Check for updates

Research/Empirical

Interrogating Teacher Evaluation: Unveiling Whiteness as the Normative Center and Moving the Margins

Journal of Teacher Education
1–14
© 2018 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0022487118764347
journals.sagepub.com/home/jte
SAGE

Maria del Carmen Salazar[1]

Abstract

This article frames teacher evaluation from a critical race theory (CRT) perspective to unveil whiteness as the normative center of frameworks for teaching, and the marginalization of Communities of Color. The author places CRT on the ground by proposing a culturally responsive alternative, the Framework for Equitable and Excellent Teaching (FEET). The FEET is strategically designed to position the resources of historically marginalized Communities of Color at the center of teacher evaluation. This article describes the development of the FEET through three phases of mixed-methods research. The findings of the research were used to develop and improve the FEET to increase its measurement quality and potential in capturing culturally responsive practice. This article concludes by interrogating the role of teacher evaluation in disrupting or reproducing inequity, and proposing future research opportunities.

Keywords

critical theory/critical pedagogy, equity, evaluation, school/teacher effectiveness, teacher education preparation

In the 19th century, Mann (1848) vowed that, "Education . . . beyond all other devices of human origin, is the greatest equalizer . . ." (p. 669). Mann's sentiments have been widely quoted and heralded as a call for educational equity (Peterson, 2010). Yet, scholars assert that Mann's proclamation was founded on the notion that schooling would instantiate White culture and values (Leonardo, 2002; Lynn, 2006). To date, the U.S. educational system has evolved as a powerful mechanism for producing, reproducing, and fortifying White supremacy and racial inequality (Gillborn, 2005; Stovall, 2006; Vaught, 2011). Scholars have documented the proliferation of White supremacy in the following aspects of education: standards-based instruction (Sleeter & Cornbleth, 2011), school discipline (Payne & Welch, 2015), school reform (Kumashiro, 2015), school finance (Rodriguez & Rolle, 2013), language acquisition policy and programming (Salazar, 2010), curriculum (Salinas, 2006), assessment (Valencia, 2015), tracking (Cammarota, 2014), segregation (Anyon, 2014), educator preparation (Franquiz, Salazar, & DeNicolo, 2011), and educational policy (Gillborn, 2005).

Teacher evaluation is yet another mechanism to fortify whiteness and marginalize Communities of Color. Teacher evaluation is defined as a formalized process that is used to rate teacher performance using instruments that define, assess, and develop effective teaching (Sawchuk, 2015). Teacher evaluation systems often include frameworks for teaching, student test scores, value-added models, and/or student perception surveys. The research presented in this article emerges from one approach to teacher evaluation—frameworks for teaching.

This article frames teacher evaluation from a critical race theory (CRT) perspective to unveil whiteness as the normative center of frameworks for teaching, and the marginalization of Communities of Color. The article places CRT on the ground by proposing a culturally relevant alternative, the Framework for Equitable and Excellent Teaching (FEET). The FEET is strategically designed to position the resources of historically marginalized Communities of Color at the center of teacher evaluation. The FEET assesses preservice teachers' performances, or skills, based on four dimensions, 15 competencies, and 60 indicators of equitable and excellent teaching for K-12 learners (see Table 1). The development of the FEET is presented through three phases of mixed-methods research. The research questions posed are as follows:

> **Research Question 1:** What knowledge and skills are essential to include in a FEET?

[1]University of Denver, CO, USA

Corresponding Author:
Maria del Carmen Salazar, Associate Professor, Teaching and Learning Sciences, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, 1999 E. Evans Ave., Denver, CO 80208, USA.
Email: maria.salazar@du.edu

Table 1. FEET Dimensions, Competencies, and Indicators.

Dimensions	Competencies	Indicators
Engage students in an inclusive and supportive learning community.	1.1 Establish affirming relationships with students and families.	E.1 Express value, respect, and asset perspectives of students' home cultures and communities.
		E.2 Establish positive rapport (e.g., patience, caring) with students and facilitate positive interactions between students.
		E.3 Communicate belief in capacity of all learners to achieve at high levels (e.g., college and career readiness, high expectations, growth mind-set).
		E.4 Collaborate with parents/families to identify student interests and needs and set shared goals for student learning and development.
	1.2 Use equitable classroom management strategies.	E.5 Implement a developmentally appropriate, predictable, and asset-based behavior management system that promotes a positive learning community (precise directions, positive narration, 100% expectations).
		E.6 Ensure students meet expectations by monitoring and promptly redirecting behavior (e.g., tone, movement, positioning, cues, key phrases, direct speech), and implementing an established system of rewards and consequences.
		E.7 Use predictable transition strategies to maintain students' focus on learning.
		E.8 Use an efficient process to ensure students have necessary materials for learning.
	1.3 Actively engage students in learning.	E.9 Use a variety of active engagement strategies to ensure each student participates through discussion and movement (e.g., interactive technology, total physical response, call-and-response, storytelling, props, simulations, scenarios, games, music/rhythm, aesthetics).
		E.10 Incorporate modalities that facilitate content learning (e.g., auditory, visual, kinesthetic, tactile, and intra/interpersonal, musical, naturalistic, logical, verbal, technological).
		E.11 Provide opportunities for students to experience joyful learning that includes discovery, application, and/or collaboration.
		E.12 Demonstrate student-centered approach by consistently incorporating student voice and choice.
Plan rigorous and relevant, standards- and outcome-based lesson and unit plans.	2.1 Use culturally relevant backward design curriculum planning to develop units.	P.1 Identify big ideas, essential questions, enduring understandings, and social justice themes that are relevant to students' interests and diversity.
		P.2 Create innovative units of study that are aligned to relevant content, language, and college and career readiness standards.
		P.3 Supplement or adapt district-approved curriculum to reflect student diversity and promote cultural competence.
		P.4 Include materials and resources that reflect the culture(s) of students and include a variety of cultures.
		P.5 Design rigorous, relevant, and authentic unit performance tasks.
		P.6 Develop a sequence of lessons aligned to unit goals and social justice themes.
	2.2 Design measurable, challenging, and relevant lessons.	P.7 Set clear, rigorous, measurable content and language objectives based on unit goals (e.g., higher order thinking skills).
		P.8 Create a logical sequence with each lesson component aligning to objectives and assessments.
		P.9 Develop rationale that connects lesson objective with unit goals, students' lives, and social justice themes.
		P.10 Incorporate topics that draw on student diversity (e.g., race, ethnicity, culture, gender, class, abilities, sexual orientation, religion) and include the contributions of diverse populations.
		P.11 Provide opportunities for students to identify oppression locally and globally, counteract stereotypes, develop critical consciousness, and see themselves as agents of change.
	2.3 Analyze and develop assessments and use data to plan instruction.	P.12 Analyze assessments for validity, reliability, and bias (e.g., cultural, linguistic, gender, class, religious).
		P.13 Include a variety of formative and summative assessment tools to gather data on student knowledge and skills.

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Dimensions	Competencies	Indicators
		P.14 Analyze standardized and classroom-based student assessment data to set SMART learning targets.
		P.15 Use assessment data to identify individual student learning goals and design differentiated learning experiences (e.g., English language learner [ELL], special education, gifted).
		P.16 Use technology to collect, track, analyze, and share assessment data with students and families, and use feedback to make planning decisions.
	2.4 Demonstrate knowledge of content and student development.	P.17 Analyze current research related to content pedagogy to identify implications for student learning.
		P.18 Understand how students' neurological, cognitive, and cultural development affect learning and development.
		P.19 Identify prerequisite content and language knowledge and skills including typical errors, misconceptions, and difficulties.
		P.20 Use knowledge of content to plan rigorous and relevant units and lessons that develop literacy and numeracy across the content areas.
Teach equitably by establishing high expectations for student achievement and providing support.	3.1 Set context for lesson.	T.1 Post, preview, and review clear, rigorous, measurable content and language objectives (CLOs).
		T.2 Engage students in discussing lesson rationale that connects content to students' diversity, lived experiences, prior content knowledge and skills, and interests.
		T.3 Promote real-world application of content in local, national, and global contexts that facilitates college and career readiness.
		T.4 Clearly define performance expectations orally and in writing using student-friendly language.
	3.2 Facilitate clear and rigorous learning experiences.	T.5 Provide clear, concise, and relevant explanations of content (e.g., mental models, culturally relevant examples, accessible language).
		T.6 Use gradual release lesson cadence (I do, we do, you do) to scaffold students' independent application of learning.
		T.7 Align learning experiences to objectives.
		T.8 Adequately pace learning experiences by attending to student learning cues and progress on the learning task.
	3.3 Promote rigorous academic talk.	T.9 Promote high-level thinking by holding students accountable for using academic language, making claims, and articulating evidence-based reasoning
		T.10 Facilitate academic conversations by posing high-level questions and asking students to explain their thinking (e.g., elaborate, clarify, provide examples, build on or challenge ideas, paraphrase, synthesize).
		T.11 Set discussion norms and facilitate conversations that foster critical consciousness (e.g., interrogate multiple perspectives, ask critical questions, and take critical stances).
	3.4 Make content and language comprehensible for all learners.	T.12 Incorporate students' first language and/or use materials in students' home language to increase comprehension of language and content.
		T.13 Incorporate a variety of manipulatives and realia to support content learning and language development.
		T.14 Make content comprehensible by incorporating technology, visual representations, key vocabulary, graphic organizers, total physical response, and modeling.
	3.5 Use formal and informal assessment data to monitor student progress toward learning targets.	T.15 Collect data on individual student progress toward content and language objective and analyze data to adjust instruction for individuals and subgroups (e.g., ELL, special education, gifted).
		T.16 Engage students in continually assessing their own progress toward unit/lesson objectives and personal/group goals.
		T.17 Provide students with frequent, timely, specific, and individualized feedback.
		T.18 Frequently check for understanding and adjust instruction according to evidence of student learning.
	3.6 Differentiate instruction to challenge students and meet diverse student needs.	T.19 Use assessment data to differentiate instruction according to student needs (e.g., language levels, academic needs, special needs, learning styles, and/or cultural ways of knowing).

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

		T.20 Implement flexible grouping strategies to meet diverse student needs.
		T.21 Provide options for differentiated content, learning experiences, and/or assessments that allow for student choice.
		T.22 Collaborate with support specialists to develop and apply specific accommodations for individual students based on language needs, IEPs, and other legal requirements.
Lead by exemplifying standards of professional practice.	4.1 Meet professional standards of practice.	L.1 Adhere to ethical and legal responsibilities for students' learning, behavior, safety, and confidentiality as specified in local, state, and federal statutes.
		L.2 Maintain professional demeanor and communication in accordance with school, district, and/or university policy.
		L.3 Use standard language in written, verbal, nonverbal, and/or electronic communication, and code-switch when appropriate.
	4.2 Demonstrate professional growth and commitment.	L.4 Demonstrate asset orientations in interactions with peers, faculty, students, families, and colleagues.
		L.5 Use feedback and data to set clear and measurable goals to improve instruction and promote student learning and development.
		L.6 Participate in school, district, and community initiatives and advocate for community needs (e.g., professional development opportunities, school events, community engagement).

Note. The complete model, including rubrics and observation tools, can be accessed at http://portfolio.du.edu/msalazar. FEET = Framework for Equitable and Excellent Teaching.

Research Question 2: What are the strengths and weakness of the FEET?

Research Question 3: To what extent are the psychometric properties of the FEET adequate?

The research findings were used to develop and revise the FEET to increase its measurement quality and potential to capture culturally relevant pedagogy. This article concludes by interrogating the role of teacher evaluation in disrupting or reproducing inequity, and proposing future research opportunities.

Theoretical Framework

CRT is a body of scholarship that challenges discourses, ideologies, and structures that reproduce racism and inequity (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). The historical roots of CRT can be traced to the turn of the 20th century with the work of race scholars such as W.E.B. DuBois (Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). Contemporary CRT perspectives emerged out of critical legal studies in the 1980s as a response to the persistence of racism in U.S. society (Delgado, 1995). CRT extended into education in the 1990s (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004).

CRT in Education

According to Solórzano and Yosso (2002), CRT in education is defined as, "a framework or set of basic perspectives, methods, and pedagogy that seeks to identify, analyze, and transform those structural, cultural, and interpersonal aspects of education that maintain the marginal position and subordination of Students of Color" (p. 42). Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) describe five tenets of CRT that are embedded in the ideologies, policies, and practices of schooling: (a) centrality of race and racism, (b) challenge to the dominant ideology, (c) importance of the experiential knowledge of Communities of Color, (d) commitment to social justice, and (e) the use of interdisciplinary perspectives. The section that follows briefly describes four of the tenets as they apply to education.

CRT foregrounds race as the most essential construct for analyzing inequity, challenging oppressive systems, and identifying solutions for a more just society (Zamudio, Russell, Rios, & Bridgeman, 2011). CRT assays the intersection of race and racism with school practices and policies (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Lynn & Parker, 2006). Specifically, CRT challenges racism in education and exposes the "culture of power" (Delpit, 1988), or the mainstream knowledge—that is, ideologies, values, beliefs, ways of knowing, and acting—that is prized by the dominant culture and is necessary to acquire more power in society. Dominant cultures proliferate their prized knowledge through masternarratives, or mind-set of positions, perceived wisdoms, and shared cultural understandings, that shape perceptions of race (Delgado & Stefancic, 1993). The dominant group perpetuates masternarratives to (a) position their cultural capital as the standard; (b) privilege the culture, ideals, and beliefs of Whites; and (c) maintain White supremacy.

One of the most important functions of CRT is to deconstruct and counteract the masternarratives of the dominant group through counternarratives, a tool to expose and challenge racism and inequality (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Counternarratives can be used as a counterhegemonic force to challenge structural aspects of education that maintain the

marginalization and subsequent subordination of Communities of Color (Ladson-Billings, 1998).

Counternarratives acknowledge the "power of culture" (Pang & Barba, 1995), or cultural knowledge—that is, the linguistic, cultural, and familial resources, to name a few—that Communities of Color draw on to survive and thrive. Pang and Barba (1995) stress that to best serve the needs of Students of Color, schools must implement affirming approaches that build on students' resources.

Most importantly, CRT advances social justice. Social justice is hostile toward deficit ideologies applied to Communities of Color, embraces the assets of marginalized communities, and engages in action that benefits marginalized communities (Salazar & Rios, 2016). CRT scholars advocate for concrete approaches that translate CRT to frontline action that challenges subordination and affects the lives of historically marginalized communities (Parker & Stovall, 2004; Stovall, 2006; Yamamoto, 1997).

CRT and Teacher Evaluation

This article examines one approach to teacher evaluation, frameworks for teaching. Frameworks for teaching are commonly used performance-based teacher evaluation models that define, assess, and develop effective teaching through performance-based expectations, rubrics of performance, and field-based observation instruments (New Teacher Project, 2011).

The masternarrative. CRT can be evoked to make the claim that frameworks for teaching promote a masternarrative of objectivity and neutrality. As a case in point, frameworks for teaching often incorporate generic teaching knowledge and skills that purportedly benefit *all* learners. Such frameworks are often based on "a general consensus about what it is that teachers and teacher candidates should know and be able to do" (Cochran-Smith, 2010, p. 202). Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, and Rothstein (2012) describe the general consensus of knowledge and skills that foster effective teaching, including (a) understanding content concepts; (b) connecting content to prior knowledge and experiences; (c) scaffolding learning; (d) facilitating standards- and outcome-based instruction; (e) providing students with opportunities to apply knowledge and master content; (f) assessing student learning, making instructional adjustments, and supporting students in monitoring their own learning; (g) giving explicit feedback; and (h) managing student behavior and classroom routines. A number of contemporary teacher evaluation models advance the aforementioned knowledge and skills that foster effective teaching, including the Danielson Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013).

The counternarrative. The counternarrative suggests that frameworks for teaching portray "a homogenized 'we'" (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 29) that justifies a generic approach for "all." In reality, the masternarrative of objectivity and neutrality positions whiteness at the normative center and fortifies the "whitestream" (Denis, 1997; Grande, 2000). Urrieta (2010) describes the notion of *whitestreaming* as, "a coercive force that imposes white history, mores, morals, language, customs, individualism, cultural capital, and other forces as the norm or standard U.S. in society" (p. 47). Thus, the masternarrative of objectivity and neutrality universalizes the dominant groups' interests, namely maintaining White supremacy and systematically excluding historically marginalized populations.

As a result, Communities of Color are systematically excluded in frameworks for teaching because generic teaching approaches do not explicitly include a focus on culturally relevant pedagogy. Ladson-Billings (1995) defines culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) as, "a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p. 20). While more recent scholarship advocates for "culturally sustaining pedagogy" (Paris, 2012), this article uses the construct proposed by Ladson-Billings to honor her scholarship and impact on the field. According to Ladson-Billings (1998), CRP rests on three propositions, students must: (a) experience academic success, (b) develop and/or maintain cultural competence, and (c) develop critical consciousness. Academic success is traditionally conceptualized according to whitestream ways of knowing (e.g., independence, positivism, objectivity, neutrality, linearity, written word, Standard English, Western canon). In contrast, Ladson-Billings (1998) describes academic success related to skills such as, "literacy, numeracy, and technological, social, and political skills in order to be active participants in a democracy" (p. 160). Students of Color can experience academic success by developing cultural competence in the dominant society (e.g., culture of power), sustaining their cultural, linguistic resources, and familial resources (e.g., power of culture), and engaging in critical thought and action toward social change (e.g., critical consciousness). The construct of critical consciousness emerges from the work of Paulo Freire (2000). Critical consciousness is the process by which students learn to think critically about their own contributions and the contributions of society to injustice and oppression, and take transformative action toward the aim of social justice (Salazar, 2013).

Teacher Evaluation From the Center

As a case in point, Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013) centers the whitestream and excludes the resources of Communities of Color. This is the most widely used approach to define and evaluate effective teaching (Malmberg, Hagger, Burn, Mutton, & Colis, 2010; Pianta & Hamre, 2009). It is used in teacher preparation, mentoring and induction, professional development, and teacher evaluation (Danielson, 2013). The Danielson (2013)

Framework is based on generic indicators of effective teaching. Danielson confirms this assertion in her own words. She states, "The framework doesn't give specific guidance on how to address diverse needs, it's generic and applies to all teaching situations, subjects, and grade levels. I don't think there is any framework published that does offer that type of guidance" (DeWitt, 2011, para. 6).

The whitestream by default. Given the lack of specificity of teacher performance related to the needs of diverse learners, and the fact that the majority of teachers are White, approximately 82% (U.S. Department of Education, 2016), there is vast room for interpretation during the enactment of the generic teaching performances described in the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013). Teachers using the frames of the dominant culture will likely manifest whitestream ways of knowing and being in the world. For instance, the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013) describes elements related to the classroom environment such as structure, respect, active listening, turn-taking, physical proximity, politeness, time, and fairness. These elements are cultural constructs that vary according to the norms of diverse cultures (Gay, 2000). As a case in point, the focus on "structure" can be interpreted as inculcating linear ways of knowing that are contrary to how collectivist cultures may function. Another example is that turn-taking is culturally mediated and, in some cultures, includes overlapping speech and/or call-and-response interactions. A teacher who approaches teaching through the whitestream may interpret cultural differences as discipline issues, or a lack of student interest or ability. In contrast, the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013) should explicitly state that teachers and students should co-create a classroom environment that is inclusive of diverse ways of being in the world (e.g., proximity, politeness, fairness, etc.).

Exclusion of culturally relevant pedagogy. In addition to offering generalized teaching practices that instantiate the whitestream by default, the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2013) fails to identify explicit indicators of cultural relevance. The Framework delineates broad elements such as knowing students' backgrounds and their lives outside of school, and supporting community cultural events. These elements can be generalized to all learners and are bereft of a specific focus on the needs of Students of Color. Of its four domains, 22 components, and 76 elements, only one element and indicator explicitly address the needs of marginalized youth. The element, "knowledge of student's cultural heritage," is accompanied by an indicator that teachers should provide opportunities for families to share their heritages. One additional element stresses that teachers should "ensure suitability for diverse learners." However, the Danielson (2007) Framework does not provide specificity, instead it describes suitability for diverse learners as equivalent to setting outcomes appropriate for *all* students.

Danielson (2007) acknowledges that educators have criticized the Framework for excluding important elements such as cultural awareness. In response, Danielson (2007) makes the claim that, "implicit in the entire framework is a commitment to equity" (p. 32) because *all* students are included. In reality, the generalized focus and lack of specificity related to diverse learners instantiates the whitestream and renders Students of Color invisible.

Moving Teacher Evaluation From the Margins to the Center

Critical race scholars take the position that "the margins can and should be viewed as both sites of oppression and sites of resistance, empowerment, and transformation" (Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998, p. 215). hooks (2000) advocates for repositioning the margins to the center to disrupt oppressive conditions. She cautions that marginality should not be lost; rather, the margins must remain "a site one stays in, clings to even, because it nourishes one's capacity to resist" (p. 207).

It is vital to situate the power, or the experiential knowledge, of marginalized communities at the center of frameworks for teaching. The FEET is strategically designed to position the cultural, linguistic, and familial resources of historically marginalized Communities of Color at the center of teacher evaluation. The FEET evaluation model measures preservice teacher performances, or skills, based on four dimensions, 15 competencies, and 60 indicators of effective and equitable teaching for K-12 learners (see Table 1). The performances are rated according to accompanying rubrics of performance at a four-level rating scale (e.g., *unsatisfactory, developing, proficient, advanced*). Moreover, an 11-item field-based observation protocol provides both summative and formative assessment of preservice teacher performance. The FEET was developed by faculty at the University of Denver and is used by teacher education program supervisors evaluating preservice teacher performance during teaching events in the field.

The FEET was conceptualized through a CRT epistemological lens. Specifically, the FEET dimensions, competencies, and indicators include knowledge and skills that teachers need to help students: (a) navigate the dominant culture; (b) sustain their cultural, linguistic, and familial resources; and (c) develop critical consciousness. The sections that follow corroborate these assertions.

Navigating the dominant culture. The FEET includes teacher performances that incorporate the culture of power based on alignment with the general consensus of knowledge and skills that promote quality teaching, as delineated by Darling-Hammond et al. (2012). These include teaching performances that (a) integrate skills for college and career readiness, (b) set high academic expectations, (c) communicate a belief in students' capacity to achieve at high levels,

(d) develop students' academic language, (e) facilitate the acquisition of content knowledge and skills through higher order thinking skills, (f) design units and lessons based on state and national content standards, (g) hold students accountable for learning, and (h) implement a classroom management system that facilitates learning.

Sustaining resources. The FEET is infused with culturally relevant teacher performances designed to draw on the power of culture, as described by critical race and multicultural scholars (Delpit, 2013; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Nieto, 2009; Paris, 2012; Salazar, 2013; Sleeter & Cornbleth, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). These include the following: (a) learn about culturally relevant pedagogy and the impact of culture on learning; (b) build affirming relationships with students and parents; (c) demonstrate interest value and respect for students' home cultures and communities; (d) collaborate with parents/families; (e) develop a positive learning community; (f) incorporate multiple learning modalities; (g) engage students in collaborative learning; (h) use instructional strategies to support English language learners and special needs students; (i) integrate multicultural materials and resources; (j) develop lessons that reflect the cultures of students, counteract stereotypes, incorporate the contributions of diverse populations; and provide opportunities for social justice pursuits; (k) connect content to students' diversity; (l) include students' native language in instruction; and (m) differentiate learning experience based on students' diversity and needs.

Developing critical consciousness. In addition, the FEET incorporates a focus on critical consciousness in teacher performances, as described by critical scholars (Cammarota, 2014; Delpit, 2013; Freire, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2004; Nieto, 2009; Salazar, 2013). This is accomplished through the preparation of teacher candidates to provide students with opportunities to (a) express their voice and have choice, (b) counteract stereotypes, (c) identify oppression locally and globally, (d) engage in social justice pursuits, (e) examine multiple perspectives, (f) ask critical questions, and (g) take critical stances.

Filling the gap. The FEET fills a gap in teacher evaluation by providing a framework for teaching that includes teaching performances that incorporate the culture of power, sustain the power of culture, and nurture critical consciousness. In contrast, generic frameworks for teaching privilege the culture of power, exclude the resources of historically marginalized Communities of Color, and negate critical stances. In generic frameworks for teaching, culturally relevant teacher performances are omitted; therefore, they are not valued or incentivized through the evaluation process. For example, using anti-bias strategies and providing students with opportunities to engage in social justice pursuits would not be recognized in a generic framework. As a result, the covert message, or possibly overt message, is that culturally relevant pedagogy is irrelevant and unnecessary for teacher and student success. Conversely, the FEET is strategically designed to bring visibility to Communities of Color by placing their needs at the center of teacher evaluation. This is evidenced in the dimensions, competencies, and indicators of the FEET summarized above and delineated in Table 1. The section that follows describes the research methods used to develop, pilot, and test the FEET.

Research Methods

Critical race scholars face many challenges in conducting research related to race. Welch and Pollard (2006) state that "researchers from disenfranchised populations find themselves silenced, or only listened to if they frame their ideas in language that is familiar and comfortable for those in the center" (p. 2). Urrieta and Villenas (2013) contend that the legitimacy of scholars doing race-based work is often questioned because they are perceived as biased and unscholarly. CRT researchers are often criticized for advancing theory based on narrative inquiry, and forsaking traditional empirical and/or psychometric approaches (Parker, 1998). In the field of teacher evaluation, it is vital to advance models and instruments that are empirically and psychometrically sound. As a response to the aforementioned challenges, the FEET places CRT on the ground using theoretically, empirically, and psychometrically sound approaches.

The FEET was developed, piloted, and tested through the use of qualitative and quantitative methods. This allowed for the co-construction of knowledge through epistemologies valued by historically marginalized Communities of Color and the dominant culture. Lynn and Parker (2006) state, "Critical race scholars are committed to conducting both qualitative and quantitative research that exposes racist beliefs, practices, and structures in schools and the broader society" (p. 282). In addition to the use of qualitative and quantitative research methods, the FEET is grounded in CRT methodology. Delgado Bernal (1998) suggests that critical race scholars use the following data sources: (a) existing literature on the topic, (b) professional experience, (c) personal experience, and (d) data gathered from the research process. This focus is apparent in the following description of the three phases of research used to develop, pilot, and test the FEET. The first and second phases of research resulted in the development and field-testing of the FEET. The third phase of the research tested the psychometric properties of the FEET.

Phases of Research

Phase 1. The first phase of research was completed from 2007 to 2010 through a 3-year exploratory qualitative research project. The purpose of this phase was to define performance expectations for equitable and excellent teaching

through the design of a framework for teaching. The research question posed was, What knowledge and skills are essential to include in a FEET? This phase included the following procedures: (a) identify performance-based expectations for preservice teachers, (b) determine the structure and organization of the framework, (c) develop rubrics of performance, and (d) design standardized field-based observation instruments. This phase resulted in the initial development of the FEET.

Phase 2. In the second phase of the research, the FEET evaluation model was field-tested from 2011-2013 with 120 preservice teachers at the University of Denver Teacher Education Program. In 2013, a 15-item quantitative and qualitative survey was distributed to 68 respondents, including field supervisors, preservice teachers, and mentor teachers. The purpose of the survey was to collect feedback from respondents on the technical properties of the FEET performance expectations, rubrics, and observation instruments. The research question posed was, What are the strengths and weaknesses of the FEET? The survey was distributed in the form of a standardized questionnaire and delivered electronically using Qualtrics software. Using a 2-point scale (*adequate/inadequate*), the respondents were asked to rate the clarity, accuracy, ease of use, and inclusion of culturally relevant pedagogy in the FEET. The pilot and survey results were used to revise the FEET.

Phase 3. In the third phase of the research, from 2014-2016, a team of researchers, including the author, conducted a study of the reliability and validity estimation of the FEET. The purpose was to test the measurement quality of the FEET. The research question posed was, To what extent are the psychometric properties of the FEET adequate? To test the reliability, the research team used FACETS (Version 3.71.2; Linacre, 2015) software to analyze data using a basic Rasch model. The results were used to revise the FEET. In addition, the research team correlated candidate FEET scores with scores from a validation measure, the Core Competencies of Novice Teachers Survey (Seidel, Green, & Briggs, 2011), to estimate convergent validity for the FEET.

Results

Development and Field-Testing

Performance-based expectations. A standards- and research-based approach was used to develop performance-based expectations for equitable and excellent preservice teachers. This included purposeful selection of available public documents related to national standards, models, and instruments that define quality teaching. This allowed for the identification of "readiness" requirements for preservice teachers entering the field. The data sources included the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards (InTASC, 2013), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS; 2015), and two nationally recognized frameworks for teaching: the Danielson (2013) Framework for Teaching and the Teach for America (2015) Teaching as Leadership Framework.

Moreover, a systematic review of the available literature was conducted related to equitable and excellent teaching. The review was based on the following methods: search, screening, appraisal, data extraction, and analysis. First, four electronic databases (ERIC, EBSCO, ProQuest, Google Scholar) were selected to identify peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and book chapters based on the following keyword search related to equitable and excellent teaching: effective, quality, culturally relevant/responsive, linguistically responsive, equity, social justice, critical pedagogy, multicultural, and humanizing. Next, snowballing techniques (Atkinson & Flint, 2001) were used to identify references of selected journals, books, and book chapters for relevant sources that aligned with the construct of equitable and excellent teaching. The targeted research was published between 1995 and the present. The initial year was selected based on Ladson-Billings and Tate's (1995) seminal work on CRT in education.

The screening phase included the completion of annotated bibliographies to ensure alignment with the keyword search. In the appraisal phase, the sources were narrowed to 165 peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and books that met the keyword search criteria in the abstract. A significant proportion of the literature, approximately 75%, highlight pedagogical practices that address the needs of diverse learners. Moreover, approximately 55% originate from Scholars of Color. Next, data were extracted, analyzed, and coded through a macro-level deductive content analysis to identify general themes for performance expectations. Subsequently, qualitative research computer software ATLAS.ti (ATLAS.ti, 2015) was used to conduct micro-level inductive content analysis and develop open, axial, and selective coding schemes used to generate themes and subthemes. The emerging data transformation resulted in codes by tallying the number of times concepts occurred in the textual data. This approach revealed key themes and subthemes of equitable and excellent teaching that recurred across the data sources. Emerging themes and subthemes were represented as domains, competencies, and indicators based on degree of specificity. Next came an extensive review of performance expectations for alignment, coherence, clarity, appropriate sequence, and practical usage. Subsequently, the data were compared with literature from celebrated scholars including Delpit (1988), Gay (2000), Hollins (1993), Ladson-Billings (2009), Lucas and Villegas (2013), Nieto (2009), and Sleeter (2001), to strengthen the focus on culturally relevant pedagogy.

As a developer of the FEET, I also drew from my own personal and professional experiences, as a Latina from the

margins, to develop the FEET performance expectations. I use the first person in this section to interrupt "neutral" and "objective" ways of knowing and being in the world. I was born in Mexico and ripped from my motherland as an infant. I grew up in the Southwestern United States. As a result, I felt *ni de aquí, ni de allá*, neither from here, nor from there. I experienced a dehumanizing educational system. My submersion into the whitestream was agonizing (Salazar, 2013). My teachers stole my humanity. Consequently, I rejected all that was native to me. I survived my K-12 experience by remaining silent and learning to navigate the culture of power. I did not thrive until I entered higher education with a determination to reclaim the power of my culture. I came into contact with role models, men and women of color, who successfully navigated the culture of power and maintained the power of their culture, albeit with invisible scars. My critical consciousness burgeoned out of the pages of Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. I woke. I became a high school teacher to help students navigate and challenge the whitestream, sustain the power of their culture, and nurture critical consciousness. My personal and professional experiences influenced the lenses I used to develop the FEET. Thus, the FEET is inclusive of relationships, culture, language, family, community, high expectations, college readiness, and critical perspectives in an effort to preserve the humanity of every child.

Structure and organization. Once the performance-based expectations were defined, the structure and organization of the FEET was determined by analyzing the structures of two national frameworks for teaching: the Danielson (2013) Framework for Teaching and the Teach for America (2015) Teaching as Leadership Framework. These were selected based on perceptions of usability held by educators. The frameworks were compared with the emerging FEET dimensions, competencies, and indicators to identify strengths and rectify gaps in the FEET, and provide a template for its structure and organization. The FEET is structured in a way that moves from the simple themes related to equitable and excellent teaching (e.g., dimensions), to more detailed descriptions of performances (e.g., competencies), and evidence of behaviors indicating the performances are evident (e.g., indicators). The FEET moves from a holistic to incremental focus to prepare teachers to engage, plan, teach, and lead for equitable and excellent teaching.

Rubrics of performance. After determining the structure and organization of the framework, the next step was the development of rubrics of performance. According to Papay (2012), "a high-quality, standards-based evaluation system requires rigorous instructional standards with clear rubrics that define success on these standards" (p. 134). The FEET rubrics are based on the four dimensions of equitable and excellent teaching with detailed performance indicators at the competency level, using a four-level rating scale with the following labels: 4 = *advanced*, 3 = *proficient*, 2 = *developing*, and 1 = *unsatisfactory*. The rubrics provide exemplars of performance at four levels of proficiency. The FEET proficient and advanced performance rubric ratings are aligned with the three levels of the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions (InTASC, 2013).

Observation instruments. Subsequently, observation instruments were developed to facilitate the practical implementation of the FEET, and to allow for summative and formative assessments of preservice teachers. Papay (2012) indicates that standards-based observation tools provide summative data that identify meaningful targets for formative improvement. The FEET includes a numerical rating scale that is used to quantify observations resulting in greater accuracy. The FEET evaluation model includes spiraled and progressive observation tools that align with proficient levels of performance, provide summative ratings of performance, facilitate formative feedback from field supervisors, and include preservice teacher self-reflection and goal setting.

Field-testing. In the second phase of the research, the FEET evaluation model was field-tested from 2011-2013 with 120 preservice teacher candidates from the graduate Teacher Education Program at the University of Denver, a private institution of higher education (IHE) that is dedicated to the public good. A 15-item survey was developed and disseminated to collect feedback from supervisors, mentor teachers, and preservice teachers on the technical properties of the rubric and observation instrument. The results showed that the respondents identified two competencies and four indicators that needed to be revised for greater clarity, accuracy, and ease of use. The FEET was revised based on the survey data.

Psychometric Testing

From 2014 to 2016, a research team composed of the author and three faculty and graduate student researchers conducted a study of the psychometric properties of the FEET observation instrument to examine its reliability and validity estimation. The participants included eight field supervisors, one Graduate Research Assistant (GRA), and 65 preservice teachers at the Teacher Education Program at the University of Denver.

Reliability estimation. Due to a confluence of variables, multiple factors need to be examined to assess the reliability of an instrument. The research team applied a Many-Faceted Rasch Model (MFRM) to assess the reliability of the FEET observation instrument across multiple facets. The researcher team used FACETS (Version 3.71.2; Linacre, 2015) software to analyze data in the four-faceted model. The facets used were supervisor (rater stability), candidate (teacher candidate proficiency levels), time (the rate of change of teacher

Table 2. Summary of Supervisor Measure and Fit Statistics.

Supervisor	Measure (logit)	*SE* (logit)	InfitMS	OutfitMS
Rater 1	0.34	.07	0.71	0.78
Rater 2	−0.18	.07	0.62	0.70
Rater 3	−0.71	.08	0.66	0.74
Rater 4	0.09	.08	0.71	0.81
Rater 5	−0.19	.07	0.88	1.04
Rater 6	0.29	.07	0.73	0.88
Rater 7	0.07	.08	0.71	0.82
Rater 8	0.29	.10	0.76	0.90

Note. InfitMS = infit mean square; OutfitMS = outfit mean square.

Table 3. Time Difficulty Measure, Standard Error, and Fit Indices.

Time	Measure (logit)	*SE* (logit)	InfitMS	OutfitMS
Pre-Fall	3.04	.08	1.17	1.36
Post-Fall	3.01	.09	1.10	1.33
Pre-Winter	2.53	.06	0.77	0.89
Post-Winter	2.39	.07	0.68	0.76
Pre-Spring	1.70	.07	0.52	0.38
Post-Spring	1.49	.05	0.47	0.41

Note. InfitMS = infit mean square; OutfitMS = outfit mean square.

candidate performance over time), and item (item difficulty). The chi-square test, fit indices, separation ratio, and reliability of separation indicators were used to determine the performance of each individual facet. The sections that follow describe the results that emerged from each facet.

Supervisor facet. The supervisor facet measures rater stability. Fit indices indicate that supervisors' ratings were fitting. That is, all nine supervisors' mean square values fit within the accepted range of 0.5 to 1.5 logit considered "productive of measurement" (Linacre, 2015). This indicates the items are understood and applied appropriately by the raters. While the ratings are within an accepted range, the fixed chi-square reveals supervisor separation (6.18) and reliability of separation (.95). It appears that supervisors' severity ratings differ significantly. A closer examination of the individual levels of severity/leniency reveals that the raters' logit positions are not far from each other, with the exception of Rater 3. See Table 2 for summary.

The research team also examined measures of supervisor central tendency and halo effect. A chi-square value on the candidate, $\chi^2(df = 67) = 540.0$, $p < .001$, indicates the presence of variability of ratings of apprentices and thus shows no supervisor-level central tendency effect in the data. That is, the supervisors utilized the full range of the rating scale. Moreover, the supervisors' ability to distinguish among the items and assign similar ratings across items was examined. A significant chi-square test on the items, $\chi^2(df = 12) = 4{,}966.8$, $p < .001$, indicates differences among the items and the absence of a halo effect, or the tendency to assign ratees similar ratings on conceptually distinct traits. The supervisors demonstrated that they distinguished among the items.

Overall, the supervisors demonstrate a good understanding of the use of the FEET observation instrument. There is no randomness in the way the supervisors assign the ratings. The supervisors also show evidence of distinguishing the candidates' abilities and rating them at different performance levels. However, the variability in the severity and leniency of supervisor ratings indicates a need for improved supervisor training.

Candidate facet. The candidate facet measures teacher candidate performance based on FEET ratings. The significant chi-square statistic for candidates demonstrates different proficiency levels. There are differences among the candidates' rated abilities, with a separation ratio and reliability of separation of 2.52 and .86. The results are fitting based on mean square infit within the accepted range of 0.5 to 1.5 logit (Linacre, 2015). The results indicate that candidates demonstrate different proficiency levels. A table is not illustrated due to the amount of data.

Time facet. The time facet measured preservice teacher performance across evaluation occasions. The significant chi-square test for the time (session) facet shows the presence of differences by time of evaluation. A separation ratio of 21.79 with reliability of separation greater than .99 further informs us of the difference in time of evaluating the preservice teachers. A significant chi-square, higher separation ratio, and reliability of separation indicate substantial variability in the time point difficulty measure. See Table 3 for summary. Results show a gradual increase in the preservice teachers' proficiency from fall to spring quarter. The results offer an indication that the FEET items allow for preservice teachers to demonstrate growth in teaching skills.

Item facet. The item facet measures item function, or the item difficulty or ease. A significant chi-square test statistic for items indicates differences in the item difficulties. An item separation ratio of 18.40 and the reliability of separation of greater than .99 show the variability in difficulty of the administered items. The logit measure of item difficulty ranges from a low of –2.45 (easy item) to a high of 2.56 (difficult item). See Table 4 for summary. The distribution of items low to high difficulty indicates the FEET instrument is capturing different levels of teaching skill. There are no misfitting items. The results show that in general, the items function well in capturing teaching skills proficiency.

Overall, the facet analysis indicates that the FEET has adequate measurement quality, as evidenced in that the (a) supervisors show adequate use of the FEET evaluation instrument, (b) candidates' teaching proficiency increased

Table 4. Item Difficulty Measure, Standard Error, and Fit Indices.

Item	Measure (logit)	*SE* (logit)	InfitMS	OutfitMS
Item 1	−1.56	.11	0.98	1.05
Item 2	−0.31	.08	0.63	0.96
Item 3	−1.00	.10	0.84	1.10
Item 4	−0.49	.08	0.64	1.06
Item 5	0.73	.07	0.99	1.15
Item 6	2.47	.09	0.60	0.49
Item 7	2.44	.09	0.49	0.33
Item 8	−0.28	.08	0.63	0.95
Item 9	2.56	.09	0.45	0.30
Item 10	−2.12	.12	0.85	0.86
Item 11	−2.45	.12	0.94	0.93

Note. InfitMS = infit mean square; OutfitMS = outfit mean square.

over time, (c) candidates demonstrate proficiency in the targeted teaching skills, and (d) distribution of items is adequate. It is important to note that although the supervisor ratings are fitting, they demonstrate variability in candidate ratings, thus indicating a need for improved supervisor training.

Validity estimation. The research team also examined the convergent validity of the FEET to test if the concepts developed in the FEET correlate with other instruments designed to measure a theoretically similar construct. The researchers used a preservice teacher self-report of teaching competencies survey known as the Core Competency Survey (CCS; Seidel et al., 2011). The CCS contains 46 statements related to eight core competencies of effective teaching: (a) pedagogical content knowledge; (b) classroom management; (c) culturally responsive classroom practices; (d) planning/providing effective instruction; (e) design/adapt curriculum, instruction, assessments; (f) high expectations; (g) language and ELL supports; and (h) reflection/professional growth (Seidel & Whitcomb, 2015). Reliabilities for the CCS subscales ranged from .75 to .88 in the development sample with a dominant first factor with alphas for the total score exceeding .85 (Seidel et al., 2011).

The results of the convergent validity testing indicate that reliabilities between the FEET measure and CCS multi-item subscales were .95 and .96. The subscales show adequate correlation, suggesting evidence for convergent validity between the FEET measure and the CCS. The CCS is an appropriate referent for establishing convergent validity because it is inclusive of culturally responsive practices. The CCS differs from the FEET in that it is used as a self-assessment of teaching practice, not an observation instrument. Moreover, the CCS does not include a focus on critical consciousness.

Multicultural validity. The FEET also holds up to indicators of multicultural validity, defined as "the correctness or authenticity of understandings across multiple, intersecting cultural contexts" (Hopson & Kirkhart, 2012, p. 13). Hopson and Kirkhart (2012) indicate that multicultural validity can be assessed based on the following: (a) quality of the relationships that surround the evaluation process, (b) alignment of theoretical perspectives underlying the evaluation, (c) congruence with the life experience of participants in the evaluation process, (d) cultural appropriateness of epistemology and method, and (e) social consequences of understandings and the actions taken. The author asserts that the FEET demonstrates multicultural validity based on alignment with Hopson and Kirkhart's specifications; these include, (a) demonstrates quality relationships with those involved in the evaluation process, including faculty, supervisors, mentors, and teacher candidates; (b) uses theoretically sound methods and incorporates a wide body of literature related to equitable and excellent teaching; (c) includes the experiential knowledge of Communities of Color through the inclusion of the author's experiences, literature related to historically disenfranchised Communities of Color, and literature by Scholars of Color; (d) establishes cultural appropriateness in research methodology through the use of qualitative and quantitative methods; and (e) promotes reflection and action for equity and social justice.

Implications

The FEET is a theoretically, empirically, and psychometrically sound teacher evaluation model that positions the resources and needs of historically marginalized communities at the center of teacher evaluation. Although the FEET is a promising teacher evaluation model, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of the FEET. In terms of methodological limitations, the psychometric testing of the FEET examined a limited number of aspects related to reliability and validity. For example, the FEET has not yet established predictive validity, some believe this is an essential marker for measuring equitable and excellent teaching. Moreover, the FEET was not developed based on feedback from K-12 students and families, thus some might question its multicultural validity.

In terms of conceptual limitations, for critical race scholars, it is vital to continuously interrogate the systems that have the power to liberate and oppress historically marginalized Communities of Color. The FEET includes teaching practices that reify the culture of power. In addition, the structure of the FEET is based on linear modalities that are indicative of White ways of knowing. On the contrary, the FEET is inclusive of the resources of historically marginalized Communities of Color, and it challenges structures that reinforce inequity. In essence, the FEET is working "simultaneously within and against the system" (Cochran-Smith, 2010, p. 459). Yet, Lorde (1983) questions the practice of using the master's tools to dismantle the master's house, adding that only the smallest change is possible with such an approach.

Tatto, Richmond, and Carter Andrews (2016) assert that research in teaching and teacher education is vital for examining contradictions in teaching and learning. They describe one of these contradictions as the manner in which teacher quality is secured, evaluated, and reported. The emergence of the FEET provokes important questions about the inherent contradictions in teacher evaluation. Does the use of traditional paradigms in teacher evaluation fortify the dominant culture and instantiate hegemonic instruments of oppression? Does moving the margins to the middle result in positioning historically marginalized communities at the center of whiteness? How do we acquiesce to the reality of teacher evaluation and continue to resist it?

The FEET evaluation model has the potential to make a positive impact in the current educational context. It should be tested in diverse contexts such as preservice teacher preparation programs, K-12 classrooms with inservice teachers, and professional learning communities. It is important to establish the FEET's potential to be implemented across various contexts.

It is also important that critical race scholars continue to challenge structures of racial domination and oppression, and strive for social justice. Future research on this topic should include a comprehensive assessment of national teacher evaluation tools (e.g., Danielson Framework for Teaching, Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, Classroom Assessment Scoring System, and edTPA) for the inclusion of culturally relevant pedagogy. It is also important to continue to research the validity of teacher evaluation tools, including their multicultural validity, predictive validity, and content validity. Scholars should also examine the use of qualitative research methods in the development of teacher evaluation measures, to ensure the inclusion of the voices of Communities of Color. Most importantly, scholars must continue to imagine, create, implement, and test approaches to teacher evaluation that transgress and promote social justice.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Anyon, J. (2014). *Radical possibilities: Public policy, urban education, and a new social movement*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Atkinson, R., & Flint, J. (2001). Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies. *Social Research Update*, *33*(1), 1-4.

ATLAS.ti. (2015). (Version 8) [Software]. Available from atlasti.com

Bernal, D. D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *68*(4), 555-583.

Cammarota, J. (2014). The social justice education project. In J. Cammarota & A. Romero (Eds.), *Raza studies: The public option for educational revolution* (pp. 107-121). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2010). Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 445-467). New York, NY: Springer International Handbooks of Education.

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

Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument*. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group.

Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *93*(6), 8-15.

DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there: Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, *33*, 26-31.

Delgado, R. (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1993). Critical race theory: An annotated bibliography. *Virginia Law Review*, *79*, 461-516.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, *58*(3), 280-299.

Delpit, L. (2013). *"Multiplication is for white people": Raising expectations for other people's children*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Denis, C. (1997). *We are not you: First Nations and Canadian modernity*. Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press.

DeWitt, P. (2011). *A framework for good teaching: A conversation with Charlotte Danielson*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/finding_common_ground/2011/10/a_framework_for_good_teaching_a_conversation_with_charlotte_danielson.html

Franquiz, M., Salazar, M., & DeNicolo, C. (2011). Challenging majoritarian tales: Portraits of bilingual teachers deconstructing deficit views of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *34*(3), 279-300.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of white supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, *20*(4), 485-505.

Grande, S. (2000). American Indian identity and intellectualism: The quest for a new red pedagogy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *13*(4), 343-359.

Hollins, E. R. (1993). Assessing teacher competence for diverse populations. *Theory Into Practice*, *32*(2), 93-99.

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. London, England: Pluto Press.

Hopson & Kirkhart. (2012). *Strengthening evaluation through cultural relevance and cultural competence*. Retrieved from https://www.wcasa.org/file_open.php?id=869

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2013). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions*. Retrieved from https://www.ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards

Kumashiro, K. K. (2015). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, *34*(3), 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education*, *24*, 211-247.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education. In G. Ladson-Billings & D. Gillborn (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 49-67). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American Children* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*, 47-68.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *5*(1), 29-50.

Linacre, J. M. (2015). FACETS (Version 3.71.4) [Computer program]. Chicago, IL: MESA Press.

Lorde, A. (1983). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In C. Morraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color* (pp. 94-101). New York, NY: Kitchen Table Press.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, *52*(2), 98-109.

Lynn, M. (2006). Dancing between two worlds: A portrait of the life of a black male teacher in South Central LA. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *19*(2), 221-242.

Lynn, M., & Parker, L. (2006). Critical race studies in education: Examining a decade of research on U.S. schools. *The Urban Review*, *38*(4), 257-290.

Malmberg, L., Hagger, H., Burn, K., Mutton, T., & Colis, H. (2010). Observed classroom quality during teacher education and two years of professional practice. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *102*(4), 916-932.

Mann, H. (1848). Annual Reports on Education. Boston, MA: Cornhill Press.

National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. (2015). *Five core propositions*. Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/five-core-propositions

New Teacher Project. (2011). *Rating a teacher observation tool: Five ways to ensure classroom observations are focused and rigorous*. Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_RatingATeacherObservationTool_Feb2011.pdf?files/TNTP_RatingATeacherObservationTool_Feb2011.pdf

Nieto, S. (2009). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Pang, V. O., & Barba, R. H. (1995). The power of culture: Building culturally affirming instruction. In C. A. Grant (Ed.), *Educating for diversity: An anthology of multicultural education* (pp. 341-358). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Papay, J. (2012). Refocusing the debate: Assessing the purposes and tools of teacher evaluation. *Harvard Educational Review*, *82*(1), 123-141.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93-97.

Parker, L. (1998). "Race is race ain't": An exploration of the utility of critical race theory in qualitative research in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 43-55.

Parker, L., & Stovall, D. (2004). Actions following words: Critical race theory connects to critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*(2), 167-182.

Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2015). Restorative justice in schools: The influence of race on restorative discipline. *Youth and Society*, *47*(4), 539-564.

Peterson, P. E. (2010). *Saving schools: From Horace Mann to virtual learning*. London, England: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Pianta, R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2009). Conceptualization, measurement and improvement of classroom processes: Standardized observation can leverage capacity. *Educational Researcher*, *38*, 109-119.

Rodriguez, G. M., & Rolle, R. A. (2013). *To what ends and by what means: The social justice implications of contemporary school finance theory and policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Salazar, M. C. (2010). Pedagogical stances of high school ESL teachers: Huelgas in high school ESL classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *33*(1), 111-124.

Salazar, M. C. (2013). A humanizing pedagogy: Reinventing the principles and practice of education as a journey toward liberation. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 121-148.

Salazar, M. C., & Rios, F. (2016). Just scholarship! Publishing academic research with a social justice focus. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *18*(1), 3-11.

Salinas, C. (2006). Educating late arrival high school immigrant students: A call for a more democratic curriculum. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *8*(1), 20-27.

Sawchuk, S. (2015). *Teacher evaluation: An issue overview*. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/teacher-performance-evaluation-issue-overview.html

Seidel, K., Green, K., & Briggs, D. (2011). *An exploration of novice teachers' core competencies: Impact on student achievement, and effectiveness of preparation* (Award #R305A120233, Fiscal Year 2012). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/funding/grantsearch/details.asp?ID=1274

Seidel, K., & Whitcomb, J. (2015). Exploring novice teachers' core competencies. In G. K. LeTendre & A. W. Wiseman (Eds.), *Promoting and sustaining a quality teacher workforce* (pp. 197-238). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(2), 94-106.

Sleeter, C. E., & Cornbleth, C. (2011). *Teaching with vision: Culturally responsive teaching in standards-based classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Solórzano, D., & Villalpando, O. (1998). Critical race theory, marginality, and the experience of students of color in higher education. In C. A. Torres & T. R. Mitchell (Eds.), *Sociology of education: Emerging perspectives* (pp. 211-224). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Solórzano, D., & Yosso, T. (2002). A critical race counterstory of race, racism and affirmative action. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 155-168.

Stovall, D. (2006). Forging community in race and class: Critical race theory and the quest for social justice in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *9*(3), 243-259.

Tatto, M. T., Richmond, G., & Carter Andrews, D. (2016). The research we need in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *67*(4), 247-250.

Teach for America. (2015). *Teaching as leadership framework*. Retrieved from http://www.teachingasleadership.org/sites/default/files/Teaching%20As%20Leadership%20Framework%20(One%20Pager).pdf

Urrieta, L. (2010). Whitestreaming: Why some Latinas/os fear bilingual education. *Counterpoints*, *371*, 47-55.

Urrieta, L., & Villenas, S. A. (2013). The legacy of Derrick Bell and Latino/a education: A critical race testimonio. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(4), 514-535.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development. (2016). *The state of racial diversity in the educator workforce*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-workforce.pdf

Valencia, R. R. (2015). *Students of color and the achievement gap: Systemic challenges, systemic transformations*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Vaught, S. E. (2011). *Racism, public schooling, and the entrenchment of white supremacy: A critical race ethnography*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Welch, O. M., & Pollard, D. S. (2006). Women researchers of color: Have we come a long way? In D. S. Pollard & O. M. Welch (Eds.), *From center to margins: The importance of self-definition in research* (pp. 1-6). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Yamamoto, E. K. (1997). Critical race praxis: Race theory and political lawyering practice in post-civil rights America. *Michigan Law Review*, *95*, 821-900.

Yosso, T., Smith, W., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*(4), 659-691.

Zamudio, M., Russell, C., Rios, F., & Bridgeman, J. L. (2011). *Critical race theory matters: Education and ideology*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Author Biography

Maria del Carmen Salazar's research and scholarship are grounded in notions of educational equity. She has authored numerous publications on humanizing pedagogy, culturally responsive teacher evaluation, culturally responsive teaching, and college access and success for Latina/o students. She also served on the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), a national collaborative to revise model content standards and develop learning progressions for teacher licensure, assessment, and development. She was a key contributor in the development of the 2011 InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and 2013 Learning Progressions. She currently serves on the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Board of Directors and Equity Committee.