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Abstract

This mixed-methods study aimed to examine questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. The study measures the extent to which questionnaires reflect teachers' reactions to and learning in professional development sessions, how teachers view the use of questionnaires to evaluate these sessions, and how to improve that evaluation process. Data from a district-mandated professional development evaluation questionnaire was collected and analyzed from a sample of 825 teachers. Their experiences completing the questionnaires were measured by collecting survey and focus group data. The theories of satisficing and andragogy were used to frame the data analysis. I find that questionnaires do not accurately reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning in professional development sessions. In addition, the data showed that teachers have a negative view of using questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions. Based on the data, I recommend that districts use focus groups and other qualitative forms of data to improve the evaluation of professional development.
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Chapter I: Introduction

A room full of exhausted teachers wrap up a three-hour professional development session after completing an almost full school day. With only minutes to go until dismissed, an email is sent to teachers with a digital evaluation form to complete. They are familiar with this process, as it is a standard procedure at the end of every professional development session they attend. It is also a standard form with standard questions. The first set of questions is a series of close-ended, Likert scale questions. They attempt to gather feedback from teachers about their experiences during their session, specifically if they were satisfied, felt the time spent was adequate and well planned, and that the content would be helpful to them. Following these questions are some optional, open-ended questions that aim to dig deeper by requesting teachers to share what they learned, what additional support they need, how they will apply their learning, and suggestions for the next steps. Within minutes, for some even seconds, laptops are snapped shut, and teachers pack up after they complete their evaluation. The time it takes for most to complete their evaluation is about the same as checking a box off on a to-do list.

A week or so later, teacher leaders who presented the professional development sessions receive a spreadsheet, and they independently review the results. It is immediately apparent that the sea of numbers on the screen primarily are fives, the highest rating on the five-point Likert scale. One or two teachers have rated their sessions as all ones, with a few twos, threes, and fours sprinkled about. The majority of the open-ended questions are blank. Of the completed questions, a few have constructive responses and indicate that the teachers actually reflected on their learning. The other comments, added by the teachers who favored scoring one on the scale when they completed the evaluation, indicate that they were less than happy with their session and were not afraid to make that known.
As the presenter of this session, reviewing the teachers' evaluations of my work, I am fully aware that this professional development was not a perfect five. There could have been more teacher collaboration built-in, I could have found ways to offer teacher choice to make their learning more meaningful, and I could have provided more details about the purpose of the session. Unfortunately, this data, whose goal was to help me improve the session according to teachers' feedback, left me with little guidance for the next steps and did not give me a clear picture of whether I successfully did my job. It also left me with many questions: Are teachers truly satisfied with their experiences in professional development? Are they learning? Can I trust the data from these questionnaires? Is there a better way to evaluate professional development?

**Purpose of Study**

Evaluating K-12 teacher professional development is essential to ensure that training opportunities effectively improve teacher practice and student learning (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Tiered models are beneficial for evaluating professional development at different levels, with teacher reaction and learning as the initial phases (Guskey, 2016). At the early stages of evaluation, it is common to use questionnaires to gather information from teachers about their experiences with professional development (Kutner et al., 1997).

This mixed-methods study aimed to examine the use of questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. The study intended to determine if questionnaires accurately reflect teachers' experiences during professional development, specifically regarding their reaction to and learning during professional development sessions. When examining teachers' experiences with the evaluation process, application of the theory of andragogy (Knowles, 1973) aided in exploring how their role as adult learners impacts their reflection and evaluation of professional development. Andragogy, also sometimes called adult learning theory, is "a set of
core adult learning principles that apply to all adult learning situations" (Knowles et al., 2011, p. 2). The theory of satisficing helped explore how teachers interacted with the evaluations to assist with understanding their results. This theory explores how respondents engage with surveys when the cognitive load becomes too much. They resort to giving answers that are just satisfactory by using a variety of response tactics that help to make responding easier (Krosnick, 1991).

**Rationale for Study and Problem Statement**

In Pennsylvania, Act 48 of 1999 requires that educators continue to expand their teaching knowledge through continued education. This law mandates that "educators must earn six credits of collegiate study; or six credits of PDE-approved continuing professional education courses; or 180 hours of continuing education programs, activities or learning experiences through a PDE approved provider; or any combination of the above every five years to maintain active certification status" (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2016, p. 1). Local school districts are considered PDE-approved providers and offer opportunities for teachers to obtain the required 180 hours through professional development opportunities.

Professional development can "change the way teachers teach and how much students learn" (DeMonte, 2013, p. 4). Therefore, these continuing education opportunities must be of high quality. Evaluation of professional development is necessary to make this determination. These evaluations must go beyond simply documenting participation or measuring enjoyment, as found in many school districts (Guskey, 2000). It is common to use questionnaires to evaluate teachers' experiences with professional development, specifically their reaction and initial learning; therefore, it is crucial that these tools accurately reflect teachers' experiences (Kutner et al., 1997).
The results of this study will provide the information needed to improve upon teacher-facing professional development evaluation, specifically questionnaires, which may benefit the overall evaluation process of professional development within K-12 school districts.

**Research Questions**

- **Questions**
  - To what extent do questionnaires reflect teachers' reactions to and learning in professional development sessions?
  - How do teachers view the use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions?
  - How can the evaluation of professional development be improved to better assess teachers' reaction to and learning in professional development sessions?

- **Hypotheses**
  - Questionnaires do not reflect teachers' reactions to and learning in professional development sessions.
  - Teachers view questionnaires as a requirement they must complete. While some teachers may take the time to reflect and answer honestly, most teachers aim to complete the questionnaire quickly and with little reflection.
  - The use of focus groups to evaluate professional development sessions would allow for more authentic feedback from teachers.

**Rationale for Methods**

This study used an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). As shown in Figure 1 below, after teachers participated in a professional
development session, they completed a district-mandated evaluation, the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire (see Appendix D). Data was collected from 825 teachers. This quantitative data served as a basis for examining teachers' experiences throughout the study. Next, teachers had the option to complete the Questionnaire Reaction Survey, which gathered information about participants' experience completing the district's evaluation. This quantitative data provided basic, initial information about teachers' experiences evaluating professional development. In addition, qualitative data collection occurred during focus groups with participants. These focus groups were used to explore teachers' experiences completing the evaluation questionnaire and provided an opportunity to hear their perspectives about the evaluation process.

Examining both the quantitative and qualitative data helped identify if questionnaires reflect teachers' reaction to and learning during professional development, if teachers feel there is value in completing questionnaires at the end of professional development sessions, and if there are ways to improve the evaluation process.
Figure 1

Explanatory Sequential Mixed-Methods Study Plan

Significance of Study

Research about the traits of effective professional development as well as the impact of professional development on teachers' learning and instruction is extensive (Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Hammond et al., 2017; Ingvarson et al., 2005; Jacob et al., 2015; Learning Forward, n.d.-a; Wayne et al., 2008; Wei et al., 2010; Yoon et al., 2007). However, there is little research about the tools used to evaluate professional development, especially regarding teachers' reactions and learning. In addition, these tools, such as questionnaires, must be deemed valid and reliable so the data we collect is trustworthy and valuable (Kline, 2005; Messick, 1994). This study begins to fill a gap in the literature by providing research that can help school districts effectively evaluate teachers' experiences with professional development.

Limitations

One limitation of this study was that this study focused only on professional development sessions that are mandatory for teacher attendance. Examples of high-quality professional
learning often include teacher choice, whether it be what or how they are learning (Bayar, 2014; Patton et al., 2015; Stewart, 2014). Because teachers did not have a choice in attending these events or selecting content that is most relevant to them, the results of this study may be limited. Replicating this study using professional development sessions that integrate teacher choice may reveal different findings.

Another limitation of this study was my position as a researcher at a site where I am employed. As an employee in the district who has been and continues to be involved with planning and leading professional development, participants may have hesitated to respond openly. Therefore, I ensured the protection of anonymity to all participants during and after the study. Additionally, I provided information to them about the purpose of the study to help them understand the benefits of sharing openly, such as an overall improvement in the professional development evaluation process.

A final limitation was focusing only on teachers' reactions to and learning during professional development. Thomas Guskey's (2016) framework proposes that to evaluate professional development fully, organizations must examine it at five different levels: participants' reactions, participants' learning, organizational support and change, participants' use of new knowledge and skills, and student learning. This framework indicates that success at one level does not guarantee success at others, so evaluation of professional development must occur at all levels. While this study did not examine the final three levels, organizational support and change, participants' use of new knowledge and skills, and student learning, it provides a starting point for districts interested in assessing their evaluation process.
Definition of Terms

Andragogy

Andragogy is a theory that recognizes the needs of and differences in adult learners. The theory identifies that as we move into adulthood, we become more reliant on self-directed learning and benefit more from experiential learning. In addition, adults' readiness to learn directly relates to their job-related needs, which leads them to a problem-focused stance on learning (Knowles, 1973).

Evaluation

"Evaluation is the systematic investigation of merit or worth" (Guskey, 2000, p. 41).

Professional Development

Professional development is the "processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students" (Guskey, 2000, p. 18).

Questionnaire

Questionnaires are an evaluation tool frequently used to collect self-reported data, often about respondents' perceptions. Questionnaire responses are collected using close-ended questions, open-ended questions, or both. In addition, questionnaires collect data about professional development, including information about teachers' experiences, reactions, knowledge acquired, and plans to use their new learning (Kutner et al., 1997).

Satisficing
Satisficing occurs when a survey respondent does not use their full cognitive ability to complete a survey or a survey question and instead "settles for generating merely satisfactory answers" (Krosnick, 1991, p. 215).

**Summary**

Evaluation of professional development is a necessary task to guarantee the achievement of session goals and that both teachers and students benefit. Questionnaires are one of the most time-effective and cost-effective ways to gather teacher feedback, but unfortunately, they are often unclear and only address surface-level topics (Desimone, 2011). In addition, questionnaire respondents often will engage in satisficing behaviors by not applying their full cognitive abilities to answering questions (Krosnick, 1991). Therefore, this study aimed to understand teachers' experiences better when completing professional development evaluations to determine whether questionnaires were an appropriate tool for gathering their feedback about their reactions and learning. Chapter II further explores the literature surrounding this topic.
Chapter II: Review of Literature

According to Machi and McEvoy (2016), "a literature review is a written document that presents a logically argued case founded on a comprehensive understanding of the current state of knowledge about a topic of study" (p. 5). Chapter II provides a dive into the literature that begins by taking a 30,000-foot view of the topic of study and recounts the history of teacher education and the path toward the use of professional development. The review continues by defining professional development and finding what the literature constitutes as effective professional development. Next, this chapter provides some background on the process used in education for evaluating professional development. Finally, it comes to a close by discussing questionnaires as tools for evaluating professional development and their importance in being reliable and valid. Woven throughout this review is an exploration of the theme of bureaucracy in the history of education.

This review of the literature starts in the figurative clouds. Then, it descends to earth, bringing the purpose of this study into focus, which is to explore the use of questionnaires for the evaluation of professional development. The entire descent through the literature shows a common theme: despite having federal and state laws that mandate requirements, there is little consensus on many topics surrounding professional development, including teacher preparation, what constitutes professional development, the traits of effective professional development, and how to evaluate professional development. The discussion of bureaucracy in education will help to understand this theme.

Machi and McEvoy (2016) complete the definition of a literature review by explaining that "this case establishes a convincing thesis to answer the study's question" (p. 5). This literature review's purpose was to understand the lack of consensus on multiple areas of
professional development. This understanding, coupled with the theoretical framework, helped define the study's purpose, identify the study's methods, and analyze the results.

The Bureaucracy of Teacher Education

The first formal teacher education in the United States began in the early nineteenth century with the introduction of the common school system. Due to a need for more teachers who were better qualified than the past volunteers, the creation of normal schools began to standardize training for teachers. Education reformers of the time, like Horace Mann and Cyrus Pierce, envisioned these schools to provide a well-rounded educational experience, creating model teachers that could serve as exemplars in schools across the country. However, common schools were expanding at a rapid rate, and the need for large quantities of teachers forced normal schools to choose "between quality and quantity" in teacher candidates and led to "choosing relevance over rigor" in their programming (Labree, 2018, pp. 292-293). In addition, normal schools were an affordable option, compared to colleges and universities. Over time, perspective students began to pressure the normal schools to expand their focus outside of teaching. Between 1911 and 1930, 88 normal schools became teacher colleges and offered additional programming. By the 1970s, the teacher colleges transitioned to state colleges and universities (Labree, 2018).

Growth in the number of teachers led to increased administration and the establishment of educational institutions as bureaucracies. In 1850 the schools of Boston, for example, were supervised by a committee of elected citizens who oversaw the grammar and high schools and additional members they appointed to guide the primary schools. The first superintendent was appointed in 1851, followed by a second superintendent, principals for the primary schools, a school board, and a board of supervisors. By 1876, seven district-level administrators, 48
principals, and a school board of 24 elected members controlled the Boston schools. School leaders rationalized the organization and bureaucratization of Boston schools by indicating it was "a partial solution to the problem of regulating behavior within the occupation" (Katz, 1968, p. 170). This process did little for supporting the massive Boston school system; however, it set up a system that ensured that they and their colleagues would build a career as administrators and continue to climb the ladder. While this example focuses on Boston schools, expansion of a top-down system occurred in cities across the country (Katz, 1968).

While normal schools were the more common form of teacher education, elite universities began teacher preparation programs in the late nineteenth century. The University of Michigan created a chair of education position in 1879 after seeing the growing need for highly qualified teachers (Steffes, 2012). Taking a more academic approach, rather than producing a high quantity of teachers, these universities turned their focus towards research and moved some of their focus away from preparation programs. For example, at the University of Michigan, the purpose of the education department was "training educational leaders for higher positions of public school service, developing education as a profession, and promoting the study of educational sciences" with an emphasis on the "historical, philosophical, and theoretical aspects of education and offered courses in the history of education, school supervision, comparative education systems, and principles of teaching and governance" (Steffes, 2012, p. 32). The academic focus of universities left little room for students to learn about practical application and led to the removal of teacher education programs in many of these universities. The quantity, quality, and requirements of formal teacher education were inconsistent from the start (Labree, 2018).
This period of growth in teacher education was not fueled only by the expansion of common schools and the need for teachers. Educational requirements specific to the field of teaching began to emerge. Schools introduced requirements for administrators to have some professional training; however, this was not well defined (Steffes, 2012). In the mid-1800s, states began to implement laws outlining requirements for teachers, such as the need to obtain a teaching certificate or pass an examination. Because states were in control, the expectations were different across the country. As recently as 1937, eight states had no educational requirements, and fourteen states still did not require formal teacher training, only high school graduation. In 1946, the establishment of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards occurred, leading to nationwide consistency with teacher education and certification, such as requiring a bachelor's degree from an approved program (Angus, 2001). The National Commission on Excellence in Education was created in 1981 by the Secretary of Education, T.H. Bell, to research the status of education in the United States. From this commission came "A Nation At Risk," a report that found "disturbing inadequacies in the way the educational process itself is often conducted" and identified aspects of educational content, student expectations, time, and teaching in need of improvement (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 26). The report included recommendations for each of these four categories. In response to the suggested area of improvement surrounding teaching, the report recommended the need for higher standards for teacher education, the ability for teachers to demonstrate competence and aptitude for teaching, and holding teacher preparation programs accountable for their graduates. Additional recommendations were for school boards to expand the length of teachers' contracts to ensure time for professional development and for districts to implement programs that require master teachers to supervise newly hired teachers (National Commission on
Excellence in Education, 1983). This push for reform ushered in a wave of bureaucratic control over schools and teaching. Proposed recommendations by the federal government attempted to formalize processes for aligning curriculum, training teachers, identifying instructional standards, and guiding instruction by having "clear goals and certain means" (Rowan, 1990, p. 356). The federal government "centralized decision making and standardized working procedures [to] promote efficiency by focusing workers' efforts on achieving clearly defined goals and by minimizing workers' deviation from the prescribed means of achieving these goals" (Rowan, 1990, p. 356). However, as research occurred, the complex nature of teaching became apparent. Success in education relies on teachers' knowledge and decision-making skills and not on their ability to follow routines and processes (Rowan, 1990).

Over these 100 years, control over children's education shifted from local communities to centralized control by school boards who answer to state governments that the federal government controls. In this bureaucratic system, decision-making that should focus on the needs of students has become politicized, and "politicians and administrators sometimes pursue their interests at the expense of citizens' interests. As a result, who wins and who loses in politics is not necessarily representative of what ordinary citizens actually want" (Chubb & Moe, 2011, p. 31). Chubb and Moe (2011) acknowledge that members of school communities, such as parents and students, do have a say in the running of their schools. However, they recognize that the bureaucratic system has made it so "they have no right to win. In the end, they have to take what society gives them" (p. 32). With each piece of legislation passed and report created, "education bureaucracy grows," and those affected, such as teachers, are "struggling to deal with multiple and often contradictory objectives" (Smith & Larimer, 2004, p. 729).
Following the release of A Nation At Risk, a series of education reform legislation was passed: The Improving America's Schools Act in 1994, No Child Left Behind in 2001, and the Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015. Each of these pieces of legislation outlined specific requirements for school reform, including the preservice and continuing education of teachers. To maintain active certificates, teachers must meet state-specific requirements for continuing education (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015; Improving America's Schools Act, 1994; No Child Left Behind, 2001). For example, teachers in Pennsylvania must complete six college credits, six state-approved continuing professional education credits, or 180 hours of continuing professional education activities every five years. As a result, districts must keep track of continuing education within their district. After completing training that qualifies for continuing education credits, districts must collect a roster of those who participated and evaluations for the sessions. Within 30 days, they must upload this information to the state's system. School districts must maintain records for seven years. While the district is required to review activities to ensure that they meet requirements set by the state, no approval is needed by the state to ensure they are of high quality (Pennsylvania Department of Education, n.d.). It is common for teachers to meet these continuing education requirements by participating in activities that fall under the category of professional development.

**What is Professional Development?**

There is little consensus on what defines professional development (TNTP, 2015). The Cambridge dictionary says professional development is "training that is given to managers and people working in professions to increase their knowledge and skills" (Cambridge, n.d.). This definition describes a more traditional view of professional development where teachers assume the role of students and are provided knowledge to acquire. In fact, even the term development
"evokes images of what someone does to someone else: develop them" (Easton, 2008, p. 755).

This definition of professional development, as a form of training, is often found in districts that use professional development time for product implementation training from publishing companies. Teachers' time is spent becoming familiar with materials and procedural tasks (Crowley, 2017). A nationwide study of teachers found that 94.8% of those surveyed took part in this more traditional type of professional development, such as workshops, conferences, or training (Wei et al., 2009).

Other educational scholars take a more holistic approach to defining professional development. Thomas Guskey (2000) believes professional development is the "processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students" (p. 18). This definition opens up the possibilities of what constitutes professional development. For example, a less traditional form, teacher coaching, is on-the-job training where an instructional coach partner with a teacher to improve instruction and student learning. Coaches offer "support, feedback, and intensive, individualized professional learning" within the school day and building (Knight, 2006, p. 36).

As highlighted previously, the introduction of legislation provided districts and teachers some insight into what constitutes professional development. In 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law. This piece of legislation reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Among other things, ESSA provided some guidance to school districts in defining professional development. ESSA states that "professional development means activities that are an integral part of school…strategies for providing educators…with the knowledge and skills necessary to enable students to succeed in a well-rounded education and to meet the challenging State academic standards" and they must be "sustained (not stand-alone, 1
day, or short term workshops), intensive, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom focused" (U.S. Department of Education, n.d., p. 296). Following the definition is a list of activities and characteristics that may be considered professional development but does not explicitly require states to use any that are listed. While this wording aims to help define professional development for state and district compliance, it only sets some very high-level parameters and remains somewhat vague. Even more concerning is the fact that despite including this wording as part of a federally mandated law, research conducted by Frontline Research & Learning Institute found that of the 3,227,306 enrollments in professional development activities from over 200 school districts in their nationwide sample, only about 20% met the criteria outlined in ESSA (Combs & Silverman, 2016).

In addition to debates about defining professional development, there are also conflicting views about the purpose of professional development. Much of the literature focuses on professional development outcomes as it applies to teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Lindsey et al., 2016; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2009; Wei et al., 2009). More traditional approaches to professional development, such as college courses and stand-and-delivery type sessions, aim to improve the skills of teachers (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2009; Wei et al., 2009). The goal of some activities is to cause a change in teachers to improve their effectiveness (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Lindsey et al., 2016). Finally, other organizations create professional development opportunities to improve student learning and achievement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Lindsey et al., 2016; Mizell, 2010). A solid definition of what professional development is, along with its purpose, is necessary for the district to evaluate the effectiveness of its efforts.
Effective Professional Development

In a meta-analysis of 35 studies of professional development that resulted in student achievement growth, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) found that high-quality professional development is content-focused, incorporates active learning, supports collaboration, uses models of effective practice, provides coaching and expert support, offers feedback and reflection, and is of sustained duration. This research found that "effective professional learning incorporates most or all of these elements" (Hammond et al., 2017, p. vi). However, a study conducted within three large school districts with more than 10,000 teachers disputes these findings. The research found no evidence about the type or amount of professional development that led to teacher improvement, even when the activities met common criteria for effective professional development, such as job-embedded or differentiated sessions (Jacob et al., 2015).

Another review of the literature examined 1,343 professional development studies but was unable to determine any common characteristics among those that resulted in positive outcomes (Loveless, 2014).

To help define what makes effective professional development, Learning Forward, a national professional organization whose mission is to promote effective professional learning, created a set of standards to guide districts. The seven standards aim to increase the effectiveness of teachers and students by focusing on seven areas:

- **"Learning Communities"**: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment.
• **Leadership**: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students requires skillful leaders who develop capacity, advocate, and create support systems for professional learning.

• **Resources**: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students requires prioritizing, monitoring, and coordinating resources for educator learning.

• **Data**: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students uses a variety of sources and types of student, educator, and system data to plan, assess, and evaluate professional learning.

• **Learning Designs**: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students integrates theories, research, and models of human learning to achieve its intended outcomes.

• **Implementation**: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students applies research on change and sustains support for implementation of professional learning for long-term change.

• **Outcomes**: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students aligns its outcomes with educator performance and student curriculum standards” (Learning Forward, n.d.-a).

These standards highlight the importance of looking at professional development at a systemic level and differentiating the needs of teachers, buildings, and districts when planning professional learning. In addition, Learning Forward identifies four prerequisites needed for any professional development to have the possibility of being effective. As explained below, these
four sets of skills "are so fundamental that the standards do not identify or describe them" (Learning Forward, 2016, p. 8).

1. "Educators' commitment to students – all students – is the foundation of effective professional learning. Committed educators understand that they must engage in continuous improvement to know enough and be skilled enough to meet the learning needs of all students. As professionals, they seek to deepen their knowledge and expand their portfolio of skills and practices, always striving to increase each student's performance. If adults responsible for student learning do not continuously seek new learning, it is not only their knowledge, skills, and practices that erode over time. They also become less able to adapt to change, less self-confident, and less able to make a positive difference in the lives of their colleagues and students.

2. Each educator involved in professional learning comes to the experience ready to learn. Professional learning is a partnership among professionals who engage with one another to access or construct knowledge, skills, practices, and dispositions. However, it cannot be effective if educators resist learning. Educators want and deserve high-quality professional learning that is relevant and useful. They are more likely to fully engage in learning with receptive hearts and minds when their school systems, schools, and colleagues align professional learning with the standards.

3. Because there are disparate experience levels and use of practice among educators, professional learning can foster collaborative inquiry and learning that enhances individual and collective performance. This cannot happen unless educators listen to one another, respect one another's experiences and perspectives, hold students' best interest at the forefront, trust that their colleagues share a common vision and goals, and
are honest about their abilities, practices, challenges, and results. Professional accountability for individual and peer results strengthens the profession and results for students.

4. **Like all learners, educators learn in different ways and at different rates.** Because some educators have different learning needs than others, professional learning must engage each educator in timely, high-quality learning that meets his or her particular learning needs. Some may benefit from more time than others, different types of learning experiences, or more support as they seek to translate new learning into more productive practices. For some educators, this requires courage to acknowledge their learning needs and determination and patience to continue learning until the practices are effective and comfortable" (Learning Forward, 2016, p. 8-9).

Creating these standards and skills helps define what professional development is and the skills essential for teachers to succeed. However, while this framework offers districts a guide for planning and implementing professional learning that meets the requirements of ESSA, they are not mandated to adhere to the standards.

Formalizing definitions of professional development, identifying traits that make it effective, and adhering to standards created are all necessary steps for planning, implementing, and improving professional development experiences. Evaluation of these experiences is crucial to identifying the effectiveness. Unfortunately, the common theme of the literature surrounding professional development, the lack of clarity, extends to its evaluation. The following section of this review of the literature will discuss the evaluation of professional development and explores a framework for evaluating professional development within districts.
Evaluating Professional Development

Professional development must be of high quality to have the most significant impact on teacher and student learning. To ensure this, evaluation of professional development is necessary. Evaluation is “the systematic investigation of merit or worth” (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994, p. 3). It is used to identify ways to improve programs and plans, know that learning is transferring into practice, and prove the value of the training (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016).

Researchers and school districts must have processes in place and tools to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities and programs. Program evaluation in education became prominent in the late 1950s as part of a push for educational reform and was dominated by quantitative, experimental designs. Moving into the late 1960s, models for educational program evaluations that included qualitative methods began to emerge, and models that offered evaluators choice with the type of data they would collect (Worthen, 1990). However, despite a growing focus on evaluating educational programs, there is not a consensus on the best methods to measure professional development effectiveness. This may be due to the lack of a consistent understanding of what defines high-quality, effective professional development.

Often, evaluations done by districts following professional development are inadequate. This includes evaluations that only document that teachers participated, are too shallow and only measure enjoyment, or are too brief and do not measure change over time (Guskey, 2000). It is most common for districts to evaluate professional development with forms measuring teachers’ self-reported feelings and opinions (Desimone, 2009; Early & Porritt, 2014). A study conducted across 1000 schools in the United Kingdom found that measurement of teacher satisfaction was the most common form of professional development evaluation (Goodall et al., 2005).
Even studies conducted on a larger scale, outside of districts, fail to evaluate professional development and its impact on student achievement effectively. For example, the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance conducted a meta-analysis of more than 1,300 studies on the effects of professional development and found that only nine of the studies were designed and conducted where an accurate evaluation occurred (Yoon et al., 2007). This same group conducted a similar study more recently and found that of 910 studies, only five met their criteria for adequate studies with valuable data (Gersten et al., 2014). Much of the literature paints a grim picture about professional development; however, Opfer and Pedder (2011) believe that research conducted on the effectiveness of professional development is being done all wrong. They propose that the research is not looking at professional development as the complex being that it is, but rather "focus on specific activities, processes, or programs in isolation from the complex teaching and learning environments in which teachers live" (Opfer & Pedder, 2011, p. 377). In this review of the literature, researchers found that they had to examine three systems: the teacher, the school, and the activity. These make up a complex system that must be studied as a whole, not in parts. In addition, this study found that the context of the system impacts the results, meaning that what works at one site may have a different outcome at another (Opfer & Pedder, 2011).

Concurrent with the findings of Opfer and Pedder, other scholars believe the only way to evaluate professional development is by looking at the system as a whole (Guskey, 2016; Learning Forward, n.d.-b). Learning Forward suggests that districts evaluate their professional development system using the seven previously mentioned standards. By doing so, districts are not looking at one specific set of data but a collection of varied information about the impact of professional learning (Learning Forward, n.d.-b). Thomas Guskey (2016) created a framework
for evaluating professional development, based on the Kirkpatrick Model used in industries outside education, that reflects the content of Learning Forward's Standards for Professional Learning. This framework evaluates professional development at five levels: participants' reaction, participants' learning, organizational support and change, participants' use of new knowledge and skills, and student learning outcomes. Guskey notes that evaluation of professional development must occur at all levels because success at one does not guarantee success at others (Guskey, 2016).

Figure 2

*Thomas Guskey's Five Levels of Evaluating Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>What Questions Are Addressed?</th>
<th>How Will Information Be Gathered?</th>
<th>What Is Measured or Assessed?</th>
<th>How Will This Information Be Used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Level 1:** Teachers' Reactions | • Did teachers like it?  
• Was their time well spent?  
• Did the materials make sense?  
• Was the instructor knowledgeable and helpful? | • Questionnaires administered at the end of the session. | • Initial satisfaction with the experience. | • To improve program design and delivery. |
| **Level 2:** Teachers' Learning | • Did teachers acquire the intended knowledge and skills? | • Paper-based or digital instruments.  
• Simulations  
• Demonstrations  
• Participant reflection  
• Participant portfolios | • New Knowledge and skills of teachers | • To improve program content, format, and organization |
| **Level 3:** Organizational Support and Change | • What was the impact on the organization?  
• Did it affect organizational climate and procedures?  
• Was implementation advocated, facilitated, and supported?  
• Were problems addressed quickly and efficiently? | • District and school records  
• Minutes from follow-up meetings  
• Questionnaires  
• Structured interviews with principals or administrators  
• Participant portfolios | • Organization's advocacy, support, accommodation, facilitation, and recognition | • To document and improve organizational support  
• To inform future change efforts |
Level 4:
Teachers' Use of New Knowledge and Skills
- Did teachers effectively apply new knowledge and skills?
- Questionnaires
- Structured interviews with teachers and administrators
- Teacher portfolios
- Teacher reflections
- Direct or videotaped classroom observations
- Degree and quality of implementation
- To document and improve implementation of program content.

Level 5:
Student Learning Outcomes
- What was the impact on students?
- Did it affect student performance/achievement?
- Did it influence students' emotional/physical wellbeing?
- Are students more confident learners?
- Is attendance increasing?
- Student records
- School records
- Questionnaires
- Structured interviews with students, teachers, administrators, and parents
- Teacher portfolios
- Learning outcomes: cognitive, affective, conative, psychomotor
- To focus and improve all aspects of program design, implementation and follow-up
- To demonstrate overall impact of professional development


**Questionnaires**

Sir Francis Galton invented the questionnaire in the 1870s as a way to represent qualitative data in a numerical form (Gillham, 2001). Questionnaires are “form[s] used in a survey design that participants in a study complete and return to the researcher” (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019, p. 391). These tools measure the early stages of professional development evaluation in education, such as participants' reactions to and learning during sessions (Guskey, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Completion of questionnaires can be done on paper or through digital means. Items on questionnaires can be open or close-ended (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). These two types of questions serve different purposes and gather different types of data.
Close- and Open-Ended Questions

Close-ended questions collect a large amount of data in a short amount of time; however, the data is limited. Closed-ended question formats include check boxes, rating scales, multiple-choice, and yes/no questions. The researcher sets answer choices, so participants are restricted to only those choices, which may impact results (Boynton & Greenhalgh, 2004; Krosnick & Presser, 2010). Close-ended question data is beneficial to a researcher because the data is easily comparable and allows for statistical analysis (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019).

Open-ended questions allow for participants to input their own text. These types of questions are most valuable when the researcher is unsure of how participants will respond or does not want to constrain the responses. However, this data is more difficult and time-consuming to analyze (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019).

Questionnaire Design

Questionnaire design is complex. When designing questionnaires, it is necessary to include high-quality questions and show respect to the participants (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). While this list is not exhaustive, when designing survey questions, one should:

1. "Use simple, familiar words (avoid technical terms, jargon, and slang);
2. Use simple syntax;
3. Avoid words with ambiguous meanings, i.e., aim for wording that all respondents will interpret in the same way;
4. Strive for wording that is specific and concrete (as opposed to general and abstract);
5. Make response options exhaustive and mutually exclusive;
6. Avoid leading or loaded questions that push respondents toward an answer;
7. Ask about one thing at a time (avoid double-barreled questions); and

8. Avoid questions with single or double negatives" (Krosnick & Presser, 2010, p. 264).

Question order is also an essential facet of questionnaire design. Therefore, when creating a survey, it is important to remember that:

1. "Early questions should be easy and pleasant to answer, and should build rapport between the respondent and the researcher.

2. Questions at the very beginning of a questionnaire should explicitly address the topic of the survey, as it was described to the respondent prior to the interview.

3. Questions on the same topic should be grouped together.

4. Questions on the same topic should proceed from general to specific.

5. Questions on sensitive topics that might make respondents uncomfortable should be placed at the end of the questionnaire.

6. Filter questions should be included, to avoid asking respondents questions that do not apply to them" (Krosnick & Presser, 2010, p. 264).

It is common to use Likert scale ratings on questionnaire surveys. This is because they are easy to administer and familiar to participants (Weng, 2004). However, to have reliable data, it is necessary to design the scales carefully (Krosnick & Berent, 1993). Each value on the scale should be labeled to improve the reliability of the data and allow for better interpretation of the results (Krosnick, 1999; Krosnick & Berent, 1993; Weng, 2004). There is conflicting research about the number of scale points needed for a reliable tool (Matell & Jacoby, 1971; Preston & Colman, 2000; Lissitz & Green, 1975). However, a review of the literature found that “a rating scale with fewer than 5 scale points should…be discouraged if possible” (Weng, 2004, p. 969).
When designing questionnaires to use as a tool for research, there is much to consider: the use of close-ended versus open-ended questions, the wording of questions, the order of questions, and Likert scale options. These options all impact the outcome of the data and the questionnaire's validity and reliability.

**Questionnaire Validity and Reliability**

Validity refers to the ability of a tool to "measure what is intended to be measured" (Field, 2009). There are four main types of validity: content validity, face validity, criterion validity, and construct validity (Del Greco et al., 1987). Reliability indicates that a tool is consistent and the results are repeatable. This can be examined in three main ways: test-retest reliability, internal consistency reliability, and interrater reliability (Taherdoost, 2016). Del Greco et al. (1987) explain the importance of validity and reliability in a simple anecdote: "the thermometer must indicate the correct temperature to be valid and must repeatedly give the same reading to be reliable" (p. 699). When creating tools to evaluate professional development, such as a questionnaire, they must be valid and reliable so that the data produced is valid and reliable. These concepts are crucial in ensuring the quality of professional development, which is required by law and can be—depending on how it is executed and evaluated—a nourishing part of a teacher's ongoing education.

**Theoretical Framework**

A theoretical framework is "an integration of the theoretical concepts that apply to the problem under investigation" (Sanden & Egbert, 2013, p. 94). It helps to identify your problem, plan and guide your research, analyze your data, and add to the body of literature. Theoretical frameworks are built from a solid knowledge of the literature surrounding your problem and help
select your methodology. "Without a theoretical framework, a study has no reason" (Sanden & Egbert, 2013, p. 108). The framework for this dissertation is two-pronged. On one side, it will use the theory of satisficing to understand how and why participants interacted with the evaluation the way they did. On the other side, it focuses on the people involved with professional development, the teachers, using the theory of andragogy to understand teachers' experience with participating in and evaluating professional development.

*Theory of Satisficing*

When respondents complete an item on a questionnaire, they work through a series of cognitive processes. They start by interpreting the question and its intent. After that, respondents recall relevant information and use that information to construct a judgment. Finally, they use that judgment to create a response (Tourangeau, 1984). Respondents who engage in these processes when completing questionnaires "in a thorough and unbiased manner…may be said to be optimizing" (Krosnick & Presser, 2010, p. 265). Those who do not have the motivation, interest, or stamina to work through this cognitive practice may disregard parts of or completely neglect this process and "settle for generating merely satisfactory answers" (Krosnick, 1991, p. 215). Satisficing occurs when respondents fail to complete all the necessary cognitive processes. This theory emerged as an alternative to rational choice theory, which was used in the field of social sciences to explain why people made the choices they made. Social theorists believe that people make choices based on their preferences, morals, or needs. They weigh their options, think about the outcome and what they will gain from each selection, and choose (Appelrouth & Edles, 2016). Examples include taking less time to understand what the question is asking, being less purposeful in answer selection, or inadequately retrieving information that could assist with answering the question.
Krosnick (1991) identified a series of satisficing response strategies that respondents may use when completing a survey. For example, respondents may exhibit one or more of the following strategies when answering surveys: "choosing the first response alternative that seems to constitute a reasonable answer, agreeing with an assertion made by a question, endorsing the status quo instead of endorsing social change, failing to differentiate among a set of diverse objects in ratings, saying 'don't know' instead of reporting an opinion, and randomly choosing among the response alternatives offered" (Krosnick, 1991, p. 220). Rushing through surveys, skipping questions, non-differentiation, or straight-lining, and ending before finishing are also forms of satisficing but are more common on online surveys (Barge & Gehlbach, 2012).

Satisficing occurs more often when the task has a high level of difficulty, the respondent has a low ability level, the respondent lacks motivation, or a combination of the three (Krosnick, 1991; Roberts et al., 2019). Ratings for satisficing strategies range from weak to strong. Weak satisficing occurs when respondents work through the four cognitive stages when selecting answers, but not with their full attention, motivation, or skill. Strong satisficing happens when respondents begin to answer questions superficially and without much thought, skipping some cognitive stages altogether (Krosnick, 1991).

There is not much research on survey satisficing and its effect on validity and reliability measures. Hamby and Taylor's (2016) research on survey satisficing agreed with prior research about conditions that lead to satisficing behavior, task difficulty, low ability, and low motivation. They also found that "satisficing behavior appears to be associated with improved internal consistency reliability and convergent validity but also worsened discriminant validity" (Hamby & Taylor, 2016, p. 926). Barge & Gehlbach (2012) conducted a study that used the Theory of Satisficing to evaluate the quality of data collected via surveys. They found that "as satisficing
becomes more pronounced, the reliabilities of scales increase, as do the correlations between scales” (p 23). The impact of satisficing behaviors on the validity and reliability of surveys could give researchers a false view of the instrument and, therefore, the data collected. “Satisficing respondents can negatively influence the data enough to introduce correlations where, in fact, none exist” (Barge & Gehlbach, 2012, p. 26).

**Andragogy**

Andragogy is a theory, most recently popularized by Malcolm Knowles, recognizing adult learners' needs and differences (1973). Andragogy is "a set of core adult learning principles that apply to all adult learning situations" (Knowles et al., 2011, p. 2). The following six assumptions frame the andragogic model:

- **The need to know:** To value new learning, adults need to understand why they are learning the new content.
- **The learners' self-concept:** As people progress into adulthood, they become less dependent on others for learning and rely on self-directed learning.
- **The role of the learners' experiences:** As adults age, they gather knowledge that impacts their learning. These experiences shape them as learners and are essential to new learning through activities that allow them to share their knowledge.
- **Readiness to learn:** Adult learners' readiness to learn is directly related to their specific, job-related needs.
- **Orientation to learning:** Adult learners take a problem-focused stance on learning, preferring to engage in experiences that will provide solutions to problems they are facing.
• **Motivation:** Internal pressures are more motivating to adults than external pressures.

  Adults are more motivated by increased job satisfaction and self-esteem than promotions and salary increases (Knowles et al., 2011).

  Professional development is one of the primary forms of adult learning in education. However, when teachers participate in more traditional forms of professional development, they often take on the role of the student. The format, style, content, etc., of the sessions will play a role in how teachers engage in learning. This, in turn, may impact how teachers reflect on their experiences and, eventually, interact with the evaluation. Applying the theory of andragogy while analyzing the data will help better understand teachers' reactions during the evaluation of the professional development sessions they attend. Themes will be explored around the assumptions about adult learners to help identify if these beliefs play a part in teachers' responses to evaluation questionnaires about initial reaction and learning during professional development sessions.

**Summary**

  The theories of andragogy and satisficing frame the theoretical framework for the proposed study, as shown in Figure 3. The use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development will be explored from a theoretical perspective by examining teachers' experience with questionnaires and how their position as adult learners impacts their experience. In addition, the data gathered from the questionnaire will be analyzed to determine both the validity of the tool and how satisficing affect the evaluation process. Together, these data will allow for a thorough analysis of the use of questionnaires when evaluating professional development.
Educational psychologist Lee Shulman (2004) stated, "classroom teaching is perhaps the most complex, most challenging, and most demanding, subtle, nuanced, and frightening activity that our species has ever invented" (p. 504). Professional development, one aspect of the profession, is meant to help improve the craft of teaching to impact student learning. However, the ambiguity with defining professional development, the qualities of effective professional development, and the best ways to measure its worth lead to teachers devaluing their experiences (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014). While teachers attempt to understand the purpose of the professional development activities they are required to participate in, they are also navigating the bureaucracy of the school institution. Graeber (2015) describes bureaucracies as "utopian forms of organization…[that] have a naïve faith in the perfectibility of human
nature..[that] leads then to set impossible standards and then blame the individuals for not living up to them" (p. 65). Teachers will struggle to succeed without a distinct understanding of professional development and realistic expectations for growing within a bureaucratic system. Therefore, it is necessary to bring clarity to the field of educational professional development to leverage the time spent by teachers in a way that produces the most significant outcomes for students.
Chapter III: Methodology

Research Design and Description of Methods

This study aimed to examine the use of questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. In addition, the study intended to determine if questionnaires accurately reflect teachers’ experiences during professional development, specifically regarding their reaction to and learning during professional development sessions. Based on the findings, one goal of this study was to provide recommendations for improving the process of evaluating professional development. Therefore, the use of an explanatory sequential design was appropriate to answer the research questions:

- To what extent do questionnaires reflect teachers' reactions to and learning in professional developments sessions?
- How do teachers view the use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions?
- How can the evaluation of professional development be improved to better assess teachers' reaction to and learning in professional development sessions?

This study included three phases. During the first phase, quantitative data was collected to gather information about teachers’ evaluation of professional development. The second phase focused on exploring teachers’ experiences with completing evaluation questionnaires, specifically in regards to their reaction to and learning in the sessions. During the third phase, qualitative data was collected to further explain their interactions with the questionnaires and identify if questionnaires are adequate tools for evaluating professional development sessions in order to provide recommendations for improving the process.
Description of the Setting

The setting for this study was a large public-school district in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. This district employed more than 900 teachers and served approximately 13,000 students in grades K-12. Permission to conduct this study was granted by the site, as shown in Appendix A.

Participants

The population for this study was K-12 teachers who participated in a district-provided professional development session and took part in an evaluation of the session. Teachers in this study included contracted employees of the school district who served as full- or part-time teachers, including all grade levels and subject areas. In addition to classroom teachers, the population included non-classroom teacher positions, such as school counselors, gifted education teachers, literacy specialists, etc. Teachers not invited to participate were those who did not attend the professional development session or complete the session evaluation, as well as those teachers who were involved in the creation or presentation of the professional development. Included below is additional information about participants for each phase of this study.

Phase I

Phase I of this study occurred at the end of a district-wide professional development session. As with all district professional development, teachers completed a district-created evaluation at the end of the session. While this is considered the first phase of the study, teachers would have engaged in all of the Phase I procedures regardless of this study. Anonymous data for all teachers was collected. The purpose of this phase of the study was to gather data using a
district-created questionnaire to be analyzed and used as a point of comparison throughout the remainder of the study.

**Phase I Participants**

In Phase I, all K-12 teachers from the population who completed the district-provided District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, following a professional development session, were included in the initial, anonymous pool of data. A total of 825 teachers met these requirements, and anonymous data was collected for the entire group.

**Phase I Procedures**

In Phase I, all K-12 teachers attended a 2 ½ hour, district-mandated professional development session. The session took place on an early dismissal day. On early dismissal days, professional development begins after school is in session for six hours and extends an additional hour past teachers’ typical workday. During the last ten minutes of the session, teachers were provided with the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, described below, to complete. Teachers received a link to the form via email. Completing this form is a requirement for all teachers who attend the professional development sessions and is not specific to this study.

**Phase I Instrumentation**

The District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire is a district-created questionnaire used to collect information from participants at the end of most professional development sessions. The questionnaire was created in Google Forms and is shared out digitally via email or the chat feature of Zoom if the session was virtual. The form has a series of 14 questions, as described below.
The questionnaire begins by collecting basic information from the respondent. These questions are required and include:

- Name (First) – Short Answer
- Name (Last) – Short Answer
- Building – Drop-down List
- Select your department – Drop-down List
- I have participated in this professional development activity. – Yes/No Checkbox

The first four content-based questions on the questionnaire are required. Respondents select their answer using a Likert scale, with one point meaning that they strongly disagree and four or five points, or the highest response, representing that they strongly agree. There are no additional labels on the scale. The first question is measured using a 5-point Likert scale, while questions two through four are rated using a 4-point Likert scale.

1. I am satisfied with the session attended.
2. Time in the workshop was sufficient to accomplish the goals of the session.
3. The workshop was well planned and interactive.
4. Content and strategies will be useful in my work.

The final set of questions is open-ended questions. These questions are optional for respondents. In addition, the questionnaire includes an optional, open-ended response question that allows for additional comments, questions, or concerns; however, for this study, analysis of this question’s data did not occur.

5. What is the most significant thing you learned?
6. What support do you need to implement what you learned?
7. How will you apply what you have learned and/or discussed?

8. How can we build on this session for follow-up learning?

District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire data is collected via the Google Form and displayed in a Google Sheets spreadsheet.

**Phase II**

In Phase II, all Phase I participants were invited to continue participating in the study. The purpose of this phase of the study was to have teachers reflect on their experience with completing the professional development evaluation from Phase I of the study. In addition, Phase II data analysis will help understand teachers' experience with using questionnaires to evaluate professional development.

**Phase II Participants**

Phase II participants were recruited through the Questionnaire Reflection Survey. In addition to their survey responses, this instrument asked participants to allow their District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire data anonymity to be lifted and express if they would be interested in participating in a future focus group. As a result, 156 teachers completed the Questionnaire Reflection Survey, 77 allowed for their District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire data to anonymity to be lifted, and 42 agreed to participate in a future focus group.

**Phase II Procedures**

Immediately following the professional development session and completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, all K-12 teachers received an email that
included the Questionnaire Reflection Survey (see Appendix E). Teachers, who agreed to participate, completed the Questionnaire Reflection Survey. After completing the two anonymous questions, the survey invited participants to agree to participate in the study's Phase III.

*Phase II Instrumentation*

The Questionnaire Reflection Survey is an instrument created in Qualtrics for use in this study. The survey initially shared information with participants about the study, including the purpose, time expectations, associated risks and benefits, privacy rules, and contact information for those involved with the investigation. Next, participants were prompted to read all information relating to informed consent and select to agree or not agree to participate. The survey contained two Likert scale questions, shown below. Each included a five-point Likert scale with the following labels: strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree nor agree, agree, strongly agree.

1. When completing today's District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, did your responses accurately reflect your reaction to your experience in the session?

Survey questions that relate to reaction include the following multiple-choice questions:

- I am satisfied with the session attended.
- Time in the workshop was sufficient to accomplish goals of the session.
- The workshop was well planned and interactive.
- Content and strategies will be useful in my work
2. When completing today's District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, did your response accurately reflect your learning during the session? Survey questions that relate to your learning include the following open-ended questions:

- What is the most significant thing you learned?
- What support do you need to implement what you learned?
- How will you apply what you have learned and/or discussed?
- How can we build on this session for follow-up learning?

**Phase III**

In Phase III, the study continued by asking Phase II participants to join focus groups. The focus groups intended to gather qualitative data about teachers' experiences completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. Four questions guided the group discussion and prompted teachers to share their experiences and views.

**Phase III Participants**

Phase III participants included 12 teachers who participated in focus groups. These participants represent a variety of grade levels and content areas, including elementary teachers, secondary teachers, encore teachers, special education teachers, and guidance counselors.

**Phase III Procedures**

All teachers who completed the Phase II Questionnaire Reflection Survey received an email inviting them to participate in a focus group. The email included a link to a Qualtrics Focus Group Participation Survey that reiterated the purpose, risks and benefits, and time expectations of the study (see Appendix H). It also requested that participants agree to the terms of the study and provide contact information and availability. Selection of participants occurred
based on willingness to participate and availability, resulting in a random sampling of teachers. Scheduling of focus groups occurred by contacting participants by email and providing an Outlook calendar invitation. The day before each focus group session, participants received reminder emails.

Due to the impact of Covid-19, focus groups were held virtually on Zoom. Participants agreed to allow recording of the focus groups. After all of the members arrived in the Zoom room, participants introduced themselves to each other. A short introduction was provided to thank the group for their participation, remind them about the purpose of the study and that the Zoom session would be recorded, and provide a time for participants to answer questions. This introduction can be found in the Focus Group Guide in Appendix I.

Following the introduction, the focus group began. Participants answered a series of four questions, described in detail below. Participants had ample time to share answers to these questions and engage in a fluid conversation.

**Phase III Instrumentation**

The focus group consisted of four questions to guide discussion about teachers’ experience completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. The questions, found in the Focus Group Guide in Appendix I, are listed below:

1. Talk about your experience with completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire at the end of professional development sessions. This could include thoughts, feelings, concerns, questions.
2. The closed-ended, Likert scale questions on the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire measure teachers' reaction to professional development
sessions. They are displayed on the screen. Do you think that these questions accurately measure your reaction to professional development?

3. The open-ended questions on the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire measure teachers' learning during professional development sessions. They are displayed on the screen. 81% of teachers who completed the survey skipped at least one of the four open-ended questions, and 63% skipped all of them. Based on this information and your experiences, do you think that the questionnaire gains an accurate picture of teachers' learning during professional development sessions?

4. Do you believe that questionnaires are a useful tool in evaluating professional development, or do you think are some better methods for measuring teachers' reaction to and learning during professional development sessions?

The first question asked focus group participants to share their experience completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. This question is the broadest of the four and prompted a general discussion. The second question provoked dialog about the closed-ended Likert scale questions. This data is comparable to the Phase I close-ended question data and the data from Phase II, question one on the Questionnaire Reflection Survey. The third question focused on the open-ended evaluation questions and is also comparable to Phase I and II data. Finally, the last question asked participants to provide feedback about their thoughts about the effectiveness of questionnaires to evaluate professional development and any alternative evaluation methods.

**Positionality and Researchers' Bias**

Researchers are responsible for recognizing their positionality within their study. Throughout the entire research process, the beliefs and experiences of the researcher play a
considerable role. Understanding their position within the study is necessary for the researcher to do to be able to recognize the lens through which they view the research (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). In this study, my current role as an Elementary Instructional Coach and my past role as the Mathematics Curriculum Leader affect my positionality. Both of these roles are heavily involved in professional development, assisting in the planning and delivery. In addition, a general belief about the necessity and importance of professional development may impact the study. While these roles are not administrative, I am no longer a classroom teacher and often interact with district administration, which may cause some participants to view the researcher as a superior and affect their willingness to share openly.

Summary

This explanatory sequential mixed-methods study examined teachers’ experiences when completing professional development evaluations to help determine whether questionnaires are an appropriate tool for gathering their feedback about their reactions to and learning during sessions. Based on this information, the study aimed to provide recommendations about improving the evaluation of professional development. Phase I gathered data from a district-created professional development evaluation questionnaire. Phase II of the study allowed teachers to briefly describe their experience with completing the questionnaire. Finally, in Phase III, focus groups gave teachers a forum to take a deep dive into their experiences, which helps explain the Phase I and Phase II data.
Chapter IV: Results

In this chapter, I present the results from this three-phase study. The data is laid out in chronological order, following the order in which data was collected during the study. First, Phase I data is displayed and discussed to show the total results of the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. While this data is critical, on its own it does not help to answer the study’s research questions:

- To what extent do questionnaires reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning in professional development sessions?
- How do teachers view the use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions?
- How can the evaluation of professional development be improved to better assess teachers’ reaction to and learning in professional development sessions?

Next, Phase II data from the Questionnaire Reflection Survey is presented. This data sheds light on the use of questionnaires to measure teachers’ reactions to and learning during professional development sessions because it asked them to reflect on their experience with completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. Finally, data from the focus group is shared from Phase III of the study. The conversations and comments from teachers during this phase of the study helped to explain their perceptions about questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions. The culmination of the data presented below provides educators with beneficial knowledge about the evaluation process of professional development. This data could help improve the evaluation process for future sessions and, therefore, professional development in general.
Phase I Data

The participants of this study, all K-12 teachers who took part in a professional development session, were required to complete a district-provided evaluation, the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. A total of 825 teachers completed this questionnaire. Participants were spread across the elementary, middle, high, and cyber school levels within that sample and across all departments. Data for the makeup of Phase I data is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

*District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education/Computer Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade K</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coaches</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Specialists</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to collecting basic demographic information, this questionnaire consisted of two sections: four close-ended questions that aimed to measure teachers’ reactions to professional development and four open-ended questions that aimed to measure teachers’ learning during professional development sessions. The questions are listed below:

1. I am satisfied with the session attended.
2. Time in the workshop was sufficient to accomplish the goals of the session.
3. The workshop was well planned and interactive.
4. Content and strategies will be useful in my work.
5. What is the most significant thing you learned?
6. What support do you need to implement what you learned?
7. How will you apply what you have learned and/or discussed?
8. How can we build on this session for follow-up learning?

Nearing the end of the professional development session, teachers were provided with the digital questionnaire via an emailed link. The results of the questionnaire were collected digitally and compiled on a spreadsheet. A total of 825 teachers participated in Phase I of the study by completing the questionnaire. It is unclear whether all teachers who participated in the professional development session completed the questionnaire. This is due to the fact that the
questionnaire gathers attendance information in addition to being used to evaluate sessions.

Anonymous data for all 825 teachers were used for analysis in Phase I of this study.

**Closed-Ended Questions**

The overall results for questions one through four, the close-ended questions, are shown in Table 2. All 825 participants completed each of the closed-ended questions, as they are required to submit the digital questionnaire. When analyzing the data, it is essential to note that question one is measured using a 5-point Likert scale, while questions two through four use a 4-point Likert scale. Only the endpoints on the Likert scale were labeled, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The overall picture from the close-ended questions indicates that the participants were primarily satisfied and had a positive reaction to their professional development sessions. Data for each of these four questions is below.

**Table 2**

*District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire Close-Ended Question Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36%)</td>
<td>(1.21%)</td>
<td>(9.57%)</td>
<td>(17.33%)</td>
<td>(71.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.21%)</td>
<td>(2.91%)</td>
<td>(18.67%)</td>
<td>(77.21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36%)</td>
<td>(3.15%)</td>
<td>(17.21%)</td>
<td>(79.27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.21%)</td>
<td>(4.24%)</td>
<td>(15.88%)</td>
<td>(78.67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Participant Response (N=825)*

**Question 1 - I am satisfied with the session attended.** The first survey question aims to measure teachers’ reaction to the session based on their overall satisfaction. This question is measured using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.
There are no labels for the values of two through four, so it must be assumed that a rating of 3 would indicate a neutral reaction. 88.85% of participants rated their overall satisfaction as a four or five, indicating positive-leaning satisfaction. 9.57% of participants rated this category with a 3, while only 1.57% of participants rated their overall satisfaction with a 1 or 2, indicating they were not satisfied with the professional development. Question one has a mean of 4.58, a median of 5, and a standard deviation of 0.74. The skewness for this question is -1.82, which indicates that the scores are clusters at the high end of the scale. Figure 4 shows that the responses are not normally distributed.

**Figure 4**

*District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire – Question 1 Responses*

---

**Question 2** - Time in the workshop was sufficient to allow for new learning and practice new concepts. The second question aimed to identify whether teachers felt that the professional development session provided them with enough time to learn and practice the content that was being presented. This question is measured using a four-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. There are no labels for the values of two and
three. A total of 95.88% of teachers scored question two a 3 or 4, a positive response, while the remaining 4.12% scored it 1 or 2, indicating they disagreed with the statement. Question two has a mean of 3.72, a median of 4, and a standard deviation of 0.58. The skewness for this question is -2.31, which, similar to the first question, indicates that the scores are clusters at the high end of the scale.

**Figure 5**

*District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire – Question 2 Responses*

---

**Question 3 – The workshop was well planned and interactive.** Question three aimed to determine if teachers thought that the professional development session was well planned and interactive. This question is measured using a four-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. There are no labels for the values of two and three. A total of 96.48% of teachers gave a score of 3 or 4 for question three, indicating they agreed that the workshop was well planned and interactive. 3.51% of participants disagreed with this statement. Question three has a mean of 3.75, a median of 4, and a standard deviation of 0.52. The
skewness for this question is -2.20, which indicates that the scores are clusters at the high end of the scale. Figure 6 shows that the responses are not normally distributed.

**Figure 6**

*District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire – Question 3 Responses*

---

**Question 4 – Content and strategies will be useful in my work.** Finally, question four aimed to collect data on teachers’ perceptions of the usefulness of the content presented during the session. This question is measured using a four-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. There are no labels for the values of two and three. 94.55% of participants agreed that the content and strategies presented would be useful in their work, while 5.45% disagreed. Question four has a mean of 3.72, a median of 4, and a standard deviation of 0.60. The skewness for this question is -2.34, which indicates that the scores are clusters at the high end of the scale. Figure 7 shows that the responses are not normally distributed.

**Figure 7**

*District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire – Question 4 Responses*
Reliability. To determine if the questionnaire is reliable, internal consistency was examined. Cronbach’s alpha for this tool was $\alpha = .92$. This shows that the questionnaire has excellent internal reliability. Because the questionnaire consisted of only four questions, internal consistency was also examined using Spearman’s rank correlation, which confirmed the findings.

Satisficing. Non-differentiation, or straight-lining, is a type of satisficing where survey respondents answer all or most questions with the same response (Barge & Gehlbach, 2012). When analyzing the responses to the close-ended questions within this study, non-differentiation is defined as responding either with the same Likert-scale response or responding with the highest score for all questions. By analyzing the data from the close-ended questions, satisficing behaviors were exhibited by a large percentage of the participants. Of the 825 participants, 703 used non-differentiation when responding to their survey, accounting for 85.21% of participants. Five hundred sixty-six of these participants responded with the highest score possible on the close-ended questionnaire questions.
According to the data collected from the close-ended, Likert scale questions, teachers evaluated the professional development session overall positively. Mean scores for all four Likert scale questions land at the high end of the scales, indicating substantial agreement with the question statements and, thus, overall positive reaction to the evaluated aspects of the professional development sessions. Of the 825 participants, 566 of them gave the highest score possible on the close-ended questions on the questionnaire by scoring question one a five and giving four points to questions two through four.

**Open-Ended Questions**

The open-ended questions on the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire are optional to answer. The purpose of these questions, listed below, is to gather feedback from teachers on their learning during the professional development sessions, reflect on how they will use the knowledge moving forward, and identify any needs based on this new learning.

5. What is the most significant thing you learned?

6. What support do you need to implement what you learned?

7. How will you apply what you have learned and/or discussed?

8. How can we build on this session for follow-up learning?

**Satisficing.** When analyzing the open-ended question data, I identified participants who engaged in satisficing. For the open-ended questions within this study, satisficing is defined as submitting a blank response or giving an insufficient response to the questions. An insufficient response is quantified as a response of fewer than four words. The response rate for these questions is shown in Table 3. Of the 825 Phase I participants, 756 of them, or 91.64%, engaged
in one or more instances of satisficing, and only 69 participants did not engage in satisficing of the open-ended questions.

Table 3

Satisficing – Open-Ended Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Blank Answer</th>
<th>Insufficient Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(65.09%)</td>
<td>(73.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(68.97%)</td>
<td>(84.48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(70.79%)</td>
<td>(77.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73.82%)</td>
<td>(83.64%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Participant Response (N=825)*

Phase I Data Summary

In Phase I of this study, I analyzed data collected from the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. The first set of questions, the closed-ended questions, were scored high by participants, indicating a generally positive reaction to the professional development. Based on the nature of the data collected from these questions, it would be appropriate to assume that responses to the open-ended questions found on the second half of the questionnaire would be similar. However, this was not found to be true. When answering the second set of questions, the open-ended questions, nearly 92% of participants engaged in some form of satisficing. When looking at the Phase I data as a whole, only 6 participants did not engage in any satisficing behaviors. This means that 99.27% of Phase I participants used one or
more types of satisficing to reduce their cognitive load when completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire.

**Phase II Data**

In Phase II of the study, all 825 K-12 teachers who participated in the professional development session were invited to continue participation by completing the Questionnaire Reflection Survey. This two-question survey asked teachers to reflect on their experience completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, focusing on their reaction to and learning during the session. These questions relate directly to the sets of close-ended and open-ended questions. Each question included a five-point Likert scale with the following labels: strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree nor agree, agree, strongly agree. A total of 156 teachers completed the Questionnaire Reflection Survey, which accounts for only 18.91% of Phase I participants. Table 4 displays the overall results from this survey.

**Table 4**

*Questionnaire Reflection Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.33%)</td>
<td>(17.31%)</td>
<td>(17.95%)</td>
<td>(39.10%)</td>
<td>(17.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.18%)</td>
<td>(28.21%)</td>
<td>(21.15%)</td>
<td>(26.92%)</td>
<td>(11.54%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Participant Response (N=156)*

**Questionnaire Reflection Survey - Question One**

The first question on the Questionnaire Reflection Survey, shown below, relates to teachers’ reactions to the professional development session. This question asks teachers to reflect on their experience answering the close-ended, Likert scale questions.
1. When completing today’s District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, did your responses accurately reflect your reaction to your experience in the session? Questions that relate to reaction include the following multiple-choice questions:

- I am satisfied with the session attended.
- Time in the workshop was sufficient to accomplish goals of the session.
- The workshop was well planned and interactive.
- Content and strategies will be useful in my work.

A total of 68 teachers, or 43.59% of participants, had a neutral or negative response to this question, indicating that their answers to the close-ended questions did not accurately reflect their reaction to the session. Question one has a mean of 3.48, a median of 4, and a standard deviation of 1.13. The skewness for this question is -0.615, indicating that the data is only moderately skewed. Figure 8 shows that scores are slightly skewed toward the higher end of the rating scale but close to being within the range for a normal distribution.
The second question on the Questionnaire Reflection Survey, shown below, relates to teachers’ learning during the professional development session. This question asks teachers to reflect on their experience answering the open-ended, optional questions.

2. When completing today’s District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, did your response accurately reflect your learning during the session? Survey questions that relate to your learning include the following open-ended questions:

- What is the most significant thing you learned?
- What support do you need to implement what you learned?
- How will you apply what you have learned and/or discussed?
- How can we build on this session for follow-up learning?
A total of 96 teachers, or 61.54% of participants, had a neutral or negative response to this question, indicating that their answers to the open-ended questions did not accurately reflect their learning in the session. Question two has a mean of 3.00, a median of 3, and a standard deviation of 1.188. The skewness for this question is -0.031, indicating that the data is not skewed. Figure 9 shows that scores are normally distributed.

**Figure 9**

*Questionnaire Reflection Survey – Question 2 Responses*

![Histogram showing distribution of responses for Question 2.](image)

*Questionnaire Reflection Survey – Additional Questions*

After participants completed the two-question survey, they were invited to provide some identifying information, including their name and building. Also, they were given the option of allowing the anonymity of their Phase I data to be lifted to compare results from Phase I and Phase II of the study. Of the 156 Phase II participants, 77 agreed to provide their demographic information and non-anonymous data for further evaluation. These 77 participants were invited to participate in Phase III of this study.
Phase III Data

In Phase III of the study, the 77 teachers who agreed to continued participation were invited to join focus groups. Three focus groups were conducted with a total of 12 participants. Not only did the focus group participants represent various subject areas and grade levels, their Phase I data closely mirrored the data of all Phase I participants. When answering the close-ended Phase I questions, 83.33% of focus group participants used nondifferentiation, compared to 85.21% of all Phase I participants. The data for the close-ended questions was extremely close, with 91.67% of focus group participants engaging in satisficing by skipping questions or giving insufficient answers, compared to 91.64% of all Phase I participants. The focus group participants were asked a series of four questions. Their responses were recorded using Zoom and later transcribed.

When analyzing the focus group data, transcriptions were coded using themes from the review of the literature and theoretical framework. These themes discussed below begin with the most prevalent theme and progress towards the least prevalent. Table 5 displays each theme and the number of times the theme was mentioned during the focus groups.

Table 5

*Focus Group Themes Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Format and Quality</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisficing Behaviors</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traits of Effective Professional Development</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andragogy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theme of bureaucracy has been pervasive throughout the history of education. For this reason, the theme of bureaucracy was used when examining focus group data. During the focus group, three subthemes emerged under the umbrella of bureaucracy. First, participants were unclear about how the data collected was being used and who was actually looking at or analyzing it. Second, participants felt that completing the questionnaire was just checking a box on a list of things they were required to do. Finally, participants were unclear about the true purpose of the questionnaire.

During the focus groups, the single most discussed topic was about teachers’ perception that no one looks at or analyzes the data collected from the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. Participants’ comments, such as when Lori stated, “I’m not sure where these go, to be honest,” indicate that it is unclear who the audience is for the district’s questionnaire. This lack of clarity continues with teachers’ understanding of the purpose of the questionnaire. The questions presented in the questionnaire clearly ask for teachers’ feedback about their experience and learning during the professional development and provide a space for reflection for moving forward. Unfortunately, George stated, “there’s no purpose to it or it’s not conveyed to us properly.” Some participants in the focus groups indicated that they thought the questionnaire’s true purpose was to record attendance to prove they participated. Stephanie said, “it functions as an attendance-only tool. It’s not actually working to inform future professional development practice.” In the absence of a known purpose, the participants felt as if they were just “checking a box that maybe is a state mandate or something the districts are required to offer their employees.” Table 6 shows a selection of additional quotes for each bureaucracy subtheme.
### Table 6

**Bureaucracy Quotations from Focus Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucracy Subtheme</th>
<th>Example Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of the Data</td>
<td>“I’ve never had anyone follow up with me on my commentary.”  &lt;br&gt;“We don’t know who’s really reading this.”  &lt;br&gt;“If they’re actually using the data, if they pointed out at some point like, hey, we saw your data, and we decided this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Purpose</td>
<td>“I don’t know if it’s for attendance or if they actually care what we write, so then that makes me less likely to actually write the thing.”  &lt;br&gt;“I wish…I had a little bit more knowledge as to what was done with the questionnaire information. I might have more vested interest in…my responses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking the Box</td>
<td>“I know this is my ticket out of here.”  &lt;br&gt;“To get the credit…fill the requirement, and move on.”  &lt;br&gt;“It’s an accountability, making sure that contractually we’re doing what we’re supposed to be doing.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questionnaire Format and Quality**

Designing questionnaires to gather evaluative data is not a simple task. They must use simple wording that is also specific enough to avoid confusion or ambiguity. In addition, questions must ask about only one thing at a time, should not be leading, and avoid double negatives (Marden & Wright, 2010). While there was no specific question asking participants to discuss the format and quality of questions on the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, this topic emerged during the focus group discussion.

Michael asked, “what does that even mean?” when discussing the wording in the questions. George indicated, “that’s so subjective…satisfied…what does satisfied mean?” Ambiguous wording and phrases that could mean different things to different people can cause confusion when responding to questionnaires. In addition to not fully understanding the wording
of the questions, participants also found that not all questions applied to the sessions they attend throughout the year. Even though the content and delivery of professional development changes, the questionnaire remains the same. Linda commented, “They tried to make them…all be standard regardless of what kind of PD you received, which is helpful because at least…I know what the questions are…it probably makes it faster and easier.” This quote indicates that teachers recognize that the questions do not pertain and that because of that, they are more likely to engage in satisficing behaviors when completing them. One final theme discussed regarding the format and quality of the questionnaire was the use of double-barreled questions. The use of both of the terms well-planned and interactive in question three was discussed. Participants agreed that this question “should be two separate questions.”

Suppose the format and quality of the questionnaire are not of a high standard, such as having ambiguous wording, questions that are not applicable to the professional development, and double-barreled questions. In that case, it makes it difficult to trust the data that is collected. Table 7 shows a selection of additional quotes about the format and quality of the questionnaire.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format/Quality Subtheme</th>
<th>Example Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous Meaning</td>
<td>“How are you supposed to answer a question like I’m satisfied with the session attended?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Interactive can also mean different things.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>“The questions are always going to be the same for the PD regardless of what it is you’re actually learning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“This is pretty general and doesn’t always align with the purpose of everyone’s different PD across the district.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I don’t feel that the questions relate to the activity.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-Barreled Questions</td>
<td>“The…question says well planned and interactive. That almost should be two separate questions.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisficing Behavior

Questionnaire respondents engage in satisficing to reduce their cognitive load and make the process of completing the questionnaire easier (Krosnick, 1991). In addition to analyzing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire data, I gathered information from focus group participants as they discussed how they engaged in satisficing behaviors when completing the questionnaire. Analysis of the use of minimally acceptable answers occurred with Phase I data; however, participants did not discuss this form of satisficing during the focus groups.

Rushing to complete the questionnaire was the most common form of satisficing discussed during the focus group. Lori indicated that she tries “to fill it out as quickly as possible,” and Audrey shared that teachers “don’t always have time to put true reflections down.” This form of satisficing was not measured during Phase I data, so it is important to note that most focus group participants shared that they engage in this behavior.

Skipping the open-ended questions was another popular form of satisficing both in the Phase I and focus group data. Allison said, “I never filled out those four questions,” and Stephanie agreed, saying, “I rarely make comments.” This data was confirmed by comparing their comments to the Phase I data collected. Ten of the twelve focus group participants skipped at least one of the open-ended questions, and eight skipped all four.

Similarly, non-differentiation as a satisficing strategy was high within the focus group. The comments shared by participants about their use of non-differentiation, such as “I’m sure to give all fives regardless of what we are doing,” were mirrored by the Phase I data. Again, ten of
the twelve focus group participants used this form of satisficing. Nine rated the professional development with the highest possible score, and one participant chose all threes. Two participants also indicated that their satisficing behaviors were impacted by who was presenting the professional development session. Lori said, “I’m pretty much threes…unless…it asks the question about the presenter. And there my bias comes out if it’s the presenter that I know, or you know, another educator. I’m going to definitely put a four in there to support them.” This comment adds another facet to explore regarding satisficing behaviors when analyzing questionnaires’ data. Table 8 shows a selection of additional quotes about satisficing.

**Table 8**

*Satisficing Quotations from Focus Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisficing Subtheme</th>
<th>Example Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushing Through</td>
<td>“I fill it out as fast as I can.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s at the end of a long day…you do this, and you can leave. So it’s a moment, I’m done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I know it’s my ticket out of here.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipping Questions</td>
<td>“I skip [the open-ended] entirely.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I feel like I usually skip those, too. I feel like my brain is fried. I’m done…I think a lot of us skip.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“If I don’t have to answer it, I don’t.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-differentiation</td>
<td>“Oftentimes, when I fill these out, I go right down the middle.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Typically, it is straight fives.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But if it’s like a person that…it feels like I’m evaluating…I’m always going to give them fives.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Traits of Effective Professional Development*

Using Learning Forward’s seven standards for increasing the effectiveness of professional development as a guide, I analyzed focus group data to uncover whether the quality of professional development had any impact on questionnaire results. The seven standards
include learning communities, leadership, resources, data, learning designs, implementation, and outcomes (Learning Forward, n.d.-a). However, during the focus groups, no discussion about the standards of leadership, learning communities, or resources occurred.

It was evident from the focus group discussions that teachers believe the implementation of professional development is ineffective. Olivia indicated that the professional development felt “disjointed because they’re one time and then things aren’t revisited,” and Teri added that it “should be…ongoing and like you’re…building on it. It shouldn’t just be in…isolation.” Participants shared that they did not like professional development to be held after they had been teaching already that day. Stephanie added that “the most meaningful days…are professional development on non-school days.” The learning design also was an area that participants voiced concern about. Jacob felt that the district is “not providing the professional development [they] hoped for” and that she doesn’t “think the professional development is developing” teachers as it is intended to do. Participants briefly commented on aspects of professional development outcomes and data; however, these were not heavily discussed. Table 9 provides additional quotes from the focus group for the four standards for effective professional development discussed.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits of Effective Professional Development Quotations from Focus Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective PD Subtheme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                  | “I feel like [teachers] cannot attend…mentally or emotionally to the professional development because they are usually attending to…issues that started in the morning. Whereas when we have non-student days, like a true 8:00 to 3:30 PD day, the [teachers]
CHECKING THE BOX

Conclusion

This study aims to examine the use of questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. In addition, the study aimed to determine if questionnaires accurately reflect teachers’ experiences during professional development. The quantitative and qualitative data collected helps to answer the first two research questions:

• To what extent do questionnaires reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning in professional development sessions?

• How do teachers view the use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions?
The data from Phase One, which was collected from the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire, told two conflicting stories. When examining teachers’ responses to the close-ended questions, the data initially looked very positive, with mean scores for each question near the top of the rating scale. A quick look at this data would indicate that teachers were happy with their professional development and suggested that on their questionnaire. However, further analysis of this data tells the other story. Using the theory of satisficing during the Phase One data analysis shows that most teachers employed at least one form of satisficing when completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. Satisficing helps to reduce the cognitive load when completing a survey, which leads to less reliable data. Only six of the 825 participants did not engage in satisficing during Phase One of the study. This information alone makes it difficult to trust the data collected from the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire and indicates that the questionnaires don’t accurately reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning during professional development sessions.

When comparing teachers’ responses to the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire from Phase One of the study with the data collected in Phases Two and Three, it is evident that questionnaires do not reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning in professional development sessions. Phase Two data, collected via the Questionnaire Reflection Survey, indicated that the district questionnaire did not accurately measure their experiences during professional development sessions. Of the participants, 43.59% believe that the close-ended questions did not accurately reflect their experience, and 61.54% indicate that the open-ended did not. The fact that approximately half of the participants do not feel that the district questionnaire measures what it intends to measure is troublesome. It may be one of the reasons that so many teachers engage in satisficing when completing the District Professional
Development Evaluation Questionnaire. Phase Three data, collected during the focus groups, also supported the idea that the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire does not accurately reflect teachers’ experiences. Participants discussed how the process of completing the evaluation was bureaucratic in nature, causing them to question the evaluation process. They also identified problems with the quality and format of both the questionnaire and the professional development session. During the focus groups, participants discussed how they engaged in satisficing behaviors when completing the questionnaire.

In chapter five, the data collected and analyzed from the three phases of this study will be further discussed. This discussion aims to answer the final research question: How can the evaluation of professional development be improved to better assess teachers’ reaction to and learning in professional development sessions?
Chapter V: Discussion

This mixed-methods study aimed to examine questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. In addition, the study aimed to determine if questionnaires accurately reflect teachers’ experiences during professional development, specifically regarding their reaction to and learning during the professional development sessions. Therefore, the study intended to answer three questions:

- To what extent do questionnaires reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning in professional development sessions?
- How do teachers view the use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions?
- How can the evaluation of professional development be improved to better assess teachers’ reaction to and learning in professional development sessions?

In Chapter IV, the study results provided answers to questions one and two. The following discussion will build upon those answers and provide suggestions synthesized from the data collected during the study to improve professional development evaluation and answer question three.

Summary of Study

This study began immediately following a district-wide professional development session. All K-12 teachers participated in a 2 ½ hour, district-mandated professional development. The session took place on an early dismissal day, meaning teachers had already worked for approximately 6 hours before and extended their workday close to an hour past their typical day. During the last ten minutes of the session, teachers completed a mandatory
evaluation questionnaire to record their attendance and provide feedback about their experience. In Phase I of the study, teachers completed the District Professional Development Questionnaire Evaluation questionnaire. This questionnaire was created using Google Forms and shared with teachers via email or the chat feature of Zoom. In addition, the data was collected and displayed in a Google Sheets spreadsheet. Phase I data consisted of anonymous data for all 825 teachers who completed the District Professional Development Questionnaire Evaluation.

In Phase II of the study, all 825 teachers who completed the District Professional Development Questionnaire Evaluation received an invitation to continue participation. This invitation was in the form of a Qualtrics survey, the Questionnaire Reflection Survey, which asked teachers to identify how the district questionnaire accurately reflected their reaction to and learning during the professional development session. Of the 825 teachers from Phase I, 156 completed the Phase II survey. This survey also asked participants to lift the anonymity of their Phase I and Phase II data, which 77 participants allowed.

Finally, in Phase III of the study, these 77 participants were invited to join focus groups to discuss their experiences with completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. Forty-two participants expressed interest in taking part in focus groups, 12 scheduled and participated in three focus groups. A series of four questions guided the discussion during the focus groups. Their responses were recorded using Zoom and later transcribed. During all of the focus groups, the discussions related directly to the theoretical framework used in this study and provided suggestions for improving professional development evaluation. A discussion of these is below.
The Theories of Satisficing and Andragogy: Application to Findings

"Without a theoretical framework, a study has no reason" (Sanden & Egbert, 2013, p. 108). This study’s theoretical framework consists of two parts. The theory of satisficing examines the mental processes participants use when they complete a survey. The theory of andragogy is "a set of core adult learning principles that apply to all adult learning situations" and includes six assumptions about how adults learn (Knowles et al., 2011, p. 2). Applying these theories to the data presented in Chapter IV, discussed below, helps answer each of the three research questions in this study.

Theory of Satisficing: Application to Findings

When respondents complete an item on a questionnaire, they work through a series of cognitive processes. They start by interpreting the question and its intent. After that, respondents recall relevant information and use that information to construct a judgment. Finally, they use that judgment to create a response (Tourangeau, 1984). When respondents fail to complete each of these cognitive processes, they are satisficing. Krosnick (1991) identified a series of satisficing response strategies that survey respondents may demonstrate. Respondents may exhibit one or more of the following strategies when answering surveys: “choosing the first response alternative that seems to constitute a reasonable answer, agreeing with an assertion made by a question, endorsing the status quo instead of endorsing social change, failing to differentiate among a set of diverse objects in ratings, saying ‘don’t know’ instead of reporting an opinion, and randomly choosing among the response alternatives offered” (Krosnick, 1991, p. 220). Rushing through surveys, skipping questions, and ending before finishing are also forms of satisficing but are more common on online surveys (Barge & Gehlbach, 2012).
At first glance, the data collected during Phase I using the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire was overwhelmingly positive. Specifically, the close-ended, Likert scale questions had overall mean scores near the top of the rating scales. In addition, the reliability of the close-ended questions was extremely high. However, applying the Theory of Satisficing uncovers trends in this data that question whether the information is trustworthy. Of the 825 participants, 703 used non-differentiation when responding to close-ended questions on their survey, accounting for 85.21% of participants, and 756 of them, or 91.64%, engaged in one or more instances of satisficing when answering the open-ended questions. When looking at the Phase I data in its entirety, only 6 participants did not engage in any satisficing behaviors. This means that 99.27% of Phase I participants used one or more types of satisficing to reduce their cognitive load when completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire.

These participants engage in satisficing behaviors because they do not have the motivation, interest, or stamina to fully engage in the cognitive processes needed to complete the questionnaire in an unbiased and thoughtful way (Krosnick & Presser, 2010; Krosnick, 1991). Phase I data showed high numbers of participants skipping questions, using non-differentiation or straight-lining answers, and providing insufficient responses. This indicates that, while completing the questionnaire, almost every participant reduced their cognitive load by using one or more satisficing behaviors resulting in suboptimal data. In addition, satisficing affects the data because it alters the validity and reliability of instruments (Barge & Gehlbach, 2012; Hamby & Taylor, 2016). The high percentage of satisficing on the District Professional Development Questionnaire Evaluation makes it challenging to trust the data collected.
During the focus groups, participants discussed different forms of satisficing. Rushing through the questionnaire was the most common subtheme of satisficing addressed by participants. Olivia shared, “I fill it out as fast as I can.” George also indicated that he rushed through the completion of this evaluation questionnaire by saying, “It’s at the end of a long day…you do this, and you can leave. So it’s a moment. I’m done.” A second subtheme participants shared about was skipping questions. Phase I data supports the notion that teachers engage in this form of satisficing. Olivia admitted, “If I don’t have to answer it, I don’t” when the group talked about optional questions. Most of the focus group participants shared this sentiment. Finally, the third subtheme of satisficing, non-differentiation, or straight-lining, was addressed during the focus groups. Participants discussed different ways they engaged in straight-lining when completing the evaluation. Jessica said, “Oftentimes, when I fill these out, I go right down the middle,” while Olivia added, “Typically, it is straight fives.” Allison also will choose to rate the session high but provided some insight to why. She said, “If it’s…a person that…it feels like I’m evaluating…I’m always going to give them fives.” George agreed that if a teacher presents the session, he will often rate them high because “It is no fault of theirs. They were told to [send] this message.”

Of the 825 Phase I participants, only six did not engage in any satisficing when completing the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. When analyzed alongside the Phase III data, it is evident that satisficing has a considerable impact on the results of questionnaire data. This data supports the idea that there is a need for better and alternate forms of evaluation of professional development.
Theory of Andragogy: Application to Findings

Andragogy is “a set of core adult learning principles that apply to all adult learning situations” (Knowles et al., 2011, p. 2). Since professional development is one of the primary forms of adult learning in education, the theory of andragogy can help us understand teachers’ experience as learners during professional development sessions. I explored the six assumptions of andragogy when analyzing the focus group data; however, the focus group questions did not prompt much discussion about their role as learners during the professional development sessions. Despite that, discussions about all six of the assumptions occurred.

The Need to Know. To value new learning, adults need to know why they are learning the new content (Knowles et al., 2011). While not outwardly expressed or analyzed, this assumption is hinted at throughout the study. During each focus group, discussions often turned away from the questionnaire tool and toward the quality and content of the professional development. For example, Audrey stated, “I never feel like it is something that is going to help me much,” and Jacob said, “They’re not providing the professional development we hope for.”

While not strictly related to learning, the focus groups indicated a need to know about the purpose of completing the evaluation at the end of the professional development session. For example, Linda stated, “I don’t know if it’s for attendance or if they actually care what we write, so that makes me less likely to actually write the thing.” In addition, participants may be less likely to reflect on their experience without knowing the purpose or the use of the data.

The Learners’ Self-Concept. As people progress into adulthood, they become less dependent on others for learning and rely on self-directed learning (Knowles et al., 2011). During the focus group, participants shared comments related to their self-concept as learners.
For example, Audrey identified her need for self-directed learning when she said, “self-paced training would be really useful because then you are taking your time and learning at your pace and learning what you need and taking your time on the specifics that you need to focus on, rather than sitting and having…an hour and a half just jammed at you, that you are…missing half of it.”

**The Role of the Learners’ Experiences.** As adults age, they gather knowledge that impacts their learning. These experiences shape them as learners and are essential to new understanding through activities that allow them to share their knowledge (Knowles et al., 2011). Focus group participants address the role of the learners’ experience in terms of their learning during professional development sessions over time and the application of their knowledge in their practice. Offering an alternate way to measure learning, Terri suggested that “a productive way to see if teachers…are picking up on it” would be to “bring a lesson that [they] have done or bring a student work sample” and have a discussion about “how did you apply this in your teaching over the last month…PD should be ongoing and like you’re kind of building on it.” Olivia shared similar feedback about building on learning over time by sharing, “I almost feel like a lot of PD could use the additional day, or the additional time right near it, or backed up…next to one another to really…continue your thinking and your thought process behind what it is.”

**Readiness to Learn.** Adult learners’ readiness to learn is directly related to their specific, job-related needs (Knowles et al., 2011). Data collected from the focus groups did not specifically pull together teachers’ readiness to learn and their job-related needs. However, this assumption relates closely to some of the quotes shared by participants relating to the need to know assumption. Participants indicated that the professional development sessions were not
meeting their learning needs. In addition, participants spoke about their mindset entering into the session. Jacob said, “I want to be more positive about learning and…trying to put forth the effort to grow in my classroom.” About the format of professional development sessions that occur at the end of a school day, Stephanie explained that teachers “cannot attend…mentally or emotionally to the professional development because they are usually attending to…issues that started in the morning. Whereas when we have non-student days…the [teachers] seem to be more focused and present.”

**Orientation to Learning.** Adult learners take a problem-focused stance on learning, preferring to engage in experiences that will provide solutions to problems they are facing (Knowles et al., 2011). Therefore, for professional development to be meaningful, it has to address teachers’ issues in their classrooms. Unfortunately, the participants in the focus groups indicated that is not evident in the sessions they attend. Jessica said, “I struggle…to find the relevance with…what we’re doing.” George suggested “if we had some choice” in professional development they attend or if sessions were “self-selected and we can pick things to apply to us.” These suggestions could lead to teachers’ feeling better oriented to learning during professional development sessions.

**Motivation.** Internal pressures are more motivating to adults than external pressures. For example, adults are more motivated by increased job satisfaction and self-esteem than promotions and salary increases (Knowles et al., 2011). Participants did not address job satisfaction or self-esteem directly during the focus group conversations; however, their lack of motivation to participate in professional development was evident in their dissatisfaction with professional development discussed in Chapter IV.
Improving the Evaluation of Professional Development

The third research question in this study asks: how can the evaluation of professional development be improved to better assess teachers’ reaction to and learning in professional development sessions? An analysis of the data collected during the three phases of this study indicates that there is much room for improvement. Recommendations fall into the four categories discussed below: bureaucracy, questionnaire format, effective professional development, and alternatives to questionnaires.

**Bureaucracy**

Over the past century, the education system has become a bureaucracy in which the governing bodies make the rules and set the requirements (Chubb & Moe, 1990). These rules and conditions are set at the broad, national level, down to the local level. One form of bureaucratic regulation relates to the necessity of school districts to follow the rules surrounding professional development. Specific to evaluations, districts are required to track teachers’ participation in professional learning through attendance and evaluation surveys. Within 30 days, they must upload information and maintain records for seven years (Pennsylvania Department of Education, n.d.).

During the focus group, Audrey noted that she felt the professional development evaluation process was just “checking a box that maybe is a state mandate or something that districts are required to do.” To minimize the bureaucratic feel, teachers need to clearly understand the evaluation process. As stated in Chapter IV and, again, above, when discussing the Need to Know assumption of Andragogy, teachers who complete questionnaires must know the purpose for the evaluation, who analyzes the data, and how the data ultimately impacts
professional development in the future. Without a clear understanding of this process, teachers feel it is just another thing on their to-do list that they check the box as they finish.

**Questionnaire Format**

As discussed in Chapter II, questionnaire design is complex (Krosnick & Presser, 2010). The literature and discussion during the focus groups identified some problems with the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire. When writing questionnaires, it is essential to “avoid words with ambiguous meanings” (Krosnick & Presser, 2010, p. 264). During the focus group, participants pointed out two words in the questions that they felt were not clearly defined. The word “satisfied” was identified by three participants as being ambiguous. Michael asked, “what does that even mean?” George agreed when he said, “that’s so subjective…satisfied…what does satisfied mean?” Audrey also identified the word “interactive” as being difficult to define. She noted that “interactive also can mean different things.” School districts can improve questionnaires by including a definition or examples of what the terms mean within the questions.

Questions on a questionnaire should “ask about one thing at a time (avoid double-barreled questions)” (Krosnick & Presser, 2010, p. 264). For example, focus group participants identified that question number three on the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire asks two different things about the professional development session, if it was well planned and interactive. Jacob voiced this concern when he said, “the…question says the workshop was well planned and interactive. That almost should be like two separate questions.”

Another suggestion from the focus group participants was to craft questionnaires specifically for the professional development session instead of using a generic questionnaire
every time. Terri suggested that because “the purpose for PD is always different…the purpose of the PD should align with the…evaluation form. [It] is pretty general and doesn’t necessarily always align with the purpose of…different PD across the district.” Linda identified one positive, in her eyes, for having a standard questionnaire for all sessions, saying it “is helpful because at least when you go and you’re like, oh I know what the questions are…it probably makes it faster and easier. And if no one’s reading them, then why would they care to change?”

To improve the questionnaire, it is necessary to change the Likert scale. George noticed that “the Likert scale is a five for the first question and a four on the others.” He suggested more consistency with the tool by having either just four-point scales or five-point scales throughout. In addition, all values on the Likert scale must be labeled, not just the extremes. Likert scales that have labels for each value have better validity than those that do not (Hamby & Taylor, 2016; Krosnick, 1999).

The final suggestion for improving the quality of the questionnaire has to do with when teachers complete the questionnaire. Audrey suggested breaking the questionnaire into two parts, one for just the attendance and one sent later for reflection and evaluations. For example, she said, “If you had a questionnaire at the end of your training…you are just getting credit…And then a second questionnaire was sent out maybe two days later and then the people who took the time to answer these would be giving honest feedback, maybe not even make it mandatory.” Likewise, providing the evaluation a few days later could allow teachers time to reflect on their experience, identify if the professional development was meaningful, and complete the evaluation at a time that works best for them.
Effective Professional Development

While not directly related to the evaluation of questionnaires, focus group participants spent a great deal of time discussing the quality of the professional development sessions. Learning Forward, a national organization focused on professional learning, identified the following seven standards necessary for effective professional learning: learning communities, leadership, resources, data, learning designs, implementation, and outcomes (Learning Forward, n.d.-a). Participants discussed four standards during the focus groups: implementation, learning design, outcome, and data.

Even though the quality of professional development was not the intent of the focus group questions, the number of times participants mentioned traits of effective professional development makes it worth examining. This indicates that the quality of the professional development may impact teachers’ experience evaluating the session. However, it is crucial to question why, if teachers are so dissatisfied with the quality of the professional development sessions they attend, they are rating these same sessions so positively on the evaluations.

Improving the effectiveness of professional development using Learning Forward’s seven standards could indirectly impact the evaluation process. However, focus group participants indicated two of the standards directly related to the evaluation process. The first is implementation. Stephanie shared that she felt that when sessions are on early dismissal days, teachers “cannot attend….mentally or emotionally to the professional development because they are usually attending to…issues that started in the morning. Whereas when we have non-student days, like a true 8:00 to 3:30 PD day, the [teachers] seem to be more focused and present because there hasn’t been issue brewing.” If teachers feel they cannot focus on professional development, that can carry over into the evaluation process. The second standard directly related to the
evaluation process is the data standard. Lori said, “Maybe have some of the data that’s accrued shared. I’ve never seen any of the data shared.” By sharing evaluation data, teachers could better understand the importance of the topics of their professional development and the outcome of professional development sessions. Sharing data and communicating the use of the data can help teachers see the importance of the evaluation.

**Alternatives to Questionnaires**

The final focus group questions prompted participants to suggest alternatives to questionnaires for evaluating professional development. All of the suggestions for other options were to move from using questionnaires to providing time at the end of each session for teachers to provide verbal feedback. Oliva suggested a “debriefing or reflection at the end could be more telling” than data gathered from a questionnaire. Dave added, “Sometimes I feel like a small group debrief at the end, where you just have…an informal conversation.” Jessica agreed by saying, “I would also appreciate a conversation.” Finally, Michael gave some more specific ideas when he suggested that professional development presenters “spend a little time just going around and they don’t even have to hit every table or group…they could just pick three…and have…their own little Q&A with that person and [that] would be more meaningful to them than any questionnaire.” Based on participants' suggestions and the data collected during Phase III of this study, districts should consider the use of focus groups as an alternative to questionnaires.

**Limitations of Study**

**Limitations of Methodology**

The instrumentation used in this study led to a limitation in the methodology. This study aimed to examine the use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development. However,
Phase II of this study used a questionnaire. While the two-question tool was just one minor piece of a more extensive study, it is necessary to point out that the study used a questionnaire to analyze the use of questionnaires.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, Phase III of the study consisted of virtual focus groups. Zoom served as the platform for hosting the meetings. Recent research on the impact of focus groups found some disadvantages to holding virtual focus groups. Marques et al. (2021) found areas that could affect participation in focus groups. Participants’ understanding of technology, ensuring that Zoom is working correctly, and the need to minimize the size of groups to make it more manageable are among some of the issues surrounding virtual groups. While these limitations are important to note, the participants in this study had ample experience with using computers and Zoom before this study.

**Limitations of Analysis**

One limitation in the analysis portion of this study is that no analysis of the content of the open-ended questions occurred. A more in-depth analysis of the open-ended responses would provide an additional layer of information about this phase of the study.

Another limitation of the analysis was that the study did not explore one of the primary forms of satisficing, when participants rush through surveys. This form of satisficing could have been measured by timing how long it took participants to complete the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire.
**Limitations of Generalizations**

A final limitation relates to the generalization of the study. The collection of data occurred from only one professional development session. The findings would be more generalizable if data collection took place across multiple professional development sessions.

**Implications for Future Research**

While this study gives many suggestions on improving the evaluation of professional development, it is just a starting point. Future research is necessary to add to the body of research about using questionnaires as an evaluation tool. For example, future studies could benefit from examining multiple professional development sessions instead of just one. Gathering quantitative data throughout an entire school year and then conducting focus groups at the end of the year could provide a more accurate picture of the participants’ evaluation of professional development. Another suggestion for future research would be to examine data based on teacher demographics. Analyzing data based on years of experience, grade or subject taught, building where they work, gender, or race could uncover some trends that are not evident in the present study and could provide some more specific suggestions for improving the evaluation process. Finally, exploring the use of focus groups as an alternative to questionnaires is a necessary next step. The data collected and the suggestions from the focus group participants in this study indicate that focus groups have the potential for being a superior evaluation for professional development sessions.

**Conclusion**

This mixed-methods study examined questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. The combination of quantitative and qualitative data analysis provided the
information needed to answer the three research questions. The first question asked was: To what extent do questionnaires reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning in professional development sessions? An examination of the Phase I data showed that almost all teachers engaged in satisficing while completing the evaluation, making the data questionable. Phase II data showed that around half of the participants had a neutral or negative response when asked whether they felt the District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire accurately reflected their reaction to and learning during the professional development session. Finally, the focus group participants made it abundantly clear that the questionnaire results did not match how they truly felt about the professional development session. The culmination of this data indicates that the questionnaires do not accurately reflect teachers’ reactions to and learning in professional development sessions.

The second research question asked: How do teachers view the use of questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions? Again, focus group participants were vocal that using the questionnaire in the current form did not provide an accurate measure of their experience in professional development sessions. Discussions proved that teachers did not engage fully with the evaluation and scored the session high despite being dissatisfied. They also felt the evaluation process was just another bureaucratic process, noting that they did not know what the data was even used for, the were not aware of what purpose the evaluation served, and felt like they were just checking a box on a list of things to do. Teachers had a negative view of using questionnaires to evaluate professional development sessions.

The final question asked was: How can the evaluation of professional development be improved to better assess teachers’ reaction to and learning in professional development sessions? The discussion above provides many suggestions for improving the evaluation of
professional development. I can think of no better way to end this dissertation than by revisiting these recommendations. The data from this research study identified the following recommendations for improving upon the professional development evaluation process:

- Ensure that teachers have a clear understanding of the evaluation process. This includes knowing the purpose of the evaluation, who analyzes the data collected, and how the data will impact future professional development.
- If using questionnaires, be sure that the questions do not have ambiguous wording, are not double-barreled, and are specific to the content of the professional development session.
- When using questions with a Likert scale, use the same scale for all questions and provide a label for each value on the scale.
- Provide sessions that meet expectations for high-quality professional development.
- Use focus groups as an alternative to questionnaires. For example, short question and answer sessions or debrief conversations at the end of professional development sessions provide a wealth of information that can not be obtained from a questionnaire.
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### Appendix D: District Professional Development Evaluation Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question / Prompt</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name (First)</td>
<td>Short Answer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Last)</td>
<td>Short Answer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Dropdown List</td>
<td>Building Names</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Your Department</td>
<td>Dropdown List</td>
<td>Department Names</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participated in this professional development activity.</td>
<td>Checkbox</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the session attended.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
<td>1-4 (Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in the workshop was sufficient to accomplish the goals of the session.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
<td>1-4 (Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop was well planned and interactive.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
<td>1-4 (Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content and strategies will be useful in my work.</td>
<td>Likert Scale</td>
<td>1-4 (Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the most significant thing you learned?</td>
<td>Open-Ended Text Box</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What support do you need to implement what you learned?</td>
<td>Open-Ended Text Box</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you apply what you have learned and/or discussed?</td>
<td>Open-Ended Text Box</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we build on this session for follow-up learning?</td>
<td>Open-Ended Text Box</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments, questions, or concerns.</td>
<td>Open-Ended Text Box</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Questionnaire Reflection Survey Participation Email

The following email was sent to the K-12 teacher to request participation in Phase II of this study.

Dear K-12 Teachers:

The purpose of this email is to request your participation in a short, anonymous survey about your experience with completing the DAS Professional Development Attendance and Evaluation form today. This survey is part of a study I am conducting for my dissertation, a requirement for the Education, Policy and Planning EDD program at West Chester University. Completion of this survey is optional.

The survey, along with additional information about the study, can be found by clicking here. Following the short survey, you will find a request to continue your participation in this study by providing your name and approval for me to access the results of your Professional Development Attendance Evaluation form you completed today. Again, participation is optional.

Thank you for taking the time to consider participation in my study. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to reach out to me through this email or the contact information below.

This study has been approved by the WCU IRB – Protocol IRB-FY2021-223.

Sincerely,

Cristin Young
cy276318@wcupa.edu
484-678-7294
Appendix F: Questionnaire Reflection Survey

Informed Consent

Professional Development Evaluation:
A Mixed-Methods Study of Teachers’ Experience with Questionnaires

This research is being conducted by Cristin Young as part of her doctoral dissertation. Participation in this research project is voluntary. Below you will find detailed information about this study.

Purpose of this Study - The purpose of this study is to examine the use of questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. The study aims to determine if professional development questionnaires accurately capture teachers’ reaction and initial learning, and how their experiences as adult learners in professional development sessions relate to their responses on the questionnaires.

Time Expectations - The following survey consists of two questions and will take 2-5 minutes to complete. Following the two question survey, you will have the option to participate in future phases of this study.

Experimental Medical Treatments - There are no experimental medical treatments in this study.

Potential Risk - There are minimal risks associated with this phase of the study. Data collected during this phase remains anonymous, unless you agree to participate in future phases of this study.

Potential Benefit - No immediate benefits are anticipated, however the results of this study may lead to improvements in the professional development evaluation process.

Privacy - Data collected in this phase of the study remains anonymous, unless you agree to participate in future phases of this study. All data collected will be stored digitally in password protected files and will remain private, only accessible by the study researchers.

Payment - No participants will be paid to participate in this study.

Context - In the case of a research related injury, please contact:

- **Primary Investigator** - Cristin Young at 484-678-264 or cy276318@wcupa.edu
- **Faculty Sponsor** - David Backer at 203-917-7410 or dbacker@wcupa.edu

You may reach out to Cristin Young with any questions regarding this study.

By agreeing to participate below, you indicate:

- You have read the above information and understand the statements.
- Agree to allow the use of your anonymous answers to the following 2 question survey as part of this research study.
- Understand that your participation is voluntary and that you can stop at any time.
- Know that is is not possible to know all risks associated with a study.

Please select an answer and click the arrow below to proceed.

- I agree to participate in the two question survey.
- I would not like to participate.

Questions
When completing today's professional development evaluation questionnaire, my responses accurately reflect my initial reaction to my experience in the session. Survey questions that relate to your initial reaction include the following multiple choice questions:

- I am satisfied with the session attended.
- Time in the workshop was sufficient to accomplish goals of the session.
- The workshop was well planned and interactive.
- Content and strategies will be useful in my work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When completing today's professional development evaluation questionnaire, my responses accurately reflect my initial learning during the session. Survey questions that relate to your initial learning include the following open-ended questions:

- What is the most significant thing you learned?
- What support do you need to implement what you learned?
- How will you apply what you have learned and/or discussed?
- How can we build on this session for follow-up learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Participation

Thank you for your time. If you decide you would like to participate, you can revisit the survey link at a later time.

Future Participation

Phase Two of this study will examine results of the PD Attendance and Evaluation Form, completed at the end of professional development sessions, with the results of this survey.

- I agree to allow my results of the PD Attendance and Evaluation Form be used as part of this study.

- I do not agree to allow my results of the PD Attendance and Evaluation Form to be used as part of this study.

First Name
CHECKING THE BOX

Last Name

Building

By signing below, I give consent to allow my data from the PD Attendance and Evaluation Form to be included as part of the research study.

SIGN HERE

Survey Powered By Qualtrics
Appendix G: Focus Group Participation Email

The following email was sent to select K-12 teachers to request participation in Phase II of this study.

Dear (insert participant name):

Thank you for completing the Questionnaire Reflection Survey and for your participation thus far in my dissertation study. The purpose of this email is to request your participation in a follow-up focus group. This focus group is part of a study I am conducting for my dissertation, a requirement for the Education, Policy and Planning EDD program at West Chester University. Participation in this focus group is optional.

The focus group will take approximately 30-45 minutes and will be conducted via Zoom at a date and time that works for you. The focus group will have approximately 4-8 participants made up of other K-12 teachers available at the same date and time. Your name and any identifiable information will be redacted and will not be shared at any point in this study.

If you would like to take part in a focus group, please click here to find out additional information about the study, to provide your consent, and to select dates and times that fit your schedule. I will contact you shortly after to confirm the date and time for your participation.

Thank you for taking the time to consider taking part in my study. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to reach out to me through this email or the contact information below.

This study has been approved by the WCU IRB – Protocol #IRB-FY2021-223.

Sincerely,

Cristin Young
Cyoung1714@gmail.com
484-678-7294
Appendix H: Focus Group Participation Survey

Default Question Block

Teachers' Initial Reaction and Learning:
A Mixed-Methods Approach to Examining K-12 Teachers' Evaluation of
Professional Development

This research is being conducted by Cristin Young as part of her doctoral dissertation. Participation in this research project is voluntary. Below you will find detailed information about this study.

Purpose of this Study - The purpose of this study is to examine the use of questionnaires as an evaluation tool for professional development. The study aims to determine if professional development questionnaires accurately capture teachers’ initial reaction and learning, and how their experiences as adult learners in professional development sessions relate to their responses on the questionnaires.

Time Expectations - Focus groups will take approximately 30-45 minutes, however a 1 hour block of time will be allotted for each focus group.

Experimental Medical Treatments - There are no experimental medical treatments in this study.

Potential Risks - There are minimal risks associated with this phase of the study. Data collected during this phase remains anonymous, unless you agree to participate in future phases of this study.

Potential Benefits - No immediate benefits are anticipated, however the results of this study may lead to improvements in the professional development evaluation process.

Privacy - All data collected will be stored digitally in password protected files and will remain private, only accessible by the study researchers. All identifiable information about participants will be redacted from any documents.

Payment - No participants will be paid to participate in this study.

Contact - In the case of a research related injury, please contact:

- Primary Investigator - Cristin Young at 484-678-294 or cy276316@wcupa.edu
- Faculty Sponsor - David Backer at 203-917-7416 or dbacker@wcupa.edu

You may reach out to Cristin Young with any questions regarding this study.

By agreeing to participate below, you indicate:

- You have read the above information and understand the statements.
- Agree to allow the use of your focus group data as part of this research study.
- Understand that your participation is voluntary and that you can stop at any time.
- Know that is is not possible to know all risks associated with a study.

Please select an answer and click the arrow below to proceed.

☐ I agree to participate in a focus group.

☐ I would not like to participate.
Thank you for considering participation in a focus group. If you would like to participate in the future, please revisit this survey or contact Cristin Young at cy276318@wcupa.edu.

First Name

Last Name

Building

Email Address

Please select all dates/times you are available to participate in a focus group.

- [ ] Saturday, November 20 at 9:00AM
- [ ] Saturday, November 20 at 1:00PM
- [ ] Sunday, November 21 at 9:00AM
- [ ] Sunday, November 21 at 1:00PM
- [ ] Wednesday, November 24 at 9:00AM
- [ ] Wednesday, November 24 at 11:00AM
- [ ] Saturday, November 27 at 9:00AM
- [ ] Saturday, November 27 at 11:00AM
- [ ] I would like to participate, but none of these times work for my schedule.
By signing below, I give consent to allow my data from my interview to be included as part of the research study.

SIGN HERE

Survey Powered By Qualtrics
Appendix I: Focus Group Guide

Before Focus Group Starts

- Start Zoom Meeting:
  - Record
  - Transcript
- Welcome participants as they arrive.

Opening Comments

We are going to get started. First, thank you all for taking time out of your day to participate in this focus group. This focus group is one part of my research study, a requirement for achieving my doctorate of education in the EDD Policy, Planning and Administration program at West Chester University.

Today’s focus group will be recorded; however, the recording is for my own reference and will not be shared with anyone. Identifiable information about all participants will be redacted, and each participant has been assigned a unique number to be used when needed to refer to the data from the study.

The purpose of my study is to examine the use of questionnaires as a tool for evaluating professional development sessions. My study aims to determine if questionnaires accurately reflect teachers’ experiences during professional development, specifically in regards to their reaction to and learning during professional development sessions.

This focus group is really just a conversation among the group members. Feel free to join the conversation whenever you wish. Also, I understand that you are zooming in from home/school, so if you need to mute yourself or attend to something, please do so.

Are there any questions before we begin?

Focus Group Questions

To start, I would like to do a quick introduction. Please tell us your name and tell us what you teach. I will begin. My name is Cristin Young, and I am an elementary instructional coach. My time is spent supporting [Redacted] and [Redacted] Elementary Schools.

1. I am going to start with a very general question. Talk about your experience with completing the district’s PD Attendance and Evaluation Form at the end of professional development sessions. This could include thoughts, feelings, concerns, questions.

2. The closed-ended, Likert scale questions on the PD Attendance and Evaluation Form measure teachers’ reaction to professional development sessions. They are displayed on
the screen. Do you think that these questions accurately measure your reaction to professional development?

3. The open-ended questions on the PD Attendance and Evaluation Form measure teachers’ learning during professional development sessions. They are displayed on the screen. 81% of teachers who completed the survey skipped at least one of the four open-ended questions, and 63% skipped all of them. Based on this information and your experiences, do you think that the questionnaire gains an accurate picture of teachers’ learning during professional development sessions?

4. Do you believe that questionnaires are a useful tool in evaluating professional development, or do you think are some better methods for measuring teachers’ reaction to and learning during professional development sessions?
 References


https://dx.doi.org/10.1136%2Fbmj.328.7451.1312

https://dictionary.cambridge.org


https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2013.798741


https://www.jstor.org/stable/367351


[https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/house-bill/1?q=%7B%22search%22%3A%22no+child+left+behind%22%7D&s=6&r=10](https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/house-bill/1?q=%7B%22search%22%3A%22no+child+left+behind%22%7D&s=6&r=10)

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS.*

https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264068780-en


https://www.education.pa.gov/Educators/ContinuInEd/Act%2048%20and%20PERMS/Pages/Act-48-Continuing-Professional-Education-Requirements-FAQ.aspx


