An Examination of Principals' Perceptions of Professional Development in an Urban School District

Mary K. Boudreaux
Assistant Professor
Department of Leadership
College of Education
3798 Walker Avenue, Ball Hall 123, Memphis, TN 38152, 901.678.5024

Abstract

School districts require teachers to engage in continuous learning of new skills. Federal and state laws rely on multiple indicators to measure and improve student performance. However, punitive attention through the No Child Left Behind legislation has been directed at professional development as a means to improve student academic achievement even though there is a diverse body of research linking professional development to student achievement and academic performance as a positive strategy in high-performing schools and districts. The specific purpose of this study is to examine principals' perceptions of teacher professional development. These dimensions include: amount of time, sufficient resources, alignment with school improvement plan, data-driven, reflective, follow-up, collaboration, evaluation, implementation and student learning. The results of this research will help to validate the need for principal support of teachers having practice time to implement strategies introduced during professional development so that student achievement is positively impacted.

Keywords: professional development, principals, data-driven

Introduction

With the enactment of The No Child Left behind (NCLB) legislation, school districts are pressured to bring upon changes to improve student performance on standardized tests. One particular goal of NCLB included having *all* students attain reading and math proficiency by 2013-15 (Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 2011). Professional development training was imposed upon teachers to meet the demands of rigorous standardized testing. States required attendance of such professional development in teachers' content area or multi-subject area in order to improve teacher quality. "To increase academic achievement by improving teacher and principal quality" the NCLB administration provided *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants* to "address challenges to teacher quality" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 2-4).

Under the educational reform of the Obama administration, a blueprint building upon the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964, focused on improving teacher effectiveness (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). One particular goal of with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in states, funds through the *Race to the Top* grant focused on "improving the effectiveness of teachers" and "preparing, placing, and supporting beginning teachers … in high-need schools" (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, p. 9). The goals of education reform under the Obama administration involve: (1) supporting college-and career-ready standards, preparing college-and career-ready students; (2) rewarding progress and success; and, (3) turning around the lowest-performing schools (p. 7). In order to increase teacher effectiveness, school districts may utilize the *Race to the Top* funds "to support educators in improving their instructional practice through effective, ongoing, job-embedded, professional develop that is targeted to student and school needs" (p. 15). While many states have adopted the Common Core standards to raise standards for student learning, the biggest challenge remains: "how to implement them successfully –how to bring them to life for every student in every school" (Hargreaves, 2014, p. xv). Districts struggle with meeting the demands of the complexity in teachers' depth of knowledge. Hargreaves agrees that a challenge lies in districts training underprepared and mid-career teachers (trained under the NCLB legislation) to implement the new standards.

Moreover, the author states, "a few half-day training courses here and there will not be enough" (p. xvi). Implementation of standards is only one concern of educational reform. Another defining measure, according to Hargreaves (2014) is utilizing data-driven results. In a collaborative effort the use of Big Data informs educational practice, that is, "they provide educators with valuable feedback on their students' progress and difficulties that can inform decision making and… changes in practice" (p. xvii). Underlying this discussion on educational practice and reform is the premise that educational policy has historically affected the direction of professional development for school districts and schools (Long, 2014; Valencia & Wixson, 2004; Wilkinson & Son, 2011). In order to assess "whether money spent made an impact on professional development" (Long, 2014, p. 37), educational reform such as the implementation of the Common Core standards through federal resources, i.e., Race to the Top and ARRA must be analyzed. Few studies have assessed school districts' professional development opportunities, formal and informal under the Obama administration. There lies an overwhelming concern of professional development researchers in regards to a paucity of studies on professional development programs and teacher effectiveness in school districts (Borko, 2004; Birman, Desimone, Porter &Garet, 2000; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon (2001). The goal of this study is to examine urban principals' perspectives about their teachers' professional development.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical background of this study is based upon the behavioral frameworks of Frederick Herzberg's (1968) Motivator-Hygiene Theory and Abraham Maslow's (1970) Hierarchy of Needs Theory. These blended theories describe motivational factors that effective leaders "must give careful consideration to the comfort level of the individuals who function in the organization" (Green, 2013, p. 123). That is, "the leader is aware of the needs that individuals are seeking to satisfy" (Green, 2013, p. 123). Herzberg's model involves seven motivational factors: (1) job content (2) achievement (3) recognition (4) work itself (5) responsibility (6) growth, and (7) advancement; whereas, Maslow's theory involves three specific needs: (1) knowledge, (2) understanding, and (3) self-actualization (Zepeda, 2012). These theories are considered helpful in understanding relationships and building trust that motivates individuals or communities to collaborate and communicate towards reaching a shared vision and mission. Such theories enable organizations and learning communities to plan programmatic and instructional activities that are more meaningful in the development of effective, highly qualified teachers, "who will exhibit the style of behavior that is most effective in reaching organizational goals" (Green, 2010, p. 12).

Literature Review

Reform Efforts

With every president or new federal administration, the goals of professional development changes. Such programs as Race to the Top ($3.5 billion) and the School Improvement Grant ($4 billion) provided money to implement job-embedded professional development in school districts. More specifically, the grantees of Race to the Top must utilize these funds to create teacher evaluation systems that will measure teaching and learning; hence, "developing teachers… by providing relevant coaching, induction, and/or professional development" (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, Sec. D[2]iv[a]). Professional development for school improvement grantees are guided by, "understanding what and how students are learning and on how to address students' learning needs, including reviewing student work and achievement data and collaboratively planning, testing, and adjusting instructional strategies, formative assessments, and materials based on such data"(U.S. Department of Education, 2011, p. 30).

According to Croft, Coggshall, Dolan, Powers, &Killion (2010), job-embedded professional development (JEPD) is defined as "teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning" (p. 2). Therefore, professional development is no longer an isolated task. Zepeda (2012) asserts "effective professional development is learning at the site from the work teachers do" (p. xxii). Teacher involvement in the professional development process is essential. To ensure effective JEPD, professional development involves an alignment with state standards and school improvement goals (Hirsh, 2009). Zepeda (2012) contends, "professional development must be grounded…clearly stated…and be embedded in core beliefs that are under constant scrutiny" (p. 4).

Several lessons have been learned from research on professional development (Zepeda, 2012). That is, professional development (1) extends over time; (2) includes planned follow up(3) is job-embedded connecting to the work of teaching; (4) is content-specific and related to subject matter; (5) promotes reflection and inquiry;

(6) Includes multiple modalities of learning – active engagement; (7) is site-based and includes teachers from the same grade and subject level; and, (8) is based on student performance data (p. 9). Little (1994) advocates that professional development can be a reform strategy for capacity "to equip teachers individually and collectively to act as shapers, promoters, and well-informed critics of reforms" (para 4). Six principles guide a reform strategy approach. Zepada (2012) indicates that professional development (1) offers engagement with ideas, materials and colleagues in and out of teaching environments; (2) takes explicit account of the context of teaching and experiences of teachers; (3) offers support for informed dissent; (4) places classroom practice in the larger contexts of school practice and the educational career of children; (5) prepares teachers and others to employ techniques and perspectives of inquiry; and, (6) the ensurance of balance between individual interests and institutional interests (p. 65). Adding to this list, the Annenberg Institute for School Reform (AISR) asserts that professional development is ongoing, embedded within context-specific needs of a particular setting, aligned with reform initiatives, and grounded in collaborative, inquiry-based approach to learning (p. 1). Learning Forward, formerly the National Staff Development Council, created the 2011 Standards for Professional Learning. Based upon research on professional development, these reform-focused standards of Learning Forward posit three key categories: Context, Process, and Outcome "that lead to effective teaching practices, supportive leadership, and improved student results" (para 1). Context standards involve three specific areas: learning communities, leadership, and resources. Process standards refer to: data, learning designs, and implementation. The stand alone outcome standard addresses the outcomes performance standards and learning outcomes.

Implementing Professional Development

"A typical teacher spends 68 hours each year – more than a week – on professional learning activities typically directed by districts" (Boston Consulting Group, 2014, p. 3). The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation hired the Boston Consulting Group in 2014 to study "roadblocks to implementing effective professional development" (p. 3). The findings suggest that (1) few teachers (29 percent) are highly satisfied with current professional development offerings; (2) few teachers (34 percent) think professional has improved; (3) large majorities of teachers do not believe that professional development is helping them prepare for the changing nature of their jobs, including using technology and digital learning tools, analyzing student data to differentiate instruction, and implementing the Common Core State Standards and other standards; (4) professional development formats strongly supported by district leadership and principals, such as professional learning communities and coaching, are currently not meeting teachers' needs; and, (5) principals largely share teachers' concerns about the efficacy of professional learning (p. 3).

Matthews (2012) wrote in the *Washington Post* that many educators say that the $20 billion spent annually on professional development is wasted because educators are not given the time nor the opportunity to practice the new strategies introduced. Maeroff (1993) also supports the idea of the lack of success that many professional development sessions produce which should be increasing student achieve. However, Maeroff goes a step further and explains why the processes used by many professional development sessions are ineffective. The reasons are: (1) Educators must have the confidence of being able to do their job; (2) Educators must become more knowledgeable about both the content and pedagogy that they teach because too many do not know what they need to do in order to have different results in student achievement; and, (3) Educators must play an active part in changing their own teaching.The only way to achieve the items listed above is to make sure teachers have enough time to change. As Maeroff (1993) explains that teachers' time is valuable, but limited. Time is a precious commodity and it is very important that schedules be designed so that teachers are not always teaching. If teachers do not have practice time, the results are teachers who become burnout and are not able to positively impact student achievement. Several research models add to the implementation of effective professional development. Corcoran (1995) (as cited in Zepada, 2012) states that effective professional development should: (1) stimulate and support site-based initiatives; (2) support teacher initiatives as well as school or district initiatives; (3) is grounded in knowledge about teaching; (4) models constructivist teaching; (5) offers intellectual, social, and emotional engagement with ideas, materials, and colleagues; (6) demonstrates respect for teachers as professionals and adult learners; (7) Provides for sufficient time and follow-up support for teachers to master new content and strategies and to integrate them into their practice; and, (8) is accessible and inclusive (p. 12).

Ferguson (2006) provides five conditions for effective professional development. The five conditions are: (1) Success seems feasible on goals that are clearly defined; (2) The goals seem important; (3) The experience is enjoyable; (4) Supervisors are both encouraging and insistent; and, (5) Peers are supportive (p. 52).

More recent research adds to Ferguson's (2006) conditions. Martin, Kragler, Quatroche, and Bauserman (2014) provides five characteristics of successful professional development. The five characteristics are: (1) Professional development is instructive; (2) Professional development is reflective; (3) Professional development is active; (4) Professional development is collaborative; and, (5) Professional development is substantive (p. xxi).The conditions and characteristics suggested by the aforementioned researchers add to the plethora of research on implementation of professional development by principals of schools.

Reflective Principals and Professional Development

The concept of reflective practice is explained by Ferraro (2000) and Saunders (2012) as a critical process of getting better at the process of teaching. The authors explain that true reflective practice involves different individuals so collaboration is able to take place. For example, a new teacher, a mentor of the new teacher, and other colleagues collaborate about recently observed practices, and strategies for the development of future experiences. The authors also explain that the reflective process is continuous because practices are always able to develop so that there is a stronger impact on student achievement. Dufour (2004) suggests that principals should be reflected in their implementation efforts. Four questions principals should reflect upon when planning and designing professional development are:

1. Does the professional development increase the staff's collective capacity to achieve the school's vision and goals?
2. Does the school's approach to staff development challenge staff members to act in new ways?
3. Does the school's approach to staff development focus on results rather than activities?
4. Does the school's approach to staff development demonstrate a sustained commitment to achieving important goals? (p. 6)

To meet these implementation efforts, Zepeda (2013) suggests that principals should create a professional development team. These members of the professional team become leaders within the school (instructional leaders). Zepeda (2013) adds that such tapping of in-house experts or "in-house professional development human resources" (p. 46) provides a continuous learning model that supports teacher growth. The model must be strategic and establishes an initiative. Zepeda (2013) concludes that creating in-house leadership for successful professional development involves, (1) participants understand the purpose of the initiative, (2) how the initiative is to be carried out, and (3) what is expected of each participant in the initiative (p. 47).Clearly, several influences make up the social system of the school (Green, 2013). Within these social systems groups or individuals influence the leadership of the school. Green (2013) contends that there are two factors that influence the school environment: external and internal. External factors impact school systems and change the dynamics of the organization (as a whole) i.e., federal mandates and policies. Internal factors involve the "ideas, ethics, beliefs, values, and behaviors that an individual brings into the schoolhouse" (Green, 2013, p. 100). These factors have a direct influence upon the collaborative culture of the school and/or organization. In fact, the decisions leaders make about these external and internal issues have a direct impact upon the school or organizational environment. Teachers are essential to student learning and "professional learning increases educator effectiveness" (Zepeda, 2012). Therefore, this study was conducted to explore principals' (leaders within schools) insights about teacher professional development within their schools and to promote continuous inquiry and improvement on effective professional learning.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine principal's perceptions of teachers' professional development in an urban school district. The study adds to the research on school climate as it pertains to the understudied indices of professional development within schools. The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How do urban principals perceive teachers' professional development within their schools?
2. Are there significant differences in principals' and assistant principals' dispositions of teachers' professional development within their schools?
3. To what extent do principals and assistant principals perceive professional development within their schools?

Research Methods

The researchers submitted three questions to be answered by this study. In order to answer the research, this study used a quantitative methodology that facilitates an analysis of the variables in the study.

The researchers determined that a non-experimental approach utilizing descriptive and correlational statistics would be the most appropriate for a secondary data analysis study. The survey for this study is the MET (Measures of Effective Teaching) Working Conditions Survey (New Teacher Center, 2009). The MET Working Conditions Survey analyses presented are based on the responses to a survey instrument that was based on the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey (Hirsch & Church, 2009), but customized to Tennessee. For this study, the construct of professional development was analyzed.

5.1 Population and Sample

Schools in this study were elementary, middle, high and charter all located in a large district in the Southeastern United States that was selected based on the grade configuration. The total enrollment for the large urban district was 102, 798 students in 2009 - 2010 school year. The sample for this study consisted of only 110 principal and assistant principals as displayed in Table 1. The MET (Measures of Effective Teaching) Working Conditions Survey was administered to principal and assistant principal respondents at 206 district "sites" (Swanlund, 2011).

Table 1: *Demographic Characteristics of Principal Respondents to the 2010 Administration of the Measures of Effective Teaching Working Conditions Survey (n = 110)*

Group	Principals(n = 73)	Assistant Principals(n =37)
First Year	12.2%	21.6%
2 to 3 Years	17.6%	27.0%
4 to 6 Years	31.1%	27.0%
7 to 10 Years	9.5%	5.4%
11 to 20 Years	16.2%	10.8%
20 + Years	9.5%	5.4%
Missing	4.1%	2.7%

5.2 Data Analysis

A descriptive analysis was performed on the sample group to obtain a clear understanding ofthe group. Measures of central tendency and distribution were conducted. The researcher determined means, medians, and percentiles based on the data input. Standard deviations were determined during data analysis and reported as well. This quantitative study utilized descriptive analysis to analyze the data. The results of the analysis procedures were interpreted and evaluated for implications.

Findings

Frequencies and percentages were obtained for each of twelve "professional development" items on the MET/Working Conditions Survey for all principal and assistant professor respondents (Table 1). Complementing this table of frequencies and percentages are two additional tables in which means and standard deviations were computed and compared for subgroups of principals given the responses of individuals as the unit of analysis (Table 2) and responses aggregated to the school- or administrative-level as the unit of analysis (Tables 4 and 5). With all of these responses pertinent to some aspect of professional development, these twelve items read as follows:

1. Sufficient resources are available for professional development in my school.
2. An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional development.
3. Professional development offerings are data driven.
4. Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.
5. Professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.
6. Professional development deepens teachers' content knowledge.
7. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.
8. In this school, follow up is provided from professional development.
9. Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.
10. Professional development is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.
11. Professional development enhances teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse student learning needs.
12. Professional development enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.

Research Question *1: How do urban principals perceive teacher's professional development within their schools?*

Table 2: *Frequencies and Percentages for Professional Development: All Principal Respondents*

Item	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		NA	
	N	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Sufficient resources are available for professional development in my school.	0	0	11	10.0	49	44.5	50	45.5	0	0
An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional development.	0	0	11	10.1	47	43.1	51	46.8	0	0
Professional development offerings are data driven.	0	0	5	4.7	40	37.4	62	57.9	0	0
Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.	0	0	3	2.7	41	37.3	66	60.0	0	0
Professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.	1	.9	12	10.9	58	52.7	39	35.5	0	0
Professional development deepens teachers' content knowledge.	0	0	2	1.8	57	51.8	51	46.4	0	0
Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.	0	0	0	0	47	42.7	63	57.3	0	0
In this school, follow up is provided from professional development.	0	0	9	8.2	63	57.3	38	34.5	0	0
Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.	0	0	5	4.5	54	49.1	51	46.4	0	0
Professional development is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.	0	0	15	13.8	57	52.3	35	32.1	2	1.8
Professional development enhances teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse student learning needs.	0	0	2	1.8	56	50.9	52	47.3	0	0
Professional development enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.	0	0	1	.9	50	45.5	59	53.6	0	0

Table 2 displays the frequencies and percentages of professional development related items for principals. Inspection of the percentages of agreement and strong agreement for these items reveal that only with respect to evaluation and reporting professional development results to teachers as less than optimal (13.8%.) At the other extreme, some 60% of the respondents agree that professional development is tied to the school improvement program, while 57.3% of the respondents feel that follow-up to professional development is provided in their schools.

Research Question 2*: Are there significant differences in principals' and assistant principals' dispositions of professional development within their schools?*

Table 3: Results of Independent-sample t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Professional Development for Principal and Assistant Principal

Professional Development	t	df	p	d	Std. Error Mean	95% CI for Mean Difference
Sufficient resources are available for professional development in my school.	.956	108	.341	.183	.127	-.136, .390
An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional development.	1.93	107	.056	.373	.258	-.006, .522
Professional development offerings are data driven.	*2.00	105	.047	.390	.240	.003, .477
Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.	1.93	108	.056	.371	.211	-.006, .429
Professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.	-.776	108	.440	-.149	-.106	-.375, .164
Professional development deepens teachers' content knowledge.	1.31	108	.190	.252	.130	-.071, .355
Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.	1.30	108	.196	.250	.112	-.068, .328
In this school, follow up is provided from professional development.	.925	108	.357	.178	.101	-.128, .353
Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.	.858	108	.393	.165	.006	-.132, .333
Professional development is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.	.042	107	.966	.008	.196	-.275, .287
Professional development enhances teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse student learning needs.	1.83	108	.069	.352	.224	-.016, .408
Professional development enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.	*2.17	108	.032	.417	.224	.020, .429

*$p < .05$.

An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in professional development between principals and assistant principals. Results from the *t*-tests ($\alpha = .05$) in Table 3 show that two out of the twelve mean differences for each question were statistically significant between respondents' professional development dispositions. Only two items proved to be significantly different. A significant difference in the principal and assistant principal responses with respect to professional development offerings are data driven was observed (*t* (105) = -2.00, *p* < .04, d = .39) as was a significant difference in principal and assistant principal responses to the item concerning professional development enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning (*t* (108) = 2.17, *p* < .03, d = .41). In both instances, the differences favored the principals' collective responses.

Research Question 3*: To what extent do principals and assistant principals perceive professional development within their schools?*

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations Computed from Principal and Assistant Principal Responses for Professional Development Items and Scale by Administrative Level

Item	Principals		Assistant Principals	
	(*n* = 73)		(*n* = 37)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Sufficient resources are available for professional development in my school.	3.40	.661	3.27	.652
An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional development.	3.45	.602	3.19	.749
Professional development offerings are data driven.	3.61	.571	3.37	.598
Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.	3.64	.510	3.43	.603
Professional development is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.	3.19	.616	3.30	.777
Professional development deepens teachers' content knowledge.	3.49	.503	3.35	.588
Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.	3.62	.490	3.49	.507
In this school, follow up is provided from professional development.	3.30	.545	3.19	.701
Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.	3.45	.554	3.35	.633
Professional development is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.	3.22	.716	3.22	.672
Professional development enhances teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse student learning needs.	3.52	.503	3.32	.580
Professional development enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.	3.60	.493	3.38	.545
Statistics for Twelve-Item Scale	3.46	4.62	3.32	6.48

With respect to the item-level means and standard deviation for groups (Table 4), few differences are observed. Among individual, it is noteworthy that the means obtained across all twelve items differed for both urban principals (M = 3.46, SD = 0.64) and urban assistant principals (M = 3.32, SD = 0.66).

Discussion

The MET survey contained a series of statements regarding the relationship between principal perceptions involvement and their subjective involvement in their teacher's professional involvement. The researcher sought to identify aspects found in high achieving schools' climates that could attribute to their success. The literature identified multiple contributors; however, for this study researchers analyzed the responses from principals by the use of a secondary data set related to the principals' perception about teacher professional development within their schools. According to the data results, overall, principal and assistant principals believe there is good implementation of professional development within their schools. Both groups of principals believe professional development within their schools are directly tied to school improvement and encourages teacher reflection. However, both groups of principals feel that in order to optimize professional development, more efforts should be made to provide professional development that is data driven and that can improve teachers' abilities to improved student learning within their classrooms. Lastly, when considering the mean responses from both groups, principals had a higher response rate related to effective professional development within their schools.

Conclusion

The context for this study was centered on the role of principal as instructional leader. Although, the literature indicated that professional development is successfully implemented in schools, it also identified that a learning environment must have certain attributes in order to facilitate effective professional development. Based on the surveyed items related to professional development, the responding principals did not see these aspects as a major concern that hindered effective teaching and learning within their schools, or considered as a non-motivator for job performance. In essence, it is the role of school leaders to provide a work environment that facilitates student success. Based on the information found in this study, principals as instructional leaders in school in the Midwestern region of the United States should consider the following recommendations concerning the elements of effective professional development as it relates to the use of data driven strategies to motivate teachers to improve student learning for all students.

First, Koutzes and Posner (2008) (as cited in Routzel & Clark, 2014) suggest school leaders must become transformational leaders in which they provide support and mentoring to teachers. Secondly, systems must be put in place to implement new learned information and strategies (Tallerico, 2014). A third recommendation specific to teacher efficacy is to "model hopefulness, to address conflict directly, and to counteract stories of failure" (Tallerico, 2014, p. 135). With these three motivators, Tallerico (2014) adds, "building-level leaders … sustain motivation and efficacy beliefs" in their schools (p. 135).

References

Birman, B., Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. (2000). Designing professional development that works. Educational Leadership, 57(8), 28-33.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. Educational Researcher, 33(8), 3-15.

Boston Consulting Group. (2014). Teachers know best: Teachers' views on professional development. [Online] Available: http://collegeready.gatesfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Gates-PDMarketResearch-Dec5.pdf

Croft, A., Coggshall, J. G., Dolan, M., Powers, E., & Killion, J. (2010). Job-Embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well. [Online] Available:http://docplayer.net/264476-Job-embedded-professional-development.html (April, 2010)

Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2011). Issues A-Z: No Child Left Behind. Education Week. [Online] Available: http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/no-child-left-behind/ (September 19, 2011).

Ferguson, R. F. (2006). Five challenges to effective teacher professional development. Journal of Staff Development, 27(4), 48 – 52.

Ferraro, J.M. (2000). Reflective practice and professional development. [Online] Available: http://eric.ed.gov/

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915-945.

Green, R. L. (2013). Practicing the art of leadership. A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Green, R. L. (2010). The four dimensions of principal leadership: A framework for leading 21st century schools. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hargreaves, A. (2014). Forward: Six sources of change in professional development. In

Hill, H.C. (2004). Professional development standards and practices in elementary school mathematics. The Elementary School Journal, 104 (3), 215-231.

Hertzberg, F. (1959). The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hirsch, E., & Church, K. (2009). North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Research.

[Online] Available: http://ncteachingconditions.org/sites/default/files/attachments/NC_teacher_retention.pdf

Hirsh, S. (2009). A new definition. Journal of Staff Development, 30(4), 10-16.

Little, J. W. (1994). Teacher's professional development in a climate of educational reform. Systematic reform: Perspectives on personalizing education. [Online] Available: http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/EdReformStudies/SysReforms/little1.html.

Long, R. (2014). Federal investments in professional development: What do 50 years of experience tell us about what it takes to make a difference? In L.E. Martin, S. Kragler, D. J. Quatroche, & K. L. Bauserman (Eds.), Handbook of professional development in education: Successful models and practices (pp. 22 – 41). New York: The Guilford Press.

Maeroff, G.I. (1993). Team building for school change: Equipping teachers for new roles. New York: Teachers College Press.

Martin, L. E., Kragler, S., Quatroche, D. J., & Bauserman, K. L. (2014). Handbook of professional development in education: Successful models and practices. New York: The Guilford Press.

Maslow, A. (1970). Motivation and personality (Rev. ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Matthews, J. (2012). Class struggle. The Washington Post. [Online] Available: http://www.washingtonpost.com (October 10, 2012)

National Staff Developmental Council (2011). Standards for professional learning. [Online]Available:http://learningforward.org/standards#.VhbYJLQrqlI

New Teacher Center. (2009). Teaching and learning conditions survey. [Online]Available: http://newteachercenter.org/node/1359.

Petrash, J. (2002). Understanding Waldorf education: Teaching from the inside out. Beltsville, MD: Gryphon House, Inc.

Reutzel, D. R., & Clark, S. R., (2014). Shaping the contours of professional development, pre K   12: Successful models and practices. In L.E. Martin, S. Kragler, D. J. Quatroche, & K. L. Bauserman (Eds.), Handbook of professional development in education: Successful models and practices (pp. 67 – 81). New York: The Guilford Press.

Saunders, R. (2012). Assessment of professional development for teachers in the vocational education and training sector: An examination of the concerns based adoption model.   Australian Journal of Education, 56(2), 182-204.

Spreyer, L. (2002). Teaching is an art: An A-Z handbook for successful teaching in middle schools and high school. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Swanlund, J. (2011). Tell Tennessee Teaching working conditions survey. [Online] Available: http: www.Tennessee. gov/education

Tallerico, M. (2014). District issues: Administrators at all levels involved in teachers' professional development. In L.E. Martin, S. Kragler, D. J. Quatroche, & K. L. Bauserman (Eds.), Handbook of professional development in education (pp. 125 – 144). New York: The Guilford Press.

U.S. Department of Education (2014). NCLB/Proven methods: Improving teachers quality state grants. Washington, DC: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. [Online]Available:http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/index.html

U.S. Department of Education (2010). ESEA Blueprint for Reform. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. [Online] Available: http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). Guidance on Fiscal Year 2010 School Improvement Grants under Section 1003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.   Washington, DC: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. [Online] Available: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/ sigguidance02232011.pdf

Valencia, S. W., &Wixson, K. K (2004). Literacy policy and policy research that makes a difference. In R. B. Ruddell& N. J. Unrau (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (5th ed., pp. 69-92). Newark, DE: Internaational Reading Association.

Wayne, A.J., Yoon, K.S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., &Garet, M.S. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. Educational Researcher, 37(8), 469- 479.

Wilkinson, I. A. G.,& Son, E. H. (2011). A dialogic turn in research on learning and teaching to comprehend. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.), Handbook of reading research (Vol. 4, pp. 359-387). New York: Routledge.

Zepeda, S. J., (2012). Professional development: What works. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.