Appraising Teacher Quality in Norwegian Schools

Dr. Sarah K. Anderson
Mayville State University
330 Third Street NE
Mayville, ND 58257, USA

Dr. Katherine L. Terras
University of North Dakota
231 Centennial Drive Stop 7189
Grand Forks, ND 58202-7189, USA

Marianne Dagfinrud
Halmstad Barne og Ungdomsskole
Skoleveien 4, 1580 Rygge, Norway

Abstract

This study investigated teacher quality in Norway utilizing the Framework for Teaching of Charlotte Danielson recommended by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) for developing a Norwegian teacher appraisal system. Quantitative analysis included 230 teachers who self-appraised levels of performance using an 84 item survey. Participants self-appraised as "slightly agree" to exhibiting qualities of effective teaching. Strengths comprised knowledge of child development, respectful relationships, clear standards of student conduct, writing correctly, ethical conduct and cooperative relationships with colleagues. Challenges included varying students groups for instruction, supervising classroom helpers, student monitoring of progress, and contributing service to both the school and the teaching profession. Findings suggest great potential for using the Framework to prepare, guide, improve, and evaluate teachers in Norway.

Keywords: Norway, evaluation, teacher appraisal, teacher quality, Framework for Teaching

1. Appraising Teacher Quality in Norwegian Schools

A good teacher is invaluable; defining good teaching is complex. Through analysis of Norwegian educational steering documents, Carlgren and Klette (2008) summarized the main qualifications for teachers in Norway:

> The ideal Norwegian teacher plans and carries through teaching in order to realize curricular objectives. He/she is also a role model with a robust personality. Further, she knows her subjects well and also didactics-she is able to cooperate with others and adapt her teaching to different needs among the pupils. The ideal Norwegian teacher works in teams and is a teacher as well as a counselor and advisor to the pupils. He/she is also a school developer. (pp. 125-126)

In September 2011 the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), a forum of 34 countries for collaborative response to common challenges, released their *Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Norway* (Nusche, Earl, Maxwell, & Shewbridge, 2011). The report provided strengths, challenges and pointers for future policy development in teacher appraisal; appraisal meaning the "evaluation of individual teachers to make a judgment about their performance" (p. 74).

Central to teacher appraisal, the OECD reported four strengths. First, teachers are trusted individuals and open to work-related feedback. This is evidenced by extensive autonomy to exercise duties and apparent trust by various stakeholders. The team asserted there was consensus of building a trusting, rather than controlling, environment for teachers resulting in openness to feedback. Another strength was that school leaders are beginning to receive training for teacher appraisal.

In a 2006 study on school leadership at the University of Oslo, 40% of school leaders had no formal education in management or organizational skills (Moum et al., 2011, p. 197), but a new national education for principals was introduced in 2009. The overall aim of this initiative was to better equip principals for their role as leaders, in particular, guiding the teaching and learning processes (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, 2010). It is expected as principals become better prepared for pedagogical leadership, they will also become more confident in appraising and providing feedback to staff (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 75). The third strength was attention to mentoring and guidance for newly-employed teachers. All new teachers should be *offered* induction and mentoring as of 2010. This program has the potential to encourage more appraisal and feedback for teachers (Nusche et al., 2011). The final strength was that feedback from students is an important element of formative teacher appraisal (Nusche et al., 2011). Although there is no common system, some teachers self-design student surveys to obtain feedback.

The OECD also found challenges to address in regards to teacher appraisal. They stated: (a) there is no shared understanding of what constitutes high quality teaching, (b) no guarantee teachers receive appraisal and feedback, (c) teacher evaluation is not linked to teacher and/or school development, and (d) there is an absence of career opportunities for effective teachers undermining the role of evaluation (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 73). In fact, "many Norwegian teachers have an unclear way of teaching" (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training [The Directorate], 2009) and are not likely to participate in organized academic and professional development. The Directorate (2009) qualified this statement with examples related to lower-secondary schools: less follow up with pupils, rarely correct homework, rarely set clear learning goals, leave a lot up to the pupils, not very many pupil-orientated practices are conducted, the pupils are not very often included in planning, and activities such as project work not often used (p. 92).

Furthermore, the Norwegian school system has structural complications that affect teacher quality. Educators in Norway teach multiple subjects with specialization not occurring until the upper secondary level (grade 11). The subjects a teacher may be asked to teach in primary to lower secondary include any under *The Knowledge Promotion* reform of 2006, an "objective and quality framework for primary and secondary education and training" (Ministry of Education and Research, 2007). The reform foci include: the core curriculum, quality framework, subject curricula, distribution of teaching hours per subject, and individual assessment.

The Norwegian government has recognized the necessity of expertise and has responded with changes to pre-service teacher training programs that include greater specialization for subject and grade levels (The Directorate, 2009, p. 95). A new initiative, *Competence for Quality*, aims for educators to earn continuing credits in a specific subject with national and local funding (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 77). The Directorate also implemented a teacher mentoring program, but the OECD cautioned that mentoring itself does not directly encourage appraisal unless it explicitly focuses on observation and discussion of practices (Nusche et al., 2011).

2. Current Teacher Appraisal in Norway

The OECD reported there was no guarantee Norwegian teachers receive appraisal and feedback, even with the government requirement to do so (Nusche et al., 2011). Teachers reported appraisal and feedback as strong, positive influences, yet only 56% reported receiving an annual appraisal, and almost 17% reported working in schools with no evaluation (external or self-evaluation) in the last five years (OECD, 2009). Without it is difficult to focus improvement efforts for individual teachers and the school as a whole. Likewise, it is challenging to communicate the status of teacher effectiveness to the public. As Danielson (2007) stated, "Schools have an ethical and statutory requirement to ensure teaching of high quality for all their students" (p. 177). In contrast to this obligation, a majority of Norwegian teachers agreed that substandard work is tolerated within schools and 89% agreed sustained poor teacher performance would not lead to dismissal (The Directorate, 2009). If high quality teachers are vital to good student outcomes, this is a disturbing statistic.

Current practices in Norway continue to lack linkage to professional development. Teachers report one of the lowest rates of professional development among OECD countries but one of the highest demands for more (OECD, 2009). The Directorate stated it is "desirable" to put more importance on continuing educational credits, holding brief courses, seminars and colleague-based projects (2009, p. 96). Engaging teachers, focusing on reflection, and establishing a non-threatening environment are what quality evaluation processes do much to encourage (Danielson, 2007). Without appraisal of work, absence of career opportunities for effective teachers is the product.

How can an educator move from novice to expert, from competence to accomplishment to leadership if there is no way to judge so? Nusche et al. (2011) found this deficiency of opportunities and recognition likely to undermine the role of teacher appraisal (p. 84). Current appraisal approaches differ across the otherwise nationalized system. At present, individual teacher appraisal is not part of the national assessment system (NKVS), but some accountability devices are "seeping" into the conventional design (Christophersen, Elstad, & Turmo, 2010, p. 414). According to The Directorate (2012), the NKVS consists of national tests, international surveys, user surveys (pupil, apprentice, instructor, teacher and parent), supervision, and The School Portal (data access) (p. 117). Current evaluation of teacher quality in Norway, while typically poorly documented, is observed in three main ways: (a) student input, (b) non-mandatory, external evaluation, and (c) informal comparison to the teacher basics outlined by the Ministry of Education and Research during an annual dialogue with the school leader. Each school sets its own procedure as there is no government guidance beyond the statement that evaluation should occur (Nusche et al., 2011).

An example of student evaluation of teachers from an upper secondary school (grades 11-13) is the common questionnaire from the city of Oslo. Once per year students are asked to appraise their teacher's work in four areas: organization and teaching, management and student monitoring, assessment, and personal impression of the teacher. This student assessment reflects the importance in Norway of the student-teacher relationship (The Directorate, 2009). Results are placed in the teacher's personnel file.

School owners, the cities and counties (kommune), can also implement their own external evaluation which involves educational criteria. One such example from a city in south-eastern Norway is a school-wide strength and weaknesses analysis. External observers spend time in the school observing areas of weakness and then provide improvement recommendations. A specific example may be teacher evaluation focused on engaging learners, assessment, feedback and follow-up or adaptive teaching.

Finally, school leaders evaluate teachers through dialogue and informal observations. In a report to Norwegian Parliament titled *The White Paper on Teacher Education "The teacher – the role and education"* (Ministry of Education and Research, 2009), fundamental areas of teacher competence were outlined. These addressed teachers' primary task, "to prepare and guide the pupils' learning process in a systematic manner" (p. 1). These criteria were stated as "the basis for exercising the teaching profession," and should be "developed and renewed throughout the entire teaching career" (pp. 1-2). Some school leaders do independently formalize this process, creating their own versions of class management and quality lesson norms (The Directorate, 2009). However, the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), a comparative study for the OECD of teaching in 23 countries, revealed school leaders in Norway place greater importance on administrative tasks than instructional leadership. Teachers reported school leaders are not very active when it comes to observation of teaching and feedback. Sadly, teachers reported tolerance for poorly executed, substandard work.

Together, these measures of competency provide valuable information. Student input is an important element of good evaluation, but not reliable as the sole measure of teacher quality. Independent observations can provide objective observations, and much can be gained through dialogue and reflection. However, the non-defined or mandated, inconsistent use of assessment and lack of results-driven action do seem to form what Allerup, Kovac, Kvåle, Langfeldt and Skov (2009) called a "weak system" (as cited in The Directorate, 2009, p. 92).

3. The Framework for Teaching

Since Norway does not have a clear set of performance criteria for appraisal, the internationally reputable Framework for Teaching (hereafter, *the Framework* or *Framework*) of Charlotte Danielson (2007) was suggested by the OECD as a reference contribution for development of appraisal standards (Nusche et al., 2011). Danielson (2007) defined good teaching practice through 75 individual elements clustered into 22 components condensed into four domains (see Figure 1).

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
- Knowledge of Content and the Structure of the Discipline
- Knowledge of Prerequisite Relationships
- Knowledge of Content-Related Pedagogy

b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
- Knowledge of Child and Adolescent Development
- Knowledge of the Learning Process
- Knowledge of Students' Skills, Knowledge, and Language Proficiency
- Knowledge of Students' Interests and Cultural Heritage
- Knowledge of Students' Special Needs

c. Selecting Instructional Outcomes
- Value, Sequence, and Alignment
- Clarity
- Balance
- Suitability for Diverse Learners

d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
- Resources for Classroom Use
- Resources to Extend Content Knowledge and Pedagogy
- Resources for Students

e Designing Coherent Instruction
- Learning Activities
- Instructional Materials and Resources
- Instructional Groups
- Lesson and Unit Structure

f. Designing Student Assessment
- Congruence with Instructional Outcomes
- Criteria and Standards
- Design of Formative Assessments

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
- Teacher Interaction with Students
- Student Interactions with One Another

b. Establishing a Culture for Learning
- Importance of the Content
- Expectations for Learning and Achievement
- Student Pride in Work

c. Managing Classroom Procedures
- Management of Instructional Groups
- Management of Transitions
- Management of Materials And Supplies
- Performance of Non-Instructional Duties
- Supervision of Volunteers And Paraprofessionals

d. Managing Student Behavior
- Expectations
- Monitoring of Student Behavior
- Response to Student Misbehavior

e. Organizing Physical Space
- Safety and Accessibility
- Arrangement of Furniture and Use of Physical Resources.

Domain 3: Instruction

a. Communicating with Students
- Expectations for Learning
- Directions and Procedures
- Explanations of Content
- Use of Oral and Written Language

b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- Quality of Questions
- Discussion Techniques
- Student Participation

c. Engaging Students in Learning
- Activities and Assignments
- Grouping of Students
- Instructional Materials and Resources
- Structure and Pacing

d. Using Assessment in Instruction
- Assessment Criteria
- Monitoring of Student Learning
- Feedback to Students
- Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress

e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
- Lesson Adjustment
- Response to Students

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

a. Reflecting on Teaching
- Accuracy
- Use in Future Teaching

b. Maintaining Accurate Records
- Student Completion of Assignments
- Student Progress in Learning
- Non-instructional Records

c. Communicating with Families
- Information About the Instructional Program
- Information About Individual Students
- Engagement of Families in the Instructional Program

d. Participating in a Professional Community
- Relationships with Colleagues
- Involvement in a Culture of Professional Inquiry
- Service to the School
- Participation in School and District Projects

e. Growing and Developing Professionally
- Enhancement of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skill
- Receptivity to Feedback from Colleagues
- Service to the Profession

f. Demonstrating Professionalism
- Integrity And Ethical Conduct
- Service To Students
- Advocacy
- Decision Making

Figure 1: The Framework for Teaching. Copyright 2011 by Charlotte Danielson. Reprinted with permission

Domain 1, Planning and Preparation, encapsulates how the teacher designs instruction; it involves transforming content area topics into accessible learning activities through carefully chosen strategies. It is the arrangement for learning a teacher creates. In Domain 2 a teacher sets the stage for learning by making the classroom environment conducive to learning.

This includes relationships and atmosphere that make the planning possible to carry out. The primary mission of teaching takes place in Domain 3, Instruction. Teachers communicate, question, discuss, engage, assess and respond to student needs. And finally, in Domain 4, criteria for being a professional educator are described. This work extends beyond the classroom and technical requirements to make teaching a true profession: reflection, maintaining records, communicating, growing and developing, and showing ethical regard within the larger community (Danielson, 2007, pp. 26-31). While these domains serve as a framework for evaluation, they are designed to be a roadmap for novice teachers, common language for enhancement of practicing teachers, and a link between teacher certification requirements and professional practice (Danielson, 2007, p. 7). If the recommendation from OECD is accepted, these criteria would be used in Norway to assess teachers.

4. Purpose of the Study

The principal research objective was to collect and analyze information about teacher quality in Norway through self-appraisal using the Framework for Teaching of Charlotte Danielson (2007). Danielson stated that self-assessment is "the most powerful use of the framework" (p. 168). The investigation was guided by the following questions:

- How effective do teachers in Norway view their teaching as self-appraised with Danielson's *Framework*?
- Which domains/components of quality teaching do teachers in Norway view as their strengths and challenges?
- Does gender, teaching location in Norway, or years of experience impact how teachers rate their teaching?
- What does the study indicate about potential use of *the Framework* for teacher appraisal in Norway?

5. Methods

5.1 Participants and Locations

The study sample consisted of 230 teachers actively teaching in Norway during the 2011-2012 school year. A response rate of 45% was achieved. Maximum variation sampling procedures were utilized to document diverse variations and to identify important common patterns, thus participants represented 25 diverse primary/lower secondary schools. Sixteen schools (64%) were classified as urban and nine (36%) as rural by examining settlement, municipality and city statistics from Statistics Norway. Rural schools were classified as under 5,000 inhabitants within the settlement area (not necessarily a city) as Norway requires a locale to have 5,000 inhabitants for city classification (Statistics Norway, 2012b); total populations ranged from 225 to approximately 2,500 in the rural category and from 7,000 to approximately 1 million in the urban. Of the 230 participants, 68 were male (30%) and 162 female (70%) reflecting national statistics of 73% female teachers (Statistics Norway, 2012a). Of all respondents 8% (n = 18) taught 0-2 years, 16% (n = 37) 3-6 years, 13% (n = 30) 7-10 years, 25% (n = 58) 11-15 years, and 36% (n = 83) had been teaching 16 or more years. Four participants (2%) did not indicate years taught. Teachers represented 13 of 19 administrative districts (fylke) of Norway. Of all respondents, two (1%) were familiar with Danielson's (2007) work.

The sample represented practicing teachers in schools visited by the first author through the U.S.-Norway Fulbright Foundation's Roving Scholar program, a unique, cross-cultural exchange. The program brings American teachers to Norway for one academic year to travel the country for teachers and students to share a sense of the American teaching experience. Generous support from the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research means school visits on a variety of topics and strategies are free (www.fulbright.no). The program facilitated unique access to participants across the country and was conducted independent of both the Fulbright Program and the Norwegian Government.

5.2 Instrumentation

The self-administered survey involved 84 Likert-scale questions (see Appendix) developed by separating components of *the Framework* into individual items. For example, in the original Framework, Domain 2, Component 1e, Element 1 reads "safety and accessibility" (see Figure 1). Survey item 42 reads "As a teacher I…have a classroom that is safe for all students." Item 43 reads, "As a teacher I…ensure all learning is equally accessible to all students." Wording for survey items was reduced and checked according to *Framework* levels of

Table 1: Framework Elements Converted to Survey Items

Domain	Teaching Responsibility	# of Elements	Survey Item	Likert Items
Domain 1	Planning and Preparation	22	1-28	28 (+6)
Domain 2	Classroom Environment	15	29-44	16 (+1)
Domain 3	Instruction	18	45-64	20 (+2)
Domain 4	Professional Responsibilities	20	65-84	20 +(0)

performance (Danielson, 2007). This instrumentation process resulted in more survey items than *Framework* elements (see Table 1).

Participants self-appraised teaching quality on a 6-point, symmetric Likert scale. The six ordered response levels were: 1= Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly Disagree; 4 = Slightly Agree; 5 = Agree; 6= Strongly Agree. Response levels included an equal amount of positive and negative positions with no neutral option, utilizing the "forced choice" method (Fink &Kosecoff, 1998). The scale was used to replace *Framework* terminology (Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished) to eliminate associations with adeptness; the goal being to collect data more reflective of actual teaching practice and less reliant on positive or negatively associated terminology.

To improve survey design, the preliminary survey was distributed in a pilot study, in English, with 14 American teachers (response rate of 20%). Teachers in America could stand-in as participants during the survey-refining process (Dryer, 1995, p. 236). This enabled researcher examination of multiple study aspects: procedures of distribution/collection, type of data values to expect, participant experience, and item comprehension (p. 238). Decisions were made to offer the survey in both Norwegian and English, to distribute a paper survey instead of an online version, and clarify item language. Next, the survey was translated into Norwegian by the authors, a 15-hour process reflecting the intricate nature of words and meanings (Pollard, 1992). A field test using the first 19 surveys was conducted to test reliability. The instrument was found to be internally consistent with Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha at .93 and with the item-to-overall correlations being all positive. According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), alpha coefficients of .70 or higher are considered acceptable.

5.3 Data Collection

Data were collected from September 2011 to May 2012. To adapt for cultural variables, the survey was explained and distributed in-person, both in English and Norwegian, at each school by either the first author or the Fulbright contact teacher. Survey dissemination varied from school to school, but fit the Norwegian system of local autonomy in decision making (The Directorate, 2009). At some schools, the school leader or head teacher translated the request for voluntary participation, at others, the contact teacher addressed the staff, and at others, only the languages department completed the survey. Clarification of no penalty for non-participants was given. At times the researcher formally addressed teachers within a planning meeting or simply through discussions during breaks. Some surveys were collected immediately after completion with the researcher present in the school, and others were returned via mail or email. In schools where this occurred, follow-up emails to contact teachers were sent out approximately three weeks post distribution. No incentives were provided for completion, but discussions were held about the opportunity to examine the potential criteria for teacher assessment. To ensure confidentiality, surveys were anonymous and coded; they were kept in a locked location and handled by only the researchers (Fink &Kosecoff, 1998). Participants were provided with the purpose and intention to use results for educational research.

5.4 Data Analysis

Analyses consisted of descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, standard deviation, variance, range and percentages), frequencies and correlations. The sample included 230 participants with missing values on individual survey items ranging from 0-17 (see Table 3). Missing data indicated a Likert selection was not made on a particular item; frequencies and percentages were calculated for a valid percent. Descriptive statistics were figured using computerized scoring software (i.e., SPSS) to summarize demographic information and to describe distributions and correlations across domains and items. Composite results and individual items were analyzed for disagreement (strongly disagree, disagree and slightly disagree) and agreement (slightly agree, agreed and strongly agree).

Statistics by demographic variables of gender, teaching experience, urban/rural setting, and school ownership were also analyzed. Possible relationships were examined between individual survey items and between domains. Parameters of significance of 0.05 were exceeded for Pearson tests, all significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

6. Results

6.1 Self-Appraised Effectiveness

Results offer an understanding of the first three research questions: (1) how effective do teachers in Norway view their teaching as self-appraised with Danielson's *Framework*, (2) which domains/components of quality teaching do teachers in Norway view as their strengths and challenges, and (3) does gender, teaching location in Norway, or years of experience impact how teachers rate their teaching. The last question concerning use of *the Framework* is addressed in the discussion. Results are displayed according to *Framework* domains in Table 2 and individual survey items in Table 3. Data yielded a composite mean of 4.60, a Likert response level between slightly agree-4 and agree-5. Overall, teachers predominately responded with slight agreement they could carry out *Framework* responsibilities. Composite frequencies by domains ranged significantly from 3.21 (Slightly Disagree) to 5.95 (Strongly Agree) with means ranging from 4.49 to 4.70 (see Table 2).

Table 2: Descriptives for Domains

Variable	M	SD	r
Domain 1 Planning and Preparation	4.57	.43	.91
Domain 2 Classroom Environment	4.70	.44	.84
Domain 3 Instruction	4.63	.47	.90
Domain 4 Professional Development	4.49	.50	.88

Teachers self-reported they slightly agree to carrying out professional responsibilities of teaching in all domains. No domain yielded as a particular area of strength or weakness. Table 3 displays composite survey results for all participants. In terms of valid percent, teachers most frequently indicated slight agreement on individual survey items.

	Survey Item	*N*	Missing Data	*N* Response % and Frequencies					
				Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Slightly Disagree 3	Slightly Agree 4	Agree 5	Strongly Agree 6
	Domain 1: Planning and Preparation								
1.	Demonstrate extensive knowledge of class content	229	0.0 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	2.2 (n = 5)	13.1 (n = 30)	69.0 (n = 158)	15.7 (n = 36)
2.	Know prerequisite relationships between topics and concepts	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	9.6 (n = 22)	71.3 (n = 164)	17.8 (n = 41)
3.	Familiarize myself with a wide range of pedagogical approaches	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	7.9 (n = 18)	42.3 (n = 96)	41.9 (n = 95)	7.0 (n = 16)
4.	Have knowledge of child and adolescent development	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	3.9 (n = 9)	21.7 (n = 50)	53.9 (n = 124)	20.4 (n = 47)
5.	Know the learning process	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	.4 (n = 1)	1.3 (n = 3)	26.6 (n = 61)	60.7 (n = 139)	10.9 (n = 25)
6.	Have knowledge of individual students' skills	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	4.3 (n = 10)	27.4 (n = 63)	56.1 (n = 129)	11.7 (n = 27)
7.	Understand how much individual students know	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	5.7 (n = 13)	33.0 (n = 76)	49.6 (n = 114)	11.3 (n = 26)
8.	Understand students' language proficiency	228	0.9 (n = 2)	0.4 (n = 1)	1.8 (n = 4)	11.0 (n = 25)	36.8 (n = 84)	42.1 (n = 96)	7.9 (n = 18)
9.	Have knowledge of students' interests	228	0.9 (n = 2)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.8 (n = 4)	7.9 (n = 18)	40.4 (n = 92)	43.9 (n = 100)	6.1 (n = 14)
10.	Have knowledge of students cultural heritage	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.7 (n = 4)	9.1 (n = 21)	40.4 (n = 93)	42.2 (n = 97)	6.5 (n = 15)
11.	Know of students' special needs	228	0.9 (n = 2)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	5.7 (n = 13)	34.2 (n = 78)	47.8 (n = 109)	12.3 (n = 28)
12.	Set high expectations for learning outcomes	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	0.9 (n = 2)	16.6 (n = 38)	65.9 (n = 151)	16.2 (n = 37)
13.	Order learning concepts logically	223	3.0 (n = 7)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	4.0 (n = 9)	28.3 (n = 63)	53.8 (n = 120)	13.9 (n = 31)
14.	Write clear outcomes	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	4.8 (n = 11)	30.9 (n = 71)	48.3 (n = 111)	16.1 (n = 37)
15.	Set outcomes for different types of learning (ex. factual/conceptual/social)	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	2.6 (n = 6)	10.0 (n = 23)	42.2 (n = 97)	35.7 (n = 82)	9.1 (n = 21)
16.	Plan outcomes that take into account diverse learners	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.4 (n = 1)	1.7 (n = 4)	10.0 (n = 23)	48.9 (n = 112)	34.5 (n = 79)	4.4 (n = 10)
17.	Know many resources for classroom use	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.7 (n = 4)	8.3 (n = 19)	38.7 (n = 89)	42.6 (n = 98)	8.7 (n = 20)
18.	Know resources for enhancing content knowledge	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.7 (n = 4)	7.8 (n = 18)	35.7 (n = 82)	45.2 (n = 104)	10.9 (n = 25)
19.	Know many resources for student use	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	14.8 (n = 34)	31.3 (n = 72)	39.6 (n = 91)	13.0 (n = 30)
20.	Design outcomes-based learning activities for diverse learners	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	11.5 (n = 26)	51.5 (n = 117)	32.2 (n = 73)	3.5 (n = 8)
21.	Select engaging instructional materials that support outcomes	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	7.1 (n = 16)	48.9 (n = 110)	38.2 (n = 86)	4.4 (n = 10)
22.	Vary student groups for different instructional outcomes	230	0.0 (n = 0)	4.3 (n = 10)	8.3 (n = 19)	18.7 (n = 43)	37.4 (n = 86)	26.1 (n = 60)	5.2 (n = 12)
23.	Design clear lesson plans	228	0.9 (n = 2)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	8.8 (n = 20)	32.5 (n = 74)	44.3 (n = 101)	13.6 (n = 31)
24.	Structure clear unit plans	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	12.2 (n = 28)	28.4 (n = 65)	45.9 (n = 105)	12.7 (n = 29)
25.	Design assessments consistent with instructional outcomes	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.4 (n = 1)	0.9 (n = 2)	6.6 (n = 3)	37.4 (n = 85)	41.0 (n = 93)	13.7 (n = 31)
26.	Set clear assessment criteria	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	7.0 (n = 16)	37.6 (n = 86)	43.7 (n = 100)	10.5 (n = 24)
27.	Use well-designed formative assessment	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.4 (n = 1)	0.4 (n = 1)	7.9 (n = 18)	38.9 (n = 89)	44.5 (n = 102)	7.9 (n = 18)
28.	Use assessment results to plan future instruction	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.7 (n = 4)	5.7 (n = 13)	44.5 (n = 102)	42.4 (n = 97)	5.7 (n = 13)

Domain 2: Classroom Environment

29.	Interact with students in a way that reflects respect	228	0.9 (n = 2)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	10.5 (n = 24)	52.6 (n = 120)	36.8 (n = 84)
30.	Have a classroom where students care for one another	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	4.9 (n = 11)	30.7 (n = 69)	47.1 (n = 106)	16.9 (n = 38)
31.	Convey the importance of content to students	230	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	13.9 (n = 32)	63.5 (n = 146)	22.2 (n = 51)
32.	Convey high expectations for all students	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	2.6 (n = 6)	21.8 (n = 50)	55.0 (n = 126)	20.5 (n = 47)
33.	Instill in students a sense of pride in work	229	0.4 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	4.4 (n =10)	33.6 (n = 77)	45.9 (n = 105)	16.2 (n = 37)
34.	Organize productive small group work	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	10.1 (n = 23)	48.0 (n = 109)	37.0 (n = 84)	3.5 (n = 8)
35.	Manage transitions efficiently	222	3.5 (n = 8)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.4 (n = 3)	4.5 (n = 10)	45.5 (n = 101)	44.6 (n = 99)	4.1 (n = 9)
36.	Mange materials and supplies well	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.4 (n = 1)	8.4 (n = 19)	18.1 (n = 41)	34.4 (n = 78)	32.2 (n = 73)	6.6 (n = 15)
37.	Manage non-instructional tasks (ex. taking attendance)	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.4 (n = 1)	3.5 (n = 8)	6.6 (n = 15)	26.1 (n = 59)	48.2 (n = 109)	15.0 (n = 34)
38.	Supervise classroom helpers (volunteers, paraeducators)	213	7.4 (n =17)	5.2 (n = 11)	11.7 (n = 25)	12.7 (n = 27)	30.5 (n = 65)	33.3 (n = 71)	6.6 (n = 14)
39.	Develop clear standards of student conduct	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	14.5 (n = 33)	50.2 (n = 114)	33.9 (n = 77)
40.	Prevent conduct problems by monitoring student behavior	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	1.3 (n = 3)	20.7 (n = 47)	59.9 (n = 136)	17.6 (n = 40)
41.	Respond to student misbehavior effectively	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	2.7 (n = 6)	19.0 (n = 43)	53.1 (n = 120)	25.2 (n = 57)
42.	Have a classroom that is safe for all students	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	3.1 (n = 7)	15.5 (n = 35)	58.4 (n = 132)	22.6 (n = 51)
43.	Ensure all learning is equally accessible to all students	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	12.0 (n = 27)	47.1 (n = 106)	34.2 (n = 77)	5.8 (n = 13)
44.	Organize the physical classroom space	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	2.2 (n = 5)	8.0 (n = 18)	36.4 (n = 82)	44.4 (n = 100)	8.9 (n = 20)

Domain 3: Instruction

45.	Make the purpose for learning clear	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	7.1 (n = 16)	34.5 (n = 78)	49.1 (n = 111)	8.8 (n = 20)
46.	Give clear directions	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	15.9 (n = 36)	61.7 (n = 140)	21.1 (n = 48)
47.	Explain content in ways that connect to students' knowledge	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	2.6 (n = 6)	26.4 (n = 60)	58.1 (n = 132)	12.3 (n =28)
48.	Speak properly (ex. Correct usage, vocabulary)	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	19.4 (n = 44)	57.3 (n = 130)	22.0 (n = 50)
49.	Write correctly using standard conventions	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.4 (n = 1)	0.9 (n = 2)	3.1 (n = 7)	13.7 (n = 31)	47.1 (n = 107)	34.8 (n = 79)
50.	Ask high quality questions	226	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	6.6 (n = 15)	38.5 (n = 87)	46.9 (n =106)	8.0 (n = 18)
51.	Use high quality discussion techniques	223	3.0 (n = 7)	0.4 (n = 1)	0.9 (n = 2)	9.4 (n = 21)	50.2 (n = 112)	33.6 (n = 75)	5.4 (n = 12)
52.	Ensure that all students participate in discussions	226	1.3 (n = 3)	0.4 (n = 1)	1.3 (n = 3)	18.6 (n = 42)	44.2 (n = 100)	27.4 (n = 62)	8.0 (n = 18)
53.	Make sure all students are engaged in content activities	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	7.6 (n = 17)	23.1 (n = 52)	56.9 (n = 128)	12.4 (n = 28)
54.	Create productive groups based on the lesson	223	3.0 (n = 7)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.8 (n = 4)	14.3 (n = 32)	49.3 (n = 110)	30.5 (n = 68)	4.0 (n = 9)
55.	Choose materials that fit the instructional purpose	223	3.0 (n = 7)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	5.4 (n = 12)	35.9 (n = 80)	48.4 (n = 108)	9.9 (n = 22)
56.	Pace lessons properly for all students	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	9.8 (n = 22)	49.3 (n = 111)	33.3 (n = 75)	7.6 (n = 17)
57.	Make students fully aware of assessment criteria	226	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	4.0 (n = 9)	33.2 (n = 75)	42.0 (n = 95)	19.9 (n = 45)
58.	Monitor student learning	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	4.4 (n = 10)	33.6 (n = 76)	50.0 (n = 113)	11.9 (n = 27)
59.	Give good feedback to students in a timely manner	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	3.1 (n = 7)	26.1 (n = 59)	53.5 (n = 121)	17.3 (n = 39)
60.	Allow for students to assess the quality of their own work	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	3.0 (n = 7)	17.2 (n = 39)	50.2 (n = 114)	23.8 (n = 54)	5.7 (n = 13)
61.	Allow students to monitor their own progress	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	4.4 (n = 10)	16.8 (n = 38)	50.4 (n = 114)	22.6 (n = 51)	5.8 (n = 13)
62.	Make adjustments to a lesson when needed	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	2.2 (n = 5)	24.3 (n = 55)	58.4 (n = 132)	15.0 (n = 34)
63.	Seize opportunities to enhance student learning	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.8 (n = 4)	31.6 (n = 71)	53.3 (n = 120)	13.3 (n = 30)
64.	Am persistent in seeking approaches for students who need help	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	8.4 (n = 19)	32.4 (n = 73)	46.2 (n = 104)	11.6 (n = 26)

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

65.	Reflect on lessons for effectiveness	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.9 (n = 2)	0.0 (n = 0)	4.0 (n = 9)	28.2 (n = 64)	50.7 (n = 115)	16.3 (n = 37)
66.	Reflect on teaching for use in future teaching	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	1.8 (n = 4)	19.1 (n = 43)	58.7 (n = 132)	20.0 (n = 45)
67.	Effectively monitor student completion of assignments	227	1.3 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	6.6 (n = 15)	38.8 (n =88)	45.8 (n = 104)	8.4 (n = 19)
68.	Have a good system for keeping information on student learning	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.4 (n = 1)	1.3 (n = 3)	5.8 (n = 13)	31.0 (n = 70)	46.9 (n = 106)	14.6 (n = 33)
69.	Maintaining information on non-instructional activities (ex. order forms)	218	5.2 (n =12)	1.8 (n = 4)	0.9 (n = 2)	12.8 (n = 28)	32.6 (n = 71)	40.4 (n = 88)	11.5 (n = 25)
70.	Provide frequent information to families about instruction	223	3.0 (n = 7)	1.8 (n = 4)	7.6 (n = 17)	27.4 (n = 61)	36.8 (n = 82)	23.3 (n = 52)	3.1 (n = 7)
71.	Provide frequent information to families on students' progress	222	3.5 (n = 8)	0.5 (n = 1)	0.9 (n = 2)	10.8 (n = 24)	34.7 (n = 77)	46.4 (n = 103)	6.8 (n = 15)
72.	Successfully engage families in instructional programs	220	4.3 (n =10)	2.2 (n = 5)	8.6 (n = 19)	31.4 (n = 69)	40.9 (n = 90)	15.5 (n = 34)	1.4 (n = 3)
73.	Have cooperative relationships with colleagues	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	10.2 (n = 23)	57.8 (n = 130)	31.1 (n = 70)
74.	Promote a culture of professional inquiry	222	3.5 (n = 8)	0.5 (n = 1)	1.8 (n = 4)	10.8 (n = 24)	37.8 (n = 84)	39.6 (n = 88)	9.5 (n = 21)
75.	Make a substantial contribution of service to the school	217	5.7 (n =13)	8.3 (n = 18)	12.0 (n = 26)	21.7 (n = 47)	26.3 (n = 57)	22.6 (n = 49)	9.2 (n = 20)
76.	Volunteer to participate in school projects	221	3.9 (n = 9)	2.3 (n = 5)	10.0 (n = 22)	21.7 (n = 48)	34.4 (n = 76)	23.5 (n = 52)	8.1 (n = 18)
77.	Seek out opportunities to enhance knowledge about teaching	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	1.3 (n = 3)	12.4 (n = 28)	40.0 (n = 90)	33.3 (n = 75)	12.9 (n = 29)
78.	Am receptive to feedback from colleagues	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.4 (n =1)	6.7 (n = 15)	16.0 (n = 36)	40.9 (n = 92)	27.1 (n = 61)	8.9 (n = 20)
79.	Contribute to the teaching profession (research, supervise future teachers)	222	3.5 (n = 8)	8.6 (n = 19)	12.6 (n = 28)	23.9 (n = 53)	24.8 (n = 55)	21.6 (n = 48)	8.6 (n = 19)
80.	Demonstrate ethical conduct (ex. honesty, integrity)	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	4.9 (n = 11)	50.4 (n = 114)	43.8 (n = 99)
81.	Am alert to the needs of students	226	1.7 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.9 (n = 2)	14.6 (n = 33)	64.6 (n = 146)	19.9 (n = 45)
82.	Challenge negative practices to ensure all students are honored	218	5.2 (n =12)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	5.5 (n = 12)	33.0 (n = 72)	46.8 (n =102)	14.7 (n = 32)
83.	Make decisions based on high professional standards	223	3.0 (n = 7)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	2.2 (n = 5)	22.4 (n = 50)	61.4 (n = 137)	13.5 (n = 30)
84.	Fully comply with school regulations	225	2.2 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.4 (n = 1)	4.0 (n = 9)	21.3 (n = 48)	50.7 (n = 114)	23.6 (n = 53)

Slight disagreement occurred occasionally, but rarely was disagree or strongly disagree chosen. Domain 2: Classroom Environment had the overall highest levels of agreement, and items with the highest level of disagreement occurred in Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities.

6.1.1 Domain 1: planning and preparation.

In the Domain 1, approximately 75% of teachers slightly agreed to carrying out teaching responsibilities of planning and preparation, that is: demonstrating knowledge of content, pedagogy, students, and resources; setting instructional outcomes; and designing instruction and assessments (see Table 4). Approximately 16% of teachers agreed to the ability to execute effectiveness in this domain. The remaining teachers (8%) slightly disagreed.

Table 4: Domain 1 Planning and Preparation: Cumulative Percent

Variable	Slightly Disagree 3 (%)	Slightly Agree 4 (%)	Agree 5 (%)
Composite (n = 230)	8.3 (n = 19)	75.6 (n = 191)	16.1 (n = 20)
Gender			
Male (n = 69)	10.1 (n = 7)	72.5 (n = 50)	17.4 (n = 12)
Female (n = 158)	7.6 (n = 12)	76.6 (n = 121)	15.8 (n = 25)
Teaching Experience			
0-2 years (n=18)	16.7 (n = 3)	77.7 (n = 14)	5.6 (n = 1)
3-6 years (n = 37)	13.5 (n = 5)	81.1 (n = 30)	5.4 (n = 2)
7-10 years (n = 30)	10.0 (n = 3)	66.7 (n = 20)	23.3 (n = 7)
11-15 years (n = 58)	1.7 (n = 1)	72.4 (n = 42)	25.9 (n = 15)
16 or more years (n = 83)	7.2 (n = 6)	79.5 (n = 66)	13.3 (n = 11)
Setting			
Urban (n = 153)	8.5 (n = 13)	72.5 (n = 111)	19.0 (n = 29)
Rural (n = 77)	7.8 (n = 6)	81.8 (n = 63)	10.4 (n = 8)
Ownership			
Public (n = 204)	7.8 (n = 16)	77.5 (n = 158)	14.7 (n = 30)
Private (n = 26)	11.5 (n = 3)	61.6 (n =16)	26.9 (n = 7)

Note: No cumulative percent for (n = 230) occurred in the strongly disagree (1), disagree (2) or strongly agree (6) categories.

Both females and males responded with approximately 75% slight agreement. No significant difference in performance levels for new and experienced teachers was found, consistent with results for the larger domain. The more experience a teacher possessed the more agreement was indicated, with the exception being teachers with 16 or more years of experience. In this demographic area 7.2% of teachers slightly disagreed compared with 1.7% of teachers with 11-15 years of experience, which is more than teachers in all other experience categories (0-15 years). Teachers in urban settings self-appraised with approximately equal levels of agreement as rural teachers. Public teachers responded similarly to those in private settings.

Disaggregation of individual survey items in this domain suggests teachers most strongly agree to demonstrating knowledge of student development (20.4%) and of content and prerequisite relationship between topics and concepts (17.8%). Comparatively, some teachers responded they do not execute the following skills: vary student groups for different instructional outcomes (31.3%), know many sources for student use (16.1%), understand student's language proficiency (13.2%) and structure clear unit plans (13.2%).

6.1.2. Domain 2: classroom environment.

In Domain 2 a teacher sets the stage for learning. Approximately 75% evaluated themselves with slight agreement in building a classroom environment that promotes learning (see Table 5). No significant difference in agreement of performing responsibilities for new and experienced nor male versus female teachers was found.

Urban teachers had a slightly higher level of agreement than rural teachers (9% difference) yet the majority of both urban (95.4%) and rural (96.1%) teachers indicated agreement. There was no significant difference in ratings for schools in public or private settings.

Table 5: Domain 2 Classroom Environment: Cumulative Percent

Variable	Slightly Disagree 3 (%)	Slightly Agree 4 (%)	Agree 5 (%)	Strongly Agree 6 (%)
Composite (n = 230)	4.3 (n = 10)	74.8 (n = 162)	20.9 (n = 58)	0.0 (n = 0)
Gender				
Male (n = 69)	7.2 (n = 5)	71.1 (n = 49)	21.7 (n = 15)	0.0 (n = 0)
Female (n = 158)	3.2 (n = 5)	70.2 (n = 111)	26.0 (n = 41)	0.6 (n = 1)
Teaching Experience				
0-2 years (n = 18)	11.1 (n = 2)	77.8 (n = 14)	11.1 (n = 2)	0.0 (n = 0)
3-6 years (n = 37)	8.1 (n = 3)	78.4 (n = 29)	13.5 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)
7-10 years (n = 30)	3.3 (n = 1)	56.7 (n = 17)	36.7 (n = 11)	3.3 (n = 1)
11-15 years (n = 58)	1.7 (n = 1)	60.4 (n = 35)	37.9 (n = 22)	0.0 (n = 0)
16 or more years (n = 83)	3.6 (n = 3)	75.9 (n = 63)	20.5 (n = 17)	0.0 (n = 0)
Setting				
Urban (n = 153)	4.6 (n = 7)	66.0 (n = 101)	28.7 (n= 44)	0.7 (n = 1)
Rural (n = 77)	3.9 (n = 3)	79.2 (n = 61)	16.9 (n = 13)	0.0 (n = 0)
Ownership				
Public (n = 204)	3.9 (n = 8)	71.6 (n = 146)	24.0 (n = 49)	0.5 (n = 1)
Private (n = 26)	7.7 (n = 2)	61.5 (n = 16)	30.8 (n = 8)	0.0 (n = 0)

Note: No cumulative percent for (n = 230) occurred in the strongly disagree (1) or disagree (2) categories.

Within this domain, data suggests teachers demonstrated particular skills at a higher level of performance. They indicated agreement in creating an environment of respect and rapport such as interacting with students in a way that reflects respect and developing clear standards of student conduct. However, many teachers disagreed to multiple elements of managing classroom procedures: supervising classroom helpers (26.9%), managing materials and supplies well (12.9%), and organizing small group work (11.4%). Some teachers (12.9%) also disagreed to ensuring all learning within the physical space is accessible to all students.

6.1.3. Domain 3: instruction.

Danielson (2007) considered Instruction to be at the "heart of the framework" (p. 77). This domain is where teachers indicated 73.6% agreement (see Table 6).

Table 6: Domain 3 Instruction: Cumulative Percent

Variable	Slightly Disagree 3 (%)	Slightly Agree 4 (%)	Agree 5 (%)	Strongly Agree 6 (%)
Composite	7.5 (n = 17)	73.6 (n = 170)	18.9 (n = 43)	0.0 (n = 0)
Gender				
Male (n = 69)	5.8 (n = 4)	76.8 (n = 53)	17.4 (n = 12)	0.0 (n = 0)
Female (n = 155)	8.4 (n = 13)	71.6 (n = 111)	19.4 (n = 30)	0.6 (n = 1)
Teaching Experience				
0-2 years (n = 17)	5.9 (n = 1)	76.5 (n = 13)	17.6 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)
3-6 years (n = 37)	18.9 (n = 7)	73 (n = 27)	5.4 (n = 2)	2.7 (n = 1)
7-10 years (n = 30)	13.3 (n = 4)	60 (n = 18)	26.7 (n = 8)	0.0 (n = 0)
11-15 years (n = 57)	7 (n = 4)	64.9 (n = 37)	28.1 (n = 16)	0.0 (n = 0)
16 or more years (n = 82)	1.2 (n = 1)	82.9 (n = 68)	15.9 (n = 13)	0.0 (n = 0)
Setting				
Urban (n = 152)	5.9 (n = 9)	71.1 (n = 108)	22.3 (n = 34)	0.7 (n = 1)
Rural (n = 75)	10.7 (n = 8)	78.6 (n = 59)	10.7 (n = 8)	0.0 (n = 0)
Ownership				
Public (n = 202)	7.4 (n = 15)	75.3 (n = 152)	16.8 (n = 34)	0.5 (n = 1)
Private (n = 25)	8.0 (n = 2)	60.0 (n = 15)	32.0 (n = 8)	0.0 (n = 0)

Note: No cumulative percent for (n = 230) occurred in the strongly disagree (1) or disagree (2) categories.

The percentage of females and males indicating agreement is approximately equal. Of teachers in their first years on the job (0-2), only 5.9% indicated they did not display qualities of good instruction, while teachers with 3-6 years experience indicated slight disagreement (18.9%) and those with 7-10 years 13.3%. Urban teachers self-appraised similarly to rural teachers with rural teachers significant distribution in the slightly agree rating. Further, private school teachers (32%) indicated higher agreement than public (16.8%), yet the majority of both groups slightly agreed to demonstrating skills of quality teaching with only 7.4% of public school teachers and 8% of private signifying any disagreement.

Data infers teachers were more confident in their abilities to communicate with students, particularly in their own oral and written language proficiency. However, some teachers disagreed to using good questioning & discussion techniques such as ensuring all students participate in discussions. They also disagreed to engaging students in the learning process through self-assessment of work quality (20.2%) and monitoring their own progress (21.2%).

6.1.4. Domain 4: professional responsibilities.

Teachers slightly agreed (71.8%) that they met the professional responsibilities of teaching (see Table 7). However, a significant percent of teachers in particular demographic areas stated disagreement in carrying out professional responsibilities, which makes Professional Responsibilities the domain with most disagreement or "minimal competency" (Danielson, 2007, p. 40).

Table 7: Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities: Cumulative Percent

Variable	Disagree 2 (%)	Slightly Disagree 3 (%)	Slightly Agree 4 (%)	Agree 5 (%)
Composite (n = 230)	0.4 (n = 1)	11.4 (n = 24)	71.8 (n = 167)	16.4 (n = 38)
Gender				
Male (n = 69)	0.0 (n = 0)	13.0 (n = 9)	69.6 (n = 48)	17.4 (n = 12)
Female (n = 155)	0.6 (n =1)	9.7 (n = 15)	72.9 (n = 113)	16.8 (n = 26)
Teaching Experience				
0-2 years (n = 17)	0.0 (n = 0)	23.5 (n = 4)	58.9 (n = 10)	17.6 (n = 3)
3-6 years (n = 37)	0.0 (n = 0)	18.9 (n = 7)	78.4 (n = 29)	2.7 (n = 1)
7-10 years (n = 30)	3.3 (n = 1)	10.0 (n = 3)	56.7 (n = 17)	30.0 (n = 9)
11-15 years (n = 57)	7.0 (n = 4)	66.7 (n = 38)	26.3 (n = 15)	0.0 (n = 0)
16 or more years (n = 82)	8.5 (n = 7)	79.3 (n = 65)	12.2 (n = 10)	0.0 (n = 0)
Setting				
Urban (n = 152)	6.6 (n = 10)	71.7 (n = 109)	21.7 (n = 33)	0.0 (n = 0)
Rural (n = 75)	1.3 (n = 1)	92.0 (n = 69)	6.7 (n = 5)	0.0 (n = 0)
Ownership				
Public (n = 202)	0.5 (n = 1)	11.9 (n = 24)	72.7 (n = 147)	14.9 (n = 30)
Private (n = 25)	4.0 (n = 1)	64.0 (n = 16)	32.0 (n = 8)	0.0 (n = 0)

Note: No cumulative percent for (n = 230) occurred in the strongly disagree (1) or strongly agree (6) categories.

There was no difference in this domain between responses for males and females. Interestingly, teachers indicated they exhibit less professional responsibility with more years of experience. Teachers with 3-6 years indicated the highest level of agreement (81.1%) while teachers with 16 or more years rated themselves with only 12.2% agreement. Both urban (71.7%) and rural (92%) teachers rated overall disagreement. The majority of public school teachers (87.6%) indicated they carry out professional responsibilities whereas the majority of private school teachers disagreed (68%).

Within this domain, desegregated data yielded items of particularly high levels of agreement and disagreement. Teachers agreed to reflecting on teaching and maintaining accurate records. Almost all respondents agreed to demonstrating professionalism, particularly ethical conduct (99.1%). And while they report having cooperative relationships with colleagues (99.1%), all other aspects of participating in a professional community were marked with high levels of disagreement. In addition, communicating with families was an area of disagreement. Approximately 42% did not disagree they successfully engage families in instructional programs, nor do they provide frequent communication to families (36.8%).

6.2 Strengths and Challenges

In regard to strengths on individual items, participants agreed to displaying particular behaviors of quality teaching. The five highest items for each domain are displayed in Table 8. Data suggests teachers self-appraised as competent at these components.

Table 8: Strengths: Five Questions with Highest Level of Agreement Arranged by Domain

Domain	Agree (%)		Survey Item
Domain 1	98.7	Q2.	Know prerequisite relationships between topics and concepts
Planning and Preparation	98.7	Q12.	Set high expectations for learning outcomes
	98.3	Q5.	Know the learning process
	97.8	Q1.	Demonstrate extensive knowledge of class content
	96.1	Q4.	Have knowledge of child and adolescent development
Domain 2	99.9	Q29.	Interact with students in a way that reflects respect
Classroom Environment	99.6	Q31.	Convey the importance of content to students
	98.6	Q39.	Develop clear standards of student conduct
	98.2	Q40.	Prevent conduct problems by monitoring student behavior
	97.3	Q32.	Convey high expectations for all students
	97.3	Q41.	Respond to student misbehavior effectively
Domain 3	98.7	Q46.	Give clear directions
Instruction	98.7	Q48.	Speak properly
	98.2	Q63.	Seize opportunities to enhance student learning
	97.7	Q62.	Make adjustments to a lesson when needed
	96.9	Q59.	Give good feedback to students in a timely manner
Domain 4	99.1	Q73.	Have cooperative relationships with colleagues
Professional Responsibilities	99.1	Q80.	Demonstrate ethical conduct
	99.1	Q81.	Am alert to the needs of students
	97.8	Q66.	Reflect on teaching for use in future teaching
	97.1	Q83.	Make decisions based on high professional standards

Note: Agreement indicates a combined percentage of Likert responses of Slightly Agree (4), Agree (5) and Strongly Agree (6).

Results also indicated teachers self-evaluated as disagreeing to certain quality teaching behaviors, an indicator of below the teacher licensing standard "of do no harm," an occurrence that requires priority attention and intervention (Danielson 2007, p. 39). Data revealed disagreement within each of the domains; the five items with highest disagreement are included in Table 9.

Table 9: Challenges: Five Items of Highest Disagreement Arranged by Domain

Domain	Disagreement (%)		Survey Item
Domain 1	31.3	Q22.	Vary student groups for different instructional outcomes
Planning and Preparation	16.1	Q19.	Know many resources for student use
	13.2	Q8.	Understand students' language proficiency
	13.1	Q24.	Structure clear unit plans
	13.0	Q15.	Set outcomes for different types of learning
Domain 2	29.6	Q38.	Supervise classroom helpers
Classroom Environment	26.9	Q36.	Mange materials and supplies well
	12.9	Q43.	Ensure all learning is equally accessible to all students
	11.4	Q34.	Organize productive small group work
	10.5	Q37.	Manage non-instructional tasks
Domain 3	21.2	Q61.	Allow students to monitor their own progress
Instruction	20.3	Q52.	Ensure that all students participate in discussions
	20.2	Q60.	Allow for students to assess the quality of their own work
	16.1	Q54.	Create productive groups based on the lesson
	10.7	Q51.	Use high quality discussion techniques
Domain 4	45.1	Q79.	Contribute to the teaching profession
Professional	42.2	Q72.	Successfully engage families in instructional programs
Responsibilities	42.0	Q75.	Make a substantial contribution of service to the school
	36.8	Q70.	Provide frequent information to families about instruction
	34.0	Q76.	Volunteer to participate in school projects

Note: Disagreement indicates a combined percentage of Likert responses of Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2) and Slightly Disagree (3).

6.3. Correlations and Variance

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationships between domains and between individual items. All data displayed in Table 10 illustrate direct, positive relationships. There is a statistically significant positive relationship between Domain 1: Preparation and Planning and Domains 2: Classroom Environment $r(225) = .703$, $p < .001$, Domain 3 $r(225) = .746$, $p < .001$, and with Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities $r(225) = .656$, $p < .001$. This same pattern of significant, positive relationships occurred among domains.

Table 10: Domain and Individual Survey Item Correlations

Variables		Pearson Coefficient	*p*
Domain 1 and 2		.703	.000
Domain 1 and 3		.746	.000
Domain 1 and 4		.656	.000
Domain 2 and 3		.750	.000
Domain 2 and 4		.700	.000
Domain 3 and 4		.745	.000
Q1	Q2	.596	.000
Q4	Q5	.567	.000
Q6	Q7	.630	.000
Q9	Q10	.572	.000
Q16	Q20	.514	.000
Q20	Q21	.525	.000
Q14	Q45	.544	.000
Q25	Q26	.566	.000
Q26	Q27	.508	.000
Q32	Q33	.531	.000
Q33	Q34	.504	.000
Q37	Q69	.526	.000
Q39	Q41	.530	.000
Q40	Q41	.583	.000
Q54	Q34	.535	.000
Q50	Q51	.641	.000
Q52	Q53	.527	.000
Q57	Q26	.644	.000
Q58	Q59	.516	.000
Q60	Q61	.772	.000
Q62	Q63	.598	.000
Q65	Q66	.710	.000
Q70	Q72	.540	.000
Q71	Q72	.579	.000
Q75	Q76	.680	.000
Q74	Q78	.544	.000

Note: Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

A statistically significant positive relationship was found between Q60, allow for students to assess the quality of their own work and Q61, allow student to monitor their own progress, $r(225) = .772$, $p < .001$. These two survey items are actually one *Framework* element but were separate during instrumentation as individual items. Teachers had a significant percent of disagree on both items (Q60 20.2%; Q61 21.2%). Similarly, there was a statistically significant positive relationship between Q65, reflect on lessons for effectiveness and Q66, reflect on teaching for use in future teaching $r(225) = .710$, $p < .001$. These two items both relate to professional reflection.

Results indicated relationships between three sets of survey items. The first, Q6, have knowledge of individual student's skills and Q7, understand how much individual students know, $r(225) = .630$, $p < .001$, are survey constructs under the element "knowledge of students' skills [Q6], knowledge [Q7] and language proficiency [Q8]" (see Figure 1). There was a positive relationship between Q6 and Q8, understand student skills and language proficiency, $r(225) = .389$, $p < .001$, and between Q7 and Q8 $r(225) = .463$, $p < .001$, understand how much individual students know and language proficiency.

A similar relationship is evident between Q50, ask high quality questions and Q51, use high quality discussion techniques $r(225) = .641$, $p < .001$. These were individual survey constructs and individual *Framework* elements under Domain 3: Instruction, Component 3b, using questioning and discussion techniques (Danielson, 2007, p. 82). This same relationship was found concerning Q75 and Q76, $r(225) = .680$, $p < .001$. Likewise, these were individual survey constructs and individual *Framework* elements (Domain 4, Component 4d). Further positive relationships, with smaller coefficients, exist between numerous single items and are detailed in Table 10. The correlations are consistent with *Framework* design and reflective of overall responses of slightly agree. Additionally, five circumstances occurred when an item had a positive correlation with multiple survey items.

Table 11: Survey Item Correlations

Survey Item	*M* Level	Correlated Item	*M* Level	Coefficient $p < .001$
Q20. Design outcomes-based learning activities for diverse learners	4.25 Slightly Agree	Q16. Plan outcomes that take into account diverse learners	4.28 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .514$
		Q21. Select engaging instructional materials that support outcomes	4.37 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .525$
Q26. Set clear assessment criteria	4.55 Slightly Agree	Q25. Design assessments consistent with instructional outcomes	4.59 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .566$
		Q27.Use well-designed formative assessments	4.50 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .508$
		Q57. Make students fully aware of assessment criteria	4.76 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .644$
Q33. Instill in students a sense of pride in work	4.74 Slightly Agree	Q32. Convey high expectations for all students	4.93 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .531$
		Q34. Organize productive small group work	4.31 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .504$
Q41. Respond to student misbehavior effectively	5.01 Agree	Q39. Develop clear standards of student conduct	5.17 Agree	$r(225) = .530$
		Q40. Prevent conduct problems by monitoring student behavior	4.93 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .583$
Q72. Successfully engage families in instructional programs	3.63 Slightly Disagree	Q70. Provide frequent information to families about instruction	3.82 Slightly Disagree	$r(225) = .540$
		Q71. Provide frequent information to families on student's progress	4.46 Slightly Agree	$r(225) = .579$

Data displayed in Table 11 suggests teachers who slightly agreed they could design learning outcomes also rated their skills at considering diverse learners in the planning and selecting engaging materials to meet outcomes as a slight agreement. It was also found that teachers who slightly agreed to setting clear assessment criteria also slightly agreed to designing assessments consistent with instructional outcomes, using well-designed formative assessments and making students fully aware of assessment criteria. These items encompass *Framework* components of designing student assessments and using assessment in instruction.

According to the next correlation, a teacher who slightly agrees to instilling pride in work is one who also agrees conveying high expectations and organizing group work so it is productive. The data also suggests that a teacher who agrees to respond to student misbehavior effectively also agrees to developing clear standards and slightly agrees to preventing conduct problems. Finally, the correlation of question 72 with 70 and 71 suggests teachers who slightly disagree to engaging families in instructional programs also slightly disagree to giving families information about instruction, but slightly agree they provide information about student progress.

7. Discussion

This study investigated information about teacher quality in Norway through self-appraisal. The sample was collected only from schools in Norway visited through the Fulbright Roving Scholar program and from teachers willing to complete it. The instrument was a self-appraisal tool which is subjective to respondents' motivation, honesty, memory, etc., but instrument clarity was gained using an evidence-based measurement tool (i.e., Danielson's 2007*Framework)*. After an extensive review of literature, it appears to be the first study that documents teacher effectiveness in Norway using established criteria of teaching quality.

7.1 Self-Appraised Effectiveness

Findings answer the research question of how effective teachers in Norway view their teaching. Overall, 230 teachers noted they more than "slightly agreed" *but* not "agreed" their teaching performance was effective. In each *Framework* domain, teachers indicated slight agreement (see Table 2 and Table 3) to carrying out multiple aspects of professional practice, particularly considering years of teaching experience. The participant profile documented 75% of teachers surveyed had seven or more years of experience and only slightly agreed they meet standards of quality teaching. Experienced teaching professionals who only slightly agreed they perform quality work is a concern. This is consistent with a "disturbing finding" from The Directorate (2009) that substandard work is tolerated (p. 92) in Norwegian schools coupled with the decline of student test scores (Christopersen, Elstad, & Turmo, 2010, p. 413).

To explain why a participant group of mostly experienced teachers only slightly agree, assumptions about Danielson's (2007) *Framework* and organization of Norwegian schools are important to consider. *Experience* and *expertise*, Danielson (2007) explained, are not equivalent. Expertise involves automaticity of patterns and routines so conscious attention can be paid to other matters, such as finding/interpreting exceptionalities in classroom observations instead of describing literal actions (p. 38). These require experience to gain, but also mindful effort. As the OECD recognized, maturity and on-the job learning increase experience and can be beneficial, but experience can also create problems: inaction, lack of innovation and resistance to change (OECD, 2009, p. 30). The structure of primary and lower secondary schools in Norway tends to prevent acquiring expertise as educators teach multiple subjects, specialization does not occur until the upper secondary level (grade 11), and teachers often follow students through grade levels requiring new curricula in each subject every year.

7.2 Sources of Strength and Challenges

Survey items did illuminate strengths for teachers in Norway (see Table 8). Participants reported strength in demonstrating ethical conduct (Q73), and indeed, the OECD found that Norwegian teachers are perceived as trusted professionals (Nusche et al., 2011, p.77). They conduct themselves with intellectual honesty and in ways consistent with the moral code (Danielson, 2007, p. 106). Another strength was interacting respectfully with students (Q29). In terms of quality, this is an essential component teachers in Norway perform well. Without these respectful relationships, exercise of instructional skills would be hindered. As Danielson (2007) specified, teaching depends, fundamentally, on the quality of relationships among individuals (p. 64). A majority of participants also reported cooperative relationships with colleagues (Q80). This is commensurate with The Directorate's findings which indicated "Norwegian teachers cooperate with each other to a relatively great extent" (2009, p. 92).

However, cooperation was qualified as practical coordination of tasks-the academic work of instruction and assessment is carried out individually, and discussions about challenges and improving teaching practices have been relatively rare (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 81). Carlgren and Klette (2008) acknowledged educational restructuring has required teachers to become more collaborative in curriculum planning, mentoring, and group decision-making. The intent with which individual teachers reported performance for this study is unknown, but information from these sources is important to consider.

Teachers also reported high performance in understanding child development (Q4), setting clear standards of student conduct (Q39), preventing conduct problems (Q40) and effectively responding to misbehavior (Q41). There was a positive correlation among these three items. These findings resonate with statements from The Directorate about school leaders emphasizing classroom management, discipline, conduct and positive relationships (2009, p. 92). It appears there is a possible connection between focus from school leaders on an improvement initiative and higher agreement in teacher self-appraisal. The OECD has recognized that in order for teacher appraisal to be effective, school leaders need training. The Directorate established particular skills/attitudes a leader should master for appraisal and guiding practices: setting goals for teaching work, setting and enforcing standards for quality work, giving feedback to individuals, creating pride, aspirations and a desire to achieve results, challenging teachers, and setting definite demands on quality (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 78). A focus on pedagogical practices by school leaders may lead to higher performance in certain *Framework* items.

Teachers also reported low performance on certain items (see Table 9), particularly in Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities, which focuses on making a substantial contribution to the school and profession. Contributions to the school include volunteering to participate in school events or assuming leadership roles in school projects, while contributions to the profession may be classroom research, conference presentations, supervising pre-service teachers, study groups, or writing articles for publication (Danielson, 2007, p. 104). If teachers do not assume duties that allow the school to operate smoothly and advance the profession, this would be reflected in the overall school quality. These additional professional duties may or may not be compensated according to time in the U.S. system to which the *Framework* was created. In the Norwegian system, there are generally provisions for certain extra tasks and responsibilities (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 76). One such task possibly considered "extra" is supervising volunteers and teacher assistants. Respondents reported relatively high levels of disagreement in their ability to supervise class helpers, but even though not all teachers have classroom helpers, helpers do need guidance and supervision to contribute to the classroom (Danielson, 2007, p. 71). A teacher will need skills in components of effective teaching, such as planning and arranging student groups, in order to make helpers useful. Additional adults in the classroom can be beneficial in flexible grouping for adapted teaching, but 31.3% of respondents reported they disagree to varying student groups for different instructional outcomes (Q22). In a policy review, Haugen (2010) found that Norwegian guidelines on equity favor a more equalized educational system where diversity may "lose." Conclusions suggest this lack of differentiated teaching may cause educational failure (p. 374). These areas self-rated with disagreement may be where teachers in Norway can, as Carlgren and Klette (2008) identified, "Extend their role as professionals and assume more responsibility beyond the classroom doors" (p. 117).

It has been recognized when families are involved in the educational process, student outcomes are improved. Numerous teachers disagreed to exhibiting *Framework* Component 4c, communicating with families (Q70, Q71, & Q72). In fact, almost half of all respondents indicated disagreement. The Directorate has recognized aspects of family background (e.g., immigrants, education, income, marital status) are correlated with lower student achievement (2011, p. 72; 2012, p. 46). According to Bæck (2010), parents in Norway have not traditionally been very involved in schools because home and school have been regarded as separate arenas (p. 549). However, Norwegian authorities have worked to have parents be more prominent in the learning process. While results of this study indicated involvement with families was low, the OECD noted there are good levels of trust between parents and teachers (Nusche et al., p. 77), a necessary platform for collaboration. Improvements in this area could serve to increase student outcomes.

Through the data analysis process, one unexpected finding emerged. According to the research conducted by the Nordic Institute for Education and Research, of 23 OECD countries surveyed, Norwegian teachers reported the highest level of confidence in their teaching (i.e., self-efficacy) (Vibe, Evensen, & Hovdhaugen, 2009).

In fact, Norwegian teachers reported their capability to accomplish a given level of performance almost twice as high as other OECD countries and nearly three times as high as any other European country (The Directorate, 2009, p. 92). The OECD (2009) reported self-efficacy of influence to work-related behavior, including performance (p. 111). Consequently, quality performance would be expected from Norwegian teachers. Teachers in this study only slightly agreed to meeting teacher quality criteria (see Figure 1). If non-responders or different schools had participated in the survey, results may have varied, or those who chose to respond may be different from those who did not respond. Given the traditional ambiguity of appraisal criteria in Norway, it is interesting that results from evidence-based criteria of teaching and prior reports on self-efficacy are contradictory.

7.3 Potential Framework Use in Norway

The results of this survey do reflect favorable use of The Framework for Teaching aimed at appraisal in Norway. This is particularly accurate in regard to meeting OECD teacher appraisal policy recommendations (Nusche et al., 2011): (a) develop standards to guide teacher appraisal and professional development, (b) strengthen appraisal for improvement purposes, (c) strengthen the role of educational leadership, (d) create a common career structure linked to a more formal appraisal process at key stages of the career, and (e) ensure appropriate articulation between appraisal and school evaluation (p. 85).

Foremost, *the Framework* meets requirements for appraisal set forth by both OECD and The Directorate: longitudinal, predictable and organized (2009, p. 95). Intended use of *The Framework* is throughout the career-span: organizing teacher education courses, observing experienced teachers, supervising student teachers, recruiting/hiring, mentoring, peer coaching, supervising/evaluating, ensuring high-quality teaching, and promoting professional learning (Danielson, 2007). *The Framework* uses standard criteria organized and displayed on a rubric with example indicators of performance provided (see Figure 1). The intention of *the Framework* is manifold: (a) to prepare new teachers, (b) provide interview questions for hiring, (c) serve as a road map for novices, (d) guide experienced professionals, (e) focus improvement efforts, and (f) communicate to the general public what is good teaching (pp. 11-12). It works to advance the quality of teaching through identification of strengths and weaknesses and setting goals for professional growth and better student outcomes (Danielson, 2010). By including rubrics and indicators for critical attributes, Danielson's latest *Framework* update, the evaluation instrument (2011), provides additional aids for more accurate observer measures.

The OECD (2009) also acknowledged the need for neutral, continuous, experienced-based, proficiency building for teachers; *the Framework* could adequately serve that purpose. The usefulness of professional standards depends largely on usage to regulate and support the work of teachers (Watson, 2005). The Norwegian Quality Assessment System (NKVS) requires individual teacher development be linked to school-wide improvement efforts. To this end, *Framework* structures coincide. Nevertheless, *the Framework* is not the only appraisal system from which Norway can seek reference. Another prominent model is Marzano's (2007) *Art and Science of Teaching*. Additionally, The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, an American resource center based in Washington, D.C., provides details and descriptions of policies in various U.S. states and more than 75 evaluation tools (www.tqsource.org). Whichever arrangement of teacher appraisal is used, it must be systematic (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 82).

The Framework itself has been widely used throughout the United States (Milanowski, 2011), and other countries have adjusted it to their own necessities. Danielson (2007) has espoused the *Framework* be modified to fit local contexts, and each country has done this to varying effects. Some programs are heavily based on *the Framework*, such as Chile's national teacher evaluations, whose four domains and 20 criteria are quite similar (Avalos & Assael, 2006). In England, *the Framework* was adapted to create the Professional Standards for Teachers, which is used to assess teachers at different stages of professional expertise. It uses qualitatively different standards that more accurately reflect "the characteristics of teachers at each career stage" (Training and Development Agency for Schools [TDA], 2007, p. 2). Similarly, Ontario, Canada, has implemented different appraisal systems for new and experienced teachers containing many of Danielson's (2007) components (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010). Portugal has considered integrating *the Framework* into current models to improve failures. In a recent review of Portugal's teacher evaluation system for appraisal, Santiago, Roseveare, van Amelsvoort, Manzi, and Matthews (2009) suggested Portugal's model overlapped well with most *Framework* components, but needed articulation and specific criteria to measure teacher performances, to which the 2011 *Framework* update addressed.

Another important distinction is *how* each country uses the results of teacher evaluations. As Santiago and Benavides (2009) pointed out, results can be used *formatively*, providing information to aid in planning improvements for teachers and schools. Results can also be used *summatively* to inform career advancement, tenure or termination decisions, or rewards. Most countries use it for these purposes, but emphasis seems to be centered on professional development and promotion purposes (Avalos & Assael, 2006; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010; Santiago et al., 2009; TDA, 2007). Conceptions for teacher evaluation and creating new systems can be examined beyond the scope of Danielson's (2007) *Framework*. In Australia each state uses different standards, but all are aligned with national standards (Marshall, Cole, & Zbar, 2012). Similarly, a majority of U.S. states are in the process of setting their own teacher evaluation procedures as a requirement of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act flexibility proviso (North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, 2012). In Finland and Japan, extensive principal-teacher conversations about student progress are encouraged, and teachers from Singapore are evaluated annually by several people on multiple measures (instruction, results, collaboration and contribution to the school) (Stewart, 2010, p. 19). Korea has also implemented national teacher evaluation built on multiple evaluations by multiple evaluators (three peers, principal, and parent and student surveys) (Seo, 2012, p. 75). These examples add to the conversation about possible implementation of *the Framework* and creating a nationalized Norwegian teacher appraisal system for inclusion in the NKVS.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Research

Future research directions could include expanding appraisal using standard criteria to consider multiple raters, such as supervisors and peers. It would also be of interest to examine a larger sample size or to compare responses from teachers within one particular city, kommune, or administrative district. Additional research could also be done to investigate the culturally dependent aspects of an evaluation system created in the U.S. and applied world-wide. It would also be interesting to conduct a more in-depth investigation, possibly qualitative, of areas where teachers in Norway marked high levels of agreement or disagreement. It would be of interest to observe and qualify how teacher-student relationships are established and what they look like in practice. The reasons behind these results may serve to establish direction for improving both teacher competency and student outcomes.

From this study, the authors believe there is great potential for using *the Framework* for teacher appraisal in Norway. To ensure quality teaching, a system needs more than just a good definition to evaluate practice; there must also exist a shared understanding of criteria and skilled evaluators (Danielson, 2010, p. 36). Strong systems of teacher evaluation also have strong systems for school-level accountability (Stewart, 2010), and "can make a substantial contribution to improving teaching and learning processes and raising educational performance" (Nusche et al., 2011, p. 85). Robust systems of either type are not based on one measure; they include a multi-faceted approach, to which the NKVS is already positioned. In *The Education Mirror 2012*, The Norwegian Directorate for Education responded to the OECD report on improving teacher appraisal; they "will assess which measures ought to be implemented as a follow-up of the recommendations from the OECD. This will be discussed extensively with relevant parties in the education sector" (The Directorate, 2012, p. 124). Feedback from teachers about their own quality in this study should assist in those efforts.

9. References

Abdul-Haqq, I. (1998). *Constructivism in teacher education: Consideration for those who would link practice to theory*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. (ERIC Document No.ED426986)

Aukrust, V.G. (2003). *Samtaledeltakelse i norskeklasserom - en studieavdeltakerstrukturerogsamtalebevegelser*. [Conversation participation in Norwegian classrooms - a study of participant structures and conversation movements.In K. Klette (Ed.)]. Oslo, Norway: PedagogiskforskningsinstituttUniversitetet i Oslo.

Avalos, B. &Assael, J. (2006).Moving from resistance to agreement: The case of the Chilean teacher performance evaluation.*International Journal of Educational Research, 45*, 254-266.

Bæck, U.-D.K. (2010). Parent involvement practices in formalized home-school cooperation. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research 54*(6), 549-563. doi: 10.1080/00313831.2010.522845

Bjørnestad, E., &Vatne, B. (2005, September). Play terms in primary school. Paper presented at the European Conference of Educational Research. Dublin, Ireland.

Carlgren, I., &Klette, K. (2008). Reconstructions of Nordic teachers: Reform policies and teachers' work during the 1990s. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research 52*(2), 117-133. doi: 10.1080/00313830801915754

Carlgren,I., Klette, K., Mýrdal, S., Schnack, K, &Simola, H. (2006). Changes in Nordic teaching practices: From individualised teaching to teaching of individuals. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research (50)*3, 301-326. doi: 10.1080/00313830600743357

Christophersen, K.A., Elstad, E., &Turmo, A. (2010). Is teacher accountability possible? The case of Norwegian high school science.*Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 54*(5), 413-429. doi: 10.1080/00313831.2010.508906

Danielson, C. (2007). Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching (2nded.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2010). Evaluation that helps teachers learn. *Educational Leadership,68*(4), 35-39.

Danielson, C. (2011, January/2010, December). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument 2011 edition*. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group.

Dyer, C. (1995). *Beginning research in psychology: Practical guide to research methods and statistics.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Engh, R. (2009). *Improving assessment practise in Norway.* Paper presented at the 35th annual conference of the International Association for Educational Assessment: Assessment for a Creative World. Brisbane, Australia.

Haugen, C.R. (2010). Equity and life-long learning: An analysis of white paper no. 16 (2006/2007) of Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research 54*(4), 357-376. doi: 10.1080/00313831.2010.493342

Fink, A., &Kosecoff, J. (1998).*How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (2nded.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Klette, K. (2003). Lærerensklasseromsarbeid; Interaksjonsogarbeidsformer i norskeklasserometter Reform 97 [Teachers work in the classroom; forms of interaction and work in Norwegian classrooms after the Reform of 1997]. In K. Klette (Ed.), Klasserommetspraksisformeretter Reform 97. Oslo, Norway: UniPubForlag.

Marshall, G., Cole, P., &Zbar, V. (2012).*Teacher performance and development in Australia: A mapping and analysis of current practice*. Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership: Limited.

Marzano, R.J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision, Curriculum and Development.

Milanowski, A.T. (2011, March). *Validity research on teacher evaluation systems based on the Framework for Teaching*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association annual meeting. New Orleans, LA.

Ministry of Education and Research (2007).*Education-from kindergarten to adult education* [Brochure]. Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no

Ministry of Education and Research. (2009). *White paper on teacher education: The teacher-the role and the education*. Report for the Sorting No. 11: Oslo, Norway.

Ministry of Education and Research (2010).*Background report to the OECD regarding support for the white paper on the quality of lower secondary education in Norway.*

Moum, K., Troan, G., &Emstad, A.B. (2011). Norway. In *Leadership in Education, European Synopsis* (197-204). Germany: NLQ Hildesheim.

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.(2012). General format. Retrieved from http://www.tqsources.org

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction. (2012). *North Dakota teacher evaluation guidelines: Draft proposal*. Bismarck, ND.

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2009). *The education mirror 2009: Analysis of primary and secondary education and training in Norway*. Oslo, Norway.

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2011). *The education mirror 2011: Analysis of primary and secondary education and training in Norway*. Oslo, Norway.

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2012). *The education mirror 2012: Analysis of primary and secondary education and training in Norway*. Oslo, Norway.

Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994).*Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nusche, D., Earl, L., Maxwell, W., &Shewbridge, C. (2011, September). OECD reviews of evaluation and assessment in education: Norway. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010). *Teacher performance appraisal: Technical requirements manual.* Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher / appraise.html

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from teaching and learning international survey (TALIS)*. Paris, France.

Piaget, J. (1950). *The psychology of intelligence*. New York: Routledge.

Pollard, R.Q., Jr. (1992).Cross-cultural ethics in the conduct of deafness research.*Rehabilitation Psychology, 37*(2), 87-101.

Santiago, P. & Benavides, F. (2009).*Teacher evaluation: A conceptual framework and examples of country practices.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/16/24/44568106.pdf

Santiago, P., Roseveare, D., van Amelsvoort, G., Manzi, J., & Matthews, P. (2009).*Teacher evaluation in Portugal: OECD Review.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Retrieved from http://www.ocde.fr/dataoecd/17/32/ 43327186.pdf

Seo, K. (2012). Lessons from Korea.*Educational Leadership 70*(3), 75-78.

Statistics Norway. (2011). *Education statistics: Pupils in primary and lower secondary school. Final figures, 1 October 2011*.Retrieved from http://www.ssb.no.

Statistics Norway.(2012a). *Facts about education in Norway 2012-key figures*.Retrieved from http://www.ssbo.no.

Statistics Norway. (2012b).*Population statistics: Population and land area in urban settlements, 1 January 2012*. Retrieved from http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects /02/01/10/beftett_en/

Stewart, V. (2010).Raising teacher quality around the world.*Educational Leadership, 68*(4), 16-20.

Training and Development Agency for Schools. (2007). *Professional standards for teachers: Why sit still in your career?* London, United Kingdom: Training and Development Agency for Schools. Retrieved from http://www.tda.gov.uk/standards.

U.S.-Norway Fulbright Foundation.(2012, October). Fulbright, Norway: Roving scholars. Retrieved from http://www.fulbright.no/en/grants/norwegian_ institutions/roving_ scholars/.

Vibe, N., Evensen, M., &Hovdhaugen, E. (2009).*Questions for the Norwegian school system: Table report from the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training's survey of schools and school owners*. Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education: Oslo, Norway.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson, L. (2005). *Quality teaching and school leadership: A can of research findings final report*. Lifelong Learning Network: Canberra, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.canberra.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/27748/quality-teaching-leadership.pdf

Subject: RE: figure permission
From: Charlotte Danielson (charlotte_danielson@hotmail.com)
To: sarahandersonk@yahoo.com;
Date: Sunday, May 6, 2012 8:20 AM

Sarah -

Thanks for writing, and the short answer is "yes;" I think it would be terrific for the form to be used in your research. Many districts have created self-assessment forms built from my framework to advance professional conversation.

In fact, I wonder whether you would want an expanded version of the framework, with rubrics for the levels of performance, to aid in self-assessment. It's a much longer document, of course, but might provide better guidance for teachers in this effort. You could shorten it to remove the white space.

in any case, I'd very much like to know more about your research. As for a document of just the domains, components, and elements, I've attached what we call "the placemat."

Best wishes, but please keep in touch as you would like to.

Charlotte

Charlotte Danielson
The Danielson Group
12 Gordon Way, Princeton, NJ, 08540, USA

(609) 921-2366 (phone)
(609) 497-3952 (fax)
(609) 468-7695 (mobile)
07796 304 397 (UK mobile)
charlotte_danielson@hotmail.com (e-mail)
www.danielsongroup.org

Date: Sun, 6 May 2012 05:57:27 -0700
From: sarahandersonk@yahoo.com
Subject: figure permission
To: charlotte_danielson@hotmail.com

Dear Charlotte Danielson,
I need to begin by stating that your work as been extremely influential to me as an educator. I am currently working as a Fulbright scholar in Norway, a country who received recommendation from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to use your Framework for Teaching to develop a national criteria for teacher appraisal.

Norwegian Framework for Teaching Survey

Please take a minute to complete the survey below. The purpose of this survey is to assess teachers' perceptions of fulfilling their own professional responsibilities. Participation is voluntary, your responses will be completely anonymous, and data will be analyzed. We appreciate your time and willingness to improve teaching and learning.

Where did you receive your training to be a teacher?	**Gender: ___ Male ___ Female**
What is the highest degree you have earned?	**How many years have you worked as a teacher?** ___ 0-2 years___ 3-6 years___ 7-10 years ___ 11-15 years___ 16 years or more
Are you familiar with Charlotte Danielson's framework for teaching? **___ Yes ___ No**	**What is the city you currently teach in?**

	Please rate each of the statements below by circling the appropriate option based on the following statement: **As a teacher I _____**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Slightly Disagree**	**Slightly Agree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1.	Demonstrate extensive knowledge of class content	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
2.	Know prerequisite relationships between topics and concepts	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
3.	Familiarize myself with a wide range of pedagogical approaches	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
4.	Have knowledge of child and adolescent development	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
5.	Know the learning process	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
6.	Have knowledge of individual students' skills	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
7.	Understand how much individual students know	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
8.	Understand students' language proficiency	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
9.	Have knowledge of students' interests	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
10.	Have knowledge of students cultural heritage	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
11.	Know of students' special needs	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
12.	Set high expectations for learning outcomes	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
13.	Order learning concepts logically	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
14.	Write clear outcomes	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
15.	Set outcomes for different types of learning (ex. factual/conceptual/ social)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
16.	Plan outcomes that take into account diverse learners	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
17.	Know many resources for classroom use	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
18.	Know resources for enhancing content knowledge	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
19.	Know many resources for student use	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
20.	Design outcomes-based learning activities for diverse learners	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
21.	Select engaging instructional materials that support outcomes	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
22.	Vary student groups for different instructional outcomes	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
23.	Design clear lesson plans	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
24.	Structure clear unit plans	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
25.	Design assessments consistent with instructional outcomes	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
26.	Set clear assessment criteria	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
27.	Use well-designed formative assessment	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
28.	Use assessment results to plan future instruction	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
29.	Interact with students in a way that reflects respect	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
30.	Have a classroom where students care for one another	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
31.	Convey the importance of content to students	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
32.	Convey high expectations for all students	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
33.	Instill in students a sense of pride in work	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
34.	Organize productive small group work	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
35.	Manage transitions efficiently	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
36.	Mange materials and supplies well	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**

37.	Manage non-instructional tasks (ex. taking attendance)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
38.	Supervise classroom helpers (volunteers, paraeducators)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
39.	Develop clear standards of student conduct	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
40.	Prevent conduct problems by monitoring student behavior	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
41.	Respond to student misbehavior effectively	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
42.	Have a classroom that is safe for all students	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
43.	Ensure all learning is equally accessible to all students	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
44.	Organize the physical classroom space	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
45.	Make the purpose for learning clear	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
46.	Give clear directions	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
47.	Explain content in ways that connect to students' knowledge	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
48.	Speak properly (ex. correct usage, vocabulary)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
49.	Write correctly using standard conventions	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
50.	Ask high quality questions	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
51.	Use high quality discussion techniques	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
52.	Ensure that all students participate in discussions	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
53.	Make sure all students are engaged in content activities	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
54.	Create productive groups based on the lesson	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
55.	Choose materials that fit the instructional purpose	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
56.	Pace lessons properly for all students	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
57.	Make students fully aware of assessment criteria	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
58.	Monitor student learning	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
59.	Give good feedback to students in a timely manner	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
60.	Allow for students to assess the quality of their own work	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
61.	Allow students to monitor their own progress	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
62.	Make adjustments to a lesson when needed	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
63.	Seize opportunities to enhance student learning	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
64.	Am persistent in seeking approaches for students who need help	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
65.	Reflect on lessons for effectiveness	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
66.	Reflect on teaching for use in future teaching	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
67.	Effectively monitor student completion of assignments	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
68.	Have a good system for keeping information on student learning	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
69.	Maintaining information on non-instructional activities (e.g. order forms)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
70.	Provide frequent information to families about instruction	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
71.	Provide frequent information to families on students' progress	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
72.	Successfully engage families in instructional programs	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
73.	Have cooperative relationships with colleagues	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
74.	Promote a culture of professional inquiry	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
75.	Make a substantial contribution of service to the school	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
76.	Volunteer to participate in school projects	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
77.	Seek out opportunities to enhance knowledge about teaching	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
78.	Am receptive to feedback from colleagues	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
79.	Contribute to the teaching profession (research, supervise future teachers)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
80.	Demonstrate ethical conduct (ex. honesty, integrity)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
81.	Am alert to the needs of students	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
82.	Challenge negative practices to ensure all students are honored	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
83.	Make decisions based on high professional standards	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
84.	Fully comply with school regulations	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**