacher preparation program;

- 30-36 college credit hours of professional education in an approved teacher preparation program for elementary or middle school; 24-30 college credit hours for a secondary program; 24-36 college credit hours for a Pre-K to 12 program; 30 college credit hours for a special education program; and 36-42 college credit hours for an early childhood program; and

- 14-week student teaching component for Pre-K to 12 programs; and 168-180 [teaching practice] hours for an early childhood program. (Teacher Preparation Study Group, 2011, p. 5)

Comparatively, individuals seeking a “fast track” into teaching in New Mexico could apply to the federally-funded and NCLB-authorized Transition to Teaching (T2T) program. T2T alternative teacher candidates only need to have a minimum of 30 undergraduate credit hours or 12 graduate credit hours in a specific content area, to pass the New Mexico Teacher Assessments, and to complete 3-6 credit hours focused on pedagogy (Transition to Teaching). According to NCLD, the purpose of T2T is to encourage the development and expansion of alternative routes to certification under State-approved programs that enable individuals to be eligible for teacher certification within a reduced period of time, relying on the experience, expertise, and academic
qualifications of an individual, or other factors in lieu of traditional course work in the field of education. (20 U.S.C. §6681)

T2T alternative licensure candidates complete the Online Portfolio Alternative Licensure (OPAL) while teaching with an internship license. The OPAL, similar to the Professional Development Dossier requirement for teachers seeking advancement in the three-tiered licensure system (see Figure 2), is organized into five strands and requires teachers to collect data (e.g., lesson descriptions, handouts, student work, video and audio recordings) and provide written explanations about their teaching practice and their effect on student learning. Before officially submitting the OPAL, alternative teacher candidates must teach for at least one year, but they are immediately classified as “highly qualified” teachers according to federal and state law without ever having student taught before entering the classroom.

NCLB provides incentives to states to contract with nonprofit entities, such as Teach for America (TFA), to “[carry] out programs that establish, expand, or improve alternative routes for State certification of teachers and principals, especially in the areas of mathematics and science, for highly qualified individuals with a [BA and/or graduate degree]” (20 U.S.C. §6613). Additionally, NCLB (2003) encouraged school districts to recruit professionals from outside of the field of education and to develop policies making it easier for alternatively certified teachers to obtain full-time positions in schools, limiting the required number of college credit hours focused on pedagogy and student teaching.

In New Mexico, because all PED-approved alternative licensure programs must include a student teaching or field-based component, alternative teacher candidates who seek student teaching experience in schools may obtain an internship license, which is a three-year
certificate/license issued by the PED authorizing a candidate to teach when the candidate does not yet meet the requirements for a Level I license (6.60.3 NMAC). Internship licenses are not renewable; therefore, all requirements must be met by the expiration date of the three-year license period. If teacher candidates complete a PED-approved teacher preparation program, then they may be issued a Level I Alternative License if they meet “the requirements for standard licensure within the three-year period allowed to complete an alternative route to licensure” (6.60.3 NMAC). Moreover, alternative teacher candidates who acquire years of experience on an internship license cannot use those years for advancement in the three-tiered licensure system.

During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the state projected needing approximately 1,500 new teachers per year for the next ten years, an estimate based on the projected teacher retirements of 500 over the next five years; national annual attrition rates of seven to ten percent; data showing that 75% of New Mexico’s trained teachers remain in the state; and data reflecting that one-third of the state’s teaching force is recruited from other states. (Ortiz-Cordova, 2001, p. 1).

In 2001, the legislature and governor devised a solution to the policy problem of teacher shortage in their enactment of SB 28, *Alternative Educational Certification*, which allowed community colleges to offer course work in teacher preparation (NM Laws 2001, Chapter 299). With the *Alternative Educational Certification* law, the then-State Board of Education (SBE) was required to approve all programs leading to educational licensure. As a result, two-year public institutions were allowed to:

- award an appropriate certificate to students completing a program leading to alternative certification for certified school instructors;
award an appropriate certificate to students completing a program leading to
certification of educational assistants; and

provide PD coursework in elementary and secondary education.

To date, there are 14 PED-approved alternative licensure programs, seven of which are at two-year public institutions, including:

1. Central New Mexico Community College;
2. Clovis Community College;
3. Eastern New Mexico University;
4. Highlands University;
5. New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology;
6. New Mexico State University;
7. Northern New Mexico College;
8. San Juan College;
9. Santa Fe Community College;
10. University of New Mexico;
11. University of Phoenix;
12. University of the Southwest;
13. Wayland Baptist University; and
14. Western New Mexico University (Teacher Preparation Study Group, 2011).

**Education Governance**

Even though states, local school boards, school districts, and charter schools control most key educational policy decisions in the United States, the federal government plays an
influential role in education policy at all levels. In a hierarchical way, most requirements in education stem from federal law, guidance as interpreted by the USDE, and then are interpreted and controlled at individual state levels, with trickle down effects to local school boards, school district, and schools. Education governance is highly decentralized and dependent on state, school districts, and school level decisions; therefore, educational policy implementation and research are discursively embedded within the “multiple contexts that shape teaching and learning” (Talbert & McLaughlin, 1993, p. 62). Because these contexts vary so much, in my study, I selected a design that would allow me to examine policies at multiple levels within an interconnected system, specific to one state, one school district, and one school high school level.

Even with the federal government’s ever-increasing role in education, educational stakeholders within individual states interpret these requirements to make them meaningful. For example, every state and the District of Columbia,\(^7\) prescribe teacher certification requirements through traditional or alternative pathways in statute. For high school teachers, traditional pathways typically include completing: 1) an undergraduate education program meeting a minimum number of credit hours in subject areas they want to teach, 2) a secondary education program, 3) student teaching, and 4) a number of state tests that meet the requirements of NCLB. As previously mentioned, alternative pathways refer to any pathway designed to help individuals obtain licensure through something other than the traditional route, such as participation in an online accelerated teacher certification program, TFA, or state-approved alternative certification directly with school districts, such as the T2T Program. Teacher certification, like so many aspects of education from textbook selection to

\(^7\) For educational research and policy purposes, the District of Columbia (D.C.) is treated as a state. The State Education Agency (SEA) for D.C. is the D.C. Office of the State Superintendent of Education.
teacher PD, varies from state to state and is a function of federalism in the United States. In this section, I provide a broad overview of the key components of education governance that affect policies mandating PD for teachers at the New Mexico state level and the TLSD district level.

Decentralization at the federal level. The U.S. is a constitutional federal republic. The U.S. Constitution, written in 1787, is the main law in the United States. Among its provisions, the U.S. Constitution outlines the structure of government, division of powers between the branches of government, and division of powers between the national government and individual state governments. Every law, passed by Congress and signed by the President, must agree with what is written in the U.S. Constitution and is known as the “Supremacy Clause” (U.S. Const. Article VII, Sec. 2). Under the Supremacy Clause, if a state law is preempted by the U.S. Constitution or a federal law or treaty, then the state law cannot be enforced. The U.S. Constitution not only defines the structure and powers of the federal government, but also contains general provisions regarding state government (Elazar, 1984, 1995). All state governments are modeled after the federal government and consist of three branches: executive, legislative, and judicial. States, in contrast to the federal government, are largely free to exercise any power not prohibited to them (U.S. Const. amend. X). In order to effectively restrict state government powers, the restrictions must be written in the state’s constitution. Similar to and different from states, tribal governments are also part of the U.S. federal system and can be thought of as “‘nations within a nation,’ or states within a state” (Garcia et al., 2006, p. 193). For example, in New Mexico, there are at least 23 “nations within a nation,” as indicated by 20 pueblos and three reservations.
The U.S. Constitution neither recognizes the need for public schools, nor does it provide for a federal role in education. Furthermore, federal law prohibits the government from prescribing the content of state curricula and assessments or exerting federal control over any aspect of education (20 U.S.C. § 1232a, §7907). However, if states choose to accept funding from the federal government, then they must also accept the restrictions that come with these monies. Most states include education for all children among several rights guaranteed in their constitutions. Furthermore, state laws typically include provisions for locally elected school boards, which allow local school boards to establish policies and regulations as long as they are in compliance with state and federal laws.

In a hierarchical way, most requirements in education are state-controlled with trickle down effects to local school boards and school districts. Even though states, local school boards, school districts, and charter schools control most key educational policy decisions in the United States, the federal government plays an influential role in education policy at all levels. This is a point particularly relevant to my study, which analyzed how PD becomes mandatory during SY 2011-12, when New Mexico still adhered to the complete requirements of NCLB. Education governance structures in the U.S. vary widely, but because of structural similarities across state governments, education governance structures can be broken down into three levels according to state education agencies (SEAs), regional boards if they have them, and local education agencies (LEAs) (Education Commission of the States 50-State K-12 Governance Structures Database).

In general, policies are enacted by all three branches of government in the form of executive orders from the president, governors, and mayors; statutes and ordinances enacted by legislative bodies such as the U.S. Congress, state legislatures, and city councils; and
judicial decisions issued by courts (Elazar, 1982, 1984, 1995). Elazar (1984) remarks that “federal democracy is the authentic American contribution to democratic thought and republican government” (p. 5). All branches of government as well as regional and school district governance structures play roles in making, enforcing, and implementing public education policy (Fullan, 1994; Grodzins & Elazar, 1982).

**History of New Mexico State constitutional amendments & HB 212.** To examine the root cause of current partisan tensions between the legislative and executive branches of government, which both affected my work at the LESC and my recruitment of participants in this study, I traced where these tensions may have originated: the constitutional amendment to create the PED as part of the executive branch of government and HB 212. New Mexico’s educational policymaking and policy implementation system is intergovernmental with distinct powers and policies at the state and local levels that have varying responsibilities and influences. Decisions in all three branches of government – legislative, executive, and judicial – shape the design of governance in public schools (Mondragon & Stapleton, 2005). Ideally, it would be best if the executive and legislative branches worked together to effectively enact much needed policy changes in New Mexico.

Seventeen years before the 2003 reforms in New Mexico, there were two changes in education that were similar to the changes that occurred in 2003: a constitutional amendment to change the structure of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the establishment of the three teacher licensure levels. The 1986 amendment to change the structure of the SBE allowed the governor to appoint, with confirmation from the legislature, five additional members to the board, and transferred fiscal authority from the authority of the governor to the State Department of Education, which was overseen by the SBE (Garcia et al., 2006).
The 15-member SBE was in charge of determining educational policy and appointing the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

In 1986, the SBE also adopted a framework for licensure that established three licensure levels. Each level was based on sets of competencies determined by the SBE, which were required as part of teacher candidate instruction in university programs. In 1993, the SBE adopted revised competencies for teachers and administrators called Nine Competencies and Indicators. To move between the three licensure levels, teachers had to meet certain criteria, be observed, and satisfactorily meet these competencies. To renew their licenses, teachers in New Mexico had to demonstrate nine competencies and indicators, complete a Professional Development Plan (PDP), and have their PDP approved and verified by the district superintendent.

Between 1986 and 2003, the executive branch of state government’s control over education in New Mexico was limited. In 1986, voters amended the New Mexico Constitution to remove the responsibility for administering state school funds and approving local budgets from the governor’s Office of Education in the Department of Finance and Administration to the State Board of Education (SBE), which was responsible for overseeing the State Department of Education (Garcia et al., 2006). The State Department of Education was the managerial arm of the SBE, whose staff was charged with implementing the SBE’s policies. Similar to a local school board, the SBE would appoint a State Superintendent of Public Instruction, whose primary duties were to support local school districts and serve as the chief administrative officer of the State Board of Education (Garcia et al., 2006).

**State level policy structure.** When discussing educational policies at the state level in New Mexico, it is important to clarify that two primary branches of government have the
power to make policies: the New Mexico State Legislature and the Public Education Department (PED), which has been the education agency under the executive branch of government since 2003. The legislature – as a whole and by committee – studies, provides direction for, allocates state funds to, and passes laws pertaining to education. The New Mexico State Legislature meets for 60 days during odd-numbered years and for 30-days during even-numbered years (NM State Constitution, Article IV, sec. 5). Additionally, the governor has the power to call the legislature into a special session by proclamation. The governor proposes legislation and education initiatives through the various executive cabinet secretaries, and prepares an annual education budget, which is considered by the legislature. New Mexico is different from other states in that both the governor and two legislative committees, the Legislative Finance Committee (through House Bill 2) and the House Education Committee (through House Bill 3), propose comprehensive state budget proposals for the legislature to consider. There is an interrelationship, separation of powers, and inherent tension involved in these two branches of government, particularly when partisan composition among them differs (Rosenthal, 2009).

Some political scientists and analysts have described state legislatures as “the engine of democracy” (Rosenthal, 2009, p. 1) because it is the first branch of government in the order in which provisions are specified in federal and state government. In a nation of approximately 316 million people, the 535 elected officials in Congress and the 7,383 elected officials occupying legislative seats across the 50 states have the duty of representing the people from their respective districts (National Council of State Legislatures [NCSL], 2014). In each of the 99 legislative bodies in the 50 states, the local district is the basic building block for the state legislature because elected officials live in, are elected, and represent these
districts (Rosenthal, 2009). In this way, legislators are tied to their constituencies, comforting them, providing assistance, acquiring resources, and sponsoring bills that reflect the interests of those they represent; thereby making the legislature the branch of government closest to the people (Rosenthal, 2009).

The New Mexico State Legislature, whose principal power is in controlling “the purse” and making laws, is a bicameral body made of 70 members in the House of Representatives and 42 members in the Senate (Garcia et al., 2006). Members of House of Representatives run for office every two years, while members of the Senate are elected for four-year terms (Garcia et al., 2006). Money cannot be expended until the legislature appropriates it, nor can taxes be collected without its authority (Hain, Clark, & Clark, 1981). The New Mexico State Legislature is distinct from other state legislatures for two reasons. First, legislators receive a $154 per-diem voucher per day during meetings and sessions and $0 in salary. Second, citizens in the state of New Mexico rely on their legislators in a unique way: “New Mexicans do not have the power of the initiative, which would allow the citizens, by petition and votes cast in an election, to pass legislation without action by the legislature” (Hain, Clark, & Clark, 1981, p. 36). Instead, there is a popular referendum process, also known as a People’s Veto, where citizens may, after collecting the signatures of registered votes equal to 10% of the votes cast for governor in the last statewide election (i.e., 53,649 votes), place specific legislation that was enacted by the legislature on the ballot for voters to reject or adopt (Citizens in Charge, 2010). Given the difficulties of undertaking a People’s Veto, legislation voted on by the New Mexico State Legislature and signed into law by the governor typically stays law until it is replaced by another law.
Much of the legislative process relies upon considerations in committees during legislative sessions and the interim throughout the year. It is in committees that the public has the opportunity to testify in favor of or in opposition to a bill and voice concerns about underrepresentation or lack of funding for education initiatives. Furthermore, study and deliberation goes on for hours during the committee stage and continues at leadership meetings, party caucuses, and on the floor (Rosenthal, 2009). In New Mexico, two committees of utmost importance during legislative sessions are the Senate and House Education and Finance Committees. During the interim, these committees are bicameral, bipartisan in nature, become the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) and Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) respectively, and meet regularly in different geographic areas throughout the state.

The LFC, established in 1957 as a fiscal and management oversight component of the New Mexico State Legislature, prepares legislation addressing financial and management issues of state government, and makes budgetary recommendations to the entire legislature for the funding of state government, higher education, and public schools. Since more than half of the state budget supports education in some way – K-12 or higher education – discussions, reports, and policy decisions endorsed by the LFC have major implications for public schools, teachers, and students. Unlike the LFC, the LESC was created to conduct a continuing study of education and laws governing education in New Mexico, as well as the policies and costs of the educational system. Developed as a permanent committee of the New Mexico Legislature in 1965, the LESC is the only permanent committee of its kind in the U.S. Both the LFC and the LESC are assisted by staffs that are responsible for providing
legislators and the public with information in the form of staff reports, briefs, and presentations.

Like most states, New Mexico has a plural executive, in which several key members of the executive branch are directly elected by the people and serve alongside the governor, but the governor is the state’s “supreme executive power” and is responsible for seeing that the New Mexico Constitution and the laws of the state are faithfully executed. As the state’s “chief legislator,” the governor advances and pursues new and revised policies and programs using a variety of tools, such as executive orders, executive budgets, legislative proposals, and vetoes (Rosenthal, 2009). Using his or her veto power, the governor may prevent a bill passed by the legislature from becoming law by either rejecting the entire bill or through a line-item veto, if it’s an appropriation bill, for parts of the legislation that he or she does not want to become law (Garcia et al., 2006). Even though the governor has strong veto power, the legislature can override the governor’s veto by a two-thirds majority vote in both the Senate and the House of the New Mexico State Legislature (Garcia et al., 2006).

Since statehood in January 1912 to January 2014, New Mexico has had 31 governors. While 12 Governors have been from the Republican Party and 19 have been from the Democratic Party over this time period, the Legislature has been under the control of the Democratic Party for the majority of the time. Between 1992 and 2013, New Mexico was one of 13 states that did not have a Republican legislature for even one year (Pallay, 2013). Democrats have a 1.5 to 1 statewide advantage over Republicans in the number of registered voters who are party members, but this advantage does not always guarantee wins for Democratic candidates since Democrats have been more willing than Republicans to vote for other party’s candidates (Garcia et al., 2006).
The partisan composition of state legislatures and governors is important because typically, the characterization of states as “red” (Republican) or “blue” (Democrat) refer to how the state’s electorate voted in the most recent presidential election, which does not capture the complexity of the political tensions that play out during legislative sessions. Partisan differences result in competition among the Republican and Democratic parties and in recent years, partisanship has created more ideological polarization (Abramovitz & Saunders, 2005; Pew Research Center, 2012). According to the 2012 American Values survey by the Pew Research Center, across 48 different questions covering values about government, economic issues, education, and other areas, the average difference between the opinions of Republicans and Democrats is 18 percentage points, nearly twice the size of the gap in surveys conducted in previous years (Pew Research Center, 2012). Partisan competition, within and among the legislative and executive branches of government, influences the education policymaking process and is in many ways adversarial, characterized by the clash of competing and conflicting interests, viewpoints, and values.

Partisan competition over education at the state level, expressed through Republican or Democrat ideological differences, is a relatively recent phenomenon in New Mexico. In 2003, the first special election for constitutional amendments in 30 years happened and that year the legislature appropriated $900,000 for the 2003 special election through House Bill (HB) 310: School-Related Constitutional Amendments (Folmar, 2005). Of the 186,570 voters participating in the special election held on September 23, 2003, 101,542 of them voted in favor of Constitutional Amendment 1 (“2003 Special Election,” 2003). After voters adopted Constitutional Amendment 1, New Mexico had a new form of state-level educational governance – under the control of the governor.
Among its requirements, Constitutional Amendment 1 amended Article 12, section 6 of the New Mexico State Constitution and transferred the State Department of Education to a cabinet department headed by a Secretary of Public Education who was a “qualified, experienced educator” that served in the governor’s executive cabinet. Additionally, instead of the State Board of Education (SBE), with ten elected members and five appointed members, there was the Public Education Commission (PEC), with ten elected members; instead of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed by SBE, there was the Secretary of Public Education, appointed by the Governor; and instead of the State Department of Education, there was the Public Education Department (PED). To help deal with the transition from the SBE to PED, during the 2003 interim the LESC formed an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Governance of Public Schools, which addressed the changes that needed to occur in the Public School Code due to Constitutional Amendment 1. Since 2003, there have been three PED’s, lead by the following women who have served as PED’s Secretary: Dr. Veronica Garcia (under Democratic Governor Bill Richardson), Dr. Susana Murphy (under Democratic Governor Bill Richardson), and Hanna Skandera as the secretary-designate\(^8\) (under current Republican Governor Susana Martinez).

**School district level policy structure.** Although there are several local government entities in New Mexico, consisting of counties and municipalities, this dissertation focuses on aspects of municipal public school districts, which are governed by school boards and are also known as local boards of education. In the United States, cities typically have local school boards of education, which function as a “creature of the Legislature, established for

---

\(^8\) Despite the state’s constitutional requirements for PED’s Secretary of Public Education to be confirmed by the Senate in the New Mexico State Legislature, Ms. Skandera has served as PED’s secretary-designate since 2011. Ms. Skandera did not receive enough votes in the Senate Rules Committee during the 2014 legislative session to be confirmed by the Senate.
the purpose of managing the affairs of the school district” (Goldhammer, 1964, p. 4).

Notably, the Recovery School District in New Orleans does not have a local school board of education and is administered by Louisiana’s Department of Education, making it the first in the country to not have any traditional public schools (Layton, 2014).³⁹

In New Mexico, all school districts have local school boards of education. Throughout my study, I use the term “district” to indicate school board because they are inseparable. The school board is the local government body presiding over the traditional school district, thus the two are inseparable. School boards are granted power according to the New Mexico Public School Code and their responsibilities are also defined in the law (22-5-4 NMSA, 1978). In general, school board members are elected to represent their local community’s beliefs and values and to work as a collective body on the school board to establish policies and regulations through a democratic process, in compliance with state and federal laws. School boards in New Mexico have the capacity to: employ the superintendent, develop educational policies for the school district that are subject to the rules of PED, issue general obligation bonds, repair and maintain all property belonging to the school district, and review, approve, and oversee the school district’s budget. Importantly, a local school board of education allocates funds in the school district’s budget. On issues related to the budget, school board members focus exclusively on education.

All school boards throughout the state may establish policies that allow employees in the district to organize and bargain collectively with the school board. New Mexico is one of 32 states that require collective bargaining for public employees per the provisions in the

³⁹ Related to the topic of education governance, in Louisiana’s state education law, the RSD is a special school district overseen by the state’s education agency, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE). Smith (2012) notes that RSD “really falls into a gray area between ‘district’ and ‘state agency.’” (p. 8).
Public Employees Bargaining Act (10-7E NMSA, 1978). Even though New Mexico requires collective bargaining, only 41% of teachers are unionized, giving New Mexico the lowest unionization of any state in which bargaining is mandatory (Winkler, Scull, & Zeehandelaar, 2012). Before 1992, collective bargaining was not part of state law in New Mexico. Between 1999 and 2002, attempts to extend the Collective Bargaining Act from 1992 were vetoed by the Republican governor, Gary Johnson (Lindy, 2011). In 2003, the legislature and the Democratic governor, Bill Richardson, reinstated collective bargaining provisions in law. Now, the law currently requires that wages, hours, terms and conditions of employment, and grievance procedures are included in the bargaining process, while pension and retirement benefits are excluded (Winkle et al., 2012). The way the law works is that school districts must collectively bargain if employees request it to do so. The law also prohibits teacher strikes (10-7E-21 NMSA, 1978).

New Mexico’s funding formula: State Equalization Guarantee (SEG). Since 1974, New Mexico’s Public School Finance Act has been widely acclaimed as one of the most innovative of school finance plans currently being used across the country (Chambers, Levin, DeLancey, & Manship, 2008; Garcia et al., 2006). New Mexico is the first of a few states to implement an equity funding formula. Appropriations through the equity funding formula, called the State Equalization Guarantee Distribution (SEG), are distributed to school districts based on the number of students and programs in certain categories in the SEG. Unlike many states, however, local school districts in New Mexico are not permitted to levy additional taxes to supplement the funding formula. As a result, approximately 90 percent of all operational funds for the education of public school students come from the New Mexico
State Legislature, to ensure spending disparities among districts are generally less than other states.

When money is allocated through the SEG, local school boards have much discretion over how to decide to use the funds in their school districts’ budget. A school district’s SEG is the amount of money the state guarantees to provide equal access to programs and services appropriate to their educational needs regardless of geographic location or local economic conditions (Garcia et al., 2006). Districts generate funds from the state based on unit weights and their population. Formula dollars received by local districts are not earmarked for specific programs. Within statutory and regulatory guidelines, school boards and their districts have the latitude to spend their dollars according to local priorities. In budget terms, money appropriated “above the line,” refers to money that flows through the SEG. Money appropriated “below the line,” however, generally goes to the Public Education Department for specific programs that can have an impact on funding formula equity. Awards to school districts from these “below the line appropriations” are contingent upon certain policy initiatives set by the PED and can vary from year to year. As a result, it is not always clear the amount of funding school districts will receive from “below the line” appropriations from year to year, whereas the specific provisions of the public school funding formula are outlined in state law guarantee more consistency.

The funding formula, or the SEG, supports the New Mexico Constitutional requirement to establish and maintain “a uniform system of free public schools sufficient for the education of, and open to, all the children of school age in the state” (Article XII, Sec. 1) despite differences in local school district wealth. The SEG is student driven and recognizes different costs for various educational programs. The New Mexico Legislature provides a
pay incentive for teachers that have received National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (National Board) certification and for teachers who teach in bilingual multicultural education programs (22-8-23.4 NMSA, 1978). These incentives are generated through the SEG to districts to provide a yearly, one-time salary differential to teachers. Furthermore, Level II teachers that possess National Board certification, complete at least three years at Level II, demonstrate instructional leader competence through the HOUSSE system, and meet “other qualifications” as determined by the PED will be eligible to advance to Level III-A without a master’s degree (22-10A-11.1 NMSA, 1978). Teachers who successfully advance from Level II to Level III-A receive a salary increase, making the statutory required minimum salary of $50,000 per year (22-10A-11 NMSA, 1978).

The Instructional Staff Training and Experience (T&E) Index, a component of New Mexico’s public school funding formula, also provides a financial incentive to school districts to hire and maintain licensed instructional staff who have advanced degrees, college credit beyond a degree, or extensive teaching experience. The T&E Index provides a mechanism for recognizing the additional costs of better education and more experienced teachers. Under the T&E Index, college credits and years of experience are used to calculate additional funding for teachers in school district’s salary schedules (22-8 NMSA 1978). An illustration of this is from Mr. Alex Dunlap, a “highly qualified” Level II Drama Teacher at Rydell High School without a MA degree who is research participant in this study and has been teaching for 30 years: “I have a BFA plus 48 [college credit] hours which is, on [the district’s salary schedule], the equivalent to a masters” (Drama Teacher Interview). According to the TLSD salary schedule, which is based on the T&E Index statute (22-8 NMSA, 1978), teachers with 30 years of experience and a BA plus 45 college credit hours
are paid $50,637. Through the funding formula, there are two opportunities for teachers to receive the Level III-A salary minimum of $50,000 without a master’s degree, as required in the three-tiered teacher licensure system (see Figure 2).

**Textual forms of state & district level policies.** When a law is passed by the legislature and signed by governor, it is chaptered in statute in the New Mexico Statutes Annotated (NMSA). If a law is related to education in grades K-12, then the details of the law are written as rules by PED, undergo a rulemaking process, and are published in the *New Mexico Register* as part of the New Mexico Administrative Code (NMAC) to support, clarify, or implement the law. In other words, administrative rules written by PED have the effect of law. Administrative rules may be created and revised by PED at any time as long as PED follows the *State Rules Act* (14-4 NMSA 1978), which mandates that all rules must be filed with the Administrative Law Division at the State Records Center and Archives.

Administrative rules serve two main purposes: 1) to carry-out the intent of the law and 2) to inform the public about how the agency will conduct its business in carrying-out the intent of the law. In order to prevent abuses of power and to provide predictability, rules clarify the *how* of policy implementation. Through the rulemaking process, citizens have the opportunity to provide public comment and respond to the rules agencies create. The formal structure of the NMAC has the following components specified in rule documents: the issuing agency, scope, statutory authority, duration, effective date, definitions, requirements, referenced materials, and history. When rules and statutes conflict, statutes govern; however, the judgment about a potential conflict and its resolve is made by the judicial branch of government and is handled in court.
School boards in New Mexico can establish policies and resolutions. School board policies typically cover its governance structure and operations, personnel and human resources, general school administration, negotiations, students, instruction, business and non-instructional operations, support services, and school and community relations. Resolutions express the school boards’ unified consensus on policy, such as requesting PED to delay full implementation of the new teacher evaluation system or urging Congress to stop sequestration.

The New Mexico affiliates of the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) are the two unions in the state that represent teachers and school employees. For all school districts in New Mexico engaged in collective bargaining, a process for obtaining economic security and for helping employers (i.e., school boards) and employees (i.e., teachers and their union) resolve disputes that may arise between them, the result is a negotiated agreement for each school year, which outlines in writing the terms both parties agree to. For the most part, the negotiated agreement is construed as a “living contract” between the unions and the school boards, where the major components stay the same throughout and are slowly modified based on teachers’ needs. The formal structure of the negotiated agreements include: articles regarding the topics of negotiated topics of interest, such as conditions of professional service and assignments and transfers, sections, and appendices.

As part of the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), states are required to develop annual measurable objectives (AMOs), which determine if schools, districts, and states are making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of having all students proficient in English language arts or reading and mathematics by 2014.
PED set the AMOs as targets for each grade level and year until the 2014 deadline (PED website). The formal structure of the AMOs includes: grade level, proficiency percentages in reading or math, and year. For high schools, AMOs also include graduation rates. AMOs are also measured annually according to school district and individual school level accountability report cards.

The formal structure of school district and individual school level accountability report cards includes: ratings of AYP, school designations (e.g., progressing, in need of improvement, corrective action, etc.), proficiency goals and participation rates of 9 groups of students, and graduation rates for high schools. Additionally, the details of individual schools and districts’ strategic plans to meet AYP are specified in annually created Educational Plans for Student Success (EPSS). The formal structure of the district and school EPSS includes: goal areas and strategies established by PED, and action steps and tasks decided by individual school boards and school districts.

In the next chapter, I describe my study’s design, data collection process, analysis processes, and limitations.
Chapter 3: Institutional Ethnographic Research Design

In this chapter, I describe the research design of my study and detail each aspect of the methodology that I used to gather and organize the data for analysis. First, I provide an overview of Institutional Ethnography. I explain the decisions I made throughout the research process, particularly around the school district and high school selection, participant recruitment, participant selection, data collection, and data analysis. I end the chapter with a description of this study’s limitations.

Institutional Ethnography (IE)

In this study, I drew on Institutional Ethnography (IE) as both a theory and method of inquiry to answer the following three overarching research questions and five sub-questions:

1) What are the characteristics of PD for full-time public high school teachers in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and Rydell High School in New Mexico as teachers report their experiences?

2) What are the characteristics of mandatory PD for full-time public high school teachers as prescribed in state, district, and school level institutional texts?

3) How does PD become mandatory for full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico?

Sub-questions

1) What was the format, topic, and duration of full-time public high school teachers’ participation in PD activities?

2) How did full-time public high school teachers rate the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated?
a. Was there a difference in how full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated?

3) What were the most common types of institutional support for PD that full-time public high school teachers received?

4) What percentage of full-time public high school teachers thought they had influence over school policies related to determining the content of their PD and teacher evaluation?

Combined, my research questions and sub-questions required a design that would interrogate the “taken-for-granted social fact” (Ng, 1995, p. 35 as cited in Eastwood, 2005) that PD, as it is mandated in specific school, district, and state contexts, follows research-based prescriptive models for high quality PD. In asking questions about how teachers’ experience voluntary and mandatory PD within a specific high school and school district in New Mexico and to understand how PD became mandatory for teachers, it was best to draw on Institutional Ethnography (IE). Developed by Dorothy Smith (1987) as a feminist methodology, IE uses people’s lived experiences to examine how their daily activities are coordinated and co-ordered by organizations and texts.

Theoretically, IE begins with three core assumptions (Deveau, 2008). First, individuals are experts on their own lives. Research that aims to discover and explore “how things are actually put together” requires grounding in people’s lived realities, particularly from the standpoint of people whose knowledge and experiences have been devalued (Smith, 2005, p. 1). Second, individuals are located in a range of social settings that are interrelated within a textually-mediated system of social relations. Third, powerful, outside forces, or
ruling relations, shape how individuals live and experience their lives within multiple local settings. What emerges from an IE is a social cartography that makes visible how social relations are locally organized and trans-locally controlled through ruling relations (Campbell & Gregor, 2004). According to Smith (2005), the social organization or institutional power structures are the ruling relations. Ruling relations are accomplished, in part, as people activate texts that organize their work.

In IE, “institution” refers to coordinated and intersecting work processes and courses of action (DeVault & McCoy, 2006; Smith, 2005). In IE, “ethnography” refers to the term in its broadest sense and is considered both a process and a method for studying interconnected sociocultural contexts, processes, and meanings (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; McCoy, 2008; Whitehead, 2002). Unlike in anthropological studies (Spindler, 1997), ethnography in IE is not understood as a method for studying culture per se (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; McCoy, 2008). Ethnographic methods in IE are used to investigate a number of phenomena in the social world, some of which are specific to certain cultures and others of which are not.

While IE uses aspects of ethnography to study people in their routine activities, such as “thick description” to describe particular contexts, settings, and people, the goal of IE is not to write an ethnography of an institution, which may be conceived of as a particular type of organization (Campbell & Gregor, 2004). In IE, an institution is viewed as a “vast complex of coordinated and intersecting work-processes taking place in multiple sites” (DeVault & McCoy, 2006, p. 17). The concept of “institution” in IE is meant to direct the researcher’s attention to coordinated and intersecting work processes taking place across multiple sites in a system of social relations. In this way, IE is similar to Marcus’s (1995, 1998) multi-sited ethnography, where researchers attend to how meanings get taken up by
people and how meanings shift across different contexts. As a critical project, IE shares a number of concerns with multi-sited ethnography (Marcus, 1995, 1998) and critical ethnography (Carspecken, 1996; McNeil, 1988, 2000), which explore the relation of localized experiences and the broader contradictions of race, class, and the de-valuing of the “public” in decentralized systems of public education. Moreover, ethnography in IE refers to more than ethnographic methods and is:

- the study of sociocultural contexts, processes, and meanings;
- a process of discovery, making inferences, and continuing inquiries;
- an iterative process of learning episodes;
- an open-ended emergent learning process, and not a rigid investigator controlled experiment;
- a highly flexible and creative process; and
- an interpretive, reflexive, and constructivist process. (Whitehead, 2002, p. 5)

Even though IE uses aspects of ethnographic methods to study people in their routine activities, this localized study of people’s experience is a point of entry to analyze the ways they participate in trans-local relations that construct their routine activities (Campbell & Gregor, 2004). For example, I use IE to describe and analyze a textually-mediated system of social relations, conceived from the standpoint of teachers, whose professional development (PD) experiences are organized by this system. First, I begin with high school teachers’ PD experiences as they reported them on the 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). As used here, experience refers to what teachers know, live, and report about their participation in PD activities. Because the ways in which larger social relations that organize teachers’ mandatory PD are not fully visible in individual and aggregate accounts of teachers’ PD
experiences, I examine institutional texts and practices of text activation that teachers and educational stakeholders engage in to mandate PD for teachers at state, district, and school levels. In this study, I am concerned with identifying how coordinated and intersecting work processes and courses of text-based action at state, district, and school levels shape teachers’ experiences of mandatory PD. Therefore, I use IE to identify, trace, and describe the social relations that exist within and extend beyond the boundaries of any one educational stakeholder or teacher’s experience (Campbell & Gregor, 2004).

In drawing on IE as a method of inquiry in this study, my overall aim is two-fold. The first aim is to discover characteristics of teachers’ mandatory PD and the social relations that are being shaped by institutional texts that have the power to hold teachers and educational stakeholders to acting in particular ways. I define characteristics as the structural features that characterize PD activities. Within a system of social relations, texts specify requirements of ruling relations, which are the socially-organized exercise of power that shapes people’s actions and their lives (Smith, 1999; 2005). Within this system, texts are of central importance because they “create this essential connection between the local of our (and others’) bodily being and the translocal organization of the ruling relations” (Smith, 2006, p. 118-119). Yet the capacity for texts to rule depends on people who activate them because it is people’s involvement with and use of texts that make things happen (Campbell & Gregor, 2004). The second aim is to produce “maps” of the ruling relations, charting a pathway from one local school level into larger institutional complexes at the district and state levels in which teachers and educational stakeholders participate, which can be then be used as blueprints for change (Smith, 2006; Townsend, 1996).
For the purposes of this study, an institutional ethnographic approach allowed for an in-depth examination of social relations that affect how PD becomes mandatory for full-time public high school teachers at one district and one high school level in New Mexico. Drawing on IE was appropriate for this study because it maintains a social ontology of a researcher’s topic based in an examination of what people do, how they work, and how this doing and working (i.e., social relations) links to others in a complex institutional web, which constitutes its social organization (Smith, 2005). The concept of social relations is central to understanding how PD for teachers becomes mandatory. Social relations implicate more than one individual in concerted sequences and are “actual practices and activities through which people’s lives are socially organized” (Campbell & Gregor, 2004, p. 30). It is the concerted sequence of actions within a system of social relations that teachers and educational stakeholders engage in that makes PD mandatory.

Teachers and educational stakeholders’ work of mandatory PD is textually-mediated by institutional structures and practices within a system of social relations. Teachers are often unaware of these structures that are shaping their local mandatory PD experiences, yet the actions they take to engage in mandatory PD is part of a system of social relations that extend beyond their local experiences. Unjustly, teachers’ PD is subordinated to the institutional text compliance requirements of external mandates. In presenting a social cartography that makes visible how PD becomes mandatory for teachers within a hierarchical system of social relations, the findings here function as an important tool for understanding its social organization and for developing strategies to change the antiquated practice of supplanting teachers’ knowledge of their individual and collective needs for PD with districts’ and schools’ plans for their PD.
School District and High School Selection

My rationale to select the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and Rydell High School is informed by my previous work with Academic Literacy for All (ALA) Project, where I developed trusting relationships with teachers at Rydell and several other middle and high schools TLSD. These experiences facilitated my ability to gain access to teachers at Rydell and within TLSD. Rydell High School in TLSD was one of the most active sites during the ALA Project and one of the most supportive because Rydell’s principal, Mr. Bob McGee, provided space in one of the classrooms for the ALA Project to conduct its graduate seminars for the duration of the project. I selected Rydell High School in TLSD as a focal site because trusting relationships had already been established through the ALA Project.

Data Collection

Interviews. It is the goal of the institutional ethnographer to use participants’ accounts to begin to analyze the complexities of social relations and to make visible the socially-organized exercise of power (i.e., ruling relations) that shapes their actions (DeVault & McCoy, 2002; McCoy, 2006; Smith, 2005). Systems of social organization are implicit and present in the language people use to share what they know about their localized experiences (DeVault & McCoy, 2002). In the interviews, I asked teacher and educational stakeholder participants to discuss texts they encountered that informed their level-specific actions in relation to mandatory PD for teachers. By interviewing teacher and educational stakeholder participants, I was able to use accounts of what they knew about their work to discover social relations of mandatory PD among and between these institutional actors within an interconnected system.
Gaining entry. Each dissertation that involves interaction with human subjects must be reviewed and approved by the University of New Mexico’s (UNM) Institutional Review Board (IRB). Between December 19, 2012 and March 14, 2013, I spent time obtaining approval from TLSD, Rydell High’s Principal Bob McGee, and UNM’s IRB. TLSD had its own review process, which took an exceptional amount of time due to turnover within the district’s central office. An expedited review was granted for this study on March 15, 2013 (see Appendix 5). I conducted interviews with a total of 15 teacher and educational stakeholder participants between April 30, 2013 and October 4, 2013. Authorization to collect data expired on January 16, 2014 and the study was closed on March 14, 2014 (see Appendix 6).

As part of my agreements with the UNM IRB and TLSD, the school district, the school, the teachers, and the educational stakeholders are identified in this study with pseudonyms to prevent identification. Because I had two categories of participants, high school teachers and educational stakeholders, I received approval from the UNM IRB for two types of informed consent documentation. For the high school teacher participants, I provided them with a written consent form, requested their signature, and provided them with a copy before and after I obtained consent.

For the educational stakeholder participants, I provided them with a written consent form, but used a verbal consent process. Part of the reason for a verbal consent process was that some of the educational stakeholders interviewed, particularly at the state and district levels, held very public positions. If confidentiality was breached due to the consent form, which would be the only record linking educational stakeholder participants to this study, and unpopular opinions were expressed in the interviews, potential harm could result in a loss of
likability from the public and/or their superiors in higher positions. In the consent form for educational stakeholders, I explained the potential for social risk and breach of confidentiality if their responses were disclosed, and no identifying information from educational stakeholder participants was collected. Once educational stakeholder participants agreed to participate and consented, their verbal agreement was reflected in the transcript of the audio recording of the interview.

**Participant recruitment.** Once I received IRB approval, I contacted Principal McGee at Rydell High School, who said that I could begin recruiting teachers at his school in April 2013, after the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) was administered. On April 10, 2013, I met with Principal McGee and a former ALA Project teacher educator (ALATE), who was a leader at the school, to distribute fliers about my study in the teachers’ lounge. With Principal McGee’s approval, the former ALATE also mentioned my study in an email to all teachers at Rydell.

I sent an email to other ALATEs at Rydell High School asking for teachers they might know who were interested in participating in my study. Two ALATEs replied with suggestions and provided these teachers’ email addresses. I reached out to four additional teachers via email. I received responses from three of these teachers, explaining that they did not want to participate due to a lack of time. One of the teachers replied in the affirmative, but did not meet the inclusion criteria because he was part-time. Exclusion criteria for teacher participants included part-time teachers and teachers that have participated in the ALA Project. These criteria were determined by checking the staff directory and/or asking if they: a) teach full-time, and b) if they have participated in the ALA Project.
Using information from the Rydell High website, I compiled a list of all the full-time teachers at the high school and emailed them. I heard back from one teacher, an English Language Arts teacher named Mr. John Keating. Mr. Keating read the consent form, agreed to participate, and scheduled our interview closer to the end of the school year. Over the summer, I did not reach out to teachers while they were on vacation. When school resumed in August of 2013, I repeated the email process and followed up emails with phone calls to teachers. Aside from Mr. Keating and two teachers referred by others, I was unsuccessful in my attempts to recruit more than three teachers.

I used snowball sampling as a recruitment technique for educational stakeholder participants at state, district, and university levels. But snowball sampling did not work in my attempts to recruit staff from the Public Education Department (PED) staff. My affiliation with the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) as a policy analyst may have negatively impacted my ability to interview PED staff, perhaps because of the tensions between the executive and legislative branches of New Mexico’s divided government (see Chapter 2). At the time I conducted my research, New Mexico’s Republican Governor and executive state education agency, the PED, developed new rules to substantially change teachers’ annual evaluations, a process organized through New Mexico’s High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) system. These changes upset several elected officials in the New Mexico State Legislature because many felt that the Governor’s changes extended the original intent of the law governing the HOUSSE system, which was established in 2003 with the enactment of HB 212.

Between July and December of 2013, I actively recruited two high-ranking PED staff members. They expressed interest in participating in my study, but needed further
clarification of how I would use the information they provided during the interviews. I explained that the interview would only include generic identifiers indicating their professional role and organization and that the interview was for my dissertation research and not for my work at the LESC. Though I made this distinction clear, I was still unable to successfully interview them.

**Participant selection.** Consistent with IE sampling and interviewing practices, I selected participants because they helped illuminate the “textual trail” of mandatory PD within the multi-level system of social relations (André-Bechely, 2005; DeVault & McCoy, 2006). It is important to note that I did not select participants to generalize to a larger population of teachers or educational stakeholders. Instead, I used teachers’ and educational stakeholders’ accounts as windows to investigate the social relations because they when they talk about their work in relation to mandatory PD, “their conversation necessarily carries traces of those social relations” (Campbell, 2008, p. 270).

I used mixed purposeful sampling, where I combined maximum variation, criterion sampling, and snowball sampling to obtain a sample of 15 participants (Creswell, 2007; Seidman, 2006). Purposive sampling means that there is a series of strategic choices about whom, where, and how I do my research. A subset of purposive sampling is criterion sampling, which ensures that certain individuals have a particular experience; in this case, teaching a subject full-time at Rydell High School. Other participants in the study suggested potential participants unknown to me and referred me to them, a strategy known as snowball sampling. For example, when I interviewed Ms. Lou Ann Johnson, the fine arts (drama) resource teacher at TLSD, she suggested that I contact Mr. Alex Dunlap, a drama teacher at Rydell High who might be willing to participate in my study. Once Ms. Johnson introduced
me to Mr. Dunalp via email, he read the consent form and agreed to participate. After I
interviewed Mr. Dunlap, he suggested that I interview his wife, a full-time Science teacher at
Rydell High.

Utilizing a snowball sampling technique, each educational stakeholder participant
was asked to suggest other persons who met criteria for inclusion in the research. The
inclusion criteria included educational stakeholders from the Public Education Department
staff, university professors, TLSD School Board members, the TLSD union representatives,
and staff from non-governmental organizations working directly with teachers, schools,
and/or districts on some aspect of mandatory PD for teachers. The exclusion criteria included
educational stakeholders who did not participate or have not participated in teachers’
mandatory PD. These criteria were determined by asking if the educational stakeholder had a
current or previous role in deciding, managing, researching, holding teachers accountable for,
and/or delivering PD for teachers. The “snowball” effect occurred as referrals multiplied at
state and district levels. For example, when I interviewed Mr. Timothy Canada, a retired PED
representative, he suggested two professors, Dr. Winona Ryder and Dr. Chris Edward
Pernell, who worked with PED to develop key institutional text components of PD in the
state’s three-tiered licensure and teacher evaluation systems. When I interviewed Dr. Ryder,
she suggested that I reach out to Dr. Ella Chavez, the TLSD union representative, who then
suggested that I interview one of the school board members.

With maximum variation and snowball sampling, I was able to learn about
educational stakeholders’ concerted sequences of actions within a system of social relations
comprised of multiple levels (see Table 1). Maximum variation sampling also allowed me to
look for patterns of how teachers’ PD became mandatory within a system of social relations
across individuals’ role, position, and location at the state, school district, and high school levels.

**Table 1: Educational Stakeholder Participants ($n = 12$)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location/Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mr. Timothy Canada</td>
<td>Retired PED Representative</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NM State Legislator 1</td>
<td>Legislator</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NM State Legislator 2</td>
<td>Legislator</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dr. Winona Ryder</td>
<td>College of Education Professor</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dr. Chris Edward Pernell</td>
<td>College of Education Professor</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dr. Nan Mercer</td>
<td>Statewide PD Provider</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SB Member 1</td>
<td>School Board Member</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SB Member 2</td>
<td>School Board Member</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ms. Tesla Langston</td>
<td>Contract Teacher (ELLs)</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ms. Lou Ann Johnson</td>
<td>Fine Arts Resource Teacher (Drama)</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ms. Liza Rainbow</td>
<td>Reading Interventionist</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dr. Ella Chavez</td>
<td>Union Representative</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In my study’s original design, I wanted to select at least eight teacher participants from Rydell High School. Because I wanted to consider how PD became mandatory for different teachers within a local context, my original goal was to include maximum variation in the teacher participants’ subject matter (i.e., English Language Arts, math, science, social studies/history, etc.) and licensure levels (i.e., Levels I, II, and III) at one high school. Due to the low number of teachers who responded to my recruitment emails and who ultimately committed to the study, I accepted the three participants I received rather than selecting for maximum variation in the aforementioned categories. The high school participants in this study included three Rydell High School teachers with Level II licenses who taught Science, English Language Arts, and Drama (Table 2). All three teachers were “highly qualified” according to federal and state requirements, members of the teachers’ union, and started teaching before the large scale changes from HB 212, *Public School Reforms Act*, were enacted in 2003. Of the three teachers, only Mr. Keating entered teaching through a traditional certification route.

**Table 2: Rydell High School Participants (n = 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location/Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wendy White</td>
<td>Science Teacher</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Keating</td>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA) Teacher</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alex Dunlap</td>
<td>Fine Arts (Drama) Teacher</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interviewing procedures.** My primary purpose for using the interview and institutional text data was to chart the sequences of text-mediated actions of how PD becomes mandatory for teachers at state, district, and school levels because the systemic organization of mandatory PD was “traceable in sequences of interaction, whether talk or text” (Smith, 2005, p. 110). After the high school teacher participants signed the consent form, I provided them with a Teacher Background Questionnaire to complete. Only one of the three teachers I interviewed, Mr. John Keating, completed and returned the Teacher Background Questionnaire. The other two teachers explained that they did not have time to complete this questionnaire. I had initially planned to use this background teacher questionnaire, modeled after the Public School Teacher Questionnaire in the 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) (see Appendix 7), to compare teacher responses at Rydell High School to high school teacher responses in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD). Because I only had one teacher response, I could not conduct an aggregate level comparison; therefore, I did not include the background questionnaire as part of my analysis.

Sticking with IE methods, questions I asked participants “in the interviews [emerged] out of the research process for institutional ethnographers, rather than being determined at the outset” (Campbell & Gregor, 2004, p. 56). After conducting an initial analysis of state law and PED rule, I was able to ascertain that Professional Development Plans (PDP) were an important institutional text in coordinating teachers’ mandatory PD. However, I did not know how teachers created PDPs or what the PDPs looked like. Before the interviews, I asked teachers to bring copies of their Professional Development Plans (PDPs) from SY 2011-12 so that I could ask specific questions about how the PDPs were created and used. Out of the
three teachers, Ms. White was the only one that did not provide a copy for my records. Pointing to their PDP from SY 2011-12, I asked teachers:

- How did you go about completing the PDP? Describe the process to me.
- How long did it take to complete the PDP?
- Where did the PDP go when it was completed?
- Did the PDP help you in your teaching? How? In what ways?

To see how teachers thought other institutional texts affected their mandatory PD, I asked, “In what ways do you think the school and district Educational Plans for Student Success (EPSS) factored into your PDP and the types of PD you had to participate in during SY 2011-12?” I showed teachers pages from the teachers’ union and school board negotiated agreement, which listed days for teachers to attend district-defined PD, and asked, “What can you describe about these district-defined PD days for SY 2011-12?” I also asked, “What other types of PD did you have to participate in for SY 2011-12, whether or not it was included in the Negotiated Agreement?” Additionally, I asked teachers questions about why PD might be important for them, if they thought the PD they participated in was useful, the most important factors in deciding what is needed for their PD, and what they thought policymakers at multiple levels should understand about their PD.

The interviews I conducted with educational stakeholders helped me piece together individual accounts of social relations that coordinated teachers’ mandatory PD across multiple sites. These stakeholder accounts provided important information about how their work at district and state levels related to teachers’ experiences of mandatory PD at a local school level. The interviews with educational stakeholders were not tightly structured, and were guided in the following ways:
After I greeted the participant and introduced myself, I provided a brief overview of the purpose of the project. I explained that the purpose was to understand how PD became mandatory for teachers at state, district, and school levels.

After obtaining verbal consent to proceed with the study, I asked participants to provide a brief overview of their role in education and to describe how they work with teachers directly and/or how their work affects teachers’ PD.

Next, I told participants I needed help making sense of how specific institutional texts at state, district, and school levels were related to each other, prompting them to explain how certain texts were produced and to describe the actions they took in relation to these texts. For example, I asked one of the TLSD School Board members, “Can you explain how the Board is involved in creating the EPSS? I would like you to describe how the district EPSS comes to be. How does the entire EPSS creation process work?” When interviewing other participants, depending on their role, position, and location, I asked about institutional texts that were crucial to the activities and processes of work they engaged in to decide and/or deliver teachers’ mandatory PD.

Lastly, I prompted the participants to talk about the most important factors in deciding what is needed for teachers’ PD, why PD might be important, what they thought policymakers at multiple levels should understand about teachers’ PD, and their perspectives about the relationship between PD and teacher evaluation in the High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSSE) and the three-tiered licensure systems.
**Transcripts.** After I conducted the interviews, I sent the audio recordings to a professional transcriptionist after labeling the files with generic identifiers indicating each interview type, position, and date (e.g., Ed Stakeholder Interview Union_8.23.13, Science Teacher Interview_9.12.13). Each transcriptionist I hired signed a confidentiality agreement, which established a legal confidentiality to prevent any unauthorized use of any part of the audio recordings and/or transcripts. After the professional transcriptionist returned the transcripts, I compared the content of the transcript with the audio recordings to ensure accuracy and made corrections where necessary. I transcribed one and a half interviews myself. In sum, I paid a total of $728.34 for 13.5 transcripts to be completed by professional transcriptionists (for a review of different transcription companies, see Adams, 2013).

For my research purposes, a useful transcript was a semantic record of the questions I asked participants and the answers they provided. I provided transcriptionists with a template, including line numbers, double-spacing, the participants’ generic identifiers, and page numbers. I instructed transcriptionists to bold any statements I made and to not bold participant responses, from the beginning of the recording until the very end. I also had transcriptionists note nonverbal utterances such as pauses for more than three seconds, interruptions, sneezes, and, laughter. I did not have transcriptionists note emphasis, speed, or tone of voice in the transcripts. I instructed transcriptionists to use the grammar and spelling conventions of standard written English, to help with reading the transcripts as semantic records. Even though the transcripts included interruptions, repetitions, and false starts, I omitted these features to avoid cluttering the text when presenting direct quotes from participants in Chapter 5 (Bailey, 2007). I discuss how I analyzed these transcripts later in this chapter (see “Data Analysis” section).
I plan to save all recordings of high school participants in password-protected files for six years, after which I will destroy them. To backup these data, recordings from the high school teachers’ interviews are also kept on a CD, which is in a locked file cabinet in a secure location. The CD with the recordings will also be destroyed after six years, according to the timeframe I specified in my IRB approval. I linked high school teachers’ information to direct identifiers through pseudonyms and codes. I kept the key to the match of pseudonyms and high school teachers’ names, or master list, in a password protected file on a standalone desktop computer in my office at UNM. I destroyed this master list after I received the IRB closure letter on March 14, 2014.

**Institutional texts.** In addition to the data I gathered from interviews with participants, I used institutional texts as a means to show how teachers’ PD becomes mandatory through a system of social organization at state, district, and school levels (Smith, 1990). In this way, I used institutional texts to visibly trace institutionalized social and ruling relations. I also used the institutional text data to explicate the characteristics of mandatory PD at state, district, and school levels. I use “institutional text” as an umbrella term in reference to statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures that are formalized in writing, replicated institutionally, and “are essential to the standardizing of work activities of all kinds across time and translocally” (Smith, 2005, p. 166).

**Gathering state, district, and school-level texts.** Before I obtained IRB approval, I initially gathered five institutional texts using New Mexico One Source of Law Online (One Source) and the online site of the New Mexico Administrative Code (NMAC). In examining the characteristics of mandatory PD for teachers, I decided to begin with the highest level of mandates in state law. I began with HB 212, a reform law enacted in 2003 that significantly
modified and created new sections of the Public School Code as discussed in Chapter 3. Using One Source, I identified sections of New Mexico’s Public School Code related to teachers’ mandatory PD through key word searches of “shall,” “must,” “require,” “accountability,” and “professional development.” The results returned seven sections of law: General Provisions (22-1 NMSA, 1978), the Assessment and Accountability Act (22-2C NMSA, 1978), the Public School Finance Act (22-8 NMSA, 1978), the School Personnel Act (22-10A NMSA, 1978), the Mathematics and Science Education Act (22-15E NMSA, 1978), the Bilingual Multicultural Education Act (22-23 NMSA, 1978), and the Statewide Cyber Academy Act (22-30 NMSA, 1978). Comparing these sections with only ones named in HB 212, I narrowed my selection to the two sections most pertinent to mandating PD for teachers: the Assessment and Accountability Act and the School Personnel Act. These sections contained explicit language outlining mandates (i.e., shall, must, require) and general characteristics for teachers’ PD.

Because these two sections of the Public School Code direct PED to specify details for the law’s implementation, I searched the administrative rules in Title 6 of the NMAC, where PED publishes its legal interpretation and implementation guidelines. In the NMAC, each rule follows a specific internal organization to provide uniformity and includes information about its issuing agency, scope, statutory authority, duration, effective date, definitions, requirements, implementation, referenced material, and history. In order to find PED’s implementation guidelines for the Assessment and Accountability Act and the School Personnel Act, I searched the NMAC for rules with these two sections of the Public School Code as its statutory authority. This search generated nearly every rule in Title 6 of the NMAC. Using “professional development” as a keyword search, I was able to narrow the
results down to three rules that named the Assessment and Accountability Act and the School Personnel Act as having statutory authority: “Standards for Excellence” (6.29.1 NMAC), “Professional Development Framework” (6.65.2 NMAC), and “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” (6.69.4 NMAC).

I read through the two sections of state law and three PED rules looking for additional texts mentioned several times and based on the frequency these texts were mentioned, I found four more institutional texts. For example, in PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule, Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) are defined as the “target used to determine student performance for NCLB” (6.29.1 NMAC). In other words, whether or not a school meets AYP is based on how students at a school perform in relation to PED’s AMOs. In this rule, AMOs are also mentioned in the specifications for districts and schools must use when creating their EPSS every year. These two examples indicated that the list of AMOs was an important institutional text, though I did not initially know why the text was important or how the text related to teachers’ mandatory PD. Using information publically available from PED’s website, I found AMOs for elementary, middle, and high schools in reading and math from 2007 to 2014 and for high school graduation from 2009 to 2020 (see Appendix 8). After conducting an analysis of how PED staff activated the AMOs, I discovered the coordinating effect between this institutional text and actions PED staff took to rate schools and districts according to whether or not they meet AYP. As part of its activation of the AMOs, PED publishes its AYP ratings of schools and districts in publically available Accountability Report Cards on its website. Using PED’s website while waiting for IRB approval, I retrieved and downloaded the TLSD Accountability Report Card and Rydell High School Accountability Report for SY 2011-12. Another example of a text mentioned several times
in state law and PED rule was “state-adopted competencies” (22-10A-19 NMSA, 1978). From my work at the LESC, I knew that these “state-adopted competencies” in the School Personnel Act were the nine teaching competencies created in PED’s “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” rule. I retrieved the Nine Teacher Competencies & Indicators from PED’s website.

I gathered nine institutional texts before interviewing participants. As part of my initial analysis, I began to identify the social relations as part of a system that had an “intertextual hierarchy,” where texts at higher levels “establish the frames and concepts that control texts at lower levels and, inversely, of texts at lower levels that are fitted to the frames and concepts of higher order texts” (Smith, 2005, p. 206). I used my understanding of this initial intertextual hierarchy to ask teacher and educational stakeholder participants how texts were produced at different levels to map the sequences of action taken by them within the social organization of mandatory PD. At the state level, the hierarchical relationship between the Public School Code and PED rule was clear because the law has statutory authority over rules created by the PED.

After I obtained IRB approval for conducting research at Rydell High School in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD), I gathered two texts from the district’s website for SY 2011-12: the TLSD Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) and the teachers’ union contract, also known as the Negotiated Agreement. I searched Rydell’s website for the school-level EPSS, but I could not find it. I emailed one of my contacts at the TLSD central office and she forwarded me a copy of Rydell High’s EPSS from SY 2011-12. During the interviews, two of the three Rydell High School teachers I interviewed provided me with copies of their Professional Development Plans (PDPs) from SY 2011-12. In sum, I gathered
a total 13 institutional texts, including nine that were created at the state level, two at the
district level, and two at the high school level:

New Mexico State Level

1. School Personnel Act;
2. Assessment and Accountability Act;
3. “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” rule;
4. Nine Teacher Competencies & Indicators;
5. “Professional Development Framework” rule;
6. “Standards for Excellence” rule;
7. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs);
8. TLSD Accountability Report Card;
9. Rydell High School Accountability Report Card;

Thunder Lighting School District (TLSD) Level

10. TLSD Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS);
11. TLSD Teachers’ Union’s Contract (Negotiated Agreement);

Rydell High School Level

12. Rydell High School Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS); and
13. Professional Development Plans (PDPs).

Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) data. To provide an overview of teachers’
perceptions of their PD experiences during a time when PD was mandated, the Schools and
Staffing Survey (SASS) Public School Teacher Questionnaire is the best dataset to use
because it provides valid and reliable estimates regarding teachers’ participation in PD
activities, teachers’ perceptions of the usefulness of PD, institutional support teachers
received for PD, and teachers’ perceptions of their influence on school policies related to PD and teacher evaluation. The SASS is a set of nine questionnaires collected from teachers, principals, school districts, schools, and libraries in the public and private sectors by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), an office within the USDE Institute of Education Sciences (IES). SASS is unique in that information from all of the questionnaires can be linked if users have IES licensed restricted-use data. The SASS is an in-depth, nationally representative survey of first through twelfth grade public and private school teachers, principals, schools, library media centers, and school districts in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Additionally, the SASS is the only available dataset that can be used to “identify systematic relationships between professional development and state and school policies on a large, nation-wide scale” (Phillips et al., 2011, p. 2586). Not only can the SASS data be analyzed nationally, but the survey can also be analyzed at specific state levels, and at district levels within individual states.

**Gaining access.** On their website, NCES publishes tables from SASS data, aggregated at various levels and by states. Publically, NCES allows users to download SASS data from the 1987-88, 1990-91, 1993-94, and 1999-00 administrations. Interested users may also access these SASS public-use datasets through the Education Data Analysis Tool (EDAT), which guides users on how to download specific datasets and syntax files that can be analyzed using statistical software packages. On the their website, there are no public-use data files for the SASS from school years 2003-04, 2007-08, and 2011-12. NCES makes SASS available for these years in a restricted-use dataset, which requires institutional licensure. I obtained a restricted-use license from IES for the 2011-12 SASS, the process of which is explained in the paragraphs below. The restricted-use dataset includes complete
responses to each item on all five public-school related questionnaires (e.g., school districts, schools, principals, teachers, and library media centers) and allows users to disaggregate information at multiple levels. In order to do an analysis of state-specific SASS data after the 1999-2000 administration, interested users must obtain a restricted-use license because NCES does not release individual states in their publicly available datasets.

The process to obtain a restricted-use license is outlined on the NCES website. At the time I requested a restricted-use license for the 2011-12 SASS data, there were four strict guidelines that must be met in order to qualify for and receive a restricted-use data license. First, my dissertation chair (the Principal Project Officer, PPO) had to submit an online formal request for the 2011-12 SASS data. In the formal request, a PPO, Senior Official (SO), and Systems Security Officer (SSO) had to be specified. In the request my chair and I submitted, my chair was both the PPO and SSO. The PPO is responsible for the day-to-day operations involving the requested data and academic applicants must have the rank of post-doctoral fellow or above to serve as the PPO. Second, affidavits for all authorized users and readers of SASS data needed to be obtained and had to be signed and notarized. In my case, this included me, my five committee members, and one postdoctoral scholar who had access to where the data were analyzed. Third, I had to identify a person authorized to sign contracts on behalf of the university, also known as the SO to the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). This person and the PPO had to sign the license document and the security plan. Lastly, all signed originals needed to be mailed to the IES data security office.

It took a total of seven months for me to obtain a restricted-use license for the 2011-12 SASS data. While writing my dissertation proposal in April of 2012, I contacted NCES and was advised to apply a few months before NCES planned to release the data in May of
2013. Between March and May of 2013, I figured out who the SO would be (i.e., the Dean of the College of Education) and had all seven users and/or readers sign the affidavits. On April 2, 2013, the PPO submitted the formal request online, specifying 2007-08 SASS data because that was the most recent restricted-use dataset option available. On October 25, 2013, I was notified that the 2011-12 SASS could officially be requested online. The PPO then had to modify the formal request, indicating that the request was for the 2011-12 SASS data instead of the 2007-08 SASS data. On October 31, 2013 we were notified by IES that the 2011-12 SASS was officially released. At the end of October 2013, I mailed all seven affidavits, the signed license document, and the security plan to the IES data security office. On November 1, 2013, the PPO and I were notified of problems with our application. Shortly after the Dean of the College of Education signed the license document as the SO, he resigned; therefore, a new SO had to be identified. On November 6, 2013, the Associate Dean for Research signed the license document and security plan as the SO since the College of Education did not have a replacement Dean at that time. On November 8, 2013 my dissertation chair (the PPO) mailed the license document and security plan to the IES data security office. On November 27, 2013, we received application approval notification from IES. The restricted-use license was approved for one year. On December 3, 2013, I picked up the SASS dataset from the PPO. On December 4, 2013, the PPO emailed IES for the passphrase in order to “unlock” the restricted-use data. Once the PPO shared the passphrase with me on December 4, 2013, I immediately began analyzing the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire data.

**2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire data source.** Nationally, the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix 7) was administered to 51,070 public school teachers. When all of the teacher responses to the Public School
Teacher Questionnaire are adjusted to represent the total population from which the sample was drawn, the weighted data includes 3.1 million public school teachers. The Public School Teacher Questionnaire on the 2011-12 SASS restricted-use data file includes records from teachers in traditional and charter public schools at elementary, middle, high, and combined school levels. Combined schools were schools with grades 9-12 and at least one grade lower than seven. The definition of teachers in the SASS included teachers who taught regularly scheduled classes to any students in grades K-12 full or part-time.

In New Mexico, the Public School Teacher Questionnaire was administered to 570 public school elementary, middle, combined school, and high school teachers. When these teacher responses to the Public School Teacher Questionnaire are adjusted to represent the total population from which the sample was drawn, the weighted data includes 21,750 public school teachers. I used SPSS 20.0 to select cases of only full-time public elementary, middle, combined school, and high school teachers in New Mexico (n = 540) and created a data file named “FT Teachers NM.” When responses are adjusted to represent the total population from which the sample was drawn, the weighted data includes 20,510 full-time public elementary, middle, combined school, and high school teachers in 61 school districts in New Mexico.

In New Mexico, the Public School Teacher Questionnaire was administered to 300 full-time public combined school and high school teachers. When these teacher responses to the Public School Teacher Questionnaire are adjusted to represent the total population from which the sample was drawn, the weighted data includes 6,240 full-time public high school teachers. After noticing main teaching assignments in early childhood and/or elementary schools, I used SPSS 20.0 to ensure that my final sample included full-time public high
school teachers who reported main teaching assignments at the high school and combined school levels in New Mexico. The process I used to select the 190 full-time public high school teachers who taught at the high school and combined school levels in New Mexico included the following steps using SPSS:

1. In the “FT Teachers NM” data file, I used the “TLEVEL” variable to select teachers who taught at the high school and combined school levels. I named this dataset “FT HS Teachers NM.”

2. In the “FT HS Teachers NM” data file, I used the “ASSIGN03” variable to remove cases of teachers who reported a main teaching assignment of early childhood or general elementary. I named this data file “NM HS Teachers Only.”

In the descriptive statistical profile of full-time public high school teachers’ PD in Chapter 4, my analysis utilized 2011-12 SASS data from full-time public school teachers at the high school and combined school levels who responded to the Public School Teacher Questionnaire in New Mexico (n = 190). When these teacher responses to the Public School Teacher Questionnaire are adjusted to represent the total population from which the sample was drawn, the weighted data includes 3,440 full-time public high school teachers. In the restricted-use data file on the 2011-12 SASS, I was able to identify TLSD because the file included the NCES identification codes for schools and school districts by state. While I provide the total number of teachers sampled at the state level, I do not provide the total number of teachers sampled at the district level due to possible confidentiality breaches.

With the exception of New Mexico’s three urban hubs in Albuquerque, Las Cruces, and Rio Rancho and the semi-urban area of Santa Fe, the state is very rural in nature. An identification of the total number of teachers sampled in TLSD on the 2011-12 SASS would
clearly reveal the district I selected as part of my study (see Appendix 9 for a school district map with student enrollment numbers for each school district). Of the 337,225 students enrolled in New Mexico’s public schools, 48.9% are enrolled in 5 out of the 89 traditional public school districts (Keaton, 2013). The need for school district confidentiality is unique to IRB requirements. These requirements for anonymity were uncharacteristic in my work at the LESC because policymakers in the executive and legislative branches of government at the state level always wanted to know who, what, and where, specifically.

*Sample selection.* The target population is all members of the population to which I hope to generalize (Dillman, 2007). The target population of this study is all traditional public and charter school teachers who taught grades 9-12 in high schools and combined schools during SY 2011-12 in New Mexico and in TLSD. Resource constraints narrow the choice of the survey population. The accessible population is all public high school teachers from the schools that actually responded to the Public School Teacher Questionnaire on the 2011-12 SASS. A sample is composed of all the members of a population that are included in the study (Dillman, 2007). The sample for this study includes all the public high school teachers that responded to the Public School Teacher Questionnaire on the 2011-2012 SASS.

The sampling frame is the subset of the population that the sample is drawn from (Dillman, 2007). For the SASS, the public school sampling frame is based upon information from the previous year’s Common Core of Data (CCD), which is a universal survey of all elementary and secondary schools in the United States. The sampling frame for public schools contained traditional public schools and specialized schools (i.e. alternative, vocational, and/or special education). The sampling frame for the teacher questionnaires consisted of lists of teachers provided by sampled schools to NCES. The Teacher Listing
Form (TLF) is sent out by NCES to obtain a complete list of all the teachers employed at each school. The sample of teachers originates from all the schools that provide the list to NCES (NCES, 1997).

The primary sampling unit of the SASS is the school. Public school samples in the 2011-12 SASS represented schools at the state and national levels. Teaming up with U.S. Census Bureau, NCES employed a mail-based survey approach with telephone and in-person field follow-up (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013). Before SY 2011-12 began, NCES mailed research applications to potential traditional public and charter school districts to request their participation and followed-up with them before the school year to confirm their participation. If districts agreed to participate, then NCES mailed 2011-12 SASS district packages to them. The 2011-12 SASS district package contained a cover letter, the School District Questionnaire, and a postage-paid return envelope. The school district then provided NCES with an electronic list of teachers in schools selected to participate on the Teacher Questionnaire (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013). Between October 2011 and June 2012, teacher questionnaires were mailed out to schools and individual teacher, librarian, and principal respondents were called from telephone centers and asked to complete the questionnaire by phone. Data collection for the 2011-12 SASS ended in June of 2012 (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013). For more information on 2011-12 SASS response rates and imputation see Appendix 10.

Sampling weights. Generally, the purpose of weighting is “to scale up the sample estimates to represent the target survey population” (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013, p. B-9). Weighting procedures of the 2011-12 SASS were conducted by NCES for three purposes: 1) to take into account the school’s selection probability; 2) to reduce biases that
may result from unit non-response; and 3) to make use of available information from external sources to improve the precision of sample estimates (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997).

Since the SASS sampling uses stratification, disproportionate sampling of certain strata, and clustered probability sampling, the SASS is not a simple random sample. Not all public school teachers have an equal probability of selection. SASS employs a complex sample design called a stratified, probability proportionate to size sample; meaning that different rates across different states and affiliations led to different probabilities of selection, mainly unequal probabilities of selection (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013). Additionally, not all teachers included in the sample responded, resulting in different response rates. To address potential issues with response rates, NCES weights the sample to more accurately approximate the counts and percentages of the public school teachers (see “Response Rates” in Appendix 10). As a result of weighting the data, it is possible to generalize the findings to full-time public high school teachers in TLSD and the State of New Mexico.

If weighting is not done, un-weighted statistics might create bias, because some groups in the population will be over-represented (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Weighting is imperative when estimating population characteristics. To obtain a representative teacher sample, schools in the 2011-12 SASS had a greater chance of selection if there were a larger number of teachers within a given school, although schools of all sizes found representation in the sample (NCES, 1997). Sampling of teachers within schools occurred at a rate of at least one and no more than 20 teachers per school, averaging between three and eight teachers per school. The SASS sample design also seeks to minimize selecting the same schools that complete other NCES school-based surveys (NCES, 1997).
For the descriptive statistical profile presented in Chapter 4, I used the “TFNLWGT” variable to weight the data when computing population estimates as recommended by Goldring, Taie et al. (2013a) in the User’s Manual for the 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey, Volume I: Overview. Unweighted, NCES sampled 190 full-time public teachers who taught at high schools and combined schools in New Mexico. The weighted data includes 3,440 full-time public high school teachers in 48 different school districts throughout the State of New Mexico.

Sample characteristics. Of the 3,440 full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico who responded to the 2011-12 Public School Teacher Questionnaire on the SASS, the majority of teachers at the district level (57.1%) and at the state level (58.5%) were female. Statewide, 53.9% of full-time public high school teachers were between the ages of 30 and 49, with 12 years as the average (median) total years of teaching experience. In the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD), 70.8% of full-time public high school teachers were between the ages of 30 and 49, with 10 years as the average (median) total years of teaching experience. Not including time spent as a student teacher, 70.8% of full-time public high school teachers reported teaching in three schools or fewer statewide and 66.9% of full-time public high school teachers in TLSD reported teaching in three schools or fewer over the course of their careers. The majority of full-time public high school teachers statewide (59.9%) and districtwide (67.3%) reported not being members of a teachers’ union or an employee association similar to a union.

Statewide, the majority of teachers (75.7%) reported entering teaching through a traditional route, meaning that they completed an undergraduate education program and participated in student teaching at a College of Education in a four-year university. In New
Mexico, there are 14 PED-approved alternative licensure programs, seven of which are at two-year public institutions (Teacher Preparation Study Group, 2011). More teachers in TLSD completed alternative teaching certification programs than teachers throughout the state. In TLSD, 40.8% of teachers reported entering teaching through an alternative certification program. Statewide, there were more full-time public high school teachers teaching in non-tested subject areas (60.6%) than those teaching in tested subject areas (39.4%). In TLSD, there were 70.9% full-time public high school teachers teaching in non-tested subject areas and 29.1% teaching in tested subject areas.

Nearly all (98.8%) full-time public high school teachers who knew their highly qualified teaching status ($n = 3,110$) reported that they were highly qualified in one or more of the subjects they taught. In TLSD, nine out of ten teachers reported being highly qualified in all of the subjects they taught. In addition to meeting federal and state-level “highly qualified” teacher requirements, teacher candidates enrolled in approved alternative licensure programs are also considered highly qualified – even if they have never taught before (Teacher Preparation Study Group, 2011). Statewide, 44.3% of teachers reported having an MA degree and 1.9% of full-time public high school teachers reported having earned a doctorate or other professional degree. Most full-time public high school teachers in TLSD (70.2%) reported earning master’s degrees as their highest degree.

**Data Analysis**

Throughout the data collection process, I engaged in an analysis process across all three sources of data. Guided by my research questions, I analyzed data to present a descriptive statistical profile of the characteristics of teachers’ PD, explicate the characteristics of mandatory PD in institutional texts, and to show how teachers’ PD becomes
mandatory through a textually-mediated system of social organization that includes school, district, and state levels. I present the results of my data analysis in Chapters 4 and 5. In the following sections, I describe the steps I took to analyze each data source.

**2011-12 SASS.** The analysis of the 2011-12 SASS data allowed me to write a descriptive statistical profile of the PD experiences of full-time public high school teachers in TLSD and in New Mexico. I used the SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix 7) to provide a district and state context in which to understand the mandatory PD experiences of the three full-time public high school teachers whom I interviewed. The statistical profile afforded by the SASS data tells a story that PD is not idiosyncratic, meaning that PD occurred in ways common to large number of teachers. Additionally, the SASS is an institutional text that fulfills a legal mandate for NCES to report on the condition of education in the United States, including characteristics of teachers’ PD. By providing an overview of teachers’ PD experiences according to survey, I am able to connect the results from the interview and institutional text data sources, in order to discover and describe the social coordination behind the survey results. In other words, what teachers report on the SASS reflects how PD is organized within a multi-level, textually-mediated system of social relations. To summarize how teachers characterized their PD on the survey, I conducted descriptive data analyses using SPSS, a statistical software package. Specifically, I analyzed characteristics of PD from the SASS including: the format, topic, and duration of teachers’ participation in PD; teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of PD; institutional support teachers’ received for PD; and, teachers’ perceptions of their influence on PD and teacher evaluation school policies. I also conducted a one-way Analysis of Variance
(ANOVA) using SPSS to test if there were differences between how teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated.

**Format, topic, and duration of teachers’ participation in PD.** Following Darling-Hammond et al. (2009), I categorized full-time public high school teachers’ PD participation into two format types: traditional/formal and job-embedded. On the 2011-12 SASS, traditional/formal types of PD included: university courses related to teaching, observational visits to other schools, workshops, conferences or training sessions as a presenter, and workshops, conferences, or training sessions not as a presenter. Job-embedded types of PD included: individual or collaborative research on a topic of professional interest, regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction (excluding administrative meetings), peer observation, and formal mentoring. The 2011-12 SASS asked teachers about their participation in PD activities focused on seven different topic areas: 1) by the content of the subject(s) they taught, 2) using computers in instruction, 3) reading instruction, 4) student discipline and management in the classroom, 5) how to teach students with disabilities, 6) how to teach English language learners (ELLs), and 7) other types of PD specified by the teacher. Duration of teachers’ PD was measured as the total number of hours teachers reported participating in PD activities in six of the seven topic areas. The survey did not have a question concerning the amount of time teachers reported spending on other types of PD.

In order to prepare the data file for analysis, I used SPSS to select cases of full-time public high school teachers in the state of New Mexico and created a separate file. I also used SPSS to select cases of full-time public high school teachers in TLSD and I created a separate file of teachers in TLSD. When analyzing the statewide and district specific data files, I used SPSS to compute descriptive statistics to report the percentages of full-time
public high school teachers’ PD according to the format, topic, and duration of their PD activities.

**Teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of PD.** On the 2011-12 SASS, teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of six of the seven PD topic areas on a four-point scale (1 = “not useful”, 2 = “somewhat useful”, 3 = “useful”, and 4 = “very useful”). In order to prepare the data file for analysis, I selected teachers’ general field of their main teaching assignment (i.e., the “ASSIGN03” variable) to create a new variable splitting teachers into tested and non-tested subjects as defined in New Mexico according to SY 2011-12. During SY 2011-12, certain state assessments were temporarily suspended by the Legislature to save money. The only tests that were required for high school students during SY 2011-12 were the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) in ELA/reading and math for all groups of students in tenth and eleventh grades (e.g., female, male, Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English language learners). Therefore, I used SPSS to select cases of teachers who taught Special Education, English and Language Arts, ESL or Bilingual Education, and Math and I defined these teachers as teachers of tested subject areas. I defined all others as teachers of non-tested subject areas. When analyzing the statewide and district specific data files, I used SPSS to compute descriptive statistics to report the percentages of full-time public high school teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated.

Before I compared the ratings of the usefulness of PD between teachers in tested and non-subject areas, I used SPSS to compute descriptive statistics in order to report the percentages of these teachers’ PD activities by PD topic and duration. I hypothesized that
teachers’ subject areas may have an impact on how teachers’ rated the usefulness of the type of PD in which they participated during SY 2011-12. The null hypothesis was: there is no difference in how full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated. I used a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test to investigate if differences existed in the means of the ratings of the usefulness of PD for teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas. An ANOVA is used when there is only one independent variable and can be used to compare two or more groups. In this study, teachers’ subject areas were categorical variables organized in two groups and this was the independent variable. Teachers’ ratings of the usefulness of PD according to the six PD topic areas as measured on the 2011-12 SASS were the dependent variables.

**Institutional support teachers received for PD.** The 2011-12 SASS asked teachers whether they were provided with six forms of institutional support from the school or district when participating in PD, including: 1) release time from teaching with teaching responsibilities temporarily assigned to someone else; 2) scheduled time in the contract year for PD; 3) a stipend for PD; 4) full or partial reimbursement of tuition for college courses; 5) reimbursement for conference or workshop fees; and 6) reimbursement for travel and/or daily expenses. When analyzing the statewide and district specific files, I used SPSS to compute descriptive statistics in order to report the percentages of full-time public high school teachers who reported that they received support (i.e., they marked “yes” on the survey in one of the six types of institutional support).

**Teachers’ perceptions of their influence on PD and teacher evaluation school policies.** On the 2011-12 SASS Questionnaire for Public School Teachers, teachers were
asked to rate their perceptions of teacher influence in two areas of school policy on a four-point scale (1 = “no influence”, 2 = “minor influence”, 3 = “moderate influence”, and 4 = “a great deal of influence”): 1) determining the content of in-service PD and 2) teacher evaluation. When analyzing the statewide and district specific data files, I used SPSS to compute descriptive statistics in order to report the percentages of full-time public high school teachers’ ratings of teacher influence on PD and teacher evaluation school policies.

**Interviews and institutional texts.** As I engaged in data analysis processes of interview and institutional text data, I focused on textually-mediated social relations in and across multiple settings because social relations are “concerted sequences or courses of social action implicating more than one individual whose participants are not necessarily present or known to one another” (Smith, 1987, p. 155). Within IE, texts are a “means of access, a direct line to the [social and ruling] relations it organizes” (Smith, 1990, p. 4). To explain how PD becomes mandatory for teachers at state, district, and school levels, I narrowed my units of analysis to the mechanics of text activation, which involves people in the coordination of text-based actions in what Smith (2005) refers to as act-text-act or text-act-text sequences and text-reader conversations.

**Data review, reduction, and analysis.** Since the emphasis in IE is on the linkages within and across boundaries of interconnected settings between different kinds of data, my analysis processes involved a back-and-forth process where I analyzed each data source in relation to the other. Specifically, in drawing on my analytic goals to: 1) discover characteristics of teachers’ mandatory PD and the social relations that are being shaped by specific texts that have the power to hold teachers and educational stakeholders to acting in
particular ways, and 2) map the ruling relations, I analyzed the data in the following overlapping “steps:”

- transcribed interviews into transcripts;
- organized institutional texts and into an intertextual hierarchy with three levels;
- mapped the ruling relations of mandatory PD;
- coded institutional texts for text activation sequences and PD characteristics from the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire;
- coded interview transcripts for text-reader conversations;
- identified patterns of social relations among and between state, district, and school levels in the intertextual hierarchy;
- used patterns in the coded data to identify the dominant and recurring theme of compliance to describe the multi-level system of social relations.

As I gathered the institutional texts, I made notes of: the level at which the text was created, whether or not other levels were mentioned in the text, the text’s stated purpose, sequences of action for mandatory PD present in the text, and what was left unexplained or undefined about mandatory PD in the text. I used these notes to group the texts into an intertextual hierarchy according to the state, district, and school levels at which the text was created.

I placed the two sections from the Public School Code, the School Personnel Act and the Assessment and Accountability Act, at the top of the hierarchy because these two sections of law have statutory authority over the other institutional texts at the state, district, and school levels. Next in the hierarchy, I ordered institutional texts created by New Mexico’s Public Education Department (PED) because PED interprets these sections of law and details
its plans for implementation in its rules or regulations. At the district level in the hierarchy, because the district’s EPSS fulfilled a requirement detailed in PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule, I listed the EPSS in a higher order than the Negotiated Agreement because in an interview with the teachers’ union representative, I learned that the Negotiated Agreement ranked highly as a school board policy, second only to state-level requirements for mandatory PD (i.e., district’s EPSS). At each level of the hierarchy, the regulatory frames of institutional texts from higher levels provide the “instructions for how the texts are to be read in the text-reader conversations built into sequences of institutional action” (Smith, 2005, p. 187). By organizing these texts in an intertextual hierarchy, I was able to discover and analyze social relations within a textually-mediated system that organizes and coordinates teachers’ local PD activities with educational stakeholders’ trans-local work of fulfilling PD compliance mandates.

In my analysis of institutional texts throughout the hierarchy, I paid particular attention to the characteristics of mandatory PD stipulated in these texts and to the sequences of actions outlined in them. My coding process focused on identifying two central concepts in IE, particularly the mechanics of text activation in text-act sequences and text-reader conversations and the identification of social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD. In the write-up of my analysis presented in Chapter 5, I include excerpts from the interviews because they provide examples of textually-mediated practices within a multi-level system of social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD. Another way to think of textual mediation is to see texts as providing the terms under which what people do becomes institutionally accountable. Within a particular system of social relation, institutional texts play a coordinative and mediating role “in that they displace and subdue
the presence of agents and subjects other than as institutional categories: they lack perspective; they subsume the particularities of the everyday lived experience” (Smith, 2005, p. 113).

In the district and school level institutional texts and interview transcripts with teachers, I used thematic coding based on categories from the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire data. For example, because the TLSD Negotiated Agreement specifies the characteristics of mandatory PD and the institutional support the district is to provide for teachers PD, I coded for aspects of traditional/formal PD, job-embedded PD, and institutional support for PD from the 2011-12 SASS. In terms of sequences of actions, I looked for directives using the language of mandates (e.g., shall, require, must) in each of the 13 institutional texts. I used the concept of texts coordinating sequences of action to analytically focus on institutional texts as “occurrence[s] embedded in what is going on and going forward” in intersecting work processes (Smith, 2006, p. 67). In this way, I analyzed texts occurring in motion through a process of text activation in what Smith (2005) refers to as act-text-act or text-act-text sequences. For example, the School Personnel Act (text) directs PED to create a statewide framework for PD. PED creates the framework (act) then directs districts to administer PD according to requirements outlined in its “PD Framework” rule (text). School districts then specify their priorities for PD (act) according to the requirements in the framework. Then, school districts, in the district’s EPSS (text), direct schools to provide PD to teachers (act) in specific areas outlined in the district’s EPSS. Analyzing these sequences of action, I began to see the ways in which these institutional texts mediated the system of social relations focused on compliance mandates for teachers’ PD at state, district, and school levels.
Drawing on the connections I made in my notes on the intertextual hierarchy, I created an analytic map to illustrate sequences of action in the intertextual hierarchy, connecting state, district, and school level requirements of mandatory PD for teachers (see Appendix 11). The map shows the social organization of mandatory PD in a generalized, textually-mediated way that is not specific to any school or district. In the map, I present the intersecting work processes and courses of action teachers and educational stakeholders take to shape teachers’ experiences of mandatory PD in New Mexico. By visually presenting the social organization of mandatory PD, I was able to see the statewide institutional power structures, or ruling relations, beyond the local school district and high school levels. In this map, I visually show my understanding of how multiple levels are interconnected and how a textually-mediated system of social relations structure mandatory PD for teachers in New Mexico.

In my analytic work, this map was complemented by my consideration of the ways that the activation of texts, or “the human involvement in the capacity of texts to coordinate action and get things done in specific ways” can bring about social and ruling relations because “the capacity to rule depends upon carrying messages across sites, coordinating someone’s action here with someone else’s there” (Campbell & Gregor, 2004, p. 33). I previously described one aspect of institutional texts occurring in motion, as part of act-text-act or text-act-text sequences. With my analytic map of the social organization of mandatory PD, I was able to organize interview excerpts as evidence of social relations at and across specific levels.

In my analysis of educational stakeholder interview transcripts, I coded for another aspect of text activation in what Smith (2005) refers to a text-reader conversation, which is a
moment in time when an institutional actor’s work is regulated by an institutional text. Smith’s (2005) notion of a text-reader conversation expands the idea of texts occurring in motion so that the reader’s and his or her active engagement with the text’s inertia can be made visible. In this text-reader conversation, an institutional actor plays both parts because one party, the text, is fixed and non-responsive to the other, the reader (Smith, 2005). The institutional actor, then, becomes the text’s agent by reading the text and by responding to it in active ways. In coding for a text-reader conversation, I looked for the “fixed” part of the conversation in the institutional text and what the interview participants said about their response to the text, examining their accounts for practices, activities, and actions they took in ways that were related to level-specific institutional texts. Similar to Peele (2005), I use the term “activity” broadly to refer to “a single unit of action or a unit of action comprised of several series of other actions” (p. 107).

An example of a text-reader conversation is when TLSD School Board Member 2 “reads” the TLSD Accountability Report Card to engage in the collective work process of creating another institutional text, the EPSS. Based on the previous school year’s data, the SY 2011-12 TLSD Accountability Report Card shows that the district did not meet its overall AYP targets in ELA/reading, math, and high school graduation, but white and Asian students did meet the required 66% Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) target in math proficiency. In her reading of these results, School Board Member 2 asserted that the basis of the district’s strategic plan to improve AYP (i.e., EPSS) was to close the academic achievement gap between white children and children of color. As part of her response to the TLSD Accountability Report Card, School Board Member 2 indicated that PD focused on cultural proficiency and “helping teachers understand cultural differences and [how to] utilize the
cultural differences of all of our children” would help to close the achievement gap. This example of a text-reader conversation highlights the ways in which higher-level institutional texts (e.g., Assessment and Accountability Act, PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule, TLSD Accountability Report Card) legitimize particular forms of social action that TLSD School Board members must take when mandating PD at the school district level.

Another example of a text-reader conversation I coded is from School Board Member 1’s explanation of how the TLSD School Board undergoes a process of negotiating and approving the teachers’ union contract, or Negotiated Agreement. The Negotiated Agreement specifies the format, PD topics, and maximum duration of mandatory PD in the district. After reviewing an initial draft of the Negotiated Agreement, TLSD School Board Member 1 explained, “if we have some issues or some things of concern, or some things we think need to be addressed, we bring that to the administration before the negotiations start and that becomes an item that’s on the table for discussion.” In this excerpt, TLSD School Board Member 1’s account illustrates how he, as a reader of the Negotiated Agreement, brings it into action. TLSD School Board Member 1 also anchors the Negotiated Agreement in the local actualities in which he, along with other educational stakeholders, work to negotiate with the union on teacher employment issues, which include mandates for teacher PD.

In the teacher interviews, I also used structural coding, referring to the questions I asked during the interview to account for how teachers’ actions related to actions educational stakeholders took at district and state levels. For example, when I asked teachers questions about their development of the PDP over the course of the school year, I coded the question and the response as aspects of text activation. My rationale for coding in these ways was informed by IE, which asserts that the sequence of social action taken by people in local
settings can be traced through institutional texts to the trans-local sites of power to which they extend (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; Smith, 1987; 2005; 2014). In my study, text-based actions at state, district, and school levels are components of the more extended social and ruling relations.

Once I manually coded all of the data for sequences of text activation and social relations, I sorted through the data to find connections within and across school, district, and state levels. I examined interview and text data for: sequence (e.g., the order in which PD became mandatory at each level), correspondence (e.g., characteristics of mandatory PD in texts in relation to texts at other levels), similarities (e.g., processes of mandatory PD occurring in the same ways according to interviews and institutional text requirements), and differences (e.g., processes of mandatory PD occurring in different ways according to interviews and institutional text requirements). I also looked for patterns of divergent perspectives, contradictions, or disconnections between interview transcript and institutional text data across multiple levels (Campbell & Gregor, 2004).

These analyses revealed that the effects of power, or ruling relations, within the institution of mandatory PD are achieved through moments of text activation that join together teachers and educational stakeholders engaged in diverse, yet coordinated sequences of action. These ruling relations, within the processes and structures of the system of social relations, are the interface between actions taken by educational stakeholders and teachers and the priorities of the state’s institutional framework in which mandatory PD takes place. While teachers are necessary links in this multi-level system of social relations, they and the PD in which they participate are subordinated to compliance mandates for PD. It is within
this hierarchical system that teachers’ mandatory PD activities are constrained by
institutional text requirements from the state and district levels.

**Limitations**

This study did not include perspectives from school administrators. Due to the new
HOUSSE teacher evaluation system requirements and various other duties, none of the
Rydell High School administrators were able to meet with me. Principals play a key role in
selecting their school’s PD and in New Mexico, principals are held accountable for the
development of their school-level Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS). The 2011-12
SASS contains five types of questionnaires for public school districts, schools, school library
and media centers, principals, and teachers. To strengthen this study, I could have linked the
Public School Teacher Questionnaire and the Public School Principal Questionnaire to
examine perspectives about PD of both teachers and principals throughout the schools and
districts sampled in the state of New Mexico. Because I did not have school administrator
interview participants, I decided to not include school administrator perspectives from the
2011-12 SASS.

I did not calculate a relative or “normalized” weight for the 2011-12 SASS because I
chose to use the teacher final weight, “TFNHWGT,” variable to calculate all statistical
findings from the 2011-12 SASS as recommended by Goldring, Taie et al. (2013a). NCES
researchers created the teacher final weight. Relative weights or “normalized weights” are
terms that are used interchangeably throughout statistics literature (Hahs-Vaughn, 2005).
Weighting is imperative when estimating population characteristics. If weighting is not done,
un-weighted statistics might create bias, because some groups in the population may not be
accurately represented (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Weil (2011), in his dissertation using
2007-08 SASS restricted-use data, created relative weights to generalize from state-specific teachers in Indiana to the national population of secondary teachers. Weil’s (2011) relative sample weight was based on the final weight for public school teachers in the 2011-12 SASS restricted-use dataset which he multiplied by the sample size, divided by the population (i.e., relative weight = teacher final weight * sample size/population).

While Weil (2011) used a relative weight to adjust for large sample sizes to avoid inflating Type I error, I chose to rely on the weights created by researchers at NCES. Generally, weights primarily adjust means and proportions, which are okay for descriptive data but may negatively impact inferential data. Unweighted, 190 full-time public school teachers who taught at high schools and combined schools were sampled by NCES for the 2011-12 SASS in New Mexico. Weighted, these 190 responses represent 3,440 full-time public high school teacher responses. My use of the teacher final weight may have adjusted the sample size of full-time public high school teachers in a way that did not reflect the actual number of full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico.

Even though I drew on Institutional Ethnography and I used its basic ontological and epistemological orientations to guide my research, some IE researchers might take issue with my use of survey data in this design because institutional ethnographic studies typically do not use surveys as data (for one example, see Restoule et al., 2013). Schensul et al. (1999) argue that ethnographic research is both qualitative and quantitative, but there is much debate about whether or not ethnographies should include quantitative research. Because Schensul et al. (1999) claim that “ethnographic researchers frequently underutilize state, national, and even international data sets, not realizing that they are an important source of information on local populations” (p. 217), I incorporate the nationally-administered 2011-12 SASS Public
School Teacher Questionnaire into my research design. In my use of the survey, I assume that it reflects teachers’ perceptions of their experiences of PD. The statistical profile afforded by the SASS data shows that PD occurred in ways common to the weighted sample of 3,440 full-time public high school teachers from 48 school districts in New Mexico who responded to the survey, indicating that teachers’ PD experiences were not idiosyncratic. Nevertheless, I recognize the limitations of treating the survey as a reflection of how teachers experience PD. On the SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire, aspects of teachers’ PD are transposed into the topic-assigned spaces provided on the survey and capture what NCES researchers decide is important about PD, which may or may not reflect teachers’ lived experiences.

I relied primarily on self-report data from New Mexico’s teachers in the 2011-12 SASS (n = 3, 440) and interviews with educational stakeholders (n = 12) and teachers at Rydell High School (n = 3). While I looked for similarities across all three data sources, I did not seek validation. Where there were points of convergence and divergence between the information, I treated all sources as “valid” information: “Taking this approach, could we say that there is no such thing as invalidity of data or method if someone can find it to be an accurate reflection of their interpretation of reality?” (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, p. 115). In most studies, researchers tend to validate the findings according to the kinds of data they collect (Creswell, 2007; Golafshani, 2003). My study does not assume that the data I collected in my investigation of the institution of mandatory PD can be added together to produce a unitary reality or truth.

In the following chapter, I present the results of the analysis of the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire data that helped to answer my research question and
sub-questions associated with: What are the characteristics of PD for full-time public high school teachers in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and Rydell High School in New Mexico as they report their experiences?
Chapter 4: Descriptive Statistical Profile of New Mexico’s Full-Time Public High School Teachers’ PD Experiences

In this chapter, I provide a descriptive statistical profile of the PD experiences of full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico. Data are drawn from the Public School Teacher Questionnaire, a part of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) administered in SY 2011-12. This profile provides an overview of teachers’ perceptions of their PD experiences during a time when PD was mandated. The survey asked teachers to characterize their participation in PD activities, the level of institutional support they received for PD, their perceptions of the usefulness of PD, and the extent of their influence on school policies related to PD and teacher evaluation. When teachers’ responses on the survey are adjusted to represent the total population from which the sample was drawn, this weighted data represent 3,440 full-time public high school teachers in 48 of New Mexico’s public school districts. In order to provide a context in which to understand the PD experiences of the three full-time public high school teachers whom I interviewed, I focused my data analysis only on the responses of full-time public school teachers who taught grades 9-12 across the state and then analyzed a subset of teachers from the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD), which served as a window into how mandatory PD operated at one school district and one high school level.

In the sections that follow, I present and interpret the findings according to the order of the following items I identified in the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire that might reveal teachers’ perceptions of their PD experiences:

- format, topic, and duration of teachers’ participation in PD;
- teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of PD;
• institutional support teachers’ received for PD; and
• teachers’ perceptions of their influence on PD and teacher evaluation policies at their school.

Format, Topic, and Duration of Teachers’ Participation in PD

The SASS does not make a distinction between mandatory and voluntary PD when asking teachers about their participation in PD activities. The research on PD demonstrates that it is an assortment of practices and options, ranging from workshops, to semester-long university courses, and local communities of practice. PD is inherently complex because it is multifaceted and is mandated in policies at multiple levels. Furthermore, the conditions in which PD becomes mandatory are contextual, specific to state and district levels where state education agencies and school districts or local education agencies centralize control for school level actions taken by teachers. The SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire enables researchers to provide aggregates of teachers’ reports of their PD experiences at national, state, district, and school levels. Consistent with other years of NCES’ administration of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), almost all teachers nationwide (99%) participated in PD activities during SY 2011-12.

Teachers’ PD participation rates by format. Similar to Darling-Hammond et al. (2009), I categorized full-time public high school teachers’ PD participation into two format types based on eight 2011-12 SASS items: traditional/formal PD and job-embedded. Traditional/formal types of PD included university courses related to teaching, observational visits to other schools, workshops, conferences or training sessions as a presenter, and workshops, conferences, or training sessions not as a presenter. Job-embedded types of PD included individual or collaborative research on a topic of professional interest, regularly
scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction (excluding administrative meetings), peer observation, and mentoring or coaching.

At the TLSD district level, 93% of full-time public high school teachers reported participating in workshops, conferences, or training sessions, 93% engaged in regularly scheduled collaboration, 84.2% conducted peer observations, and 68.7% engaged in individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to them professionally (Table 3). In TLSD on the SASS, higher percentages of full-time public high school teachers reported participating in both traditional/formal types of PD and job-embedded PD than full-time public high school teachers statewide. This district-level finding suggests that TLSD offered more opportunities to teachers for PD than other districts throughout the state during SY 2011-12.

The New Mexico state-level data on the 2011-12 SASS show that full-time public high school teachers reported participating in workshops, conferences, or training (83.7%) at higher rates than regularly scheduled collaboration (75.2%), peer observation (55.7%), or individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to them professionally (46.2%). Statewide, these findings seem consistent with the literature that suggests more teachers participate in traditional/formal types of PD than in job-embedded PD.
Table 3: Full-time Public High School Teachers’ PD Participation by Format, 2011-12 SASS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of PD</th>
<th>TLSD (%)</th>
<th>NM (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional/formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University courses related to teaching</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational visits to other schools</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/training sessions as a presenter</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/training sessions not as a presenter</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job-embedded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/collaborative research on a topic of interest</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer observation</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as formal mentor in school or district</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers’ PD participation rates by topic.** The 2011-12 SASS asked teachers about their participation in PD activities focused on seven different topic areas: 1) the content of the subject(s) they taught, 2) using computers for instruction, 3) reading instruction, 4) student discipline and management in the classroom, 5) how to teach students with
disabilities (SWDs), 6) how to teach English language learners (ELLs), and 7) other types of PD specified by the teacher. On the 2011-12 SASS, teachers were asked to fill-in the blank and name “other” types of PD activities not identified on the survey.

In TLSD, 86.3% of full-time public high school teachers reported participating in PD topics focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught, 50.4% focused on other types of PD specified by the teacher, 36.1% focused on reading instruction, 28.6% focused on how to teach ELLs, 25.8% focused on how to teach students with disabilities, 23.6% focused on using computers for instruction, and 17.7% of full-time public high school teachers reported participating in PD focused on student discipline and management in the classroom. In TLSD as well as throughout the state, the majority of full-time public high school teachers who reported participating in “other” types of PD topics mainly focused on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and instructional strategies.
Figure 5: Full-time Public High School Teachers’ PD Participation Rates by Topic Statewide, 2011-12 SASS.

Figure 5 shows that of all full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico more than half reported participating in PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught (68.6%) and using computers for instruction (50.1%). Statewide, more than half of full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas reported participating in PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught (66.0%) and using computers for instruction (52.6%). Full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas reported higher participation rates in PD overall, particularly in PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught (72.7%), how to teach students with disabilities (51.3%), reading instruction (42.9%), and other types of PD specified by the teacher (43.4%).
**Teachers’ PD participation rates by duration.** On the 2011-12 SASS, teachers who reported participating in PD activities were asked about the amount of time they had spent on activities related to each topic: 8 hours or less, 9-16 hours, 17-32 hours, or 33 hours or more. The SASS question referred to the total amount of time they had spent on the topic in the last 12 months, not the duration of any particular PD program.

As indicated in Figure 6, in TLSD, 54.2% of full-time public high school teachers reported spending 33 hours or more in PD focused on how to teach ELLs and 28.6% of teachers reported spending 33 hours or more in PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught. In three of the six topic areas, between 13 and 46 percent of TLSD’s full-time public high school teachers reported that they had spent between 17 and 32 hours in PD activities focused on: how to teach students with disabilities (12.7%), the content of the subject(s) they taught (17.6%), and using computers for instruction (45.9%). Teachers in TLSD were less likely to have spent more than eight hours in PD focused on how to teach students with disabilities (SWDs) and discipline and management in the classroom (Figure 6).

![Figure 6: Percentage Distribution of Full-time Public High School Teachers by the Amount of Time They Spent on PD Districtwide, 2011-12 SASS](image-url)
As indicated in Figure 7, in five of the six topics, between 54 and 64 percent of all full-time public high school teachers statewide reported that they had spent eight hours or less in PD activities focused on: using computers for instruction (54.3%), reading instruction (56.7%), discipline and management in the classroom (57.8%), how to teach students with disabilities (65.9%), and how to teach ELLs (63.8%). On these five topics, between 5 to 12 percent of teachers statewide reported that they had participated in PD activities lasting 33 hours or more. For teachers participating in PD activities focused on the content area of the subject(s) they taught, 23.8% participated in PD activities that lasted for 33 hours or more.

![Percentage Distribution of Full-time Public High School Teachers by the Amount of Time They Spent on PD Statewide, 2011-12 SASS.](image)

Similar to previous research (Choy et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2010), statewide findings indicate that the majority of New Mexico teachers’ PD participation focuses on the content of the subject(s) they taught and using computers for instruction, but not with much depth. Despite high levels of teachers’ participation in PD,
shorter durations suggest that teachers’ participation in PD might not have a meaningful impact on student learning. In their research, Yoon et al. (2007) found that programs that were less than 14 hours had no effect on student achievement gains. Teachers’ PD duration ranging from 30 to 100 hours (averaging 49 hours) over the course of six to twelve months, however, showed a positive and statistically significant effect on student achievement gains (Yoon et al., 2007). Notably, throughout SY 2011-12 over half of the full-time public high school teachers in TLSD reported spending 33 hours or more in PD focused on how to teach ELLs and 28.6% of full-time public high school teachers in the district reported spending 33 hours or more in PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught. At the state level, 12.4% of full-time public high school teachers reported spending more than 33 hours in PD activities focused on how to teach ELLs and approximately a quarter of full-time public high school teachers reported spending more than 33 hours in PD activities focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught. Based on research from Yoon et al. (2007), these findings suggest that New Mexico’s full-time public high school teachers’ participation in most of their PD activities is likely to have a minimal impact on teachers’ instructional practice in the classroom and on student achievement gains.

For full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas, just 25.4% participated in PD activities for 33 hours or more focused on the content area of the subject(s) they taught, even though 72.7% of them reported participating in PD focused on this topic. In four of the PD topics, between 51 and 54 percent of all full-time public high school teachers of tested subject areas statewide reported that they had spent eight hours or less in PD activities focused on: reading instruction (50.7%), using computers for instruction (51.4%), how to teach students with disabilities (54.2%), and discipline and management in
the classroom (64.4%). On three of these PD topics, between 6 to 9.6 percent of full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas statewide reported that they had participated in activities lasting 33 hours or more (Figure 8). Except for PD focused on the content area of the subject(s) they taught and how to teach ELLs, the majority of full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas spent eight hours or less on PD activities.

Figure 8: Percentage Distribution of Full-time Public High School Teachers in Only Tested Subject Areas by the Amount of Time They Spent on PD Statewide, 2011-12 SASS.

For full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas, just 22.7% participated in PD activities for 33 hours or more focused on the content area of the subject(s) they taught even though 66% reported participating in PD focused on this topic. Between 14 and 36 percent of full-time public high school teachers of non-tested subject areas statewide reported participating in PD of what Wei et al. (2010) classify as modest duration (9-16 hours) for each of the six topic areas. In the five of the PD topic areas,
between 54 and 78 percent of full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas statewide reported that they had spent eight hours or less in PD (Figure 9). These findings for full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas are similar to other studies that have found more and more teachers participating in PD of shorter durations (i.e., for eight hours or less), which tends to be less effective than sustained, job-embedded PD of longer duration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Little, 1993; Richardson, 1990; Wei et al., 2010; Yoon et al., 2007).

Figure 9: Percentage Distribution of Full-time Public High School Teachers in Only Non-tested Subject Areas by the Amount of Time They Spent on PD Statewide, 2011-12 SASS.

Teachers’ Perceptions Regarding the Usefulness of PD

On the 2011-12 SASS, teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of the PD they participated in, which was focused on one or more of the following six topic areas: 1) the content of the subject(s) they taught, 2) using computers for instruction, 3) reading instruction, 4) student discipline and management in the classroom, 5) how to teach students
with disabilities (SWDs), 6) how to teach English language learners (ELLs). On the survey, teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of their participation in these activities on a 4-point scale, ranging from “not useful” to “very useful.”

In TLSD, in each PD topic area (except for reading instruction), more than three-quarters of all full-time public high school teachers who participated thought those PD activities were useful. Moreover, 100% of full-time public high school teachers in the district rated the PD activities focused on how to teach students with disabilities, discipline and management in the classroom, and using computers for instruction as useful. Conversely, 71% of full-time public high school teachers in the district rated PD focused on reading instruction as not useful. In taking a closer look at PD focused on reading instruction in TLSD, of the 36% of full-time public high school teachers reporting participation in this topic, 48.5% of them spent 9-16 hours and 4.6% of them spent more than 33 hours in PD activities focused on the topic of reading instruction. Even though 53.1% of full-time public high school teachers in the district reported spending more than one day on PD focused on reading instruction, only 29% of them thought that this PD was useful. This district-level finding is inconsistent with other studies, which have typically found that the more time teachers spend on PD activities, the more likely they were to consider it useful (Choy et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). My point is that although New Mexico’s full-time public high school teachers may report participating in PD activities focused on particular topics in high percentages, the duration of their participation was typically not longer than a day. Furthermore, even if full-time public high school teachers participate in PD for longer durations, they may not necessarily report that the PD was useful, perhaps because of the quality of these PD activities.
As shown in Figure 10, for each topic area, more than one-half of all full-time public high school teachers statewide who had participated thought that the PD activities were useful (i.e., they rated the usefulness of PD activity as 3 or 4 on the scale of 1-4). Among the topic areas, full-time public high school teachers statewide who participated in PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught were the most likely to think that this PD was very useful (71.5%). When examining teachers of tested subject areas statewide, 78.6% of them rated PD focused on how to teach ELLs as useful and 68.5% of them rated PD focused on reading instruction as useful. More teachers of non-tested subject areas statewide reported that PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught and PD focused on using computers for instruction were useful (Figure 10).

![Figure 10: FTE Public HS Teachers’ Ratings of PD Usefulness Statewide, 2011-12 SASS.](image)
After examining how full-time public high school teachers rated the usefulness of PD statewide, I analyzed whether differences existed between how teachers of tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated. Given that the policy focus of PD in New Mexico is to increase student achievement or Standards Based Assessment (SBA) in order to meet AYP, I hypothesized that there would be a difference between how teachers of tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated during SY 2011-12. I used six dependent variables that measured teachers of tested subject areas and teachers of non-tested subject areas’ ratings of usefulness of PD focused on: 1) the content of the subject(s) they taught, 2) using computers in instruction, 3) reading instruction, 4) discipline and management in the classroom, 5) how to teach students with disabilities (SWDs), and 6) how to teach ELLs. The independent variables were two groups of full-time public high school teachers statewide split into tested subject areas and non-tested subject areas.

Table 4 presents the results of the statistical procedure (i.e., the one-way ANOVA) I used to compare these two groups of full-time public high school teachers.
Table 4: One-Way Analysis of Variance in Full-time Public High School Teachers’ Perceptions of Usefulness of PD by Tested & Non-Tested Subject Areas, 2011-12 SASS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Subject Areas</th>
<th>Tested</th>
<th>Non-Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content specific</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline &amp; Management</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to teach SWDs</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to teach ELLs</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD means Standard Deviation. SWDs means Students with Disabilities.
*Significant at the \( p < .05 \) level.

As displayed in Table 4, data indicate that there were statistically significant differences in the usefulness of PD for full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas with regard to three of the dependent variables: content specific PD, reading instruction, and how to teach ELLs. The one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) also indicated that at \( p < .05 \) there were no statistically significant differences between the
two groups for the PD topics focused on using computers in instruction, discipline and management in the classroom, and how to teach students with disabilities.

First, the ANOVA results showed \( F(1,2360) = 7.378, p = .007 \) a significant difference in how full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the content specific PD activities in which they participated. These results indicate that full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught higher \( (M = 3.02, SD = .716) \) than full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas \( (M = 2.93, SD = .868) \).

Second, the ANOVA results showed \( F(1,1270) = 72.698, p < .001 \) a significant difference in how full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the reading instruction PD activities in which they participated. These results indicate that full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas rated the usefulness of PD focused on reading instruction higher \( (M = 3.00, SD = .823) \) than full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas \( (M = 2.63, SD = .739) \).

Third, the ANOVA results indicated \( F(1,1260) = 135.044, p < .001 \) a significant difference in how full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of PD activities in which they participated that focused on how to teach ELLs. These results indicate that full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas rated the usefulness of PD focused on how to teach ELLs higher \( (M = 3.06, SD = .869) \) than full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas \( (M = 2.51, SD = .783) \).

In sum, these findings indicate that content-specific PD activities were more useful for full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas, while PD focused on reading instruction and how to teach ELLs were more useful for full-time public high school
teachers in tested subject areas. These findings suggest that full-time public high school
teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of PD may be a result of their satisfaction with
how the PD activities improved and deepened their professional understanding of how to
enhance student learning.

The finding that 50.7% of full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas
spent less than 8 hours on PD focused on reading instruction, yet they thought it was useful is
consistent with findings from a previous study (Guskey & Yoon, 2009), but inconsistent with
other studies (Choy et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Unlike previous research, in
my study, the more time teachers, particularly in tested subjects, spent on PD did not
necessarily mean that they thought it was useful. In the first federal report on PD, Choy et al.
(2006) found that the amount of time teachers spent on PD activities in a particular content
area and teachers’ perceptions of the usefulness of these PD activities were strongly related.
In their meta-analysis, Guskey and Yoon (2009) found that PD workshops focused on how to
implement research-based instructional practices, even in shorter durations, showed a
positive relationship between PD and improvements in student learning. My findings reflect
Guskey and Yoon’s (2009) assertion that workshops “are not the poster child of ineffective
practice that they are often made out to be” (p. 496), in this case as it relates to how to teach
reading.

**Institutional Support Teachers’ Receive for PD**

The 2011-12 SASS asked teachers whether they were provided with six forms of
institutional support from the school or district when participating in PD, including: 1)
release time from teaching, with teaching responsibilities temporarily assigned to someone
else, 2) scheduled time in the contract year for PD, 3) a stipend when engaging in PD outside
of work hours, 4) full or partial reimbursement of tuition for college courses, 5) reimbursement for conference or workshop fees, and 6) reimbursement for travel and/or daily expenses.

In TLSD, the percentage of teachers who took university courses related to teaching (45.8%) was much higher than teachers statewide (27.7%), which may be related to higher number of full-time public high school teachers reporting receiving institutional support in the form of reimbursement for tuition expenses. Districtwide, 29.7% of full-time public high school teachers reported that they received tuition reimbursement, when only 10% of teachers statewide reported receiving tuition reimbursement as a type of institutional support for their PD (Table 5). Except for release time from teaching, teachers in TLSD reported much higher rates of institutional support in the form of scheduled PD time during the contract year (89.7%), reimbursement for conference or workshop fees (51.8%), and reimbursement for travel expenses and/or fees (48.2%), and stipends for PD activities that took place outside regular work hours (36.3%). These findings suggest that there may be several positive incentives offered to full-time public high school teachers within the district to provide such strong institutional support for PD.

Statewide, scheduled time in the contract year for PD was the most common form of institutional support (79.4%) full-time public high school teachers reported receiving. The next most common forms of institutional support for PD were release time from teaching, received by 48.5% of New Mexico’s full-time public high school teachers, then reimbursement for travel or daily expenses (33.4% received it). New Mexico’s full-time public high school were less likely to receive reimbursement for conference or workshop fees (31.2%) and stipends for PD activities that took place outside of work hours (25.7%). One in
ten teachers received institutional support in the form of full or partial reimbursement for college tuition and fees.

Table 5: Institutional Support for Full-time Public High School Teachers’ PD, 2011-12 SASS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Support for PD Activities</th>
<th>TLSD (%)</th>
<th>NM (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release time from teaching</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled time in contract year for PD</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for PD outside of work hours</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement, tuition</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement, conference/workshop fees</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement, travel and/or daily expenses</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers’ Perceptions of Their Influence on PD and Teacher Evaluation School Policies

The 2011-12 SASS asked teachers to rate their perceptions of teacher influence in two areas of policy at their school: 1) determining the content of in-service PD programs and 2) teacher evaluation. On the survey, teachers were asked to rate their perceptions of influence in these two policy areas on a four-point scale, ranging from “no influence” to a “great deal of influence.”

Full-time public high school teachers in TLSD reported their perceptions of teacher influence on school policy in determining the content of in-service PD programs as follows:
24.2% reported no influence, 15.5% reported minor influence, 33.9% reported moderate influence, and 26.3% reported a great deal of influence. This finding, where 60.3% of teachers reported that they had a moderate amount or a great deal of influence on school policy in determining professional development content, suggests that collective participation of teachers in the design of job-embedded professional learning may be a common feature of PD for teachers in the district.

Statewide, 29.5% of full-time public high school teachers reported no influence, 38.6% reported minor influence, 23.4% reported moderate influence, and 8.5% reported that teachers had a great deal of influence on school policy in determining the content of in-service PD programs. In contrast to the district findings, 68.1% of New Mexico’s full-time public high school teachers reported that they had a minor amount or no influence on school policy in determining PD content. This finding suggests that contextual differences in the design and implementation of PD in public school districts throughout the state of New Mexico may affect how teachers perceive their influence on school policy in determining the content of their PD.

The majority of full-time public high school teachers districtwide (69.7%) and statewide (82.5%) reported that they had a minor amount or no influence on school policy related to teacher evaluation. In TLSD, full-time public high school teachers reported their perceptions as follows: 46.3% reported no influence, 23.4% reported minor influence, 26.8% reported moderate influence, and 3.5% reported that they had a great deal of influence on school policy related to teacher evaluation. Statewide, 55.4% reported no influence, 27.1% reported minor influence, 15.4% reported moderate influence, and 2.1% reported that teachers had a great deal of influence on school policy related to teacher evaluation. These
findings corroborate Darling-Hammond et al. (2009) finding that low levels of teachers’ perceptions of their influence on school policies reflect “the lack of school governance structures and professional communities that involve teachers in collective decision-making and problem-solving” (p. 27). Furthermore, research (Darling-Hammond, 2008; Guskey, 2000; Yoon et al., 2007) indicates that when educational stakeholders design systems to actively engage teachers in decision-making that directly affects their work lives, then student learning outcomes and professional learning outcomes can be attained.

The benefits of involving teachers in school policy decision-making certainly outweigh the alarming consequences of not doing so, as previous researchers have shown that schools with higher levels of teacher decision-making and influence produce lower levels of teacher turnover (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Grissmer & Kirby, 1997; Ingersoll, 2001; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2012). For example, Ndoye, Imig, and Parker (2010) found that when school leaders valued and respected teacher input in the full operation of the school, empowerment of teachers occurred and promoted overall learning and the school’s success. When teachers are supported in their professional growth, they are more committed to their school because they are actively involved in decision-making processes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Thornburg & Mungai, 2011; Wei et al., 2010). Therefore, valuing teachers’ input and involving them in policy decision-making at the school level may very well lead to teacher empowerment, which is comprised of “three interrelated components: increased teacher access to decision-making, increased teacher knowledge, and increased teacher status” (Farrell & Weitman, 2007, p. 37). This notion of teacher empowerment is a powerful one, particularly when structural, formal, and institution-based efforts are designed to put teachers at the center, keep good teachers in education, entice new teachers into the
profession, and “reverse a general trend toward treating teachers as employees who do specific tasks planned in detail by other people” (Terry, 1995, p. 1). Further, Lichtenstein, McLaughlin, & Knudsen (1991) assert that teacher empowerment must on developing teachers’ knowledge of and involvement in education policy at school, district, and state levels to ensure that empowerment is not symbolic and has an impact on how policy is created and implemented.

Summary

In this chapter, I provided a descriptive statistical profile of full-time public high school teachers’ PD experiences at the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and the New Mexico state levels. First, I examined the format, topic and duration of teachers’ participation in PD activities. I discovered that in TLSD, higher percentages of full-time public high school teachers reported participating in both traditional/formal and job-embedded PD formats than teachers statewide. The majority of full-time public high school teachers in TLSD reported participating in PD topics focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught (86.3%) and on other types of PD, which included the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and instructional strategies. The majority of all full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico reported participating in PD topics focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught (68.6%) and using computers for instruction (50.1%). In terms of teachers’ PD participation rates by duration, the overwhelming majority of teachers at the district and state level reported spending fewer than eight hours on PD, suggesting that opportunities for teachers to implement and reflect upon what they have learned is limited. Because change in instructional practices is primarily an “experientially based learning process for teachers” (Guskey, 2002, p. 384), teachers need more than one day to become
committed to new practices, implement them, and then evaluate the effects on student learning.

Second, I examined the perceptions these teachers held regarding the usefulness of their PD and compared how teachers of tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated. The ANOVA results showed significant contrasts between full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subjects in their perceptions of the usefulness of PD topics focused on content specific PD, reading instruction, and how to teach ELLs. Content-specific PD activities were more useful for full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas, while PD focused on reading instruction and how to teach ELLs were more useful for full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas. These findings suggest that full-time public high school teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of PD could be influenced by their satisfaction with how the PD activities improved and deepened their professional understanding of how to improve student learning.

Third, I reviewed the most common types of institutional support for PD full-time public high school teachers reported receiving. In this study, I found that scheduled time in the contract year for PD was the most common form of institutional support provided to full-time public high school teachers at the district (89.7%) and state level (79.4%). Compared to teachers throughout the state, except for release time from teaching, teachers in TLSD reported much higher rates of institutional support in the form of scheduled PD time during the contract year (89.7%), reimbursement for conference or workshop fees (51.8%) and travel expenses (48.2%), stipends for PD activities that took place outside regular work hours (36.3%), and tuition reimbursement (29.7%). These findings suggest that there may be
several positive incentives offered to full-time public high school teachers within the district to provide such strong institutional support for PD.

Lastly, I examined full-time high school teachers’ perceptions regarding their influence over school policy related to determining the content of their PD and teacher evaluation. The district-level findings suggest that job-embedded collaborative professional learning is a common feature of PD in the TLSD. Conversely, the state-level findings are consistent with previous research (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, Thornburg & Mungai, 2011; Wei et al., 2010), where teachers’ reports of their lack of influence over school policy decisions indicate that they are less likely to be engaged in collaborative problem-solving around school policy issues.

These findings of full-time public school high school teachers’ PD experiences, as reported by teachers on the 2011-12 SASS, are embedded within the social organization of mandatory PD in New Mexico. In the following chapter, I explicate how PD becomes mandatory for teachers in at one school district and one high school level in New Mexico.
Chapter 5: A Textually-Mediated System of Social Relations & Compliance for Mandatory PD

In this chapter, I share my findings on how professional development (PD) becomes mandatory within a textually-mediated system of social relations between teachers and educational stakeholders focused on compliance at multiple levels. Textual mediation refers to Smith’s (2005, 2006) concept that texts coordinate sequences of action among people who interpret, respond to, and/or activate the texts within interconnected institutional structures and practices. I have chosen to describe the system of social relations between teachers and educational stakeholders as an intertextual hierarchy organized into three levels, according to 13 institutional texts, including nine that were created at the state level, two at the district level, and two at the high school level. Within an intertextual hierarchy, texts at higher levels “establish the frames and concepts that control texts at lower levels” and, inversely, “texts at lower levels are fitted to the frames and concepts of higher order texts” (Smith, 2005, p. 181).

In this case, I analyzed institutional texts that mediated social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD, which increasingly narrowed the frames for these relations. Social relations implicate more than one individual in concerted sequences of textually mediated action and are “actual practices and activities through which people’s lives are socially organized” (Campbell & Gregor, 2004, p. 30). Institutional texts, as active constituents of social relations, contain messages that organize and mobilize actions that educational stakeholders and teachers must take in order to comply with legal requirements for mandatory PD. At each level within the textually-mediated system of social relations described and analyzed here, educational stakeholders and teachers interpret and respond to institutional texts by activating them in compliance-driven ways. My analysis in this chapter
focuses on the mechanics of text activation, which involves people in the coordination of text-based actions to accomplish the work of mandatory PD in what Smith (2005) refers to as *text-act-text* or *act-text-act* sequences and text-reader conversations. I present excerpts from teacher and educational stakeholder interviews to provide examples of how the actions they take to comply with mandates for PD are mediated by various institutional texts within a multi-level system of social relations. At higher levels in the intertextual hierarchy, educational stakeholders have greater flexibility in interpreting and making compliance-oriented decisions. At the lowest level in the hierarchy, teachers’ mandatory PD activities are constrained by the statutory requirements from state and district levels. Within this system of social relations, teachers’ knowledge of what they need for their own PD is not as valuable as educational stakeholders’ decisions mandating PD for them at district and state levels.

In the sections that follow, I highlight the major findings from this study that helped to answer my overarching research questions: 1) What are the characteristics of mandatory PD for high school teachers in New Mexico? and 2) How does PD become mandatory for high school teachers in New Mexico? These questions served as a pathway for my journey towards understanding the nuances, subtleties, and complexities of the textually-mediated system of social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD. Because of the many factors influencing this textually-mediated system, the answers to these research questions will reflect the institution’s complexity and will not necessarily provide a complete picture or ethnography of the institution of mandatory PD. My findings are presented differently than one would typically expect. Characteristic of studies that draw on IE, instead of themes, there are “maps” of social relations and instead of subthemes there are analytic descriptions of text-act-text sequences and text-reader conversations (Campbell & Gregor, 2004).
Mandatory PD at the State Level

In the following section, I explicate the characteristics of mandatory PD in nine state-level institutional texts that collectively establish New Mexico’s framework for mandatory PD. This institutional framework prioritizes the state’s strategy for mandatory PD, which is to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge in a High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) system so that all students meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) towards 100% in ELA/reading and math proficiency and high school graduation cohort rates. Within this framework, each institutional text formulates a process of action that educational stakeholders must implement in order to adhere to the state’s strategy. At the state level, New Mexico’s education law or the Public School Code direct the actions taken by educational stakeholders within the Public Education Department (PED) to adhere to the law. Next, state-level actions result in the creation of additional institutional texts by educational stakeholders in the PED. The PED then directs educational stakeholders to take compliance-driven actions at lower levels in the intertextual hierarchy. These coordinated sequences of action, mediated by state law and institutional texts created by the PED, comprise the state-level portion of the textually-mediated system of social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD.

Characteristics of mandatory PD in the Public School Code. The School Personnel Act and the Assessment and Accountability Act in New Mexico’s Public School Code contain the highest-level mandates for teachers’ PD. At the top of the intertextual hierarchy, ambiguous language in these two sections of state law provides much leeway to institutional actors within the PED to decide the parameters with which schools and districts must comply when mandating PD for teachers. The characteristics of mandatory PD in these
two sections of law are broadly designed to foster improvement in teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge, but are shaped without input from teachers about their PD needs. The underlying set of assumptions in these two sections of law is that if districts and schools devise clear plans for improving student achievement, then targeted PD provided to teachers will improve their pedagogical content knowledge and enhance student achievement results. As I will show in this chapter, these assumptions in the law are activated at lower levels in the intertextual hierarchy when districts and schools mandate teachers’ PD based on the needs they identify in Educational Plans for Student Success (EPSS). Thus, the law’s emphasis on “plans for improving student achievement” has a greater influence on mandatory PD for teachers than teachers’ own articulated needs. The major flaw with these two sections of law is that a mechanism to capture teachers’ PD needs is not included as part of the efforts to improve their pedagogical content knowledge and their students’ learning and achievement.

The first institutional text in the intertextual hierarchy, the *School Personnel Act*, requires the PED to create a systemic PD framework that “provides training to ensure quality teachers” and “improves and enhances student achievement” (22-10A-19.1 NMSA 1978). It also requires that the PD framework include the following broad guidelines for mandatory PD activities – that they:

(a) improve teachers’ knowledge of the subjects they teach and [their] ability to teach those subjects to all of their students;

(b) are an integral part of the public school and school district plans for improving student achievement;
(c) provide teachers, school administrators, and instructional support providers with the strategies, support, knowledge, and skills to help all students meet New Mexico academic standards;

(d) are high quality, sustained, intensive, and focused on the classroom; and

(e) are developed and evaluated regularly with extensive participation of school employees and parents. (22-10A-19.1 NMSA 1978)

What is missing from this list are requirements for the inclusion of teachers in the identification of what they need to learn to enhance their students’ learning. The School Personnel Act needs to explicitly include teachers, not just “school employees,” in the process of developing the professional development experiences in which they will be involved. In the School Personnel Act, “student achievement” is the focus, but student learning is not included as an outcome of PD. “Student achievement” is not defined in the law, but the meaning of the term from NCLB (2003) is encoded in its use in the School Personnel Act.

NCLB requires states to develop accountability systems based on state content and academic achievement standards, measured by state-developed assessments, and compared to AYP expectations for the 2014 deadline. Specifically, NCLB (2003) narrowly defines student achievement as assessment outcomes in ELA/reading, math, and high school graduation. As conceptualized in NCLB, assessment results in ELA/reading and math are assumed to indicate whether students have learned. Because the School Personnel Act requires a systemic framework for PD that “provides training to ensure quality teachers” and “improves and enhances student achievement,” mandatory PD and federal accountability requirements are inextricably linked in state law, thereby promoting an emphasis on
ELA/reading and math when schools and districts devise plans (i.e., EPSS) to improve AYP and mandate PD for teachers.

The second institutional text, the *Assessment and Accountability Act* directs the PED to create “a statewide assessment and accountability system that is aligned with the state academic content and performance standards and that measures AYP for each public school and school district” (22-2C NMSA 1978). The law also details accountability provisions from NCLB (2003), including the specific requirements for AYP, the publication of AYP ratings, and the consequences for not meeting AYP. For high schools, AYP is based on three indicators: Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in ELA/reading and math, 95% test participation rate, and cohort graduation rates (Appendix 11).

NCLB and New Mexico’s *Assessment and Accountability Act* require schools and districts to use AYP results, measured on accountability report cards created by the PED, to “drive data-driven decision making” processes at district and school levels, including mandating PD for teachers. In addition to using and evaluating data, districts and schools, in their plans to meet AYP, require that student, parent, and other stakeholder feedback address seven goal areas: 1) ELA/reading, 2) math, 3) “highly qualified” teachers, 4) English language learners (ELLs), 5) safe learning environments, 6) high school graduation, and 7) parent engagement (Appendix 11). In the accountability report cards PED creates, schools are rated according to whether or not they meet AYP goals in 100% in ELA/reading and math proficiency and high school graduation cohort rates. What is missing from the *Assessment and Accountability Act*, particularly in specifications for accountability reports, is how districts and schools account for how PD was provided to teachers and the specific costs associated with the PD activities provided to teachers, differentiated by licensure level.
and grade level. Additionally, it would be important to demarcate mandatory PD in these accountability report cards.

While the *Assessment and Accountability Act* does not prescribe the details of New Mexico’s assessment and accountability system, the law clearly demands that districts and schools hold students and teachers accountable as part of the state’s goals for meeting AYP. The lack of details in the *Assessment and Accountability Act* means that PED has room to decide how it wants schools and districts to comply with its interpretation of the law.

Also included in the state’s goals for meeting AYP is the NCLB (2003) requirement for teacher evaluation in a High, Objective, Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) system, one of two options for experienced teachers to become “highly qualified” (Appendix 11). In NCLB, experienced teachers must meet the HOUSSE system criteria if they do not have a bachelor's degree and competency in every core academic subject as demonstrated by passing a rigorous state academic subject test or successfully completing, in every core academic subject they teach, a graduate degree or coursework equivalent to an undergraduate major (20 U.S.C. § 7801). Core academic subjects include: ELA/reading, mathematics, science, modern and classical languages, the arts (e.g., music and visual arts), and social studies, including civics, government, economics, history, and geography. While states individually decide how they want to enact a HOUSSE system, NCLB requires that a state’s HOUSSE system meet the seven requirements mentioned in Chapter 1 and shown in Appendix 11. These seven HOUSSE system requirements are designed to impose uniformity “to all teachers in the same grade” in spite of the highly variable and contextualized conditions of teaching.
The *School Personnel Act* directs the PED to create a teacher evaluation system, but does not name the exact components of this HOUSSE system. This means that the PED has the room to decide the details of a HOUSSE system, as long as it meets the federal requirements (see Appendix 11). As part of New Mexico’s HOUSSE system, the *School Personnel Act* requires school principals to “observe each teacher’s classroom practice to determine the teacher’s ability to demonstrate state-adopted competencies” (22-10A-19 NMSA 1978). As a condition for continued employment, teachers must successfully demonstrate satisfactory progress and competency every year. If teachers do not demonstrate state-adopted competencies annually, then the law requires teachers to undergo a number of consequences depending on their level of licensure. If Level I teachers with fewer than three years of experience fail to demonstrate competency, then they may be terminated “for any reason [the school board] deems sufficient” (22-10A-24 NMSA 1978). If Level II and Level III teachers do not demonstrate state-adopted competencies annually, then the school district must provide them with additional PD and peer intervention. The *School Personnel Act* requires that teachers demonstrate state-adopted competencies, but leaves it to the PED to decide what the competencies are.

The HOUSSE system, as specified in the *School Personnel Act*, also requires teachers to document their compliance with district and school mandates for PD in Professional Development Plans (PDPs). At the beginning of each school year, teachers and principals must create PDPs and principals must use individual teachers’ PDPs as part of their performance evaluations. Teachers’ PDPs must also “include documentation on how a teacher who receives PD that has been required or offered by the state or a school district or charter school incorporates the results of that PD in the classroom” (22-10A-19 NMSA 163
Additionally, teachers’ evaluations in the HOUSSE system must be “based in part on how well the PDP was carried out” (22-10A-19 NMSA 1978). This section of the School Personnel Act provides imprecise measures for how PDPs are to be included in teachers’ performance evaluations. Again, imprecise language allows the PED to interpret how it will implement the law. It is unclear what is meant by “in part” in the School Personnel Act. If teachers’ evaluations have 100 parts, do teachers’ PDPs count for ten, fifty, or ninety of those parts?

In the School Personnel Act and the Assessment and Accountability Act, there is an implicit emphasis on an alignment between state standards, state-developed assessments, districts’ and schools’ plans to meet AYP, teachers’ individual Professional Development Plans (PDPs), and classroom instruction. In a coherently aligned system, the state-developed assessments represent the standards, and the assessment results indicate areas of improvement for teachers and students. In this way, strategies to improve AYP are designed to provide expectations for student achievement and for teachers’ PD. The underlying idea is that if teachers deliver instruction in better ways that follow state standards, then students will learn and student learning will be reflected in the assessment results. In this textually-mediated reality, student learning is equivalent to student achievement as measured by state-developed assessments. With this line of thinking, student assessment results can provide additional measures to supplement knowledge teachers have of what they might need professionally and what their students might need academically. Unfortunately, as I argue later in the chapter, student assessment results and districts’ and schools’ plans to improve AYP supplant teachers’ knowledge of their individual and collective needs for professional development.
As evidenced in the *School Personnel Act* and the *Assessment and Accountability Act*, the characteristics of statewide mandatory PD are based on undefined strategies for improving teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge so that students in all districts and schools meet AYP in order to make NCLB’s 2014 deadline of 100% in ELA/reading and math proficiency and high school graduation cohort rates. Even though these two sections of the Public School Code meet federal requirements for accountability, “highly qualified” teachers, and teacher evaluation in a HOUSSE system, they provide the PED with significant amounts of latitude in interpreting and implementing these statutory requirements. When the PED is directed by the Public School Code (text) to take action, the department interprets the law (act) and details its implementation plans in regulations or rules (text).

**Characteristics of mandatory PD in Public Education Department (PED) rules.**

Seven institutional texts from the PED, including three rules, Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators, accountability targets in Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), and AYP ratings in school and district Accountability Report Cards, provide the next set of state-level mandates for teachers’ PD. These coordinated sequences of action, mediated by state law and institutional texts created by the PED, comprise the state-level portion of the textually-mediated system of social relations focused on compliance.

My analysis in this section focuses on uncovering processes of mandatory PD for teachers in institutional texts activated at the state level. I argue that state-level institutional texts project the actions taken by educational stakeholders and teachers to comply with these requirements at district and school levels. Institutional texts do not determine what happens in a system of social relations; only people, through activating texts or taking action to comply with statutory requirements, determine how PD becomes mandatory for teachers.
Thus, I use excerpts from state-level educational stakeholder interviews to highlight how two sections of the Public School Code coordinate the actions they take to adhere to compliance mandates for teachers’ PD. These accounts highlight how institutional actors activate the *School Personnel Act* and the *Assessment and Accountability Act* in the creation of seven other state-level institutional texts to document the PED’s compliance with the law while directing lower levels within the intertextual hierarchy on how to comply with additional requirements for teachers’ mandatory PD.

In his interview, Mr. Canada explained that his “chief job” in New Mexico’s first PED was to oversee the development of both the assessment and accountability system and the three-tiered teacher licensure system, particularly “the details of how [teachers] would move from level to level, or what [teachers] would do when [they] were at each level, and what was expected of [them] at each level.” As explained in Chapter 2, New Mexico’s first PED as an executive agency controlled by the Governor was created in 2003 as a result of a state constitutional amendment. Mr. Canada emphasized that he and his staff in New Mexico’s first PED did not singularly create these systems: “I honestly did not know what it would look like and I did not have any idea of what it would look like.” In a one-day meeting, Mr. Canada explained how he brought together teachers, administrators, legislators, unions, parents’ groups, university professors, and researchers who collectively created a general framework for the movement between licensure levels in the three-tiered system and the role of PD in the statewide assessment and accountability system. After he held 23 public hearings throughout the state and synthesized 1,500 public comments, Mr. Canada and the PED’s legal team drafted the “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule (6.69.4 NMAC).
Mr. Canada explained that the emergency clause in HB 212 created pressure within the PED to have details of the law immediately decided. Quoting a section of the School Personnel Act that drove the focus of his work, Mr. Canada explained that the salary minimums in the three-tiered licensure system could not go into effect “until the department adopted increased competencies for the particular level of licensure and a highly objective uniform statewide standard of evaluation” (22-10A-4 NMSA 1978). The time crunch and Mr. Canada’s commitment to facilitate educators’ active participation in the system’s design motivated him to form five committees with “people from all over the state working together” to create the details of the three-tiered licensure and teacher evaluation system. The five committees were created to each focus on a specific component of the system: 1) Professional Development Dossier, 2) Local Annual Evaluation, 3) Teacher Training, 4) Administrator Training, and 5) Independent Reviewer Training. Each committee’s work, facilitated by Mr. Canada, resulted in the “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule, training manuals, and handbooks to help teachers and administrators understand, step-by-step, how to comply with the law.

Mr. Canada’s account illustrates his decision to bring together teachers, school administrators, teachers’ unions, university professors, and researchers to collaborate and collectively create the details of how to implement the School Personnel Act. Based largely on Mr. Canada’s discretion to organize multiple educational stakeholders in five committees, the first PED prioritized stakeholder feedback in its interpretation of state law. Further, Mr. Canada activates the School Personnel Act in the sequence of action he engaged in to bring multiple educational stakeholders together. Of significant note in Mr. Canada’s account is the lack of clarity in state law for New Mexico’s HOUSSE and three-tiered licensure systems,
which largely leaves it up to the officials within the PED to decide the details for how they comply with legal requirements. In his interview, Mr. Canada articulated the particular parts of the sequence he was responsible for and the point at which the PED rules were transmitted to other people in the sequence stream, mainly educational stakeholders on the five committees.

At the time when HB was enacted in 2003, because the Democratic Party controlled the first PED and the legislature, the legislators assumed that the PED would implement the intent of the law as they designed it in the School Personnel Act and the Assessment and Accountability Act. One legislator who strongly supported HB 212 explained that the three-tiered licensure and teacher evaluation systems were designed to recruit and retain, and they were “not originally [designed] to increase student performance. It was a measure designed to get better teachers, to get teachers to stay, and to get them trained” (NM Legislator 2 Interview). These intentions are mainly reflected in the course of social action taken by Mr. Canada and educational stakeholders when they interpreted the law in their creation of additional state-level institutional texts. Moreover, Mr. Canada’s emphasis on stakeholder engagement indicates his personal preference for collaboration in taking action to ensure that the PED complied with the law. Unfortunately, the fact that inclusion of teachers in the design of mandatory PD in the state’s licensure advancement and teacher evaluation systems is optional means that when the PED’s leaders and/or political party change, so might the level of inclusion. My point is that collaboration among multiple stakeholders and the deliberate inclusion of teachers needs to be formalized and explicitly stated in the institutional texts at every level in the textually-mediated system of social relations focused on compliance for teachers’ mandatory PD.
Dr. Chris Edward Pernell, who was involved in the Professional Development Dossier and Local Annual Evaluation Committees, praised Mr. Canada for his commitment to teachers’ “voice” and his “leadership in bringing people together and moving them forward.” Explaining that he worked in the Office of Education Accountability (OEA) to provide “an independent source of information and about the progress of ed reform,” Dr. Pernell emphasized that his work evaluated how the PED, districts, and schools implemented the Assessment and Accountability Act and the School Personnel Act. In 2003, during the time New Mexico’s HOUSSE system was created in the Local Evaluation Committee, Dr. Pernell explained that the system included teacher-created PDPs to combat claims that “PD activities were really a waste of time. They were drive-bys, pray-and-spray, you know, the person in the front that gives a little bit of a lecture and [professional learning] never shows up.” Dr. Pernell stated that the intent behind PD in the licensure advancement and teacher evaluation system was to treat teachers as professionals by having an annual process where teachers could be asked what they needed because “If I want [teachers] to do a good job, I need to come to [them] and say, ‘What do you need?’ And match that to what parents and the community expects.” Emphasizing the relationship of mandatory PD to licensure advancement and teacher evaluation, Dr. Pernell explained:

1 The theory of action that is still out there is that you need to have some aligned efforts
2 if you’re going to make a difference. So the hope was that if a school is struggling and
3 you look at the student data, how do you focus on that issue? How do you have some
4 systemic improvement? And the hopes were that the schools would write plans that
5 would say, ‘We’ve analyzed our data and we find that it is Native American girls in
6 math, that’s the biggest issue we’re facing right now.’ From there, the school would
say, ‘that’s what we’re going to focus on,’ and they would spend their professional
development dollars on bringing in folks and programs and doing training around
mathematics and working with Native American girls, for example, and that would lead
to some systematic training.

In lines 5-7, Dr. Pernell asserts that student achievement data appropriately signals
where improvements in teachers’ classroom instruction need to take place. His example, in
lines 7-10, indicates that the school’s plan for improvement is strategic, with measurable
goals and strategies to inform teachers’ PD, which are designed improve teachers’
pedagogical content knowledge for the enhancement of Native American girls’ math
achievement. This example also mirrors the PED’s requirements of “aligned PD” for
teachers, which must tie directly to the schools’ and districts’ student achievement data as
articulated in the PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule, as will be discussed later in the
chapter. Dr. Pernell’s account supports my assertion that there is a strategy, or theory of
change, behind New Mexico’s institutional framework for mandatory PD, which is designed
to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge in a HOUSSE system in order to
enhance Standards Based Assessment (SBA) results in reading and math and in high school
graduation. Moreover, this strategy assumes that teachers’ PD needs are directly connected to
their school and district’s plans to meet AYP for 100% in ELA/reading and math proficiency
and high school graduation cohort rates by the 2014 NCLB deadline.

Unfortunately, the connection between teachers’ PD needs articulated in PDPs and
mandatory PD in their school and district’s plans to meet AYP appears to be more of a
textual reality, with districts and schools’ plans to improve AYP overshadowing teachers’
PDPs. The PED’s interpretation of an alignment between state standards, the SBA results,
districts’ and schools’ plans to meet AYP, and teachers’ PDPs in the *School Personnel Act* and the *Assessment and Accountability Act* mediates the connection between teachers’ individual needs and the community’s expectations for PD. These interpretations resulted in the PED’s creation of three rules to guide the implementation of “aligned PD” efforts in district and school level compliance-driven actions to adhere to the *School Personnel Act* and the *Assessment and Accountability Act* in New Mexico’s Public School Code.

The third institutional text, the PED’s “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” rule, combines its three-tiered licensure advancement with annual evaluations in its High, Objective, Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) to “form an overall system for teacher evaluation and support” (6.69.4 NMAC). New Mexico’s licensure advancement and HOUSSE processes require teachers to provide evidence of their performance demonstrating nine competencies in three strands: instruction, student learning, and professional learning (6.69.4 NMAC). Differentiated by licensure levels, the HOUSSE system includes three components: 1) Professional Development Plans (PDPs) created by teachers with their principals, 2) progressive documentation and evaluation of teacher performance conducted by the principal, and 3) formative/summative evaluations conducted by the principal (Figure 11). Each school district in New Mexico must create a teacher evaluation plan to comply with statutory requirements for the HOUSSE system, which is based “in part” on teachers’ PDPs.

As the institutional actor for the PED, Mr. Canada met the statutory requirements of the *School Personnel Act* by finalizing the “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule, which serves as the foundation of the PED’s three-tiered licensure system and HOUSSE system implementation. Based on the five committees’ work that Mr. Canada
put together, Mr. Canada explained that the “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule clearly detailed the requirements for combining teachers’ evaluation and mandatory PD in the HOUSSE system. During our interview, when Mr. Canada described how the Local Annual Evaluation Committee “made it clear how to evaluate teachers,” I interjected and asked if this committee created the 9 Teacher Competencies and Indicators (see Appendix 12). Recognizing the chart right away, Mr. Canada said:

1. They did. They said, here’s what’s expected for a Level I teacher, here’s what’s
2. expected for a Level II teacher, and Level III. So this, this piece of work right here –
3. you have to commend them for this. They worked on this. But this, again, this was not
4. done by PED. None of it. This was all done by the teachers, the unions, the committee.

Mr. Canada’s quotation illustrates a significant point about the distributed or shared leadership approach the first PED took to engage in collaborative work with multiple educational stakeholders to create the details of the three-tiered licensure and HOUSSE systems. His quote also suggests that even though the PED was under the executive branch of government, the focus was on accomplishing the work set out by the legislature and not about partisan divides based on political agendas.
As shown in Figure 11, each component of the HOUSSE system is based on the fourth institutional text, the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators, that the Local Annual Evaluation Committee created. According to the “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule, the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators are informed by the state’s need for “highly qualified” teachers who can “address the learning needs of all of New Mexico’s students, including those who learn differently as a result of disability, culture, language, or socioeconomic status” (6.69.4 NMAC). Four of the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators concentrate on student learning, including:
• Competency 3, where “the teacher communicates with and obtains feedback from students in a manner that enhances student learning and understanding;”

• Competency 4, where “the teacher comprehends the principles of student growth, development and learning, and applies them appropriately;”

• Competency 6, where “the teacher manages the educational setting in a manner that promotes positive student behavior and a safe and healthy environment;” and

• Competency 7, where “the teacher recognizes student diversity and creates an atmosphere conducive to the promotion of positive student involvement and self-concept.”

Dr. Winona Ryder, a College of Education professor involved with the Professional Development Dossier Committee created by Mr. Canada, explained that she “came in right after [HB 212] was passed and the [“Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers”] rule was in place.” Noting the time crunch Mr. Canada spoke of, Dr. Ryder explained she was hired by the PED as a consultant to write the directions for the Professional Development Dossier and that “within a year, we had everything done.” Dr. Ryder explained that the three-tiered licensure advancement and annual evaluation system, two sides of the NCLB HOUSE system requirement coin, “was bounded by the law, but based upon what the National Board was doing” because National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification measures a teacher’s practice against high and rigorous standards. Dr. Ryder explained that the Professional Development Dossier Committee “had representation from both unions, teachers, and a few principals” working diligently to create a system where teachers could be supported in managing and monitoring student learning and evaluated based on the quality of their efforts to support student learning. Based on Dr.
Ryder’s account, there are mandatory aspects of PD (i.e., local annual evaluations in the PDP process) and/or voluntary aspects of PD (i.e., licensure advancement) within New Mexico’s HOUSSE system.

Dr. Ryder explained that the student-learning strand for the Professional Development Dossier and for teacher evaluation in the HOUSSE system was based on four of the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators. Dr. Ryder asserted that the student-learning strand “is one of the strongest pieces of the dossier,” but its focus on learning as it is articulated in the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators runs “counter to how schools look at kids.” In other words, schools examine students based on SBA outcomes in ELA/reading, math, and high school graduation, which reflect the narrow conception of student achievement articulated in the Assessment and Accountability Act. In activating state law and PED’s “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” rule, Dr. Ryder with others on the Professional Development Dossier and Local Annual Evaluation committees, complied with legal requirements for federal and state accountability while expanding the narrow focus of student achievement (i.e., test scores) to include student learning, measured in more dynamic ways than test scores.

Mentioning that the licensure advancement and HOUSSE systems are “probably about 75% student achievement, [they’re] just not about test scores,” Dr. Ryder explained that both systems are based on ideas in Lee Shulman’s (1987) work: “It’s the idea of teaching is reasoning plus action and we have multiple forms of data to inform any criteria that we’re trying to make a decision upon, on multiple points.” Dr. Ryder’s account explains the deliberate choice made by the first PED and educational stakeholders on the five committees to emphasize student learning over student achievement/test scores in the licensure
advancement and HOUSSE systems. Therefore, the social relations organized around fulfilling compliance mandates in the PED’s “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule de-emphasized student test score results, particularly in the PDP process of the teacher evaluation or HOUSSE system.

The use of “student learning” in the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators and the PED’s “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule contrasts with “student achievement” in the Public School Code. Unlike student achievement, student learning may not be directly related to pre-determined standards or PED’s annual measurable objectives for AYP. As Dr. Ryder aptly indicated in her interview, student learning may be highly individualized, such as in a student’s progress during a particular unit of instruction, such as a comparison of the student with himself or herself rather than with an external standard. Further, this promotes engagement and self-directed skills needed to create a lifelong learner. While closely related concepts, student learning and student achievement do not have the same meaning. Even though student learning is explicitly named in the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators, the conceptualization of student achievement has a more dominant influence on teachers’ mandatory PD, which must align with school and district goals to meet AYP in ELA/reading, math, and high school graduation.

Mentioning that the “PD Framework” rule was the last of his work to go into effect on “June 30, 2006, the day I retired,” Mr. Canada explained that New Mexico’s PD Framework “is the same thing from the National Professional Development Council (NPDC), focused on the context, process, and content standards important for teachers’ learning and growth where [PD] is sustained as job embedded.” The fifth institutional text, the PED’s “PD Framework” rule, adopted the NPDC context, process, and content standards as part of its
requirements for teachers’ PD (6.65.2 NMAC). Designed to be addressed simultaneously for
the enhancement of teachers’ professional learning, the NPDC standards describe the
characteristics of schools and districts that must be in place to sustain the effects of PD (i.e.,
context), delineate the delivery characteristics that facilitate successful adult change (i.e.,
process), and specifically identify the knowledge and skills educators need (i.e., content).
The underlying theory of action in the PED’s “PD Framework” rule is that if teachers
develop the knowledge, skills, and practices they need for their professional learning, they
will be better equipped to improve student learning and help students perform at higher
levels. Among the context, process, and content standards to help teachers learn
professionally, the PED’s “PD Framework” mandates that teachers:

- be organized into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the
  school district;
- use disaggregated student data to determine [their] learning priorities, monitor
  progress, and help sustain continuous improvement; and
- use research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous,
  academic standards and use various types of classroom assessments appropriately.
(6.65.2 NMAC)

These three aspects of the NPDC standards in the PED’s “PD Framework” rule
provide direction for districts and schools to follow when mandating PD for teachers. Based
on research from the late 1990s and early 2000s, the NPDC standards in the PED’s “PD
Framework” rule have not been changed since then and need to be updated according to the
changes made by NPDC, which has since changed its name to Learning Forward. The PED’s
“PD Framework” rule mediates the organization of mandatory PD at district and school
levels in professional learning communities focused on using student data and research-based instructional strategies to improve student learning. This is an example of a prescriptive model from the PD literature that suggests positive effects on professional and student learning (Stoll et al., 2006) The context, process, and content standards to help teachers learn professionally also exhibit the state’s emphasis on schools and districts using “disaggregated student data” in designing school and district improvement goals and PD (6.65.2 NMAC). Importantly, student data is not defined in the PED’s “PD Framework” rule, subsequently leaving districts and schools to decide which “disaggregated student data” to incorporate. Based on student data, available in TLSD and Rydell High School Accountability Report Cards, teachers’ individual priorities for professional learning must “align” somehow with improvement goals in areas determined by the school district. It is significant to note that PD provided to teachers is not an important data point to capture in these accountability report cards, but they should reflect how teachers’ needs were met. The guidelines in this rule also require that PD activities facilitate teachers’ use of classroom assessment data, and not necessarily SBA data, perhaps to assist teachers in their determination of how their professional learning relates to their students’ learning.

Detailing the requirements guiding their implementation of the Assessment and Accountability Act, the PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule requires aligned PD “tied directly to the student achievement data of the school and district” (6.29.1 NMAC). In this rule, the sixth institutional text, students’ academic achievement means the “relative success of students in learning and mastering the school subjects that they study as measured by tests of the knowledge and skills that were taught.” As their primary mechanism for planning and implementation, PED requires districts and schools to create an Educational Plan for Student
Success (EPSS), “a strategic plan written by all districts and schools to improve student performance” (6.29.1 NMAC). Mr. Canada explained that if districts and schools fail to meet AYP, the “Standards for Excellence” rule requires them to create specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely (SMART) goals in their EPSS as part of their strategic plan to meet AYP. The rule also directs districts and schools to develop, monitor, and implement the EPSS on an annual basis (6.29.1 NMAC). Under the supervision of locally elected boards of education, districts and schools must create their EPSS based on school and district-wide data analysis, comparing their students’ performance in ELA/reading and math on the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) and high school graduation to the PED’s Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) to meet AYP. AMOs are “target[s] used to determine student performance for NCLB” (6.29.1 NMAC).

The sequence of action outlined in the PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule requires districts and schools to use SBA data (text) to create (act) the EPSS (text). Implicated in these actions are requirements from both the Assessment and Accountability Act and the School Personnel Act to meet the state’s strategy for mandatory PD, which is to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge in a HOUSSE system so that students meet that year’s AMOs. In the PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule, the basis for all teachers’ mandatory PD is student test score results – regardless of a teacher’s licensure level, grade, subject level taught, or individual PD needs. In fact, alignment in the PED’s “Standards for Excellence” and “PD Framework” rules means that teachers’ professional learning needs are informed by and based largely on student data.

In examining the PED’s interpretation of the Assessment and Accountability Act and the School Personnel Act in the three rules previously mentioned, I was struck by the unclear
relationship between mandatory PD and teacher evaluation in the HOUSSE system. Not only is PD mandated in teachers’ PDPs according to goals set by teachers in the HOUSSE system, but PD is also mandated in districts’ and schools’ EPSS, which focuses on the state’s strategy in seven goal areas set by the PED to improve student performance. Dr. Nan Mercer, a statewide PD provider, explained that the relationship between PD and evaluation in the HOUSSE system “is disjointed” because PD and evaluation “have been two parallel tracks that hardly ever intersected. Very infrequently did the two meet.” Dr. Mercer’s quote suggests a problem of attempting to align externally decided PD mandates to teachers’ PDPs in their annual performance evaluations. PD as required in the districts’ and schools’ EPSS and PD as required in a teacher’s PDP do not have the same weight and are not as clearly aligned as the PED’s three rules suggest.

Fulfilling its statutory accountability requirements, the PED creates AMOs, the seventh institutional text, to concretely provide schools and districts with gradual targets for student proficiency on the SBA and for high school graduation (see Appendix 8). The AMOs are activated by PED staff in their annual ratings of students’ performance on the SBA. For example, after the PED receives SBA results in the spring semester of each school year, the PED compares these results to that year’s AMOs. The PED then uses this comparison to rate schools and districts according to whether or not they met AYP, which is the minimum level of improvement districts and schools must achieve each year, based on the AMOs. The PED publishes AYP ratings for every school and district in Accountability Report Cards, the eighth and ninth institutional texts.

In these Accountability Report cards, districts are rated as either meeting AYP or not meeting AYP according to nine population factors (i.e., all students, Caucasian, African-
American, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, English language learners, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged) multiplied by four student outcomes in reading participation, reading proficiency, math participation, and math proficiency. These 36 components, along with the high school graduation rate, total 37 possible ways a school can miss meeting AYP. If a school or district does not meet AYP in just one of these areas, then it does not meet AYP at all (20 U.S.C. §7325). Not meeting AYP has implications for teachers’ mandatory PD because schools and districts must indicate their goals for “aligned professional development” in the EPSS, which is their strategic plan to meet AYP (6.29.1 NMAC).

In sum, the nine state-level institutional texts described in this section establish an institutional framework for mandatory PD that prioritizes the state’s strategy to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge for the enhancement of student achievement. Moreover, these institutional texts mediate actions educational stakeholders and teachers take at district and school levels to comply with the state’s strategy for mandatory PD. New Mexico’s institutional framework for mandatory PD exists as a representation to evaluate teachers’ performance, informing the course of action districts and schools must take to improve “teachers’ knowledge of the subjects they teach and the ability to teach those subjects to all of their students” and provide teachers with mandatory PD, generally defined in the law as “the strategies, support, knowledge, and skills to help all students meet New Mexico academic standards” (22-10A-19.1 NMSA 1978). The School Personnel Act and the Assessment and Accountability Act in the Public School Code prioritizes a student achievement focus, while the PED’s “Performance Evaluation for Teachers” and “PD Framework” rules prioritize a focus on student learning. The tension between these two
conceptualizations as outcomes of mandatory PD for teachers manifests as these institutional texts are activated at district and school levels in the intertextual hierarchy. At the state level, social relations focused on compliance are mediated by these nine institutional texts and continue to mediate social relations at district and school levels in the intertextual hierarchy, as shown in Figure 12. What is significant to note about this textually mediated system of social relations focused on compliance is the ordering. As can be seen visually, the requirements flow from the top-down, evidence of the regulatory effects of power, or ruling relations, in the social organization of mandatory PD. In examining this arrangement, the question that remains is: how might evidence of the system’s effectiveness as communicated by teachers at the lowest level provide feedback from the bottom up to the top?
Figure 12: Institutional Texts Mediating the Social Organization of Mandatory PD.

**Mandatory PD at the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) Level**

In the following section, I explicate the characteristics of mandatory PD in the tenth and eleventh institutional texts that are activated in the intertextual hierarchy by educational stakeholder participants I interviewed at the district level, including two school board members, one teachers’ union representative, and three TLSD central office employees, who were Level III-A teachers not in the classroom. The district’s Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) and the teachers’ union contract, or Negotiated Agreement, provide district-level mandates for teachers’ PD. The state-level institutional framework for mandatory PD, vague in its specifications of mandatory PD for teachers, provides educational stakeholders at the district level with discretion in deciding how they will comply with the above-mentioned institutional text requirements for mandatory PD. At the district level in the intertextual hierarchy, educational stakeholders activate texts to comply with statutory requirements for
mandatory PD and to accomplish the state’s strategy to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge in a HOUSSE system so that students meet AYP. In addition to institutional texts, unwritten rules based on the tension between student learning and student achievement as outcomes of mandatory PD also informed actions educational stakeholders took when they complied with higher-level mandates for PD. To forefront student learning and professional learning as teachers view them, the teachers’ union bargains (act) on behalf of teachers with the school board, resulting in a contract (text) containing provisions related to teachers’ rights and benefits as well as the format, focus, and duration when PD is mandated (act) for teachers. My analysis in this section focuses on text activation at this level in the system of social relations, which includes educational stakeholders responding to higher-level institutional texts and generating the district’s EPSS and teachers’ union contract, or Negotiated Agreement. These coordinated sequences of action, mediated by institutional texts, comprise the district-level portion of the textually-mediated system of social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD.

Characteristics of mandatory PD in TLSD’s Educational Plans for Student Success (EPSS). Among the PED’s “Standards for Excellence” requirements, districts and schools are required to create Educational Plans for Student Success (EPSS) with action plans mandating PD to meet seven goal areas focused on improving student achievement results in reading, math, and high school graduation as measured in Accountability Report Cards. Based on the previous year’s data, the PED’s district and school Accountability Report Cards compare districts’ and schools’ performance in reading, math, and high school graduation to that year’s Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) to determine whether or not the district met AYP. The Accountability Report Cards’ data serve as the basis for data-
driven decisions that educational stakeholders are required to make at district and school levels.

The Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) Accountability Report Card indicates that for SY 2010-11, the district did not meet overall AYP targets in reading, math, and high school graduation. TLSD did meet AYP in 20 of the 37 areas needed, as shown in Appendix 13. Eighteen of the areas met for AYP were in the area of reading and math participation for nine population factors. The other two areas for AYP were the result of Caucasian and Asian students meeting the required 66% AMO target in math proficiency. Notably, the district’s high school graduation rate fell short of the 65% AMO target by one third of one percent. None of the student groups tested met the 75% AMO target in reading proficiency. Per the requirements in state law and PED rules, not meeting AYP has implications for teachers’ mandatory PD because schools and districts must indicate their goals for aligned PD in the district’s strategic plan to meet AYP, also known as the EPSS.

To comply with statutory requirements, the TLSD School Board annually creates an EPSS, the tenth institutional text, to meet AYP and to address seven critical goal areas: 1) ELA/reading, 2) math, 3) “highly qualified” teachers, 4) English language learners, 5) safe learning environments, 6) high school graduation, and 7) parent engagement. In developing the district’s EPSS, a TLSD School Board member asserted “the academic achievement of white children as opposed to children of color” is the basis for TLSD’s AYP improvement goals. TLSD School Board Member 2 explained, “so what we look at is all the data that we have, what our student population looks like, where they are performing and how do we change that.” Referencing the TLSD Accountability Report Card for SY 2011-12, School Board Member 2 explained that the data revealed a “significant gap between white and
Hispanic, Native American, and African American [students].” Even though 66% of white students were proficient in math, only 38% of Hispanics, 37% of Native American, and 33% of African American students were proficient in math in TLSD (see Appendix 13).

Describing how “the EPSS is really developed around the [seven] goals as a result of many other strategies to reduce the achievement gap,” TLSD School Board Member 2 explained that after the school board gathers parental input in school board meetings, the superintendent “designates a [central office staff] lead person that takes each one of those goals” to develop actions and strategies to accomplish the seven goals. Highlighting the TLSD School Board’s text activation sequence in creating the EPSS, TLSD School Board Member 2 explained that it brings the community together in school board meetings in “one centralized place [where] we divide [the EPSS] into different goal areas and we ask the parents to give us input in terms of what those strategies need to look like.” The broad language in the district’s EPSS provides room for schools to interpret how they will comply with the district’s guidelines when creating their EPSS. The School Board member explained that TLSD and individual schools’ EPSS have to be aligned with the same seven goals, noting that schools “have to be more specific to their individual schools in terms of how they address the achievement gap and academic improvement” as indicated in the school’s Accountability Report Card.

As the TLSD School Board member’s account illustrates, district-level actors from the school board and central office work together to elicit feedback from parents in order to comply with higher-level mandates for PD and improving AYP. The school board’s creation of the EPSS meets a legal requirement for district and school-based strategic plans “to improve student performance” which must also include PD “tied directly to the student
achievement data of the school and district” (6.29.1 NMAC). What is missing from the School Board member’s account is any mention of teachers’ involvement in developing the strategies and action steps in the EPSS. When I asked Dr. Ella Chavez, the TLSD teachers’ union representative, if she was involved in the EPSS at the district level she said, “I’m not in on it and no, I don’t see it.” Despite the emphasis on an alignment between state standards, the SBA, the EPSS, and mandatory PD for teachers in state law and the PED rule, the fact that neither the union nor teachers are directly involved in creating TLSD’s EPSS indicates misalignment. The breakdown in this alignment occurs at the lowest level, where teachers’ articulated needs for PD are not included in the district’s EPSS.

Even though teachers are not included in the district’s EPSS, Dr. Chavez explained “the relationship between what teachers do at their school and the [district’s] EPSS happens through the [Site Based Management Council (SMBC)] process.” Describing the “layers of mandates that impact schools and the teacher’s work,” Dr. Chavez explained that “teachers have the right to be a part of the plan at their school that impacts teaching and learning” in the SMBC process outlined in the teachers’ union contract. Regardless of the level at which teachers are involved, Dr. Chavez claimed, “these EPSS documents are viewed [by teachers] mostly as a form of compliance and not a creative, exciting way to move [their] school forward.”

In the TLSD EPSS, the School Board specifies strategies and action steps the district must take to reach targets in each of the seven goal areas. For example, as part of the TLSD’s goal for all ELL students to be proficient in English, the School Board specified increasing the number of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and/or Bilingual Education licensure endorsements for teachers who provide instruction to ELL students. The
specific actions for completing this strategy to ultimately achieve the goal in TLSD’s EPSS included incentives for teachers to obtain these endorsements through tuition reimbursement or salary differentials through the funding formula (see Chapter 2). To add TESOL and/or Bilingual Education endorsements to their teaching licenses, teachers must meet the PED’s requirements, which generally include completing a minimum number of college credit hours in TESOL and/or Bilingual Education and successfully passing the content knowledge test for the endorsement subject(s).

In the EPSS, the TLSD School Board lists professional learning communities (PLCs) as an essential part of aligned PD to increase proficiency in ELA/reading and math and high school graduation (i.e., AYP). In fact, mandatory PD for teachers through school-based PLCs is part of the strategies and action steps the district must take to reach targets in each of the seven goal areas. In compliance with the School Personnel Act and the PED’s “PD Framework” rule for context, process, and content standards to help teachers learn professionally, the TLSD School Board’s EPSS requires schools in the district to:

- have sustained PD in PLCs for ninth and tenth grades in smaller learning communities and for eleventh and twelfth grades in career academics;
- provide support in PLCs to help teachers understand and use student data; and
- provide PD in PLCs to help teachers implement culturally relevant instructional materials and strategies.

Even though the NPDC standards for a research-based conceptualization of professional learning from the PED’s “PD Framework” rule is reflected in TLSD’s EPSS, the district’s focus of mandatory PD is to fulfill the state’s strategy to increase teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge with the aim of students graduating and performing at
increasingly higher levels on the SBA in ELA/reading and math. As Ms. Lou Ann Johnson, a fine arts (drama) resource teacher in TLSD’s central office explained, “What’s tested is what drives PD. In TLSD, the crucial element is what is tested. There is definitely a push for PD to train teachers on how to get those test scores up.” As a resource teacher helping teachers use “drama to support literacy in the academic or the school sense, of reading and writing,” Ms. Johnson explained how she had to sell drama to school administrators so that students’ electives were not taken away. According to Ms. Johnson, the district’s focus on SBA outcomes in ELA/reading, based on improving the SY 2011-12 TLSD Accountability Report Card results in which no student groups met AMO targets in ELA/reading, promoted an unwritten “district expectation” for “kids not scoring proficient on their SBA test in reading or math to have an elective taken from them and [to be] put into a remedial [or intervention] class.”

As part of the district’s efforts to ensure that all students are proficient on the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) in ELA/reading during SY 2011-12, in the EPSS the TLSD School Board specified a strategy to “utilize specialized instructional strategies and materials that focus on closing the achievement gap” with several actions, including selecting Read 180 as a specialized instructional material. Read 180, a reading intervention program, requires implementation training and PD on how to use the teacher dashboard, instructional materials, and student performance data. The underlying assumption in TLSD’s EPSS is that Read 180, as a tool teachers use, would have a data-driven impact on student learning and student achievement in ELA/reading.

Ms. Liza Rainbow, a reading interventionist in TLSD who was hired by TLSD’s superintendent to “fix” the Read 180 program, explained that the program initially lacked
structure: “Principals didn’t understand who really should be placed in [Read 180]. And they didn’t really use data to place students.” Confirming the unwritten policy, or “district expectation,” to take low-performing students’ electives away, Ms. Rainbow said that it was one of the “setbacks” because students would need to enroll in an English class and enroll in Read 180. Ms. Rainbow explained that if students’ SBA scores indicated they needed reading intervention, then their counselors placed them in Read 180 during a class period, which meant students would lose an elective. This unwritten rule of removing electives from students’ schedules sends the message that tested subjects are more important than non-tested subjects, even though graduation requirements include both. Unfortunately, discarding electives that enhance student learning and engage students in ways that build on tested subjects may in fact work against TLSD’s AYP goal for increases in ELA/reading, math, and high school graduation.

Ms. Rainbow’s account of her work to develop guidelines and criteria for placing students into Read 180 and to train teachers on “what [Read 180] was, what components of the program work, how to use it, how to use the materials, how to study data, and use that data to inform instruction” highlights how she activates the SY 2011-12 TLSD EPSS. Using Smith’s (2005) notion of a text-reader conversation, I analyze Ms. Rainbow’s work as an activation of the district’s EPSS, which includes Read 180 as a specialized instructional material to achieve the AMO target of 79% student proficiency in ELA/reading. What is unique about this particular kind of conversation is that one side of the conversation is fixed and non-responsive to the other. Once the TLSD School Board finalizes and adopts the EPSS, this institutional text does not change during a particular school year. In reading the SY 2011-12 TLSD EPSS, Ms. Rainbow activates it and becomes the text’s agent by
interpreting and responding to the text in ways that are relevant to her Read 180 work.

Because the EPSS fulfilled requirements as a strategic plan to meet AYP, including PD for teachers, Ms. Rainbow explained why student data analyses drove the PD she provided to teachers using Read 180 in the district:

1 we have to be looking at [student data] all along because that’s telling us something.
2 It’s telling us that if [teachers] did a lesson and the results are low, then [students] are
3 not getting it. With that information, teachers know that they need to go back to the
4 classroom and change their teaching practice.

Ms. Rainbow’s account also highlights the connection between the PED’s “PD Framework” and “Standards for Excellence” rules, which stipulate requirements for the EPSS and mandatory PD for teachers. In lines 1-2, Ms. Rainbow’s assertion about student data links to the NPDC process standard for teachers to use “disaggregated student data to determine [their] learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement” (6.65.2 NMAC). In lines 3-4, Ms. Rainbow asserts that student data provide indicators about student learning that teachers must use to determine their priorities for PD, which will hopefully lead to changes in instructional practices. The idea is that a process of analyzing student data leads to aligned goal development between school leaders and teachers, determining the content of teachers’ professional learning in the areas of instruction, curriculum, and assessment.

For Ms. Rainbow, the fact that “most teachers had never looked at student data” meant that there was no alignment between the EPSS and PD for teachers in TLSD, when “aligned PD” was supposed to be in place according to PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule (6.29.1 NMAC). Because each of the seven goals in the EPSS include “aligned PD”
through PLCs for increasing student achievement, Ms. Rainbow asserted that any examination of student data in TLSD should include analyses of formative assessments (i.e., benchmark assessments) and summative assessment (i.e., SBA) results. After training teachers on how to retrieve their students’ benchmark and SBA results through the TLSD instructional management system, Ms. Rainbow explained that when she taught teachers how to examine their school’s “EPSS, [teachers] would be looking at [student achievement] data” and answering the questions, “What are the results? What do the results [indicate] about student learning? Because [teachers] should be looking at this because that’s going to tell [them] what [they] need to do to support [student learning].” Ms. Rainbow’s account emphasizes that her reading of the district’s and individual schools’ EPSS is part of her Read 180 work, which includes training teachers on how to use instructional materials and analyze student data to help improve classroom instruction. Ms. Rainbow is engaged in a course of compliance-driven action, mainly working with high school teachers during SY 2011-12 to fulfill institutional text requirements, and her reading of TLSD’s EPSS is integral to this action.

Another strategy for TLSD to improve student achievement in ELA/reading and math as specified in the district’s EPSS for SY 2011-12 was for teachers to “utilize the appropriate standards as guides for developing curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure success for all students.” As part of the action for this strategy in the EPSS, TLSD’s School Board required schools in the district to “train all teachers in pedagogy and strategies effective with the Common Core State Standards (e.g., close reading, argumentative writing, understanding text complexity, fluencies in math by grade, depth of knowledge/aligning rigor of instruction to rigor of standards)” and to “utilize specialized instructional strategies and materials that
focus on closing the achievement gap and addressing learning differences.” A TLSD School Board member explained that helping “teachers understand cultural differences and utilize the cultural differences of all of our children” was a top priority in order to reduce the achievement gap in TLSD. In the district’s SY 2011-12 EPSS, this priority was noted in actions that schools were required to take to “ensure all instructional materials are culturally relevant for students and that teachers use culturally relevant and engaging instructional strategies.”

**Characteristics of Mandatory PD in TLSD’s Negotiated Agreement.** Within TLSD, the Negotiated Agreement, the eleventh institutional text in the intertextual hierarchy, is considered a “living contract” between the teachers’ union and the TLSD School Board and provides the next set of district-level mandates for teachers’ PD. While mandatory PD in the EPSS prioritizes the School Board’s top strategy for improving teaching and student achievement outcomes, mandatory PD in the contract prioritizes the union’s focus on improving professional learning, or job-embedded PD focused on enhancing student learning. In its focus on professional and student learning, the union representative activates PED’s “PD Framework” rule and Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators, when the contract language is finalized during the collective bargaining process with the TLSD School Board.

TLSD School Board Member 1 explained that the TLSD School Board approves the contract after negotiations between the union and the superintendent have been finalized. The School Board member explained that if the School Board has “some issues or some things we think need to be addressed, we bring that to the administration before the negotiations start and that becomes an item that’s on the table for discussion.” TLSD School Board
Member 1 emphasized that an essential part of the bargaining process was collaboration, which “requires you to not worry about who gets credit.” Explaining that when individuals worry about their own agenda and “who gets credit,” then collaboration fails to work. Dr. Ella Chavez, the TLSD teachers’ union representative, confirmed the collaborative nature of negotiating the contract with the TLSD School Board and the central office through its Living Contract Committee. In the Living Contract Committee, Dr. Chavez meets with TLSD’s Superintendent and central office staff on a regular basis to discuss issues that may lead to changes in contract language “and if those conversations turn into changes through contract negotiations, then we change the contract in line with it.” Dr. Chavez explained that after the contract language is finalized it is emailed to teachers in TLSD, who electronically vote on it, and “then the school board has to ratify it.” This sequence of events is evidence of text activation involving multiple stakeholders as well as teachers in the creation of the contract as a district-level educational policy.

Indicating the union’s position in the intertextual hierarchy, Dr. Chavez explained, “One of the relationships between all these layers of policy documents is that certain laws trump others. So, for example, we cannot negotiate contract language that violates a state law or PED rule.” Additionally, “[TLSD] can’t pass board policy that contradicts with our negotiated agreements, although they certainly have tried.” Dr. Chavez’s remarks indicate that the Negotiated Agreement ranks highly in the intertextual hierarchy at the district level, second only to state-level requirements, such as the EPSS (see Figure 12). Thus, the social relations focused on compliance mandates for PD at the district level are mediated by these two institutional texts, which outline the characteristics of mandatory PD.
To support teachers’ PD, the Negotiated Agreement requires schools in the district to provide teachers with professional leave “without loss of pay when serving as a representative of [TLSD] or attending conferences, workshops, meetings, seminars or other activities related to the teacher’s assignment,” reflecting the union’s commitment to support teachers’ professional learning. Contradicting this priority in the union’s contract, Ms. Lou Ann Johnson explained that institutional support provided to teachers for professional leave depends on the budget and the district administration’s priority for teachers of tested subjects. For example, Ms. Johnson described the struggles of finding funds to provide a high school drama teacher with administrative leave for three days so that he could go to the Seattle Children’s Theatre as part of his PDP: “My boss said ‘No, there’s no money in the [TLSD] budget for drama.’” Ms. Johnson bargained with the TLSD administration for providing the teacher with two days of leave instead of three, explaining, “[the teacher] could take a personal or sick day for the third [because] his school was going to pay for the conference fees and the district just needed to pay for two days for the sub.” After a lot of arguing, in the end, Ms. Johnson explained that the TLSD Fine Arts Department was able to allocate money for two days of professional leave for this teacher “so we were able to pick up two of his subs and he ended up taking a personal day for his third day.” Ms. Johnson’s account suggests that TLSD prefers to provide administrative leave to teachers in tested subjects more than to teachers of non-tested subjects, even though the Negotiated Agreement indicates that the district is to provide institutional support for PD to all teachers.

While the TLSD School Board required that schools provide incentives for teachers to gain TESOL and/or Bilingual Education endorsements on their teaching licenses through tuition reimbursement and salary differentials through the funding formula, the Negotiated
Agreement provides additional incentives for teachers who received National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (National Board) certification as reflected in New Mexico’s Public School Finance Act (see Chapter 2). The SY 2011-12 TLSD Negotiated Agreement between the union and the school board stated specified the exact dollar amounts and conditions for these incentives and salary differentials, including:

- $500 reimbursement for textbook and/or testing fees for teachers pursuing Bilingual Education and/or TESOL endorsements;
- $500 for teachers with Bilingual Education and/or TESOL endorsements;
- $2,500 for teachers who teach a structured TESOL class for a minimum of one class period a day;
- $3,000 for teachers who teach content area classes in the student’s home language for a minimum of one class period a day;
- $3,500 for teachers who provide both teach TESOL and Bilingual Education;
- $5,839 for National Board certified teachers (i.e., differential value);\(^{10}\) and
- $2000 for National Board certified teachers should the state discontinue funding this differential.

Clearly, incentives listed in TLSD’s Negotiated Agreement supports teachers who pursue PD in traditional formats and in job-embedded formats (see Chapter 4). These legally binding incentives and salary differentials in the union contract indicate TLSD’s School Board, district central office, and union’s collective commitment to supporting teachers’ professional learning. As explained in the SY 2011-12 Negotiated Agreement, teachers in TLSD “engage in ongoing PD in order to maintain, gain, and enhance their knowledge and

---

\(^{10}\) The state of New Mexico provides funding for a differential for board certified teachers based on the state’s unit value multiplied by a factor of 1.5.
implement current best practice in their field of expertise.” According to the contract, in addition to establishing peer relationships and networking with each other, teachers in TLSD pursue PD through the following avenues:

- a self-directed Professional Development Plan (PDP);
- district-based PD days and staff development offerings;
- school-based PD days and staff development;
- university course work on their own time;
- collaboration with peers;
- work on various school, district and union committees; and
- presenting at and attending conferences and workshops.

What is important to note here are the components of “staff development” that are mandatory in TLSD: PDPs, district-based PD days, and collaboration with peers. Other aspects of PD could be considered voluntary because they are not expressly defined as required, such as university course work, various committees, presenting/attending conferences, pursuing National Board certification, additional licensure endorsements, or advancement to Level III in the three-tiered licensure system.

In my analysis of TLSD’s SY 2011-12 Negotiated Agreement, I discovered that the format of mandatory PD includes workshops/conferences/training sessions and regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction (excluding administrative meetings) as it relates to how teachers’ participation rates were elicited on the 2011-12 SASS. This “living contract” defined the purpose of teacher collaboration and includes provisions for school-based PD through schools’ Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and district-defined PD days. The contract required that teachers’ individual preparation time
must be considered separate and exclusive from collaboration/PLC time. The duration of
district-defined PD days was limited to 14 hours in the contract. If district-defined PD days
extended beyond 14 hours, the SY 2011-12 Negotiated Agreement required TLSD to pay
those teachers a rate of $18 per hour if teachers voluntarily agreed to participate in additional
PD.

Adhering to PD specified in TLSD’s EPSS, the SY 2011-12 Negotiated Agreement
specified that for ninth and tenth grades, academies, small learning communities and teams
might be the same as PLCs. For teachers of eleventh and twelfth graders who have the same
collaborative period and are in the same career academy, the contract stated that they could
meet as a career PLC or as an academic content PLC. The conditional language for PLCs in
the contract was designed to allow individual school’s Site-Based Management Council
(SMBC) to decide how PD would be sustained in PLCs specific to their schools. Dr. Chavez
explained, “[The SMBC] is the collaborative process for keeping a teacher involved in a
school.” The SY 2011-12 Negotiated Agreement indicates that each school’s SMBC also
determines the instructional priorities for the school community. The SBMC is designed to
engage in “consensus decision-making” and to manage the implementation process of the
“living contract,” the district and school’s EPSS, and other state and/or district policies.
According to Dr. Chavez, one of the main ways the SBMC impacts mandatory PD for
teachers at individual schools in TLSD is that the SBMC works collaboratively with school
administrators and other teachers to decide the content of mandatory PD and the date(s) that
other types of school-based PD will take place.

For SY 2011-12, the focus for district-defined PD was the PLCs, student-led as
opposed to teacher-led conferences, and student advisories (TLSD Central Office, personal
In the SY 2011-12 TLSD EPSS, these district-defined PD days were designed to meet the AYP goals of proficiency in reading and math and high school graduation. In student-led conferences, students are responsible for leading the conference and presenting their academic accomplishments and future goals to their legal guardian and advisor. Based on calculations of teacher attendance to district-defined PD as reported by high school principals throughout TLSD, in SY 2011-12 teachers participated in an average of 10.85 hours (TLSD Central Office, personal communication, April 24, 2013).

In compliance with the School Personnel Act and the PED’s “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” rule, a component of a teacher’s evaluation in the TLSD Negotiated Agreement is a teacher’s PDP, “an individualized plan that is intended to improve teaching. Each plan should be unique to the goals and growth areas identified by the teacher and his or her supervisor.” According to the TLSD Negotiated Agreement, the purpose of teacher evaluation is the “improvement of teacher performance” based on the 9 Teacher Competencies and Indicators in New Mexico’s High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) system. Consistent with PED’s HOUSSE system requirements, teacher evaluation in TLSD includes three components: 1) PDPs created by teachers with their principals, 2) progressive documentation and evaluation of teacher performance conducted by the principal, and 3) formative/summative evaluations conducted by the principal. The Negotiated Agreement requires that teachers’ completed evaluation reports, including the PDP and evaluation forms, “shall be submitted to the Department of Human Resources for inclusion in the teacher’s personnel file.” If teachers do not demonstrate competency annually as documented in these HOUSSE system forms, then the school district may choose not to re-hire them.
Mandatory PD at the Rydell High School Level

In the following section, I explicate the characteristics of mandatory PD in two school-level institutional texts that are activated by three teachers at Rydell High School (Rydell) in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD). Rydell’s EPSS and the teachers’ Professional Development Plans (PDPs) provide school-level mandates for teachers’ PD. In this section, I argue that textually-mediated social relations at the school level organize teachers’ PD as a documentary process that fulfills higher-level compliance mandates for PD. I assert that while teachers’ work of completing the PDP process in the HOUSSE system meets compliance mandates to enhance student achievement, it ignores other professional learning needs teachers might have, which may have negative consequences for teachers being able to meet their students’ learning needs. Throughout the system of social relations, the top-down emphasis on “plans for improving student achievement” has a greater influence on mandatory PD for teachers than teachers’ own articulated needs for their PD. At the lowest level in the hierarchy, teachers’ PD experiences are subordinated to compliance mandates for PD and their mandatory PD activities are constrained by institutional text requirements from state and district levels. These coordinated sequences of action, mediated by institutional texts, comprise the school-level portion of the textually-mediated system of social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD.

Characteristics of Mandatory PD in Rydell High School’s EPSS. Connecting back to state accountability requirements, the Rydell High School (Rydell) Accountability Report Card indicates that for SY 2010-11, the school did not meet overall AYP targets in reading, math, and high school graduation (see Appendix 14). Caucasian students were the only group to meet and exceed the 66% AMO target in math proficiency and the 75% AMO target in
reading proficiency. Rydell’s graduation rate was 58%, falling short of the required 65% AMO target. In its EPSS, Rydell set the following goals to increase: reading proficiency of eleventh graders to the required 79% AMO target, math proficiency of eleventh graders to the required 77% AMO target, and 3% of students meeting all graduation requirements. The other goals in Rydell’s EPSS mirrored the district’s EPSS, including highly qualified teachers, English language learners, safe learning environments, and parent engagement. In Rydell’s EPSS, PD is mandated as part of the strategies and action steps the school must take to reach the targets in each of the seven goal areas.

At Rydell, mandatory PD for teachers is structured through small learning communities (SLCs) or Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) per district-level EPSS and Negotiated Agreement requirements. Similar to the district’s EPSS, Rydell’s EPSS lists PLCs or SLCs as an essential part of aligned PD to increase proficiency in ELA/reading and math and high school graduation (i.e., AYP). At Rydell, there are two SLCs: the Freshman Academy and the Sophomore Academy. According to Rydell’s website, both of these academies follow the small learning community model, assign students to teams within each academy, place students with the same three to four core teachers for the entire school year, and allow teachers of ninth and tenth grade students to have a common preparatory period for teacher collaboration that is interdisciplinary, yet grade-level specific. The three career academies are organized around themes for eleventh and twelfth grade students and include Business & Leadership, Fine Arts, and Trades & Technology. Rydell’s career themes are academically based and allow students to take classes that focus on their Next-Step Plans, which are plans of study for college or careers developed by students with their guardians, counselors, and/or advisors.
Among its strategies and actions for mandatory PD, with the goals of increasing high school graduation rates and ELA/reading and math proficiency, Rydell’s EPSS required teachers to: continue school-based PD in the Freshman, Sophomore, and three career academies, implement the Answer-Cite-Expand or Explain (ACE) writing strategy school-wide, analyze assessment data, implement the Read 180 program, use curriculum maps to align instruction horizontally and vertically, incorporate literacy strategies across the content areas, provide sheltered instruction for English Language Learners (ELLs), and use Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock's (2001) nine high-yield instructional strategies. Rydell’s EPSS indicates that the SMBC and PLCs selected the ACE writing strategy as an instructional tool to help teachers answer open-ended questions, which constitutes 50% of the score on the SBA. Each of these strategies were emphasized at a local level to meet the state’s strategy for improving AYP.

**Characteristics of Mandatory PD in Professional Development Plans (PDPs).** As conceived and textualized, mandatory PD for teachers at Rydell High School requires teachers to demonstrate their instructional goals and competencies in their PDPs to meet the HOUSSE system requirements, have aligned PD with the districts’ and schools’ EPSS, and fit into the state’s institutional framework for mandatory PD (see Figure 12). This institutional framework, structured through an intertextual hierarchy of the first nine texts discussed earlier in this chapter, prioritizes the state’s generalized strategy to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge for the enhancement of student achievement. I present excerpts from interviews with teachers to highlight how three Level II teachers at Rydell High School experienced the PDP process in TLSD. These excerpts are part of my analysis, which emphasizes interconnectedness among the three levels, where teachers’ PDPs
mediate actions they take every school year in their mandatory PD activities and teacher evaluation processes within a HOUSSE system.

As part of the requirements in PED’s “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule, “every public school teacher must have an annual performance evaluation based on an annual PDP that meets the requirements of the state’s [HOUSSE system]” (6.69.4 NMAC). The PDP orients teachers’ PD actions in institutionally documentable ways. It is in the PDP that teachers are required to translate their PD and professional learning priorities into what the form requires. When teachers undergo their annual PDP process and complete the PDP, it is more than just a technical task. Teachers’ PDPs, differentiated by licensure levels, are an essential component of the teacher evaluation, or High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE), system. The HOUSSE system draws teachers into the practice of complying with mandatory PD requirements stipulated in at least 12 institutional texts described in this chapter.

In PED’s “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule, PDPs must have measurable objectives and must be based on, among other things: the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators for the teacher’s licensure level, the teacher’s annual evaluation from the previous school year, and district assurance that the teacher is highly qualified in the core academic subjects the teacher teaches. The sequences of text-mediated actions taken by teachers at the school level occurs in what Smith (2006) refers to as an act-text-act sequence where institutional texts are analyzed as “occurrence[s] embedded in what is going on and going forward” (p. 67). For example, PED’s “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule requires that a teacher and his principal create (act) the PDP (text) no later than 40 days after the first day of every school. When teachers meet
with their principals (act), they sit down to reference the nine teacher competencies and indicators for their licensure level (text), and then they decide (act) which of the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators (text) to put into their PDP Form (act). To complete the PDP process, the principal observes the teacher (act) before the end of the school year, completes a formative evaluation of the teacher (text), and then sends copies (act) of the paperwork (text) to the school district’s central office. School district employees in the district’s central office (act) make sure that teachers’ PDPs meet state requirements (text) and then they submit teachers’ PDPs to their personnel files (act). At the end of the annual act-text-act sequence, teachers’ PDPs are hardly ever examined after they are filed – unless the teacher receives an unsatisfactory rating on their evaluation.

In interviews with three teachers at Rydell, each teacher described the PDP process according to the act-text-act sequence previously mentioned. Within this textually-mediated system of social relations focused on compliance for mandatory PD, the PDP is the only text that is created by individual teachers. When I asked Mr. John Keating, a highly qualified Level II teacher in the Sophomore Academy who teaches ELA, about his PDP, he clarified, “like the Form 1, Form 2, Form 3 kinda thing?” In the institutional texts throughout the hierarchy, the PDP is referred to as one text when it is actually three forms. Interestingly, the three forms of the PDP are associated with each of the three components in the HOUSSE system, including teacher-defined measurable objectives based on the Nine Teaching Competencies and Indicators for the teacher’s licensure level in PDP Form 1, progressive documentation and evaluation of teacher performance based on the Nine Teaching Competencies and Indicators for the teacher’s licensure level in PDP Form 2, and principals’
formative or summative evaluations of teachers based on the Nine Teaching Competencies and Indicators for the teacher’s licensure level in PDP Form 3.

In examining Mr. Keating’s PDP Form 1, it was clear that it was a template completed by teachers in order to comply with state law and the PED rule (see Appendix 15). For instance, Mr. Keating’s PDP Form 1 required him to select one of the instruction, student learning, or professional learning strands and one of the Nine Teacher Competencies and Indicators specific to his licensure level, fulfilling compliance mandates for the PDP in the *School Personnel Act* and PED’s “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule. The PDP Form 1 also required the teacher to write a goal statement that connected back to one of the seven goals in the district’s or school’s EPSS, meeting the “aligned PD” requirements in PED’s “Standards for Excellence” rule. The PDP Form 1 asked the teacher to specify an action plan and answer the following questions: “What, specifically, will you do to address the one indicator you’ve chosen? How will your action plan affect your teaching? What difference will your action plan make for your students?” The PDP Form 1 also asked the teacher to indicate if they needed assistance, such as attending a workshop, purchasing books or materials, et cetera.

As a Level II teacher, Mr. Keating explained that even though he filled out the PDP forms every year, he did not have to complete new forms every year because his summative evaluation was completed at the end of a three-year cycle. Mr. Keating’s three-year summative cycle began in SY 2010 and for the last two years, he has selected the instruction strand and the fifth competency to work toward his PDP goal of measuring the effectiveness of using Frayer models to teach vocabulary. The Frayer model, one of Marzano et al. (2001) high-yield instructional strategies for identifying similarities and differences, is a four-square
graphic organizer that is used for word analysis, vocabulary building, and conceptual
development of literary ideas. In Rydell’s SY 2011-12 EPSS, the use of Marzano et al.
(2001) strategies was listed in the EPSS as an important component of teachers’ PD in PLCs
to increase: reading proficiency of eleventh graders to the required 79% AMO target, math
proficiency of eleventh graders to the required 77% AMO target, and 3% of students meeting
all graduation requirements. Mr. Keating reported that “the SBA has become too important”
at Rydell and in TLSD. Explaining that the SBA, comprised of 70% multiple-choice items,
does not reflect what is taught in his classroom, Mr. Keating emphasized that he teaches to
“the bigger picture of the world and the essential questions” of the ELA TLSD Curriculum
Map. TLSD’s Curriculum Maps are composed of units of study for every month throughout
the school year and offer a sequence for delivering content by providing a scope of what
must be taught to students. Using the curriculum map as a tool for instruction focused on big
ideas, essential questions, performance standards, and assessments, Mr. Keating engages in a
process of teaching to the standards that will, in an aligned design, be assessed on the SBA.
Commenting that the SBA “has become too important,” Mr. Keating relies on alternative
assessments because “What are [my students] going to do with multiple choice? Four
answers could be argued to be right. That’s not an assessment. If [the SBA] asked [students]
to explain why, then we could see some good assessment.” More than the SBA results, Mr.
Keating hoped for “overall better test scores” on a teacher-created vocabulary exam and for
him, these results were evidence of student understanding and proof that his students learned.

In PDP Form 1, Mr. Keating perceived his PD needs through the lens of the Rydell’s
EPSS and even used student data from vocabulary tests to set his professional learning
priorities, which connects back to compliance mandates in PED’s “PD Framework” rule for
“teachers to use disaggregated data to determine [their] learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement” (6.65.2 NMAC). What was striking about Mr. Keating’s activation of multiple institutional texts is that he was unaware of the requirements in these texts, noting that he did not pay attention to Rydell’s SY 2011-12 EPSS when it was presented at the beginning of the school year. Even though the PDP appears to be routine activity for the teachers, when they annually complete the PDP Forms 1, 2, and 3, they are objectified in the system of social relations focused on compliance mandates for their PD. The organizational features emphasizing the EPSS over teachers’ PDPs undermine the good intentions of the first PED and educational stakeholders at the state level, where they worked hard to prioritize the professional learning needs of teachers.

Mr. Alex Dunlap, a highly qualified Level II teacher in the Fine Arts Academy who teaches Drama, explained that all the teachers in the Fine Arts Academy collectively “select one of the areas of focus [from the 9 teacher competencies and indicators]” to put on their PDP Form 1. Mr. Dunlap’s three-year summative evaluation cycle began SY 2011-12, and for the last two years he has selected the professional learning strand and the eighth competency to work on with his Fine Arts Academy colleagues to meet the schoolwide goal to “incorporate a variety of literacy strategies in order to improve literacy across all content areas” (see Appendix 15). In the assistance section of PDP Form 1, Mr. Dunlap listed additional time to meet with other teachers in his Academy or PLC because other teachers were the greatest resources in his development as a teacher (Drama Teacher Interview). Explaining an idea he came up with to incorporate literacy across the content areas using the CCSS, Mr. Dunlap suggested that his PLC “do a Renaissance Fair because of the outgrowth of all of these disciplines at the Renaissance, arts, music, science, history, math, and
incorporate that.” Indicating that he looked at the EPSS at the beginning of the school year, Mr. Dunlap explained that priorities in the EPSS was not his main concern because it was too “broad based.” Indicating that the EPSS is about “jumping through hoops or crossing t’s and dotting i’s that’s for bureaucrats,” Mr. Dunlap explained that his priority is to keep students excited about learning and actively engaged in a safe learning environment – goals that were not evident to him as a focus in the EPSS. Interestingly, even though Mr. Dunlap did not express his PDP needs according to the EPSS, the language from the EPSS was still present in his PDP Form 1. Focusing on the CCSS and literacy strategies were also part of TLSD’s and Rydell’s EPSS requirements for mandatory PD, with the expressed aims of increasing student proficiency in ELA/reading on the SBA.

Mr. Dunlap lamented that the most important factor in deciding what is needed for his PD is “not teacher input [because] it seems to be driven by some political necessity” (Drama Teacher Interview). Referring to requirements stemming from federal and state law, which explicitly names PD as a strategy for improving teaching and learning through teacher evaluation, Mr. Dunlap explained that “teacher accountability” is based on needs external to his classroom and his efforts to improve student learning. He explained that he was annually evaluated not based on “what my kids do in this class” but on “some arbitrary top-down kind of thing,” coming from an external place he did not understand or know the details of, which limited his capacity to take action to possibly affect change. Mr. Dunlap’s comments illustrate that the alignment between the EPSS and teachers’ PD needs, contrary to its original design in three PED rules, is unidirectional, with the district’s and school’s plans for PD (i.e., EPSS) subsuming what the teacher puts into his PDP forms. Mr. Dunlap’s quote also suggests that the use of the PDP in the HOUSSE system for teacher’s evaluation is more
symbolic than meaningful for teachers, as the documentation reflects the high-stakes testing needs from the top-down, rather than from the bottom-up.

The PDP Form 2 was also a template that the teachers and their principals completed. The PDP Form 2 contained a space for teachers to provide documentation demonstrating that their PDP goals have been met and for principals to write a progress statement about the teachers’ instructional practice, which is based on HOUSSE system requirements for principals to “observe each teacher’s classroom practice to determine the teacher’s ability to demonstrate state-adopted competencies” (22-10A-19 NMSA 1978). At the time of our interview on Thursday, May 2, 2013, Mr. Keating had not completed PDP Form 2. When Rydell’s principal, Bob McGee, asked Mr. Keating for his PDP forms a few weeks before our interview, Mr. Keating said he looked incredulously at the principal, “like he was speaking Latin or something.” Instead of “just bullshitting him” like in other years, Mr. Keating said he really wanted to make this PDP process “something for me” and decided to examine the effectiveness of using Frayer models to teach vocabulary. This finding indicates that PDPs might be meaningless because they are filed away at the end of the school year and they lack utility because they are a paperwork burden that meets higher level legal mandates.

In his preparation to complete PDP Form 2, Mr. Keating discusses the importance of using summative assessment data as evidence that his PDP competency indicator to “select appropriate assessment tools and strategies for specific learning outcomes” and goal of measuring the effectiveness of using Frayer models to teach vocabulary had been met. Summative assessments provide a sampling of student achievements which lead to a meaningful statement of what they know, understand and can do. Therefore, summative assessments are evaluative in nature. In contrast, formative assessments are designed to
provide feedback for the purpose of the development of teaching and learning. Mr. Keating used the results from formative assessments to understand his students’ vocabulary strengths and weaknesses in order to help them work towards improving their overall performance in vocabulary. In this way, Mr. Keating’s formative assessments led to changes in his teaching practice and PD, as documented on his PDP forms. A key component of the PDP Form 2 is the observation conducted by the principal or vice principal and feedback provided to teachers. All three Rydell High School teachers explained that the feedback meeting was the most important component of the three-form PDP HOUSSE system process.

Explaining that a “real” PD goal of hers was to develop in math, Ms. Wendy White, a highly qualified Level II teacher in the Fine Arts Academy who teaches science, explained that she does not put this as a goal in the PDP because she would not be able to meet it due to the types of PD that were available to her as a science teacher: “Since I’ve started I’ve asked for PD in becoming a better math teacher because I have to use math in my class and every time I’m told no.” During SY 2011-12, Ms. White and other teachers in the Fine Arts Academy wrote their PDPs together and focused on literacy strategies to improve literacy across the content areas. Commenting on the mandatory PD time she spent in the Fine Arts Academy three times a week, Ms. White explained that the Fine Arts Academy was “a really highly professional group. And part of it is our [teacher] leaders; they’re fantastic. When we spend our time [in the PLC two times a week in person and one time online], we are actually striving to become better teachers.” However, during SY 2011-12, Ms. White explained that the time spent in the Fine Arts Academy, overemphasized the ACE writing strategy and reading instruction: “I’ve been doing [ACE] for years. In science, you need to answer, cite how you get your answer, and give explanations. This is just good writing. But, I don’t know
how to teach math.” When I asked for reasons why she might not be able to get her math PD needs met, Ms. White explained that “somehow, they’ve decided that math teachers are the only people who need PD in math.” When I pressed her to explain who “they” were, that decided, Ms. White said, “the state.” Explaining that the math PD she has participated in at math education conferences focuses too much on basic algebra and geometry concepts, Ms. White states that her job-embedded PD needs are based on “what the kids struggle with” in her chemistry and physics classes, including but not limited to unit conversions, scientific notations, significant digits, significant figures, and laws in physics that are inherently math-based (e.g., Newton’s Law of Universal Gravitation). While basic algebra is helpful for her to learn, Ms. White explained that because “science is so math-based,” many of the concepts she taught required a deeper understanding of how to more effectively teach the applied math in chemistry and physics.

The main issue for Ms. White was that an area of growth she identified for herself was not honored or met in the PD in which she was required to participate. Based on student achievement data in Rydell’s SY 2011-12 Accountability Report Card, white students were the only student group to meet AYP in math and ELA/reading, indicating a problem area for teachers to address in instruction, particularly for non-white students. Ms. White’s account suggests that because no student groups in TLSD met AYP in ELA/reading, schools in the district emphasized PD focused on the topic of reading instruction more than other topics that should have met teachers needs, particularly for teachers in non-tested subject areas.

For Ms. White, the three-form PDP process is a checklist to answer, “Did these teachers meet [higher-level] requirements?” Explaining how she treats the PDP process every year, Ms. White stated
So I’m not going to put anything [real] in here. This is my professional development plan. This is my goal about where I am going to be [at the end of the school year]. And your goals, if you’re setting your goals correctly, your goals are just beyond achievable. Well, if you fail to achieve your goals, then you’re a failure and you could lose your job. [We] are terrified of that, so the best thing to do is put in the PDP the thing that you’re most guaranteed to succeed at. I really feel like my future is threatened as a teacher. If I’m going to put something risky into [my PDP], that says, ‘this is what I’m going to achieve,’ and I don’t achieve that, it’s just the icing on the cake to get me out the door. (Science Teacher Interview)

In lines, 1-2, Ms. White indicates her decision to comply with setting professional goals is a textually-mediated reality, one that neither meets her PD needs nor provides room for her professional learning and growth. For Ms. White, true professional learning and growth is about learning how to teach math in a science-based way. Based on fears of failing to achieve these goals, in lines 3-6, Ms. White indicates that her goal in the PDP is based on what is easily achievable (i.e., “demonstrate a willingness to examine and implement change” in literacy-based instructional practices) and not necessarily on what she needs to learn to change her teaching practice (e.g., Newton’s Law of Universal Gravitation). In lines 7-9, Ms. White speaks to the worst consequence available for a Level II teacher not meeting her PDP goals and for not demonstrating annual competency based on the Nine Teaching Competencies and Indicators, as required by the School Personnel Act and PED’s “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” rule. Ms. White’s account demonstrates her agency in response to the negative effects of the institution of mandatory PD. She consciously decides to fit her PD “needs” to institutional categories that make her
accountable within the HOUSSE system. Consequently, the one institutional text created by teachers is the one that matters the least within the entire system because higher-level texts set the parameters in which teachers’ PD “needs” must be fitted. As a result, teachers’ professional learning is not truly supported because the professional knowledge of what they need to support student learning is ancillary to more dominant needs of the multisite institution of mandatory PD, as reflected in 12 other institutional texts throughout the intertextual hierarchy.

Like PDP Forms 1 and 2, PDP Form 3 was a template. The PDP Form 3 contained a section for teachers to write a reflection, with the prompt to “provide a written comment on the [teacher’s] PDP, including a description of student achievement and learning growth” (see Appendix 15). The PDP Form 3 section also contained a section for principals’ optional feedback and at the end, asked principals to mark if the teacher’s PDP completed one of the three strands and if the teacher met highly qualified requirements for their teaching assignment. Directly connected to compliance mandates for PD, the School Personnel Act and PED’s “Performance Evaluation Requirements for Teachers” provide a set of instructions organizing teachers’ actions in the PDP process. Together, PDP Forms 1, 2, and 3 draw teachers into the practice of complying with mandatory PD requirements in institutional texts to accomplish the state’s strategy to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge in a HOUSSE system so that students meet AYP.

In answer to my question of, “If you could speak directly to policymakers, in the legislative and executive branches of government, what would you want them to understand the most about PD?” these three teachers at Rydell emphasized that policymakers should listen to what they needed first and foremost:
Mr. John Keating: “It has to be relevant to my teaching-learning environment” (ELA Teacher Interview);

Mr. Alex Dunlap: “It’s best designed by the people using it” (Drama Teacher Interview); and

Ms. Wendy White: “I would say that PD needs to be organic. It needs to come from the teachers and the school. It needs not to be something that they decide that we need to do because whenever that happens it becomes bureaucratic, a checklist, and it loses its essence of what it is” (Science Teacher Interview).

Figure 13 illustrates the actual work processes teachers and educational stakeholders conduct to accomplish the requirements for mandatory PD outlined in four district and school level institutional texts. It is important to remember that educational stakeholders and teachers activate these four institutional texts in order to meet compliance mandates from the state and district levels. Figure 13 shows that these practices of mandatory PD are standardized across the school year and are interdependent on other institutional texts, including teachers’ PDPs, the Negotiated Agreement, the district’s and school’s EPSS, and the district’s and school’s Accountability Report Cards.
### Time’s Arrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Throughout Summer</th>
<th>Week Before School Starts</th>
<th>Beginning of Fall Semester</th>
<th>Throughout Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>End of Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Union negotiates with School Board to create Negotiated Agreement</td>
<td>• Teachers back, participate in district-defined and school-based PD days</td>
<td>• Within 1st 40 days, teacher and principal establish PDP (Form 1)</td>
<td>• Teachers complete and document measurable goals</td>
<td>• Teacher turns in reflection of PDP or requests more time by April 1st</td>
<td>• Principal completes the Formative/Summative Eval of PDP form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PED issues Accountability Report Cards</td>
<td>• School EPSS created</td>
<td>• Principal ensures that PDP aligns with district and school EPSS</td>
<td>• Teachers attend PD, do what is outlined in PDP</td>
<td>• Principal conducts exit-interview w/ teachers on how PDP was carried out</td>
<td>• A copy of the PDP (Forms 1, 2, 3) are submitted to the district and goes into the teacher’s file at the district’s central office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Board creates District EPSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Principal conducts performance evaluation of teachers (Form 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Teachers’ Professional Development Plan (PDP) Process During SY 2011-12.
Chapter 6: Discussion/Conclusion

My study examined mandatory professional development (PD) for high school teachers in New Mexico as an institutional phenomenon, exploring the characteristics of mandatory PD prescribed in educational policies as well as high school teachers’ perceptions of their PD experiences. The purpose of my study was to understand how PD became mandatory in order to identify and interrogate taken-for-granted assumptions about the implementation and effectiveness of PD, particularly from high school teachers’ perspectives. In my study, I drew on Institutional Ethnography (IE) as both theory and method of inquiry (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; Eastwood, 2005; Luken & Vaughn, 2005; McCoy, 2014; Smith 1987, 1990, 1999, 2002, 2005, 2006). "Institutional" refers to interactions, or social relations, among and between multiple organizations within an interconnected, constantly changing system. Social relations implicate more than one individual in concerted sequences of textually mediated action and are “actual practices and activities through which people’s lives are socially organized” (Campbell & Gregor, 2004, p. 30). "Ethnography" in IE refers to the term in its broadest sense and is considered both a process and a method for studying interconnected contexts, processes, and meanings (McCoy, 2008). Drawing on IE allowed me to investigate the social organization shaping teachers’ PD experiences through an in-depth examination of social relations that affect how professional development (PD) was mandatory for full-time public high school teachers at one school district and high school level in New Mexico during SY 2011-12. In this chapter, I summarize my study, discuss the major findings and implications for policy and practice, and conclude with suggestions for future research.
Summary of Major Findings

In investigating mandatory professional development as an institution, I combined careful analysis of 13 institutional texts with 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Public School Teacher Questionnaire data \((n = 3,440)\) and in-depth interviews with teachers \((n = 3)\) and educational stakeholders \((n = 12)\) that provided evidence of how teachers’ experienced PD and how PD became mandatory for full-time public high school teachers at one district and school level in New Mexico during SY 2011-12. Three overarching research and four sub-questions guided my investigation into the institution of mandatory PD. In this section and throughout this chapter, I report on the information I obtained from these three data sources, to draw my conclusions.

**Overarching Research Question #1**

*What are the characteristics of PD for full-time public high school teachers in the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD) and Rydell High School in New Mexico as they report their experiences?*

I used the SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire to answer this question at the school, district, and state levels. Based on peer-reviewed literature of prescriptive models of how PD “should be” presented in Chapter 1, the SASS examines the following six characteristics of PD, including: the format, topic and duration of teachers’ participation in PD; teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of PD; institutional support teachers’ receive for PD; and teachers’ perceptions of their influence on PD and teacher evaluation school policies. I conducted descriptive analyses using SPSS, a statistical software package. Based on thematic coding using categories from the SASS data, I conducted analyses of interview and institutional text data to answer the question for some components of the
characteristics of PD for teachers at the high school level. I focused specifically on the format, topic and duration of PD at Rydell. Associated with this research question were five sub-questions, which helped narrow the focus of my study without constraining the research. In order to narrow my study down, I concentrated on data from SY 2011-12 because that was the most recently available data from the SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire.

**Sub-question #1**

*What was the format, topic, and duration of full-time public high school teachers’ participation in PD activities?*

At Rydell High School, the three Level II teachers I interviewed reported the three-form Professional Development Plan (PDP) process as a type of PD format that was connected to their annual evaluations in the High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE). Additionally, the format of PD for teachers at Rydell was in their Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), which were organized according to the ninth and tenth grade academies and by eleventh and twelfth grade in Business & Leadership, Fine Arts, and Trades & Technology career academies. Rydell teachers also reported participating in district-based PD days, school-based PD days, university courses, National Board certification, licensure advancement, additional licensure endorsements, informal collaboration with colleagues, individual and collaborative research, work on various school, district, and union committees, and attending conferences and/or workshops. In terms of PD topics, Rydell High teachers primarily reported selecting the focus of it in their PLCs, but they prioritized how to teach: English Language Learners (ELLs), the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), the content of the subject(s) they taught, literacy strategies across the content areas, the Answer-Cite-Expand or Explain (ACE) writing strategy, Marzano et al.
nine high-yield instructional strategies (e.g., Frayer models, Cornell Notes, think alouds), and how to use curriculum maps to align instruction horizontally and vertically. At Rydell, in terms of duration, teachers reported meeting in their PLCs three times a week for one school period, and for no more than a few days throughout the school year in districtwide PD days and schoolwide PD half-days.

In TLSD, higher percentages of full-time public high school teachers reported participating in both traditional/formal and job-embedded PD formats than teachers statewide: 93% engaged in regularly scheduled collaboration, 84.2% conducted peer observations, and 68.7% engaged in individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to them professionally. The majority of full-time public high school teachers in TLSD reported participating in PD topics focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught (86.3%) and on other types of PD, which included the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and instructional strategies. In terms of teachers’ PD participation rates by duration in TLSD, 54.2% of full-time public high school teachers reported spending 33 hours or more in PD activities focused on how to teach ELLs, 28.6% reported spending 33 hours of more in PD activities focused on the content of the subject(s) they teach, and 53.1% reported spending more than eight hours on PD activities focused on reading instruction.

At the state level, in terms of PD formats, analyses revealed that full-time public high school teachers reported participating in workshops, conferences, or training (83.7%) at higher rates than regularly scheduled collaboration (75.2%), peer observation (55.7%), or individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to them professionally (46.2%). The majority of all full-time public high school teachers in New Mexico reported participating in
PD topics focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught (68.6%) and using computers for instruction (50.1%).

Regarding duration, between 54 and 64 percent of all full-time public high school teachers reported that they had spent eight hours or less on PD activities focused on using computers for instruction, reading instruction, discipline and management in the class, how to teach students with disabilities, and how to teach ELLs. However, for teachers participating in PD activities focused on the content of the subject they taught, 23.8% participated in PD activities that lasted for 33 or more hours.

**Sub-question #2**

*How did full-time public high school teachers rate the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated?*

In TLSD, in each topic area (except for reading instruction), more than three-quarters of all full-time public high school teachers who participated thought that those PD activities were useful. Moreover, 100% of full-time public high school teachers in the district rated the PD activities focused on how to teach students with disabilities, discipline and management in the class, and using computers for instruction as useful. Conversely, 71% of full-time public high school teachers in the district rated PD focused on reading instruction as not useful. More than one-half of all full-time public high school teachers statewide who participated in PD activities thought the activities were useful. Statewide, full-time public high school teachers who participated in PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught were the most likely to think that this PD was very useful (71.5%). When examining teachers of tested subjects statewide, 78.6% of them rated PD focused on how to teach ELLs as useful and 68.5% of them rated PD focused on reading instruction as useful. More
teachers of non-tested subject areas statewide reported that PD focused on the content of the subject(s) they taught and PD focused on using computers for instruction were useful.

Sub-question #2a

Statewide during SY 2011-12, was there a difference in how full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subject areas rated the usefulness of the PD activities in which they participated?

Yes, the one-way ANOVA results indicated statistically significant differences between full-time public high school teachers in tested and non-tested subjects in their perceptions of the usefulness of PD topics focused on content specific PD, reading instruction, and how to teach ELLs. Content-specific PD activities were more useful for full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas, while PD focused on reading instruction and how to teach ELLs were more useful for full-time public high school teachers in tested subject areas.

Sub-question #3

What were the most common types of institutional support for PD that full-time public high school teachers received?

In TLSD, the percentage of teachers who took university courses related to teaching (45.8%) was much higher than teachers statewide (27.7%), which may be related to the higher number of full-time public high school teachers reporting receiving institutional support in the form of reimbursement for tuition expenses. Compared to teachers throughout the state, except for release time from teaching, teachers in TLSD reported much higher rates of institutional support in the form of scheduled PD time during the contract year (89.7%), reimbursement for conference or workshop fees (51.8%) and travel expenses (48.2%),
stipends for PD activities that took place outside regular work hours (36.3%), and tuition reimbursement (29.7%). Statewide, the most common forms of institutional support teachers reported receiving were: scheduled time in the contract year (79.4%), release time from teaching (48.5%), and reimbursement for travel or daily expenses (33.4%).

**Sub-question #4**

*What percentage of full-time public high school teachers thought they had influence over school policies related to determining the content of their PD and teacher evaluation?*

Sixty-eight percent of full-time public high school teachers statewide reported that they had little to no influence on school policy in determining the content of in-service PD programs. In contrast, 60.3% of teachers in TLSD reported that they had a moderate or a great deal of influence on school policy in determining PD content, suggesting that collective participation of teachers in the design of job-embedded learning may potentially be a common feature of PD for teachers in the district. The majority of full-time public high school teachers districtwide (69.7%) and statewide (82.5%) reported that they had a minor amount or no influence on school policy related to teacher evaluation.

**Overarching Research Question #2**

*What are the characteristics of mandatory PD for full-time public high school teachers as prescribed in state, district, and school level institutional texts?*

I define characteristics as the structural features that characterize PD, which are structured within a textually-mediated system of social relations between teachers and educational stakeholders. Thirteen institutional texts, organized within an intertextual hierarchy, specified the characteristics of mandatory PD at the state, district, and school levels. I found that at the highest level in the intertextual hierarchy, in state law and PED-
rule, educational stakeholders have greater flexibility in interpreting and making compliance-oriented decisions. At the lowest level in the hierarchy, teachers’ mandatory PD activities are constrained by the statutory requirements from state and district levels. Within this system of social relations, teachers’ knowledge of what they need for their own PD is not as valuable as educational stakeholders’ decisions mandating PD for them at district and state levels.

During SY 2011-12, at the Rydell High School level, the format of the teachers’ mandatory PD was job-embedded in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and traditional in the form of workshops during schoolwide and districtwide PD days.

**Overarching Research Question #3**

*How does PD become mandatory for high school teachers in New Mexico?*

The institutional ethnographic approach I employed in this study allowed me to see the process as one of the development of controlling texts that mediate social relationships in a fairly rigid intertextual hierarchy. Within a system of social relations, institutional texts specify requirements of ruling relations, which are the socially-organized exercise of power that shapes people’s actions and their lives (Smith, 1999, 2005). Institutional texts work as “objectified forms of knowledge” (Smith, 1990, p. 61) and need to be treated as “virtual realities” (p. 62).

The nine state-level institutional texts described in this section establish an institutional framework for mandatory PD that prioritizes the state’s strategy to improve teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge for the enhancement of student achievement. Moreover, these institutional texts mediate actions educational stakeholders and teachers take at district and school levels to comply with the state’s strategy for mandatory PD. New Mexico’s institutional framework for mandatory PD exists as a representation to evaluate
teachers’ performance, informing the course of action districts and schools must take to improve “teachers’ knowledge of the subjects they teach and the ability to teach those subjects to all of their students” and provide teachers with mandatory PD, generally defined in the law as “the strategies, support, knowledge, and skills to help all students meet New Mexico academic standards”

**Discussion and Implications for Policy and Practice in Professional Development**

In this study, three important features of the New Mexico system have important implications for policies and practices in professional development: 1) high stakes testing drives top-down needs for teacher PD, thereby making it perfunctory and less meaningful for teachers because it did not meet their professional learning needs, 2) teachers’ have little to no policy influence, which is a ruling relation that might disempower teachers, and 3) teachers’ unions provide an important pressure point on these ruling relations at district levels and their influence on professional learning would better serve teachers throughout the entire state.

**High stakes testing.** Mandates for teacher professional development in New Mexico reflect the discursive power of “accountability” and “teacher quality.” The state’s three-tiered licensure system was created in response to federal requirements for “high quality” PD, “highly qualified” teachers, and teacher evaluation. New Mexico’s adherence to these federal requirements set the stage for compliance as the central ruling relation within the institution of mandatory PD.

At the highest level of a hierarchical system, teacher PD is mandated from the New Mexico State Legislature in the *School Personnel Act* and *Assessment and Accountability Act* per the federal requirements for a High, Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation
(HOUSSE) system. Then, PD is governed by rules created by the Public Education Department (PED) in the New Mexico Administrative Code (NMAC). Individual teachers, as state employees licensed by the PED and authorized by local school boards to teach in school districts under annual contracts, are at the lowest level of a hierarchy, caught in a web of compliance mandates across multiple intersecting levels. If a school district negotiates with a union, the collective bargaining agreement functions as a way to mitigate tensions between the higher and lower levels of the hierarchy. Not every school board or local education agency in New Mexico collectively bargains with a union.

During SY 2011-12, New Mexico sought to improve teachers’ performance so that all students met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) towards 100% in English Language Arts (ELA)/reading and math proficiency and high school graduation cohort rates by the NCLB 2014 deadline. These goals, highly unrealistic and unattainable, framed the state’s guidelines for PD in nine state-level institutional texts, and compliance with the mandates in these texts framed mandatory PD as part of teacher “accountability” in the state’s teacher evaluation, or HOUSSE, system. Mandatory PD and teacher evaluation in the HOUSSE system work as a type of institutional governance, making teachers accountable to an external set of goals and objectives, thereby reducing PD to a perfunctory exercise in school districts throughout the state. Based on the interviews I conducted with teachers at Rydell High School, if PD is required, then it should more closely align with the needs they identify independently of a narrow conception of student achievement. At first glance, the framework for mandatory PD is comprehensive because it appears to have a mechanism for teachers to identify their needs and goals in Professional Development Plans (PDPs) in the HOUSSE system. But upon close examination, it becomes evident that the underlying assumption reflects a faulty perspective
that providing PD to teachers will make them “better” so that student’s reading and math proficiency scores on the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) increase – as if there was a one-to-one correlation between the two.

In the Thunder Lightning School District (TLSD), the focus on tested subject areas in reading and math pushes non-tested subject areas to the side by restricting students’ electives and institutional support provided to teachers in non-tested subject areas. As a strategy to meet AYP, the TLSD’s unwritten policy is to take electives away from students so that they may “double up” on reading and/or math may have an adverse effect of disengaging students from school in what Chapman (2004) calls the “test-‘em-‘til-they drop” out methods. My findings support extant research, which has shown that NCLB and its policy goals to increasingly meet AYP in tested subjects marginalize non-tested subjects, particularly the arts, which have been slowly removed from the curriculum because these subjects are not tested (Chapman, 2004; Sabol, 2010). Importantly, most teachers do not teach in subject areas that are tested for state accountability purposes. In this study, there were more full-time public high school teachers in non-tested subject areas (60.6%) than those teaching in tested subject areas (39.4%) throughout the state. In TLSD, there were 70.9% full-time public high school teachers teaching in non-tested subject areas and 29.1% teaching in tested subject areas. As a result of the focus on tested subject areas, resources that could benefit non-tested subject areas are restricted and used primarily for tested subject areas, leaving a large number of teachers’ and students’ learning needs unmet.

Regarding the use of resources to provide institutional support for PD, educational stakeholders at the district level confirmed that the goals to improve test scores and high school graduation drove the focus for PD in traditional/formal PD, such as in workshops,
training sessions, or conferences, and job-embedded PD, such as in Professional Learning Communities (i.e., as outlined in the TLSD Educational Plan for Student Success). Ms. Lou Ann Johnson, a TLSD Drama Resource teacher, explained that these practices of limiting institutional support for non-tested teachers’ PD leaves these teachers feeling alienated and unable to pursue enriching professional learning opportunities that may not be tied directly to student test score outcomes. While data from the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire indicate that TLSD’s teachers in tested subject areas received more types of institutional support for PD overall, there are two areas where teachers in non-tested subject areas reported receiving institutional support at higher rates: reimbursement for conference or workshop fees (63.9%) and reimbursement for travel and/or expenses (63.4%). Twenty-two percent of teachers in tested subject areas reported receiving reimbursement for conference or workshop fees and twelve percent of these teachers in the district reported receiving reimbursement for travel and/or expenses. These numbers make sense, considering that teachers in tested subject areas may have been unable to travel and attend professional conferences due to restrictions on their schedules for test-administration. Research suggests that opportunities for professional learning and growth provide much-needed opportunities for teachers to renew their joy for teaching and stay committed to the profession (Day & Gu, 2007; Flint, Zisook, & Fisher, 2011; Guskey, 2000), an opportunity that may be less readily available for teachers in tested subject areas as findings from my study indicate.

At national and state levels, test scores serve as indicators of whether or not teachers have done their jobs. At the high school level, teachers teach many subjects, but the only subjects of importance are the ones that are tested, which states individually decide. Federal requirements, however, require annual assessments in ELA/reading and math in grades 3-8
and in ELA/reading and math at least once in high school. At the time of this study, during
SY 2011-12 the state of New Mexico decided that, due to costs, subjects other than
ELA/reading and math were not important to assess and/or include in its federal
accountability requirements (Herman, 2011). Therefore, ELA/reading and math scores on the
SBA heavily influenced the focus of PD at the TLSD and Rydell High School levels.
Teachers, in spite of their differing curricular roles, are considered a monolithic group who
must be “professionally developed” (Adams, 2014, p. 128) if test scores do not meet levels
deemed to be acceptable according to the school and district’s Accountability Report Cards,
based on PED’s Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) to meet AYP (see Appendix 8).

This theory of teacher learning has played out in the omnipresent professional
development workshop, a form of PD in which 93% of high school teachers in TLSD and
83.7% of high school teachers in New Mexico reported having participated. During SY
2011-12 teachers participated in this form of PD at higher rates that regularly scheduled
collaboration, peer observation, or individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest
to them professionally. These findings are consistent with the literature that suggests more
teachers participate in traditional/formal types of PD than in job-embedded PD (Choy et al.,
2006; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2010; Weil, 2011). Furthermore, this
common practice goes against the long-standing body of research indicating that PD should
be sustained, job-focused, in-depth, and based on teacher professional learning needs in
relation to their students’ learning needs (Darling-Hammond, 2012; Desimone et al., 2002;
Fullan, 1993; Garet et al., 2001; Hargreaves, 2011; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Hawley &
Valli, 1999; Yoon et al., 2007). Unless short-term workshops focus on research-based
instructional practices, then they will most likely not be considered useful because they do
not offer the ongoing assistance and feedback that is necessary for teachers to fully learn, practice, and change their teaching practice (Guskey, 2000, 2002, 2003; Guskey & Yoon, 2009). This is because research has shown that the change in instructional practices is primarily an “experientially based learning process for teachers” (Guskey, 2002, p. 384), and teachers need time to become committed to new practices, test them, see if they work, and then evaluate the effects on student learning before they adopt them.

Findings from this study have shown that at the state level, mandatory PD, for the most part, focuses on external compliance mandates, rather than teachers’ needs and input. New Mexico’s institutional framework prioritizes the state’s strategy for PD over teachers’ self-determined areas for improvement. Evidence from this study indicates that institutional mechanisms focus on having teachers adopt homogeneous, programmatic approaches for raising test scores, such as Read 180. This finding mirrors what other studies have found, namely that the current climate of high-stakes testing constrains teaching practices, narrows the curriculum, and creates feelings of disempowerment for many teachers (Au, 2007, 2011; Brantlinger, 2014). Researchers have shown that PD can and should provide teachers with tools for empowerment and helps facilitate large-scale change (Fang, 2013; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Little, 1993). However, institutional models that objectify teachers and regard teachers as the sole factor for student achievement as measured by test scores pose significant threats to the potentiality of effective PD (Baker, Sciarra, & Farrie, 2010; Randi & Zeichner, 2004; Ronfeldt et al., 2013). To counteract these threats, Desimone (2009) urges evaluations of PD and asserts that states, districts, and school must be able to answer “yes” to each of these four questions: 1) Do all teachers experience high-quality PD? 2) Does the PD increase teachers’ knowledge and skills? 3) Does the new knowledge and skills translate into
new classroom practices? 4) Do the new classroom practices improve student learning? Findings from this study suggest that there may be a number of “no” answers to most of these questions, indicating a viable area for future research, particularly because of the importance of ensuring that PD supports teacher-led professional learning.

New Mexico’s institutional framework for mandatory PD, no matter the district, stipulates key processes that are de-contextualized and generalized. Findings from this study mirror what other institutional ethnographic investigations have found (André-Becheley, 2006; Eastwood, 2005; Rankin, 2003; Smith, 2005), namely that ruling relations: 1) transform the local and particular into generalized forms in which they become recognizable and accountable across the local settings of institutional work, 2) the objectification of institutional realities overrides individual perspectives about what is needed, and 3) the translation of the local into the institutional is an essential step in making activity at local levels possible.

My findings about ruling relations contribute to the research gap noted by Johnson (2009, 2011) and Ricento (2000) calling for research that accounts for how micro level-specific interactions relate to macro-levels of social organization. As treated in my research, the connection between these two is made by drawing on Institutional Ethnography (IE), which has a nuanced way of viewing micro and macro levels in its alternative sociology to explore the social, which begins in the everyday activities of people’s lives (Campbell & Gregor, 2004). IE is a tool designed to help researchers discover how “the everyday world of experience is put together by relations that extend vastly beyond the everyday” (Smith, 2005, p. 1). What is conventionally understood of as the relationship between micro and macro is conceptualized and explored in terms of ruling relations within IE.
Teachers’ influence on school policies. Research points to teacher voice and teachers’ influence on school policies as ways to keep teachers engaged and committed to the profession (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Heibert et al., 2002; Jaquith et al., 2010; Sobol, 1997; Wei et al., 2010). Findings from this study indicated that 60.3% of high school teachers in TLSD reported that they had a moderate or a great deal of influence on school policy in determining professional development content, suggesting that collective participation of teachers in the design of job-embedded professional learning is a common feature of PD for teachers in TLSD. This makes sense given the requirements for this type of PD in the TLSD Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) and the TLSD Negotiated Agreement during SY 2011-12. While schools throughout the district were required to: 1) have sustained PD in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), 2) provide support in PLCs to help teachers understand and use student data, and 3) provide PD in PLCs to help teachers implement culturally relevant instructional materials and strategies, the district-level policy documents did not specify the exact details of what the PLC activities should be. This finding shows that even with external compliance mandates, there is room for local-level discretion.

These district-level findings in TLSD contrast with the state level findings, where 68.1% of New Mexico’s full-time public high school teachers reported that they had a minor amount or no influence on school policy in determining PD content. In multilevel analyses drawing on Schools and Staffing Survey data, researchers have shown that stronger influence on school policies can mitigate teachers’ inclinations to leave the teaching profession (Ingersoll, 2005; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Shen et al., 2010). The majority of New Mexico’s high school teachers perceiving that they have little to influence on school policy in
determining the content of the PD in which they participate suggests that the state, or more specifically the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC), examines the relationship between teachers’ policy influence and teacher turnover. Teacher turnover is of particular concern, given the high rates at which teachers leave schools and their careers (Blasé & Anderson, 1995; Shen et al., 2010). The benefits of involving teachers in school policy decision-making certainly outweigh the alarming consequences of not doing so, as previous researchers have shown that schools with higher levels of teacher decision-making and influence produce lower levels of teacher turnover (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Ingersoll, 2001; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010; Jacquith et al., 2010; Ndoye et al., 2010; Thornburg & Mungai, 2011; Wei et al., 2010).

Findings from this study indicate that the majority of full-time public high school teachers in TLSD (69.7%) and throughout the State of New Mexico (82.5%) feel that they have little to no influence on school policy related to teacher evaluation. This is an interesting finding considering that in New Mexico, there is no “school policy” related to teacher evaluation. During SY 2011-12, the three-form PDP process constituted teachers’ local annual evaluations. The PDP process, as required in the School Personnel Act and PED’s “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule, was an annual process that teachers at Rydell High generally “bullshit” (ELA Teacher Interview), passively accept because it’s just another procedure they have to complete to “cross the t’s and dot the i’s” (Drama Teacher Interview), and cannot resist even though that what teachers put on the PDP Forms as representative of their needs may not be “real” (Science Teacher Interview). These findings indicate that mandatory PD, as it is structured in relationship to teacher evaluation in
New Mexico’s three-tiered licensure and HOUSSE systems, do not incorporate teachers’ influence on the policy and do not meet teachers’ needs.

In 2010, when the LESC-endorsed legislation SB 111a *Additional Teacher Evaluation Standards* was enacted, it amended the *School Personnel Act* to require that the annual performance evaluation of a teacher include documentation showing how a teacher who receives required PD incorporates the results of that PD in the classroom and shares it with other teachers in the school district and/or school. This bill was designed to address the impact of PD activities on classroom practice by requiring teachers to demonstrate how they have made use of what they have learned. Findings from this study demonstrate that language in the law is vague, unclear, and does not clearly do what it was intended to do. Specifically, the language states “the Professional Development Plan (PDP) for teachers shall include documentation on how a teacher who receives [PD] that has been required or offered by the state or a school district or charter school incorporates the results of that [PD] in the classroom” and “performance evaluations shall be based in part on how well the [PDP] was carried out” (22-10A-19 NMSA, 1978). It is unclear what is meant by “in part” in the School Personnel Act. If teachers’ evaluations have 100 components, do teachers’ PDPs count for ten, fifth, or ninety percent of those components? This question remains unanswered and the lack of guidance from the PED on how districts are to implement this law, weakens the possibility of effective implementation of the law. Furthermore, when the LESC studied the issue in 2010, much of what the analysts found was the result of a questionnaire and not a scientific survey (Hudson, 2010). This indicates that further research in this area may need to be conducted to examine the needs of how the PDP process could better serve the needs of teachers.
In 2009, the LESC-endorsed legislation SB 193 *School Personnel Reports to Legislature* passed both chambers in the legislature but was pocket vetoed by then Governor Bill Richardson. SB 193 would have amended the School Personnel Act to require school districts and charter schools to account annually for all funds spent for PD activities. In the LFC Fiscal Impact Report (FIR) for SB 193, costs for accounting for PD activities were cited to be approximately $3 million for the PED. Furthermore, there were several substantive issues listed as a result for enacting SB 193, the primary two being that PED would need to: a) develop a uniform and statewide PD evaluation criteria to support the statewide collection, analysis, and evaluation of PD activities, and b) provide training to incorporate the reporting requirements in the context of the LEAs Educational Plans for Student Success.

Findings from my research indicate a need for teacher involvement in PD and teacher evaluation policies. One implication drawn from my research is that changes most directly impacting teachers’ professional lives need to stem from teachers and not from the PED. Therefore, instead of the PED singularly developing statewide PD evaluation criteria, there could be a movement from below, organized by the teachers’ unions, to have teachers work on components of these criteria at the local level. This would require the PED, school boards, school district central offices, and the unions to collaborate, perhaps according to a collective impact model to bring about much needed change in this area. My research provides evidence of PED’s potential to bring together multiple organizations and people with seemingly disparate agendas to collective work towards a common agenda to bring about change. This collective impact model of change, led by Mr. Timothy Canada, was how the largest reform bill since 1986, HB 212, was enacted, designed, and implemented. Furthermore, incorporating the School Board Association, New Mexico School Leadership
Institute, the state’s Colleges of Education, and other organizations that might facilitate the development of this criteria and implementation might make collaborative efforts more effective.

**Role and influence of teacher voice organizations.** Teachers’ unions, in their history, have been effective at institutionalizing teacher voice, meaning that they highlight their members’ concerns in debates and discussions about the profession and seek to make policy changes from the standpoint of these teachers’ concerns. However, the union also represents teachers’ interests even when teachers are not members of the union. Findings from my study are consistent with Bernstein’s (2003), who found that just because there is union presence, it does not mean teachers collectively bargain with the local school board and superintendent that employees them. In my study, the majority of teachers statewide (59.5%) and districtwide (67.3%) reported not being members of a teachers’ union. District level findings from my research suggest that teachers’ interests may be served by working in a district that collectively bargains with the union, even when teachers are not members of the union. I found this surprising because even though the membership numbers are low, the union still ensures that contract language promotes professional learning and provides teachers with institutional support. The district-level SASS data reveal that TLSD’s teachers’ reported higher levels of: PD participation in job-embedded learning, perceptions of usefulness of PD, and institutional support for PD. Furthermore, the fact that 60.3% of full-time public high school teachers in TLSD reported that they had a moderate to great deal of influence on school policy in determining the content of in-service PD suggests that the union was effective in ensuring teacher control and decision-making, as evidenced in contract language. The provisions in the SY 2011-12 TLSD Negotiated Agreement require
schools to have PLCs, but allows for individual school’s Site-Based Management Council (SMBCs) to decide the details of how PD would be sustained. These findings connect to Bernstein’s (2003) work indicating that collective bargaining may be a successful avenue for changing the practice of externally decided PD for teachers. In order for the union to “become a vehicle for building professional culture among its members” (Bernstein, 2003, p. 250) and to increase its membership, researchers suggest that unions reform to function as the professional voice of teachers while promoting local autonomy and control over decisions that affect teachers’ professional work lives (Mayer, Donaldson, LeChasseur, Welton, & Cobb, 2013; Villegas-Reimers, 2003).

Beyond New Mexico. Who teaches teachers to teach effectively? What systems are in place to help teachers refine and reflect on their professional practice? These questions are often lost in public debates on teacher effectiveness, as the focus of teacher performance is normally tied directly to student achievement outcomes, defined primarily by how well their students perform on standardized measures. In the current era of test-based accountability, public discourse relies on the assumptions that test scores accurately reflect teaching and learning, and that national standardized exams provide comparable data on “effective” schools, teachers, and students. This pedagogical evaluation paradigm has been put in place and supported by the federal government vis-à-vis policies that focus specifically on quantifiable markers of student achievement, academic success, and effective schools. Punitive measures are often taken against schools and school districts that fail to make adequate yearly progress toward the established goals of full student proficiency in core subject areas as measured by state assessments. However, underlying this salient institutional disorder, and arguably improvement in academic achievement, is teacher empowerment and
professional learning. Although, no single teacher can be held directly responsible for a single student’s achievement, there must be ways to train, support, and evaluate teachers in order to help them improve student-learning outcomes, above and beyond test scores.

There were four priorities in the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to: 1) target schools that are failing, making them accountable for results, 2) emphasize teaching methods that are scientifically based in research, 3) reduce federal bureaucracy and provide more flexibility to the states, and 4) strengthen teacher quality by requiring states to provide “highly qualified” teachers to all students. The law was largely successful in each of area except for the reduction of federal bureaucracy to provide more flexibility to the states. Consequently, the drive towards uniformity increased federal authority and bureaucratic burdens for states. In future reauthorizations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), instead of a teacher evaluation HOUSSE system that seeks to improve teachers based on test scores, a system that focuses on professional learning for the enhancement of student learning would most benefit teachers and students in the education system.

Future Research

The results of this study have several implications for future research. This section will detail suggestions for research in two areas: 1) costs of professional development, and 2) teacher and principal professional development.

In this study, teacher evaluation, PD, and support provided to teachers was primarily “a money thing” (TLSD Contract Teacher Interview) at the district level; therefore, decisions about how to pay for PD originate at levels external to teachers. This finding is supported by Elazar’s (1995) analysis that the appropriate level of government to perform a given function
is always the one that teachers are working in, but the appropriate level of government to
pay, or allocate funds, for that function is always a level above theirs. Much of these costs,
however, are not being tracked, presenting a need for further research. Some researchers have
found that tracking PD expenditures requires large-scale data collection efforts, including
surveys, institutional texts, and other information to figure out where the money for PD is
being spent (Odden et al., 2002). In an investigation of costs, researchers might ask the
following:

- Does the district need to develop more effective accounting codes to track PD
  spending?
- How much exactly is the district spending on PD? For which teachers (i.e., by
  licensure level, grade, subject area, years of teaching experience, etc.)?
- How much is spent on subs providing release time to teachers?
- Which model for purchasing teacher time is most cost efficient for the district?
- What current in-house staff can be used to provide coaching and professional learning
  communities?
- What external resources can be used to staff coaching and professional learning
  communities?
- What are some best practice models for cost efficient and effective PD that promotes
  professional learning and student learning?

A second area of research stems from an earlier mentioned limitation for not
including administrators’ perspectives. The SASS contains five types of questionnaires, one
of which includes principals' perspectives. Principals play a key role in selecting their
school's PD and in New Mexico, principals are held accountable by the school district for the
development of their school-level Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS). The SASS allows the Public School Teacher Questionnaire to be linked to the Public School Principal Questionnaire, providing opportunities to examine both teachers' and principals' perspectives about PD in a local district, state, and even national context. Furthermore, a critical examination of the SASS could be conducted. While I treated the SASS as an institutional text in this study, I did not attend to how the survey became active in the social organization of mandatory PD for high school teachers (for one example, see Rankin, 2003). The SASS shapes what teachers can say about their experiences, and the areas measured on the SASS research-based prescriptive models of PD that are shown to be effective (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Birman et al., 2000; Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Huffman et al., 2003; Penuel et al., 2007; Torff & Sessions, 2008; Wei et al., 2010). Research that examines what the survey shows to be “true,” particularly as it relates to what teachers consider to be useful regarding PD, is needed. Findings from this study indicate that teachers found their PD to be useful, but it was unclear these numbers mean. Surprisingly, other researchers utilizing SASS data have not found the majority of teachers reporting that PD in the areas measured on the SASS to be useful (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). These SASS results may be distinct from what teachers actually find to be useful, or why they are useful and how they are useful, according to teachers' perspectives.

**Concluding Remarks**

Contrary to popular belief, teacher professional development, in its current form, is not a linchpin for reform. Contributing to this problem is the lack of systemic ways of truly supporting teachers and building on the professional knowledge that teachers have about what they need to meet their students' needs. Historically, there have not been any ways in
which federal or even state governments have incorporated teachers’ voices as part of how professional development decisions are made. Informed by a robust body of research-based prescriptive models of PD that should work for teachers, my research has shown that PD in one school, district, and state context is mandated in educational policies based on this long-standing body of research. However, teachers’ experiences of PD do not align with research-based prescriptive models for PD, indicating a large-scale policy implementation problem that may lead to negative effects. These findings connect to other studies that have shown that teachers’ articulated hopes for what PD “should be” align with research-based prescriptive PD models in educational policies, but falls short in terms of implementation (Adams, 2014; Honig, 2006; Levin, 1998). This dissertation contributes to the body of research exposing that there is much left to do in the area of implementation policies that effectively meets’ teachers professional learning needs. The old problem of research not informing practice seems to be less of an issue in light of these findings. What is an issue that presents a grave policy concern that must be addressed is: How do we ensure that educational policies play out in the ways in which they were intended so that they best meet the professional learning needs of teachers who are tasked with meeting the learning needs of their students? What will it cost us if we do not?
References


253


Herman, P. (2011, February 28). Legislative Education Study Committee Bill Analysis: SB 360a Retrieved from 


NEA-New Mexico Professional Issues Committee. (n.d.). *Highlights and Details on Education Reform, Teacher Licensure, and Teacher Evaluation in New Mexico.*


Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press.


Santa Fe, NM: Legislative Education Study Committee.


Public Education Department, Data Dashboard. Retrieved from http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/DDashIndex.html


National Staff Development Council. Retrieved from


Appendices

Appendix 1: New Mexico State Education Data Profile ...................................................... 278
Appendix 2: New Mexico Charter Schools Growth ............................................................. 279
Appendix 3: SY 2011-12 Demographic Information: TLSD & Rydell High School ........ 280
Appendix 4: Map of Bilingual Education Programs ............................................................ 282
Appendix 5: IRB Approval Letter ..................................................................................... 283
Appendix 6: IRB Closure Letter ....................................................................................... 285
Appendix 7: Public School Teacher Questionnaire, 2011-12 SASS ................................ 286
Appendix 8: Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) ...................................................... 334
Appendix 9: SY 2012-13 School District Enrollment Map ............................................. 336
Appendix 10: Technical Notes ......................................................................................... 337
Appendix 11: Institutional Map of the Social Organization of Mandatory PD ............ 341
Appendix 12: 9 Teacher Competencies & Indicators ....................................................... 343
Appendix 13: TLSD Accountability Report Card .............................................................. 349
Appendix 14: Rydell High School Accountability Report Card ....................................... 350
Appendix 15: Level II Teachers’ Professional Development Plans (PDPs) .................... 351
### Appendix 1: New Mexico State Education Data Profile

**National Center for Education Statistics**

State Profiles Application - Data From CCD: 2011-2012

NCES is not responsible for the manner in which this data is presented. This data is provided as an extra service to the user. To view the data online, please go to the NCES State Profiles home page: [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/stateprofiles/](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/stateprofiles/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW MEXICO</th>
<th>U.S. (average)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Schools</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>337,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Grades- male</td>
<td>175,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Grades- female</td>
<td>164,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students- Amer Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>54,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students- Asian/Pacific Islander (*)</td>
<td>4,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students- Black</td>
<td>6,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students- Hispanic</td>
<td>200,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students- White</td>
<td>87,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students- Two or more Races</td>
<td>3,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prekindergarten Students</td>
<td>7,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Students</td>
<td>25,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Grade Students</td>
<td>26,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade Students</td>
<td>26,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade Students</td>
<td>25,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade Students</td>
<td>25,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Grade Students</td>
<td>25,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade Students</td>
<td>25,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade Students</td>
<td>25,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade Students</td>
<td>24,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Grade Students</td>
<td>25,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth Grade Students</td>
<td>25,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh Grade Students</td>
<td>22,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Grade Students</td>
<td>20,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungraded Students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>201,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-price Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>26,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP/ELL Students</td>
<td>52,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Education Program</td>
<td>46,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers</td>
<td>21,956.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff</td>
<td>45,500.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupil/Teacher Ratio: **15.36**

Appendix 2: New Mexico Charter Schools Growth

NM Charter Schools

Source: National Alliance for Public Charter Schools
Appendix 3: SY 2011-12 Demographic Information: TLSD & Rydell High School

Figure 3-1. All Teachers Racial & Ethnic Identity TLSD, SY 2011-12

Source: TLSD Central Office, personal communication, August 5, 2013

Figure 3-2. All Students Racial & Ethnic Identity TLSD, SY 2011-12

Source: TLSD District Website
Figure 3-3. All Teachers Racial & Ethnic Identity Rydell High, SY 2011-12

Source: TLSD Central Office, personal communication, August 5, 2013

Figure 3-4. All Students Racial & Ethnic Identity Rydell High, SY 2011-12

Source: PED Data Dashboard  http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/DDashIndex.html
Appendix 4: Map of Bilingual Education Programs

State Map of Bilingual Multicultural Education and Title III Programs by District

School Year 2011–2012

- Bilingual Education/Title II Programs (Native American)
- Bilingual Education Native American Only
- Bilingual Education Program/Title III (Native American and Spanish)
- Bilingual Education/Title II (Spanish)
- Bilingual Education Spanish Only
- Title III Programs Only
- No Bilingual Program

The map illustrates district participation in the state's BMEPs, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended, and Title III programs. Of 88 school districts in New Mexico, 62 implemented state BMEPs. There were 25 non-participating districts, but 5 of them provided Title III English language programs to their ELLs.
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DEAR TEACHER:

The Schools and Staffing Survey is the largest sample survey of America’s elementary and secondary schools. Your participation is important. Below are answers to some general questions.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY?
The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about teachers, such as professional background, teaching field, workload, and opinions about working conditions.

WHO IS CONDUCTING THIS SURVEY?
The U.S. Census Bureau is conducting this survey for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education.

WHY SHOULD YOU PARTICIPATE IN THIS SURVEY?
Policymakers and educational leaders rely on data from this survey to inform their decisions concerning K-12 schools. Because it is a sample survey, your responses represent the responses of many. Higher response rates give us confidence that the findings are accurate.

WILL YOUR RESPONSES BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL?
Your responses are protected from disclosure by federal statute (20 U.S.C., §9573). All responses that relate to or describe identifiable characteristics of individuals may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose, unless otherwise compelled by law.

HOW WILL YOUR INFORMATION BE REPORTED?
The information you provide will be combined with the information provided by others in statistical reports. No individually-identifiable data will be included in the statistical reports.

WHERE SHOULD YOU MAIL YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE?
Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope or mail it to:

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
ATTN: DCB/PCFSU, BUILDING 61G
1201 E. 10TH STREET
JEFFERSONVILLE, IN 47132-0001

WE HOPE YOU WILL PARTICIPATE IN THIS VOLUNTARY SURVEY.

SINCERELY,

JACK BUCKLEY
COMMISSIONER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this voluntary information collection is 1550-0086. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 55 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this collection, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4657. If you have comments or concerns about the contents or the status of your individual submission of this questionnaire, e-mail: did.education.surveys@census.gov, or write directly to: Schools and Staffing Survey, National Center for Education Statistics, 1990 K Street, N.W., #9019, Washington, DC 20208.
INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

The data you enter on this form will be captured through the use of imaging technology. Please print all information clearly in ordinary characters, using a blue or black ballpoint pen.

**CORRECT** marking example –
(Use care to keep characters in their designated spaces.)

```
  3 5
1 Yes
2 No
```

**INCORRECT** marking example –

```
  3 5
1 Yes  OR  1 No
2 No    2 Yes
```

a. If you are the teacher named on the cover page label, please complete the questionnaire.

b. Please do not write any comments near the answer boxes.

c. If you are unsure about how to answer a question, please give the best answer you can rather than leaving it blank.

d. If you have any questions, call the U.S. Census Bureau at 1-866-205-7457. Someone will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at: ded.education.survey@cen.sus.gov

Teachers who teach in multiple schools: Please respond to questions as they apply to the school where you received this questionnaire.

Grades K-12 and comparable ungraded levels. This survey focuses on schools offering any of grades K-12 or comparable ungraded levels at the elementary or secondary level. The term “ungraded levels” refers to schools that classify students by an alternative means other than particular grade levels (e.g., Kindergarten, 1st grade, 2nd grade, etc.).

Please correct any errors in name, address, and ZIP Code.

**Teacher name**

**School name**

**Address**

**City**

**State**  **ZIP Code**
## GENERAL INFORMATION

1. How do you classify your position at THIS school, that is, the activity at which you spend most of your time during this school year?
   - Mark (x) only one box.
     - [ ] Regular full-time teacher (in any of grades Kindergarten-12 or comparable ungraded levels)
     - [ ] Regular part-time teacher (in any of grades Kindergarten-12 or comparable ungraded levels)
     - [ ] Itinerant teacher (i.e., your assignment requires you to provide instruction at more than one school)
     - [ ] Long-term substitute (i.e., your assignment requires that you fill the role of a regular teacher on a long-term basis, but you are still considered a substitute)
     - [ ] Short-term substitute
     - [ ] Student teacher
     - [ ] Teacher aide
     - [ ] Administrator (e.g., principal, assistant principal, director, school head)
     - [ ] Library media specialist or Librarian
     - [ ] Other professional staff (e.g., counselor, curriculum coordinator, social worker)
     - [ ] Support staff (e.g., secretary)

2. Which box did you mark in item 1 above?
   - [ ] Box 1 → **GO TO item 9 on page 5**
   - [ ] Box 2, 3, or 4 → **GO TO item 4 on page 5**
   - [ ] Box 5, 6, or 7 → **Please STOP now and return this questionnaire to the U.S. Census Bureau. Thank you for your time.**
   - [ ] Box 8, 9, 10, or 11

3. Do you TEACH any regularly scheduled class(es) at this school in any of grades K-12 or comparable ungraded levels?
   (Regularly scheduled classes are those taught at least once per week.)
   - [ ] Yes → **GO TO item 4 on page 5**
   - [ ] No → **Please STOP now and return this questionnaire to the U.S. Census Bureau. Thank you for your time.**
4. How much time do you work as a TEACHER in any of grades K-12 or comparable ungraded levels at THIS school?
   ● Mark (X) only one box.
   - Full time
   - 3/4 time or more, but less than full-time
   - 1/2 time or more, but less than 3/4 time
   - 1/4 time or more, but less than 1/2 time
   - Less than 1/4 time
   - I do not teach any of grades K-12 or comparable ungraded levels

   Please STOP now and return this questionnaire to the U.S. Census Bureau. Thank you for your time.

5. How many days are covered by your contract, per contract year?
   ● Include professional development, student contact days, and any other days covered by your contract.

   Days per contract year

6. In what school year did you begin teaching at THIS school?
   ● Do NOT include time spent as a student teacher.
   (Example: If you began teaching at THIS school in September 2010 or in January 2011, you would report 2010-11.)

   School year

YOUR COMMENTS
7. **What was your MAIN activity LAST school year (2010-11)?**
   ✧ Considering all of the options below, please mark (X) the box which best applies to how you spent the MOST time LAST school year. If you were a substitute or itinerant teacher please mark (X) the box which best applies to your MAIN activity LAST school year.
   ✧ Mark (X) only one box.

- [ ] Teaching in this school
- [ ] Teaching in another public elementary or secondary school IN THIS SCHOOL SYSTEM
- [ ] Teaching in a public elementary or secondary school IN A DIFFERENT SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THIS STATE
- [ ] Teaching in a public elementary or secondary school IN ANOTHER STATE
- [ ] Teaching in a PRIVATE elementary or secondary school
- [ ] Student at a college or university
- [ ] Teaching in a preschool
- [ ] Teaching at a college or university
- [ ] Working in a position in the field of education, but not as a teacher
- [ ] Working in an occupation outside the field of education
- [ ] On leave (e.g., maternity or paternity leave, disability leave, sabbatical)
- [ ] Caring for family members, but not on leave (e.g., homemaking, childrearing)
- [ ] Military service
- [ ] Unemployed and seeking work
- [ ] Retired from another job
- [ ] Other – please specify

8a. **Did you mark box 9 (Working in a position in the field of education, but not as a teacher) OR box 10 (Working in an occupation outside the field of education) in Item 7?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No ➔ *GO TO Item 9 on page 7.*

b. **What kind of work did you do, that is, what was your occupation?**
   ✧ Please record your job title, for example, plumber, typist, or farmer.

- [ ]

- [ ]

c. **What were your usual activities or duties at the job?**
   ✧ For example, typing, keeping account books, filing, selling cars, operating, printing, and finishing concrete.

- [ ]

- [ ]
8. Continued –

d. In addition to these usual activities, were you also teaching in one or more of grades K-12 last school year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO TO Item 9 below.

9. How would you classify that teaching position?

Mark (X) only one box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular full-time teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular part-time teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itinerant teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In what school year did you FIRST begin teaching, either full-time or part-time, at the elementary or secondary level?

Do NOT include time spent as a student teacher.

Example: If you FIRST began teaching in September 2010 or in January 2011, you would report 2010-11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Excluding time spent on maternity/paternity leave or sabbatical, how many school years have you worked as an elementary- or secondary-level teacher in public, public charter or private schools?

Include the current school year.
Do NOT include time spent as a student teacher.
Record whole years, not fractions or months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR COMMENTS

FORM SASS-4A
12. Of the school years you have worked as an elementary- or secondary-level teacher in public, public charter or private schools, how many were –
   ● Include the current school year.
   ● Do NOT include time spent as a student teacher.
   ● Record whole years, not fractions or months.
   ● If none, please mark (X) the box.

   a. In public and private schools during the SAME school year?

   b. In public schools only?

   c. In private schools only?

YOUR COMMENTS

GO TO Section II on page 9
### II CLASS ORGANIZATION

13. Do you currently teach students in any of these grades at THIS school?  
*Please mark (X) Yes or No for each grade level.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prekindergarten</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>1: Yes</td>
<td>2: No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. **Continued – Do you currently teach students in any of these grades at THIS school?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Of all the students you teach at this school, how many have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) because they have disabilities or are special education students?

- If none, please mark (X) the box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>None or</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Of all the students you teach at this school, how many are of limited-English proficiency or are English-language learners (ELLs)?

- Students of limited-English proficiency (LEP) or English-language learners (ELLs) are those whose native or dominant language is other than English and who have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language as to deny them the opportunity to learn successfully in an English-speaking-only classroom.

- If none, please mark (X) the box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>None or</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. This school year, what is your MAIN teaching assignment field at THIS school?

- Record one of the teaching assignment and subject matter codes from Table 1 on page 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Main assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Are you intentionally assigned to instruct the same group of students for more than one year (e.g., looping)?

- Yes
- No

**YOUR COMMENTS**
| Table 1. Teaching Assignment and Subject-matter Codes  
For Questions 16 and 24 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Early childhood or pre-K, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Elementary grades, general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject-matter Specific</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Music</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Art or arts and crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 Drama or theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English and Language Arts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Language arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English as a Second Language (ESL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 ESL or bilingual education, General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 ESL or bilingual education, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 ESL or bilingual education, Other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Languages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 Other foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 Health education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182 Physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics and Computer Science</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191 Algebra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192 Algebra II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 Algebra III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 Basic and general mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 Business and applied math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196 Calculus and pre-calculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197 Computer science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199 Pre-algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Statistics and probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 Trigonometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

268 Other
18. Which statement best describes the way YOUR classes at THIS school are organized? (Mark (*) only one box.)

- You instruct several classes of different students most or all of the day in one or more subjects (sometimes called Departmentalized Instruction).
- You are an elementary school teacher who teaches only one subject to different classes of students (sometimes called an Elementary Subject Specialist).
- You instruct the same group of students all or most of the day in multiple subjects (sometimes called a Self-Contained Class).
- You are one of two or more teachers, in the same class, at the same time, and are jointly responsible for teaching the same group of students all or most of the day (sometimes called Team Teaching).
- You instruct a small number of selected students released from or in their regular classes in specific skills or to address specific needs (sometimes called a "Pull-Out" Class or "Push-In" Instruction).

19. Check the box you marked in item 18 and follow the arrow for the next item.

- Box 1 or 2 → [GO TO item 22 on page 12]
- Box 3 or 4
- Box 5 → [GO TO item 21 below]

20. During your most recent FULL WEEK of teaching at THIS school, what is the total number of students enrolled in the class you taught?

- Students → [GO TO item 22 below]

21. During your most recent FULL WEEK of teaching at THIS school, what is the average number of students you taught at any one time?

- Students

22. During your most recent FULL WEEK of teaching, approximately how many hours did YOU spend teaching each of the following subjects at THIS school?

- If you taught two or more subjects at the same time, apportion the time to each subject the best you can.
- Report hours to the nearest whole hour; do not record fractions of an hour or minutes.
- If you did not teach a particular subject during the week, mark (*) the "None" box.

a. English, reading, or language arts (including reading and writing)

- None or Hours per week

(1) Of these hours, how many were designated for reading instruction?

- None or Hours per week

b. Arithmetic or mathematics

- None or Hours per week

c. Social studies or history

- None or Hours per week
d. Science

- None or Hours per week

[GO TO Section III on page 14]
23. How many separate class periods or sections do you currently teach at THIS school?
   - Do NOT include homeroom periods or study halls.
   - For example, if you teach 2 classes or sections of chemistry I, a class or section of physics I, and a class or section of physics II, you would report 04 classes or sections.
   - Number of classes or sections.

24. For EACH class period or section that you reported in item 23, record the subject name, subject matter code, grade level code, and number of students.
   - MINED GRADES: List the grade with the most number of students.
   - The number of lines filled out should equal the number of class periods or sections reported in item 23.
   - Record one of the teaching assignment and subject matter codes from Table 1 on page 11 and use the grade level codes below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Name</th>
<th>Subject Matter Code</th>
<th>Grade Level Code</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5110(1)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0120</td>
<td>0130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5111(2)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0121</td>
<td>0131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5112(3)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0122</td>
<td>0132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5113(4)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0123</td>
<td>0133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5114(5)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0124</td>
<td>0134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5115(6)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0125</td>
<td>0135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5116(7)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0126</td>
<td>0136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5117(8)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0127</td>
<td>0137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5118(9)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0128</td>
<td>0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5119(10)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0129</td>
<td>0139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes for grade levels of students:

| PK | Prekindergarten | 07  | 7th grade |
| KG | Kindergarten    | 08  | 8th grade |
| 01 | 1st grade       | 09  | 9th grade |
| 02 | 2nd grade       | 10  | 10th grade|
| 03 | 3rd grade       | 11  | 11th grade|
| 04 | 4th grade       | 12  | 12th grade|
| 05 | 5th grade       | UG  | Ungraded  |
| 06 | 6th grade       |     |           |
III EDUCATION AND TRAINING

25a. Do you have a bachelor’s degree?
   • If you have more than one bachelor’s degree, information about additional degrees will be asked in item 28.
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO item 28 on page 17.

b. In what year did you receive your bachelor’s degree?
   [Year]

   c. Was this degree awarded by a university’s Department or College of Education, or a college’s Department or School of Education?
   1. Yes
   2. No

d. What was your major field of study?
   • Record the field of study code and the field name from Table 2 on page 15.
   [Code] [Major]

e. Did you have a second major field of study?
   • Do NOT report academic minors or concentrations.
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO item 25g below.

f. What was your second major field of study?
   • Record the field of study code and the field name from Table 2 on page 15.
   • Do NOT report academic minors or concentrations.
   [Code] [Major]

g. Did you have a minor field of study?
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO item 26a on page 16.

h. What was your minor field of study?
   • Record the field of study code and the field name from Table 2 on page 15.
   [Code] [Minor]
| Table 2. Major and Minor Fields of Study Codes  
For Questions 25d, 25f, 25h, 27e, and 28b  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education</th>
<th>Other Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Early childhood or pre-K, general</td>
<td>131 Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Elementary grades, general</td>
<td>132 Counseling and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>133 Educational psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Middle grades, general</td>
<td>134 Policy studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 Secondary grades, general</td>
<td>135 School psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>136 Other non-subject-matter-specific education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Special education, any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-matter Specific</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Art or arts and crafts</td>
<td>223 Criminal justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 Art history</td>
<td>224 Cultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Dance</td>
<td>225 Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 Drama or theater</td>
<td>226 Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Music</td>
<td>227 Government or civics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Language Arts</td>
<td>228 History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 Communications</td>
<td>229 International studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 Composition</td>
<td>230 Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 English</td>
<td>231 Native American studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 Journalism</td>
<td>232 Political science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Language arts</td>
<td>233 Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Linguistics</td>
<td>234 Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Literature or literary criticism</td>
<td>235 Other social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 ESL or bilingual education, General</td>
<td>246 Healthcare occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 ESL or bilingual education, Spanish</td>
<td>247 Mechanics and repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 ESL or bilingual education, Other languages</td>
<td>248 Manufacturing or precision production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>249 (electronics, metalwork, textiles, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 French</td>
<td>250 Communications and related technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 German</td>
<td>(including design, graphics, or printing; not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 Latin</td>
<td>including computer science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 Spanish</td>
<td>251 Personal and public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 Other foreign language</td>
<td>(including culinary arts, cosmetology, child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>176 Social work, protective services, custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 Health education</td>
<td>177 Interior design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 Physical education</td>
<td>178 Other health studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197 Computer science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Biology or life sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 Earth sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 Other natural sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Social studies, general</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222 Area or ethnic studies (excluding Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American studies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Miscellaneous                                      |                                                      |
| 261 Architecture                                   |                                                      |
| 263 Humanities or liberal studies                  |                                                      |
| 264 Library or information science                 |                                                      |
| 265 Military science or ROTC                       |                                                      |
| 266 Philosophy                                     |                                                      |
| 267 Religious studies, theology, or divinity       |                                                      |
| Other                                              | 268 Other                                            |
26a. What is the name of the college or university where you earned this degree?

Name of college or university

b. In what city and state is it located?

City

State

□ Located outside the United States

27a. Do you have a master's degree?

If you have more than one master's degree, information about additional degrees will be asked in item 28.

□ Yes

□ No ➔ Go to item 28 on page 17

b. Was at least a portion of the cost of your master’s degree paid for by a STATE, SCHOOL, or SCHOOL DISTRICT in which you taught?

□ Yes

□ No

c. In what year did you receive your master’s degree?

Year

d. Was this degree awarded by a university’s Department or College of Education, or a college’s Department or School of Education?

□ Yes

□ No

e. What was your major field of study?

Record the field of study code and the field name from Table 2 on page 15.

Code

Major

YOUR COMMENTS
28. Have you earned any of the degrees or certificates listed below?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Major field of study title</th>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Vocational certificate</td>
<td>0181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Associate's degree</td>
<td>0194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Second Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>0167</td>
<td></td>
<td>0188</td>
<td>0195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Second Master's degree</td>
<td>0190</td>
<td></td>
<td>0191</td>
<td>0192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Educational specialist or professional diploma (at least one year beyond a master's level)</td>
<td>0192</td>
<td></td>
<td>0194</td>
<td>0192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies</td>
<td>0196</td>
<td></td>
<td>0197</td>
<td>0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Doctorate or first professional degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., J.D., D.D.S.)</td>
<td>0199</td>
<td></td>
<td>0200</td>
<td>0201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Did any of your coursework result in a concentration or specialization in READING?
   1. Yes  
   2. No

30. Have you ever taken any graduate or undergraduate courses that focused solely on teaching methods or teaching strategies?
   • Include courses you have taken to earn a degree and courses taken outside a degree program.
   • Do NOT include practice or student teaching.
   1. Yes → How many courses?
      • Mark (X) only one box, then GO TO item 31a below.
      1. 1 or 2 courses
      2. 3 or 4 courses
      3. 5 to 9 courses
      4. 10 or more courses
   2. No

31a. Did you have any practice or student teaching?
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO item 32 below

b. How long did your practice or student teaching last?
   • Mark (X) only one box
   1. 4 weeks or less
   2. 5-7 weeks
   3. 8-11 weeks
   4. 12 weeks or more

32. Was your FIRST year of teaching before the 2007-08 school year?
   1. Yes → GO TO Section IV on page 22
   2. No → GO TO item 33 on page 19

YOUR COMMENTS


33. In your FIRST year of teaching, how well prepared were you to –
   ◆ If you are in your first year of teaching, please answer for THIS school year.
   ◆ Mark (X) one box on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Handle a range of classroom management or discipline situations?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0211</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Use a variety of instructional methods?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0212</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Teach your subject matter?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0213</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. Use computers in classroom instruction?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0214</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e. Assess students?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0215</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f. Differentiate instruction in the classroom?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0216</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g. Use data from student assessments to inform instruction?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0217</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h. Meet state content standards?</th>
<th>Not at all prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat prepared</th>
<th>Well prepared</th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0218</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
<td>3 [ ]</td>
<td>4 [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. In your FIRST year of teaching, did you participate in a teacher induction program?
   (A teacher induction program is a program for beginning teachers that may include teacher orientation, mentoring, coaching, demonstrations, and/or assessments aimed at enhancing teachers' effectiveness.)
   ◆ If you are in your first year of teaching, please answer for THIS school year.

0220
1 [ ] Yes
2 [ ] No

35. Did you receive the following kinds of support during your FIRST year of teaching?
   ◆ If you are in your first year of teaching, please answer for THIS school year.

a. Reduced teaching schedule or number of preparations

0221
1 [ ] Yes
2 [ ] No

b. Common planning time with teachers in your subject

0222
1 [ ] Yes
2 [ ] No

c. Seminars or classes for beginning teachers

0223
1 [ ] Yes
2 [ ] No
35. Continued – Did you receive the following kinds of support during your FIRST year of teaching?

d. Extra classroom assistance (e.g., teacher aides)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Regular supportive communication with your principal, other administrators, or department chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR COMMENTS
36a. In your FIRST year of teaching, did you work closely with a master or mentor teacher who was assigned by your school or district?
   ● If you are in your first year of teaching, please answer for THIS school year.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How frequently did you work with your master or mentor teacher during your first year of teaching?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once or twice a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A few times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Has your master or mentor teacher ever instructed students in the same subject area(s) as yours?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Overall, to what extent did your assigned master or mentor teacher improve your teaching in your first year of teaching?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR COMMENTS
IV CERTIFICATION

The next series of questions is about state certification. Please read the questions carefully. This section allows teachers to report up to two current teaching certificates in the state where they are teaching. Each content area has one certificate unless otherwise noted. Those who have only one certificate that applies to only one content area do NOT have to fill out the entire section and should follow the GO TO instructions.

37a. Which of the following describes the teaching certificate you currently hold that certifies you to teach in THIS state?

Mark (X) only one box:

1. Regular or standard state certificate or advanced professional certificate
2. Certificate issued after satisfying all requirements except the completion of a probationary period
3. Certificate that requires additional coursework, student teaching, or passage of a test before regular certification can be obtained
4. Certificate issued to persons who must complete a certification program in order to continue teaching
5. I do not hold any of the above certifications in THIS state → GO TO item 39a on page 20.

b. Using Table 3 on page 23, in what content area(s) and grade range(s) does the teaching certificate marked above allow you to teach in THIS state?

(For some teachers, the content area may be the grade level, for example, elementary general, secondary general, etc.)

If this certificate allows you to teach in more than one content area, you may report additional content areas in later items.

If your certificate does not restrict you to a specific grade range(s), mark all three grade ranges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Content Area</th>
<th>(2) Grade Range of Certificate (mark (X) all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Early childhood, preschool, or at least one of grades K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>At least one of grades 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content area</td>
<td>At least one of grades 9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Does this certificate marked in item 37a allow you to teach in additional content areas?

Mark (X) only one box:

1. Yes → GO TO item 37b on page 24.
2. No → GO TO item 38a on page 20.

YOUR COMMENTS
### Table 3. Certification Content Area Codes
For Questions 37b, 37d, 38c, 38e, and 39b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education</th>
<th>114</th>
<th>Developmentally delayed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Early childhood special education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Emotionally disturbed or behavior disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Learning disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Intellectual disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Mildly or moderately disabled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Orthopedically impaired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Severely or profoundly disabled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Speech or language impaired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Traumatically brain-injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Visually impaired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Other special education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subject-matter Specific |
| --- | --- |
| Arts and Music | Social Sciences |
| 141  | Art or arts and crafts |
| 143  | Dance |
| 144  | Drama or theater |
| 145  | Music |
| English and Language Arts | 220  | Social studies, general |
| 151  | Communications |
| 152  | Composition |
| 153  | English |
| 154  | Journalism |
| 155  | Language arts |
| 156  | Reading |
| 158  | Speech |
| English as a Second Language | 223  | Anthropology |
| 225  | Economics |
| 226  | Geography |
| 227  | Government or civics |
| 228  | History |
| 231  | Native American studies |
| 233  | Psychology |
| 234  | Sociology |
| 235  | Other social sciences |
| Foreign Languages | 241  | Agriculture and natural resources |
| 243  | Business management |
| 244  | Business support |
| 245  | Marketing and distribution |
| 246  | Healthcare occupations |
| 247  | Construction trades, engineering, or science technologies (including CAD and drafting) |
| 248  | Mechanics and repair |
| 249  | Manufacturing or precision production (electronics, metalwork, textiles, etc.) |
| 250  | Communications and related technologies (including design, graphics or printing, not including computer science) |
| 253  | Personal and public services (including culinary arts, cosmetology, child care, social work, protective services, custodial services, and interior design) |
| Health Education | 254  | Family and consumer sciences education |
| 255  | Industrial arts or technology education |
| 256  | Other career or technical education |
| Mathematics and Computer Science | 262  | Driver education |
| 263  | Humanities or Liberal studies |
| 264  | Library or Information science |
| 265  | Military science or ROTC |
| 266  | Philosophy |
| 267  | Religious studies, theology or divinity |
| Natural Sciences | 268  | Other |
| 210  | Science, general |
| 211  | Biology or life sciences |
| 212  | Chemistry |
| 213  | Earth sciences |
| 216  | Physical sciences |
| 217  | Physics |
| 218  | Other natural sciences |

| Miscellaneous |
| Other |
| 268  | Other |
37. Continued –
d. Using Table 3 on page 23, please record all ADDITIONAL content areas and grade ranges in which this certificate allows you to teach:
   • Please record the content area code from Table 3 on page 23
   • If your certificate does not restrict you to a specific grade range(s), mark all three ranges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Content Area</th>
<th>Grade Range of Certificate (mark (X) all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Code 0256 0256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Code 0264 0264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Code 0268 0268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38a. Do you have another current teaching certificate that certifies you to teach in THIS state?

1 □ Yes
2 □ No ➔ GO TO item 38a on page 26

b. Which of the following describes this current teaching certificate you hold in THIS state?
   • Mark (X) only one box.

279 □ Regular or standard state certificate or advanced professional certificate
279 □ Certificate issued after satisfying all requirements except the completion of a probationary period
279 □ Certificate that requires some additional coursework, student teaching, or passage of a test before regular certification can be obtained
279 □ Certificate issued to persons who must complete a certification program in order to continue teaching
38. Continued –
   c. Using Table 3 on page 23, in what content area(s) and grade range(s) does the teaching certificate marked in question 38b on page 24 allow you to teach in THIS state?
   (For some teachers, this content area may be the grade level, for example, elementary general, secondary general, etc.)
   ● If this certificate allows you to teach in more than one content area, you may report additional content areas in later items.
   ● If your certificate does not restrict you to a specific grade range(s), mark all three grade ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Content Area</th>
<th>(2) Grade Range of Certificate (mark X all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0278</td>
<td>□ Early childhood, preschool, or at least one of grades K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0279</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0280</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   d. Does this certificate marked in item 38b allow you to teach in additional content areas?
   1. Yes
   2. No ➔  Go to item 39a on page 26

   e. Using Table 3 on page 23, please record all ADDITIONAL content areas and grade ranges in which this certificate allows you to teach:
   ● Please record the content area code from Table 3 on page 23.
   ● If your certificate does not restrict you to a specific grade range(s), mark all three ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Additional Content Area</th>
<th>Grade Range of Certificate (mark X all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0292</td>
<td>0282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0283</td>
<td>□ Early childhood, preschool, or at least one of grades K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0284</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0285</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Additional Content Area</th>
<th>Grade Range of Certificate (mark X all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0296</td>
<td>0287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0288</td>
<td>□ Early childhood, preschool, or at least one of grades K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0289</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0290</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Additional Content Area</th>
<th>Grade Range of Certificate (mark X all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0290</td>
<td>0291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0292</td>
<td>□ Early childhood, preschool, or at least one of grades K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0293</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0294</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Additional Content Area</th>
<th>Grade Range of Certificate (mark X all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0294</td>
<td>0295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0296</td>
<td>□ Early childhood, preschool, or at least one of grades K-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0297</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0298</td>
<td>□ At least one of grades 9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39a. Are you certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in at least one content area?
(The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is a nongovernmental organization that administers National Board certification, a voluntary national assessment program that certifies teachers who meet high professional standards. In order to gain certification, the candidate must at least complete a portfolio of classroom practice and pass one or more tests of content knowledge.)

- 1. Yes, fully certified
- 2. No → GO TO item 39c below.

b. Using Table 3 on page 23, in what content area(s) do you hold a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certificate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO TO item 49 on page 27.

c. Are you working toward certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

YOUR COMMENTS

---

FORM 5ASS4A
40. Have you taken the following tests?
   - The Praxis Series was formerly called the National Teachers Exam (NTE).
   - Mark (X) only one box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Description</th>
<th>Taken and passed</th>
<th>Taken and have not yet passed</th>
<th>Have not taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST): Reading</td>
<td>0305 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST): Mathematics</td>
<td>0309 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST): Writing</td>
<td>0307 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The Praxis II: Subject Assessment in a specific content area</td>
<td>0308 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The Praxis III: Teacher Performance Assessment in a specific content area</td>
<td>0309 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Another test of basic skills or subject knowledge, other than those listed above, required by your state or district</td>
<td>0310 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Did you enter teaching through an alternative certification program?
   (An alternative program is a program that was designed to expedite the transition of non-teachers to a teaching career, for example, a state, district, or university alternative certification program.)

   0311
   1  Yes
   2  No

42. This school year, are you a Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) according to your state's requirements?
   (Generally, to be Highly Qualified, teachers must meet requirements related to 1) a bachelor's degree, 2) full state certification, and 3) demonstrated competency in the subject area(s) taught. The HQT requirement is a provision under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001.)

   0312
   1  HQT in all subjects taught
   2  HQT in at least one subject taught
   3  Not HQT in any subject taught
   4  I don't know my HQT status

YOUR COMMENTS


FORM SASS4A
V PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

43. In the past 12 months, did you participate in any of the following professional development activities?
   a. University course(s) related to teaching?
      1. Yes → How many?
         - Record amount, then GO TO item 43b below
      2. No

   b. Observational visits to other schools?
      1. Yes → How many?
         - Record amount, then GO TO item 43c below
      2. No

   c. Workshops, conferences, or training sessions in which you were a presenter?
      1. Yes → How many?
         - Record amount, then GO TO item 43d below
      2. No

   d. Other workshops, conferences, or training sessions in which you were NOT a presenter?
      1. Yes → How many?
         - Record amount, then GO TO item 44a below
      2. No

44a. In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities specific to and concentrating on the content of the subject(s) you teach?
   1. Yes
   2. No → GO TO item 44a on page 29

b. In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
   - Mark (X) only one box.
   1. 8 hours or less
   2. 9-16 hours
   3. 17-32 hours
   4. 33 hours or more

c. Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
   - Mark (X) only one box.
   1. Not useful
   2. Somewhat useful
   3. Useful
   4. Very useful
45a. In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on the uses of computers for instruction?

- Yes
- No → GO TO item 45a below

b. In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?

- Mark (X) only one box.
- 8 hours or less
- 9-16 hours
- 17-32 hours
- 33 hours or more

c. Overall, how useful were these activities to you?

- Mark (X) only one box.
- Not useful
- Somewhat useful
- Useful
- Very useful

46a. In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on reading instruction?

- Yes
- No → GO TO item 47a on page 30

b. In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?

- Mark (X) only one box.
- 8 hours or less
- 9-16 hours
- 17-32 hours
- 33 hours or more

c. Overall, how useful were these activities to you?

- Mark (X) only one box.
- Not useful
- Somewhat useful
- Useful
- Very useful
47a. In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on student discipline and management in the classroom?

- Yes
- No → GO TO item 48a below

b. In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
- Mark (X) only one box:
  - 8 hours or less
  - 9-16 hours
  - 17-32 hours
  - 33 hours or more

c. Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
- Mark (X) only one box:
  - Not useful
  - Somewhat useful
  - Useful
  - Very useful

48a. In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development on how to teach students with disabilities?

- Yes
- No → GO TO item 49a on page 31

b. In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
- Mark (X) only one box:
  - 8 hours or less
  - 9-16 hours
  - 17-32 hours
  - 33 hours or more

c. Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
- Mark (X) only one box:
  - Not useful
  - Somewhat useful
  - Useful
  - Very useful
49a. In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development on how to teach limited-English proficient students or English-language learners (ELLs)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No (GO TO item 50 below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?

- Mark (X) only one box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8 hours or less</th>
<th>9-16 hours</th>
<th>17-32 hours</th>
<th>33 hours or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Overall, how useful were these activities to you?

- Mark (X) only one box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on other topics not included in items 43-49?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (Please specify)</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. As a result of completing these professional development activities, did you receive credits toward re-certification or advanced certification in your main teaching assignment or other teaching field(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR COMMENTS


52. For the professional development in which you participated in the past 12 months, did you receive the following types of support?
   a. Release time from teaching (i.e., your regular teaching responsibilities were temporarily assigned to someone else)
      0369
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

   b. Scheduled time in the contract year for professional development
      0369
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

   c. Stipend for professional development activities that took place outside regular work hours
      0369
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

   d. Full or partial reimbursement of college tuition
      0361
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

   e. Reimbursement for conference or workshop fees
      0362
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

   f. Reimbursement for travel and/or daily expenses
      0363
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

53. In the past 12 months, did you do any of the following?
   a. Engage in individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally
      0364
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

   b. Participate in regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction
      0365
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No

   c. Observe, or be observed by, other teachers in your classroom (for at least 10 minutes)
      0366
      1. ☐ Yes
      2. ☐ No
### VI WORKING CONDITIONS

For questions 54-56 please report to the nearest whole hour; do not record fractions of an hour or minutes.

54. How many hours a week are you paid to deliver INSTRUCTION to a class of students in THIS school?
   
   (Example: If your base contract requires you to work 40 hours a week, with 30 of those hours for delivering instruction and 10 hours for planning, monitoring students outside of class time, etc., you would report 30 hours.)
   
   **PULL-OUT** or **PUSH-IN** TEACHERS: Please include the number of hours you instruct individual students or small groups of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total WEEKLY hours spent delivering instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. How many hours are you required to work to receive BASE PAY during a typical FULL WEEK at THIS school?
   
   (This would be base contract hours, or the equivalent, NOT including stipends or extra pay for extra duty.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total WEEKLY hours required for BASE PAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Including hours spent during the school day, before and after school, and on the weekends, how many hours do you spend on ALL teaching and other school-related activities during a typical FULL WEEK at THIS school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total WEEKLY hours spent on all teaching and school-related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. During this school year, do you or will you –

   a. Coach a sport?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. Sponsor any student groups, clubs, or organizations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c. Serve as a department lead or chair?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   d. Serve as a lead curriculum specialist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   e. Serve on a school-wide or district-wide committee or task force?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   f. Serve as a formal mentor or mentor coordinator in your school or district?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50. In the LAST SCHOOL YEAR (2010-11), how much of your own money did you spend on classroom supplies, without reimbursement?
   ✔ Please use your best estimate for costs incurred, in whole dollars.
   ✔ If none, please mark (X) the box.
   0  □ None or $________.00

59a. How often are you INFORMALLY evaluated?
   ✔ Consider only INFORMAL evaluations in your answer to this question, not formal observations or evaluations.
   0409
   1 □ Two or more times per year
   2 □ Once a year
   3 □ Once every 2 years
   4 □ Once every 3 years
   5 □ Once every 4 years
   6 □ Once every 5 or more years
   7 □ No informal evaluations are conducted

b. How often are you rated in a FORMAL evaluation?
   ✔ Consider only FORMAL evaluations in your answer to this question, not informal observations or evaluations.
   0401
   1 □ Two or more times per year
   2 □ Once a year
   3 □ Once every 2 years
   4 □ Once every 3 years
   5 □ Once every 4 years
   6 □ Once every 5 or more years
   7 □ No formal evaluations are conducted

60a. Were you, or are you going to be, rated in a FORMAL evaluation this school year?
   0402
   1 □ Yes
   2 □ No ➔ GO TO Section 11f on page 35

b. Are student test score outcomes or test score growth included as an evaluation criterion in your FORMAL evaluation this school year?
   0403
   1 □ Yes
   2 □ No
### VII SCHOOL CLIMATE AND TEACHER ATTITUDES

**61.** How much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy AT THIS SCHOOL in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Setting performance standards for students at this school</th>
<th>0429</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>Minor influence</td>
<td>Moderate influence</td>
<td>A great deal of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Establishing curriculum</td>
<td>0421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Determining the content of in-service professional development programs</td>
<td>0422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating teachers</td>
<td>0423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Hiring new full-time teachers</td>
<td>0424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Setting discipline policy</td>
<td>0425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Deciding how the school budget will be spent</td>
<td>0426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**62.** How much actual control do you have IN YOUR CLASSROOM at this school over the following areas of your planning and teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials</th>
<th>0427</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No control</td>
<td>Minor control</td>
<td>Moderate control</td>
<td>A great deal of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught</td>
<td>0428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Selecting teaching techniques</td>
<td>0429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating and grading students</td>
<td>0430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disciplining students</td>
<td>0431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Determining the amount of homework to be assigned</td>
<td>0432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 63. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The school administration’s behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging.</td>
<td>0426</td>
<td>0426</td>
<td>0426</td>
<td>0426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I am satisfied with my teaching salary.</td>
<td>0426</td>
<td>0426</td>
<td>0426</td>
<td>0426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The level of student misbehavior in this school (such as noise, horseplay or fighting in the halls, cafeteria, or student lounge) interferes with my teaching.</td>
<td>0427</td>
<td>0427</td>
<td>0427</td>
<td>0427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.</td>
<td>0428</td>
<td>0428</td>
<td>0428</td>
<td>0428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Necessary materials such as textbooks, supplies, and copy machines are available as needed by the staff.</td>
<td>0429</td>
<td>0429</td>
<td>0429</td>
<td>0429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Routine duties and paperwork interfere with my job of teaching.</td>
<td>0430</td>
<td>0430</td>
<td>0430</td>
<td>0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. My principal enforces school rules for student conduct and backs me up when I need it.</td>
<td>0431</td>
<td>0431</td>
<td>0431</td>
<td>0431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced by teachers in this school, even for students who are not in their classes.</td>
<td>0432</td>
<td>0432</td>
<td>0432</td>
<td>0432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.</td>
<td>0433</td>
<td>0433</td>
<td>0433</td>
<td>0433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The principal knows what kind of school he or she wants and has communicated it to the staff.</td>
<td>0434</td>
<td>0434</td>
<td>0434</td>
<td>0434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. There is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff members.</td>
<td>0435</td>
<td>0435</td>
<td>0435</td>
<td>0435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.</td>
<td>0436</td>
<td>0436</td>
<td>0436</td>
<td>0436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students or my school on state and/or local tests.</td>
<td>0437</td>
<td>0437</td>
<td>0437</td>
<td>0437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.</td>
<td>0438</td>
<td>0438</td>
<td>0438</td>
<td>0438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. I am given the support I need to teach students with special needs.</td>
<td>0439</td>
<td>0439</td>
<td>0439</td>
<td>0439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. The amount of student tardiness and class cutting in this school interferes with my teaching.</td>
<td>0440</td>
<td>0440</td>
<td>0440</td>
<td>0440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.</td>
<td>0441</td>
<td>0441</td>
<td>0441</td>
<td>0441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with that of other teachers.</td>
<td>0442</td>
<td>0442</td>
<td>0442</td>
<td>0442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64. To what extent is each of the following a problem in this school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Serious problem</th>
<th>Moderate problem</th>
<th>Minor problem</th>
<th>Not a problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student tardiness</td>
<td>0498</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Student absenteeism</td>
<td>0490</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Student class cutting</td>
<td>0497</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Teacher absenteeism</td>
<td>0498</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students dropping out</td>
<td>0495</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Student apathy</td>
<td>0480</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Lack of parental involvement</td>
<td>0491</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Poverty</td>
<td>0482</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Students come to school</td>
<td>0493</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Unprepared to learn</td>
<td>0486</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren’t really worth it.</td>
<td>0495</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The teachers at this school like being here: I would describe us as a satisfied group.</td>
<td>0490</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I like the way things are run at this school.</td>
<td>0497</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave teaching as soon as possible.</td>
<td>0498</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I think about transferring to another school.</td>
<td>0499</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.</td>
<td>0470</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired to go.</td>
<td>0471</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
66a. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?
   \textit{Mark (x) only one box.}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item [1] Certainly would become a teacher
   \item [2] Probably would become a teacher
   \item [3] Chances about even for and against
   \item [4] Probably would not become a teacher
   \item [5] Certainly would not become a teacher
   \end{itemize}

b. How long do you plan to remain in teaching?
   \textit{Mark (x) only one box.}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item [1] As long as I am able
   \item [2] Until I am eligible for retirement benefits from this job
   \item [3] Until I am eligible for retirement benefits from a previous job
   \item [4] Until I am eligible for Social Security benefits
   \item [5] Until a specific life event occurs (e.g., parenthood, marriage)
   \item [6] Until a more desirable job opportunity comes along
   \item [7] Definitely plan to leave as soon as I can
   \item [8] Undecided at this time
   \end{itemize}

67a. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL ever threatened to injure you?
   \begin{itemize}
   \item [1] Yes
   \item [2] No  \textit{GO TO item 66a on page 39}.
   \end{itemize}

b. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL threatened to injure you IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?
   \begin{itemize}
   \item [1] Yes
   \item [2] No  \textit{GO TO item 66a on page 39}.
   \end{itemize}

c. In the past 12 months, how many times has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL threatened to injure you?
   \begin{itemize}
   \item [1] \textit{Times}
   \end{itemize}
68a. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL ever physically attacked you?

1. Yes
2. No ➔ 60 TO Section VIII on page 40

68b. Has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL physically attacked you IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?

1. Yes
2. No ➔ 60 TO Section VIII on page 40

68c. In the past 12 months, how many times has a student FROM THIS SCHOOL physically attacked you?

[Space for input]

YOUR COMMENTS
VIII GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following questions refer to your BEFORE-TAX earnings from teaching and other employment.

69. DURING THE SUMMER OF 2011, did you have any earnings from—
   ● Report amounts in whole dollars.
   a. Teaching summer school in this or any other school?
      0509
      1  □ Yes → 0501
      2  □ No

         (1) Did all of these earnings come from your current school?
         ● Mark (X) Yes or No, then GO TO item 69b below.
         0502
         1  □ Yes
         2  □ No

   b. Working in a non-teaching job in this or any other school?
      0503
      1  □ Yes → 0504
      2  □ No

         (1) Did all of these earnings come from your current school?
         ● Mark (X) Yes or No, then GO TO item 69c below.
         0505
         1  □ Yes
         2  □ No

   c. Working in any NONSCHOOL job?
      0506
      1  □ Yes → 0507
      2  □ No

         How much? Record amount, then GO TO item 70 below.
         0507

70. DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, what is your base teaching salary for the entire school year?
   ● Report amounts in whole dollars.
      0508
      $          ,00
      For the entire school year
71. DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, do you, or will you, earn any additional compensation from this school system for extracurricular or additional activities such as coaching, student activity sponsorship, mentoring teachers, or teaching evening classes? Report amounts in whole dollars.

0509
1  Yes  →  How much?
   0510  $___00
2  No  →  Record amount, then GO TO item 72 below.

72. DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, do you, or will you, earn any additional compensation from this school system based on your students’ performance (e.g., through a merit pay or pay-for-performance agreement)? Report amounts in whole dollars.

0511
1  Yes  →  How much?
   0512  $___00
2  No  →  Record amount, then GO TO item 73 below.

73. DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, have you earned income from any OTHER sources from this school system, such as a state supplement, etc.? Report amounts in whole dollars.

0513
1  Yes  →  How much?
   0514  $___00
2  No  →  Record amount, then GO TO item 74a below.

74a. DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, do you, or will you, earn additional compensation from working in any job OUTSIDE this school system? Report amounts in whole dollars.

0515
1  Yes  →  How much?
   0516  $___00
2  No  →  GO TO item 75 on page 42

b. Which of these best describes this job OUTSIDE this school system? Mark (X) only one box.

0517
1  Teaching or tutoring
2  Non-teaching, but related to teaching field
3  Other
75. During the CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR do you, or will you, receive a retirement pension check paid from a teacher retirement system?

0519  
1. [ ] Yes → How much? Record amount in whole dollars, then GO TO item 76 below.
2. [ ] No

$00

76. Are you a member of a teachers’ union or an employee association similar to a union?

0520  
1. [ ] Yes
2. [ ] No

77a. Does your school, district, or school system offer tenure?

0521  
1. [ ] Yes
2. [ ] No → GO TO item 78 below

b. Are you tenured at your current school?

0522  
1. [ ] Yes
2. [ ] No

78. Are you male or female?

0525  
1. [ ] Male
2. [ ] Female

79. What is your current marital status?

Mark (X) only one box.

0526  
1. [ ] Married
2. [ ] Widowed
3. [ ] Separated
4. [ ] Divorced
5. [ ] Never married
6. [ ] Living with a partner in a marriage-like relationship

80. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?

0527  
1. [ ] Yes
2. [ ] No
81. What is your race?
   Mark (X) one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.
   □ White
   □ Black or African-American
   □ Asian
   □ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   □ American Indian or Alaska Native

GO TO item 82 below.

82. Are you enrolled in a state- or federally-recognized tribe?
   □ Yes
   □ No

83. What is your year of birth?
   1 9

YOUR COMMENTS
**IX CONTACT INFORMATION**

84. The survey you have completed may involve a brief follow-up next school year in order to gain information on teachers' movements in the labor force. The following information would assist us in contacting you if you have moved or changed jobs. Please keep in mind that all information provided here is strictly confidential and will only be used in the event that we need to contact you for follow-up. Your responses are protected from disclosure by federal statute (20 U.S.C., §8573). All responses that relate to or describe identifiable characteristics of individuals may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose, unless otherwise compelled by law.

Please PRINT your name, your spouse's name (if applicable), your home address, your telephone number, the most convenient time to reach you, and your work and home e-mail addresses.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Spouse's first name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse's middle name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse's last name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Street address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>ZIP Code + 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Home telephone number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA CODE** | **TELEPHONE NUMBER**
84. Continued – Please PRINT the most convenient time to reach you, your work e-mail address, and your home e-mail address.

h. In whose name is the telephone number listed?
   1. My name
   2. Other – please specify

i. Best day(s) to reach you
   Enter Mon, Tue, etc., as appropriate.

j. Best time of the day to reach you
   Mark (X) only one box.
   1. a.m.
   2. p.m.

k. Work e-mail address

l. Home e-mail address

YOUR COMMENTS
85. What are the names and addresses of two other people who would know where to get in touch with you during the coming years? Please do not list more than one person who now lives with you. Please inform these individuals that you have provided their names and someone from the U.S. Census Bureau may contact them in the coming years if we are unable to locate you.

Please PRINT contact's name, contact's relationship to you, contact's home address, contact's telephone number, and contact's work and home e-mail addresses.

(1) First Contact Person
   a. First name
      __________________________

   b. Middle name
      __________________________

   c. Last name
      __________________________

   d. Relationship to you
      __________________________

   e. Street address
      __________________________

   f. City
      __________________________

   g. State
      __________________________

   h. ZIP Code + 4
      __________________________

   i. Home telephone number
      AREA CODE    TELEPHONE NUMBER
      __________________________

   j. In whose name is the telephone number listed?
      1. Name entered in part a
      2. Other — please specify
      __________________________

   k. Home e-mail address
      __________________________

   l. Work e-mail address
      __________________________
85. Continued – What is the name and address of another person who would know where to get in touch with you during the coming years? Please PRINT contact’s name, contact’s relationship to you, contact’s home address, contact’s telephone number, and contact’s work and home e-mail addresses.

(2) Second Contact Person

a. First name

b. Relationship to you

c. Street address

d. City

e. State

f. ZIP Code + 4

g. Home telephone number

h. In whose name is the telephone number listed?

1: Name entered in part a

2: Other – please specify

i. Work e-mail address

j. Home e-mail address

86. Please enter the date you completed this questionnaire.

Month: [ ]
Day: [ ]
Year: 201

87. Please indicate how much time it took you to complete this form, not counting interruptions.

Please record the time in minutes, e.g., 55 minutes, 65 minutes, etc.

Minutes: [ ]
Thank you very much for your participation in this survey. If you have any questions, please contact us, toll-free, at 1-866-208-7437 or by e-mail at: dsd.education.surveys@census.gov

To learn more about this survey and to access reports from earlier collections, see the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) website at: http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass

Additional data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) on a variety of topics in elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and international education are available from NCES' website at: http://nces.ed.gov

For additional data collected by various Federal agencies, including the Department of Education, visit the Federal Statistics clearinghouse at: http://www.fedstats.gov
## Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONFIGURATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE K-5 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE K-6 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE K-8 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE K-12 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 6-8 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7-8 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7-12 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 9-12 SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduation AMOs for AYP

AMOs for graduation were set in 2008, and revised in 2009. These goals were approved by the U. S. Department of Education in the spring of 2010.

Targets are for the All Students group only. The federal government has mandated that accountability will require graduation accountability for subgroups in 2011. At that time PED will publish the extension of AMOs and AYP Business Rules to these groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Graduating</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: SY 2012-13 School District Enrollment Map

School District Map of New Mexico

Enrollment figures from “40D PreK-12 Enrollment for 2012-2013 School Year,” PED

LESC, February 2014
Appendix 10: Technical Notes

**Response rates.** Survey non-response on the SASS is problematic because it can create bias in the sample and reduce the sample size if not enough teachers’ respond. If the sample is biased, then it lacks the potential to be representative of the larger population from which the sample was drawn – limiting the study’s external validity (Groves et al., 2004).

**Table 10-1: Critical & Required Items for the Public School Teacher Questionnaire, 2011-12 SASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 4</td>
<td>T0025 or T0028</td>
<td>Position at school or full or part-time teaching status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T0070-T0084</td>
<td>Listed teaching at least one grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T0090 or T5090</td>
<td>Main teaching assignment at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or 11</td>
<td>T0040 or T0042</td>
<td>Year began teaching OR how many years worked in school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*And at least one of the following questions should be answered:*

| 25a | T0160 | BA degree |
| 27a | T0170 | MA degree |
| 28 | T0180-T0201 | Other degrees |

*And at least one of the following questions should be answered:*

| 78 | T0525 | Gender |
| 80 | T0527 | Hispanic or Latino origin |
| 81 | T0528-T0532 | Race |
| 82 | T0533 | Enrollment in state or federally recognized tribe |

Note: Source codes are used to identify specific items on SASS questionnaires as represented in the restricted-use data file.

Source: Goldring et al., 2013a, p. 19

Biases in the 2011-12 SASS response rates arise when: a) teachers partially complete or refuse to complete the questionnaire, i.e., what NCES calls unit-level nonresponse, and b) less than 100% of key survey items are completed, i.e., what NCES calls item-level nonresponse (Goldring et al., 2013a). NCES’ first step in processing the SASS data is determining if the questionnaire is complete. For the 2011-12 SASS Public School Teacher Questionnaire, NCES required six items to be answered in order for the public school questionnaire to be considered complete (see Table 11-1). In instances where teachers did not
respond (i.e., item-level nonresponse) to noncritical items – in other words, on every other question not listed in Table 11-1 – NCES used imputation for these items (see “Imputation,” below). In general, NCES imputed data from items found on the questionnaires of the same type that had certain characteristics in common or from the aggregated answers of similar questionnaires.

NCES’ goal in using the SASS is to obtain useful, reliable, and valid data in a format that makes it possible to analyze and draw conclusions about the total target population; in this case, approximately 3.1 million teachers nationally (Keaton, 2013). Like all surveys, how the SASS is administered affects the response rate. Generally, survey nonresponse introduces bias, which may cause non-representative estimates of the population (Groves et al., 2004). Although there is no agreed-upon minimum response rate (Fowler, 2002), the more responses NCES receives on the SASS, the more likely it is that researchers will be able to draw statistically significant conclusions about the 3.1 million teachers in the United States. Until they can examine nonresponse biases, NCES researchers do not publish estimates where the overall response rates fall below 50%.

The unweighted unit response rate for the 51,060 public school teacher participants sampled nationally on 2011-12 SASS was 76.8%. The weighted unit response rates for public school districts, schools, principals, and teachers on four of the SASS questionnaires for the United States and for New Mexico are presented in Table 11-2 (Goldring et al., 2013a).
Table 10-2: Weighted Unit Response Rates, 2011-12 SASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teacher Questionnaire</th>
<th>Overall Teacher Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3.1 million)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=21,749)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Overall teacher response is the weighted questionnaire response rate times the weighted response rate for the Teacher Listing Form.
Source: Goldring et al. 2013a, p. 12

Potential sources of unit-level response bias based on the respondent distribution before and/or after nonresponse adjustments were applied by NCES in the Public School Teacher data file (Goldring et al., 2013a). When comparing the frame and the base-weight estimates for the public school teacher listing form (TLF), Goldring et al. (2013b) found evidence of bias in 6% of the items at the national level and in 11% of the items at the state level. After nonresponse adjustments were applied to the weights, the percent of estimates with measurable bias decreased to 2% at the national level, but remained at 9% at the state level (Goldring et al., 2013b, p. 6). NCES conducted nonresponse adjustments to reduce or eliminate bias caused by low response rates on the 2011-12 SASS.

Imputation. On the 2011-12 SASS, values were imputed using two main approaches: “donor respondent” or “hot-deck imputation” and using the mean or mode from groups of similar cases (Goldring et al., 2013a). Hot-deck imputation finds items on questionnaires of the same type that had certain characteristics in common or from the aggregated answers of similar questionnaires. For example, teachers’ ages were highly related to years of experience, so the years of experience variable on the 2011-12 SASS was an important variable for imputing age-related responses that were left blank. Goldring et al. (2013a) explained that
When an appropriate donor could not be found, a mean or mode of the item values over a set of respondents with the same values for matching variables was used for the imputation. The matching variables for the item were selected in a similar manner as described above for hot-deck imputation. This mean or mode imputation was implemented only as a final method of imputation and on an as-needed basis. There was a final post-imputation check that, in a limited number of cases, resulted in an edit of the imputation. In rare cases where neither hot-deck nor mean or mode imputation succeeded, analyst imputation was used. (p. 20)

For items that were imputed, NCES researchers flagged items using “_F” before the SASS item source code (e.g., F_T0300 for T0300, which was Item 39a). Item 39a asked teachers: “Are you certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in at least one content area?” (Public School Teacher Questionnaire, 2011-12 SASS, p. 26). In the 2011-12 SASS Codebook, for the NCES flagged variable “F_T0300,” values were indicated for cases that were: not imputed, imputed using data from the record for a similar case (donor), imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases, and adjusted during analysts’ post-imputation review of data (Goldring et al., 2013b, B-902).
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Appendix 12: 9 Teacher Competencies & Indicators

New Mexico Teacher Competencies for Licensure Levels I, II, and III
Assessment Criteria

New Mexico is one of the most diverse states in the nation, and this diversity is reflected in the strengths and needs of New Mexico’s students. The ability of a highly qualified teacher to address the learning needs of all New Mexico’s students, including those students who learn differently as a result of disability, culture, language, or socioeconomic status, forms the framework for the New Mexico Teacher Competencies for Licensure Levels I, II, and III-A Assessment Criteria Benchmarks.

1. The teacher accurately demonstrates knowledge of the content area and approved curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Utilizes and enhances approved curriculum.</td>
<td>A. Enhances and extends approved curriculum.</td>
<td>A. Contributes to the refinement and development of the approved curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Gives clear explanations relating to lesson content and procedures.</td>
<td>B. Gives clear explanations relating to lesson content and procedures.</td>
<td>B. Provides clear explanations relating to lesson content and procedures in multiple ways and is aware of knowledge and preconceptions that students can bring to the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Communicates accurately in the content area.</td>
<td>C. Communicates accurately in the content area.</td>
<td>C. Communicates accurately in the content area and can create multiple paths to the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Shows interrelatedness of one content area to another.</td>
<td>D. Integrates other subjects into the content curriculum.</td>
<td>D. Can articulate to students the interrelatedness of the disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The teacher appropriately utilizes a variety of teaching methods and resources for each area taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Provides opportunities for students to work independently, in small groups, and in large groups.</td>
<td>A. Designs appropriate opportunities for large group, small group, and independent student learning experiences.</td>
<td>A. Designs and engages students in large group, small group, and independent work activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Uses a variety of methods, including demonstrations, lectures, student initiated work, group work, questioning, and independent practice.</td>
<td>B. Selects from a variety of teaching methods (demonstrations, lectures, student projects, group work, independent practice) for specific instructional goals and purposes.</td>
<td>B. Demonstrates effective selection and use of a variety of methods to make knowledge accessible to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Uses a variety of resources such as field trips, supplemental printed materials, manipulatives, and technology.</td>
<td>C. Integrates a variety of resources into instruction, including field trips, supplemental printed materials, manipulatives, and technology.</td>
<td>C. Demonstrates effective integration of a variety of resources and learning experiences into the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. The teacher appropriately utilizes a variety of teaching methods and resources for each area taught (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Provides opportunities for students to apply, practice, and demonstrate knowledge and skills learned through various modalities.</th>
<th>D. Demonstrates understanding and appropriate application of learning styles, modalities, and intelligences theories.</th>
<th>D. Designs opportunities for students to apply, practice, and demonstrate knowledge and skills based on knowledge of learning modalities, style preferences, and intelligences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Implements necessary modifications and adaptations in instruction and curriculum so that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.</td>
<td>E. Designs and implements necessary modifications and adaptations in instruction and curriculum so that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.</td>
<td>E. Engages with colleagues and parents to collaboratively design and implement necessary modifications and adaptations in instruction and curriculum so that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The teacher communicates with and obtains feedback from students in a manner that enhances student learning and understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Explains and/or demonstrates the relevance of topics and activities.</td>
<td>A. Effectively explains, demonstrates or communicates the relevance of topics and activities.</td>
<td>A. Engages students in explaining and/or demonstrating the relevance of topics and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Communicates to students the instructional intent, directions, or plan.</td>
<td>B. Consistently communicates to students the instructional intent, directions, and plans.</td>
<td>B. Engages students in establishing instructional direction and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Clarifies actions, directions, and explanations when students do not understand.</td>
<td>D. Presents directions and explanations in a variety of ways to ensure student understanding.</td>
<td>D. Presents directions and explanations in a variety of ways to ensure student understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Actively solicits communication from students about their learning.</td>
<td>E. Solicits communication from students about their learning for the purposes of ongoing instructional planning.</td>
<td>E. Engages students in the analysis and evaluation of their learning and adjusts instruction based on student feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Communicates regularly with students about their progress.</td>
<td>F. Communicates regularly with students about their progress.</td>
<td>F. Communicates regularly with students about their progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **The teacher comprehends the principles of student growth, development and learning, and applies them appropriately.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Instructs students in the use of cognitive thinking skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, divergent thinking, inquiry, and decision-making.</td>
<td>A. Consistently integrates the use of cognitive thinking skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, divergent thinking, inquiry, and decision-making into instruction.</td>
<td>A. Consistently integrates the use of cognitive thinking skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, divergent thinking, inquiry, and decision-making into instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Uses teaching techniques that address student learning levels, rates, and styles.</td>
<td>B. Adapts teaching techniques to accommodate a range of student learning levels, rates, styles and special needs.</td>
<td>B. Selects the most effective teaching techniques to address a variety of student learning levels, rates, styles and needs as well as diverse interests and backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Uses materials and media that address student learning levels, rates, and styles.</td>
<td>C. Adapts materials and media to address a range of student learning levels, rates, styles and special needs.</td>
<td>C. Selects the most effective materials and media to address a variety of student learning levels, rates, styles and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Uses resources such as community service agencies, school personnel, and parents to meet student learning levels, rates and styles.</td>
<td>D. Selects from a variety of community service agencies, specialized school personnel, and parents to address different learning levels, rates, styles, and needs.</td>
<td>D. Integrates community resources, service agencies, other school personnel, parents, and community members into the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **The teacher effectively utilizes student assessment techniques and procedures.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Uses a variety of assessment tools and strategies.</td>
<td>A. Selects appropriate assessment tools and strategies for specific learning outcomes.</td>
<td>A. Designs and uses multiple methods of measuring student understanding and growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Uses information gained from ongoing assessment for remediation and instructional planning.</td>
<td>B. Uses formative and summative assessment for remediation and instructional planning.</td>
<td>B. Integrates assessment data from multiple sources into instructional planning and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Maintains documentation of student progress.</td>
<td>C. Maintains documentation of student progress.</td>
<td>C. Maintains documentation of student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Communicates student progress to students and families in a timely manner.</td>
<td>D. Consistently maintains communication with students and families about student progress.</td>
<td>D. Develops a two-way system of communicating with students and families about student progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The teacher manages the educational setting in a manner that promotes positive student behavior and a safe and healthy environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Serves as a model for constructive behavior patterns.</td>
<td>A. Identifies, explains, and models constructive behavior patterns.</td>
<td>A. Integrates the teaching of constructive, prosocial behaviors into regular instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executes routine tasks effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td>B. Establishes and teaches effective and efficient routines.</td>
<td>B. Establishes and teaches effective and efficient routines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Establishes and states expectations for student behavior.</td>
<td>C. Establishes and reinforces expectations for student behaviors that promote citizenship in a classroom community.</td>
<td>C. Engages students in establishing expectations for building a learning community in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Has materials and media ready for student use.</td>
<td>E. Prepares and arranges material in advance for easy student accessibility.</td>
<td>E. Establishes an environment where materials and media are available and ready for student use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Minimizes distractions and interruptions.</td>
<td>F. Minimizes distractions and interruptions.</td>
<td>F. Minimizes distractions and interruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Manages student behavior effectively and appropriately.</td>
<td>G. Monitors and directs student behavior effectively and appropriately.</td>
<td>G. Develops a classroom management system that promotes acceptable and appropriate student behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Identifies hazards, assesses risks, and takes appropriate action.</td>
<td>H. Identifies hazards, assesses risks, and takes appropriate action.</td>
<td>H. Identifies hazards, assesses risks and takes appropriate action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The teacher recognizes student diversity and creates an atmosphere conducive to the promotion of positive student involvement and self-concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Demonstrates sensitivity and responsiveness to the personal ideas, learning needs, interests, and feelings of students with disabilities and or from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (e.g., Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, as well as other recent immigrant groups).</td>
<td>A. Acknowledges and validates the ideas, learning needs, interests, and feelings of students with disabilities and or from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (e.g., Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, as well as other recent immigrant groups).</td>
<td>A. Adjusts practice based on observation and knowledge of students with disabilities and or from culturally and linguistically diverse groups (e.g., Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, as well as other recent immigrant groups).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Acknowledges student performance and achievement.</td>
<td>B. Consistently recognizes student performance and achievements.</td>
<td>B. Creates curriculum designs that include student performance and acknowledgment of achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Acknowledges that every student can learn.</td>
<td>C. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and adjusts instruction to meet diverse needs.</td>
<td>C. Demonstrates an awareness of the influences of context, disability, language, and culture on student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Provides opportunities for each student to succeed and understands how students differ in their approaches to learning based on diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and exceptionalities.</td>
<td>D. Designs opportunities for each student to succeed, based on individual learning needs.</td>
<td>D. Provides accommodations and interventions that allow each student to succeed based on individual learning needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Provides students with opportunities for active involvement and creativity.</td>
<td>E. Designs specific activities that require active involvement and creativity.</td>
<td>E. Engages students in learning experiences that promote creativity, critical and divergent thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Provides opportunities for students to be responsible for their behavior and learning.</td>
<td>F. Designs opportunities that require and reinforce student responsibility for learning.</td>
<td>F. Designs opportunities that require and reinforce student responsibility for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Promotes positive student/teacher relationships.</td>
<td>G. Developes students' self-esteem, motivation, character, and sense of civic responsibility.</td>
<td>G. Fosters the development of respect for individual, cultural, linguistic, disability, and religious differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Demonstrates an awareness and respect for each student's background, experience, learning ability, language, and culture.</td>
<td>I. Demonstrates knowledge of different student backgrounds, experiences, learning abilities, languages, and cultures and incorporates this knowledge into curricular decisions and instructional methodology.</td>
<td>I. Treats all students equitably, recognizing and planning for individual differences in cultures, languages, learning abilities, backgrounds, and experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The teacher demonstrates a willingness to examine and implement change, as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Seeks out information on methodology, research and current trends in education to enhance and improve the quality of learning.</td>
<td>A. Seeks out information on methodology, research and current trends in education to enhance and improve the quality of learning.</td>
<td>A. Demonstrates the ability to reason, take multiple perspectives, be creative, and take reasoned risks to improve teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Implements a variety of strategies to enhance learning.</td>
<td>B. Demonstrates knowledge of best practices that enhance learning.</td>
<td>B. Collaborates with colleagues in the research and design of improved instructional strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Recognizes that change entails risk and modifications may be needed.</td>
<td>C. Participates in instructional improvement and school reform initiatives.</td>
<td>C. Assumes a leadership role in the study and implementation of instructional improvement and school reform initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The teacher works productively with colleagues, parents and community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I</th>
<th>Professional Teacher - LEVEL II</th>
<th>Master Teacher - LEVEL III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Collaborates with colleagues.</td>
<td>A. Actively promotes collegial relations with other school personnel.</td>
<td>A. Serves as a role model for collaborative working relations across the profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Communicates with parents on a regular basis.</td>
<td>B. Provides a system for interactive communication between teacher and parents.</td>
<td>B. Demonstrates knowledge of specific school, family, and community resources that can support student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Uses conflict resolution strategies when necessary.</td>
<td>C. Uses conflict resolution strategies as appropriate.</td>
<td>C. Assists colleagues in the use of conflict resolution strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Involves parents and community in the learning environment.</td>
<td>D. Promotes active roles for parents and community members in student learning.</td>
<td>D. Engages parents and community members productively in the work of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Communicates in a professional manner with colleagues, parents, and community members regarding educational matters.</td>
<td>E. Communicates in a professional manner with colleagues, parents, and community members regarding educational matters.</td>
<td>E. Works collaboratively and creatively with colleagues, parents, and community members regarding educational matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Rating</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Not Met CA-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Not Met CA-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met Proficiency Goal</th>
<th>Met Participation Rate</th>
<th>Not Additional Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key to Designations:
- **Not Met**: The district did not progress as expected between the given years.
- **CA-2**: Indicates the district has met its AYP goals.

### MATH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Students Participated</th>
<th>Number Tested</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Lower Bound of Estimate</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Lower Bound of Estimate</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Lower Bound of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>4528</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65.45</td>
<td>54.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>66.45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64.87</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62.65</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>37.09</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>62.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>30.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>63.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>77.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64.61</td>
<td>85.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65.52</td>
<td>66.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### READING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Students Participated</th>
<th>Number Tested</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Lower Bound of Estimate</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Lower Bound of Estimate</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>AYP Goal</th>
<th>Lower Bound of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>51.87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.50</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>71.97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71.89</td>
<td>54.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45.08</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.39</td>
<td>54.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71.75</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>49.91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72.42</td>
<td>59.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>77.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.72</td>
<td>82.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>40.37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.30</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL INDICATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-12 Not Met</th>
<th>2010-11 Not Met</th>
<th>Progressing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate (%)</td>
<td>64.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Subgroups of 25 or more must meet AYP goals.
2. 85% of each subgroup of 25 or more must participate.
3. Includes current English Language Learners (ELL) as well as those ELL within the past two years.
4. Percentages include only students enrolled for the full academic year (FAY).
5. The size of the confidence interval is based on the number of students in the subgroup, shown only for groups meeting minimum size for AYP.
6. *< 2% less than 2% of students in this group performed at or above proficient, < 80% = more than 80% of students in this group performed at or above proficient.
7. Must be 62.00% or higher.

Summary Details for groups with fewer than 10 students are masked to protect confidentiality.
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School: Rydell High
Grade Range: 09-12
District: TLSO

2011-12
Not Met
R-2
2010-11
Not Met
R-2

Summary
Math Proficiency Goal
Met Participation Rate
Met Additional Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Math Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Designations:
- R1 = School Improvement 1
- R2 = Restructuring 1
- R3 = Restructuring 2

Math Summary Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-12 Not Met</th>
<th>R-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>40.57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>31.92</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading Summary Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-12 Not Met</th>
<th>R-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>29.57</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Indicator

For Elementary and Middle Schools:
- For High Schools:
  Attendance Rate (%): 58.06
  Graduation Rate (%):

1. Subgroups of 25 or more must meet AYP goals.
2. 85% of each subgroup of 60 or more must participate.
3. Includes current English Language Learners (ELL) as well as ELL within the past two years.
4. Proficiencies include only students enrolled for the full academic year (FAI).
5. The size of the confidence interval is based on the number of students in the subgroup, shown only for groups meeting minimum size for AYP.
6. AYP scores reflect the percentage of students who performed at or above proficient.
7. Must be 62.00% or higher.
8. New school with no students or teacher participation.
9. School with fewer than 10 students are marked to protect confidentiality.
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350
Mr. John Keating’s PDP Form 1 (ELA Teacher)

TLSD LEVEL II or LEVEL III LICENSED TEACHERS PDP FORM 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>John Keating</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT/POSITION:</th>
<th>English Language Arts</th>
<th>LEVEL:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISOR:</td>
<td>Bob McGee</td>
<td>LOCATION NAME:</td>
<td>Rydell High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAND:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Strand A: Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strand B: Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strand C: Professional Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPETENCY V: The teacher effectively utilizes student assessment techniques and procedures.

GOAL STATEMENT: My goal is to measure the effectiveness of using Frayer models to teach vocabulary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY INDICATOR YOU ARE ADDRESSING</th>
<th>ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>HOW WILL YOUR ACTION PLAN AFFECT YOUR TEACHING? (i.e., what will be different in your teaching as a result of implementing this Action Plan?)</th>
<th>1) WHAT DIFFERENCE WILL YOUR ACTION PLAN MAKE FOR YOUR STUDENTS?</th>
<th>2) HOW WILL YOU BE ABLE TO TELL?</th>
<th>ASSISTANCE NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Selects appropriate assessment tools and strategies for specific learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Teach two groups of students to compare vocabulary test score outcomes. One group will use the Frayer model, a visual organizer that helps students understand key words and concepts, and the other group will not.</td>
<td>Instead of assigning the vocabulary in a book, I will have students each complete a Frayer Model for a single vocabulary term and then present it to the class and then students can take notes on each term.</td>
<td>Students using Frayer models will score higher on vocabulary tests than students who do not.</td>
<td>Frayer models in the 10th Grade Academy Frayer Model template Common Core State Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I hereby agree that the above Professional Development Plan has been developed and discussed with the employee.

Evaluator’s Signature ___________________________ Date ____________
Employee’s Signature ___________________________ Date ____________

Copies: Personnel File, Supervisor, Employee
Mr. John Keating’s PDP Form 2 (ELA Teacher)

TLSD LEVEL II or LEVEL III LICENSED TEACHERS PDP FORM 2

NAME: John Keating   ASSIGNMENT/POSITION: English Language Arts   LEVEL: 1 X 2 3
SUPERVISOR: Bob McGee   LOCATION NAME: Rydell High School

Documentation demonstrating professional development plan goals have been met (completed by the teacher):

Employee’s signature ____________________________ Date ___________

Progress Statement (completed by the supervisor):

Evaluator’s Signature ____________________________ Date ___________

Copies: Personnel File, Supervisor, Employee

Mr. John Keating’s PDP Form 3 (ELA Teacher)

TLSD LEVEL II or LEVEL III LICENSED TEACHERS PDP FORM 3

NAME: John Keating   ASSIGNMENT/POSITION: English Language Arts   LEVEL: 1 X 2 3
SUPERVISOR: Bob McGee   LOCATION NAME: Rydell High School

Based on the PED’s approved competencies and indicators

Teacher Reflection: Provide a written comment on your PDP, including a description of student achievement and learning growth.

Principal Feedback (Optional):

Yes _____ No _____ Professional Development Plan completed Strand A B C (circle one)
Yes _____ No _____ Teacher meets highly qualified requirements for teaching assignment

Evaluator’s Signature ____________________________ Date ___________
Employee’s Signature ____________________________ Date ___________

Copies: Personnel File, Supervisor, Employee
Mr. Alex Dunlap, PDP Form 1 (Drama Teacher)

NAME: Alex Dunlap  ASSIGNMENT/POSITION: Fine Arts, Drama  LEVEL: ___ 1  X__ 2  ___ 3
SUPERVISOR: Leo Levias  LOCATION NAME: Rydell High School
STRAND: ____ Strand A: Instruction ____ Strand B: Student Learning
X___ Strand C: Professional Learning

Indicate Competency(ies) – Must be based on PED’s approved competencies
The teacher demonstrates a willingness to examine and implement change, as appropriate.

Action Plan (describe action to meet goal of PDP)
I will work with Academy colleagues to meet the school-wide goal: “Teachers will incorporate a variety of literacy strategies in order to improve literacy across all content areas, as measured by data collected by departmental short-cycle assessments.” We will research and evaluate proven literacy strategies as a team. We will also use lesson study as part of a process of continuous improvement as we implement the chosen strategies.

Assistance Plan (describe assistance to be provided)
Academy meeting time to work on this.

I hereby agree that the above Professional Development Plan has been developed and discussed with the employee.

Evaluator’s Signature ___________________________ Date ____________
Employee’s Signature ___________________________ Date ____________

Copies: Personnel File, Supervisor, Employee

Mr. Alex Dunlap, PDP Form 2 (Drama Teacher)

TLSD LEVEL II or LEVEL III LICENSED TEACHERS PDP FORM 2

NAME: Alex Dunlap  ASSIGNMENT/POSITION: Fine Arts, Drama  LEVEL: ___ 1  X__ 2  ___ 3
SUPERVISOR: Leo Levias  LOCATION NAME: Rydell High School

Progress Statement (completed by the supervisor):
The teacher instructed his students to work on their assigned projects. Some students were assigned to stage craft – building the background for scenes and play. Other students were the audience for students who were directing and putting on a Drama Production scene for the school and the school community to enjoy and view for pleasure. The student, who directed her play, was acted out and performed by students in the class. The teacher observed the play along with the other students to critique the play for suggestions and improvements. The students were positive and humorous in their critique of this play production. Students were engaged in class.

Evaluator’s Signature ___________________________ Date ____________

Copies: Personnel File, Supervisor, Employee
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