High school athletic directors' perceptions of athletic coaching: A survey study of the applicability of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching to coaching

by

Erin Lynn Oliver

B.S., Baker University, 2008
M.S., Kansas State University, 2015

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2020

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify the underlying dimensions that influence high school athletic director's view of effective high school athletic coaching. By identifying these factors, it was determined if high school athletic directors agree that the components for effective athletic coaching run parallel to Charlotte Danielson's (2013) framework for effective teaching since athletic coaching is a form of teaching. The study surveyed high school athletic directors in Kansas using a modified version of the Framework for Teaching Survey developed by Sweeley (2004). The study also identified if various factors such as school size, years of experience as athletic director, and gender of the athletic director influenced athletic director's opinions of effective high school athletic coaching.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted using direct oblimin as the oblique rotation method and principal axis factoring as the extraction method. The factor analysis revealed three factors representing the underlying dimensions of athletic director views, namely, Coaching Culture, Content Knowledge, and Servant Leadership. Using the raw mean factor score for each participant calculated, the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) did not find any significant relationships existed between the identified factors and the independent variables of school size, years of experience, and gender. Overall, the results supported that Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching was applicable when applied to effective high school athletic coaching and could be applied to all high school sports of all levels for both head and assistant coaches.

High school athletic directors' perceptions of athletic coaching: A survey study of the applicability of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching to coaching

by

Erin Lynn Oliver

B.S., Baker University, 2008
M.S., Kansas State University, 2015

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2020

Approved by:
Co-Major Professor
Dr. Jia Liang

Approved by:
Co-Major Professor
Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw

Copyright

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify the underlying dimensions that influence high school athletic director's view of effective high school athletic coaching. By identifying these factors, it was determined if high school athletic directors agree that the components for effective athletic coaching run parallel to Charlotte Danielson's (2013) framework for effective teaching since athletic coaching is a form of teaching. The study surveyed high school athletic directors in Kansas using a modified version of the Framework for Teaching Survey developed by Sweeley (2004). The study also identified if various factors such as school size, years of experience as athletic director, and gender of the athletic director influenced athletic director's opinions of effective high school athletic coaching.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted using direct oblimin as the oblique rotation method and principal axis factoring as the extraction method. The factor analysis revealed three factors representing the underlying dimensions of athletic director views, namely, Coaching Culture, Content Knowledge, and Servant Leadership. Using the raw mean factor score for each participant calculated, the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) did not find any significant relationships existed between the identified factors and the independent variables of school size, years of experience, and gender. Overall, the results supported that Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching was applicable when applied to effective high school athletic coaching and could be applied to all high school sports of all levels for both head and assistant coaches.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Co-Major Professors, Dr. Jia Liang and Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw for their valuable feedback, guidance, support, and encouragement throughout this project. Thank you to my dissertation committee members at Kansas State University, Dr. Robert Hachiya, Dr. Be Stoney, and Dr. Yang Yang, for sharing their expertise and knowledge of Educational Leadership. Finally, I would like to thank my family, friends, and colleagues for always supporting me and providing encouragement when I needed it the most.

Dedication

I dedicate this paper to all the athletic coaches that have coached me as a student athlete. Thank you for always believing in me and teaching me the love of athletic competition. Lifelong lessons learned as a student through the leadership of your programs have greatly influenced me and have had a huge impact on my life. Thank you!

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Introduction to the Problem

Each year in communities nationwide, local newspapers and television media cover reports of high school athletics. From buzzer beating shots to heartfelt moments of sportsmanship, high school sports are a thriving part of our communities. In addition to local rivalries, score reports, and league and state championships, reports may also include stories of personnel issues within these high school programs. Such stories headline of winning high school athletic coaches with successful resumes that are non-renewed for the next season as a result of parent complaints or concerns of local school administration. These stories also often highlight situations of good high school athletic coaches that are non-renewed for the next season due to one poor season or not enough success in the eyes of community stakeholders.

With this growing spotlight, there seems to be a heightened awareness concerning local high school athletic programs and those individuals that lead them. Such awareness includes the optimism of potential local talent and recent success of the local high school team or it could also include the whispers of possible suggested change in the coaching staff. Such suggested changes and concerns in athletic coaching are proposed to school districts, school administrations, and local boards of education every year by patrons or parents expressing the varying views of public opinion regarding high school athletics. Each year successful and unsuccessful high school athletic coaches are non-renewed by school districts or those individuals choose to quit the profession entirely. These coaches vary in years of experience, win-loss record, age, and gender and work in schools and communities that range in size, demographics, and diversity. While reasons for non-renewal vary and reasons for coaches quitting the profession vary, school districts are faced with the decision to renew or non-renew high school athletic coaches yearly.

In recent years, it has been perceived by high school athletic coaches that public and parent opinions have had a louder voice and more input into the decision of non-renewing or renewing a high school athletic coach's contract. Many patrons and parents may feel that because they are taxpayers to the school district that their voice of concern regarding high school athletics should be heard or that their child's experience is the utmost important factor. Currently, a battle exists between high school athletic coaches wanting to hold student athletes accountable within their athletic program to build a successful program and parenting patterns that protect and rationalize student behavior. At the helm of this battle are school administrators and local boards of education trying to understand the balance between both parties to determine fact and opinion in making the ultimate decision of renewing or non-renewing a high school athletic coach's contract.

While school administrators understand that neither the athletic coach nor the parent or patron are not always wrong, and some complaints are factual and legitimate, they also understand that both parties are not always necessarily right either. In fact, in some clear-cut situations, a high school coach may need to be fired or non-renewed due to their actions or choices. Such situations may involve student safety or other factors that violate school policy or law. These situations often require the school district to have documentation of, or evidence of, the coach's behavior and actions, which some schools may or may not have. But when situations are not clear cut and documentation of a coach's performance is not available, it is then left up to the interpretation of the athletic director and school administration to make recommendations to the local board of education. The local board of education then votes to determine whether a coach's contract is renewed. The opinions of the administration and board of education on the

best course of action can often vary with the opinions of players, parents, and patrons within the community.

With such varying opinions, constant complaints from parents and turmoil becoming the spotlight in some high school sports programs, it leaves the question as to why schools continue to offer these athletic opportunities for students. School districts offer these athletic programs as extracurricular activities to teach sports and lifelong character traits such as teamwork, work ethic, accountability, and problem solving that benefit students long after high school (Blackburn, 2007; Curry, 2012; Parsh, 2007). To seek the true purpose of high school athletics, a 2007 study concluded that, "educationally based school interscholastic athletic programs assisted participants as a whole in schooling, positive character development, and responsibility" (Blackburn, 2007, p. 158). The study found that, "life lessons through teachable moments offered through participation has worked to assist the student to develop strong personal traits that carried them through adulthood" (Blackburn, 2007, p. 146).

With character development being the main purpose of high school athletics, it could be argued that the more parents try to get involved in decisions regarding the sports program and its coaches, to protect or advocate for their student athlete, the less their student athlete is getting out of the program. High school sports indirectly teach skills such as the ability for the player to problem solve on their own. When parents step in and completely skip over the player-coach-administrator chain of command for solving issues within that sport's program, it creates issues at multiple levels. For example, the school now has parents who feel they can immediately give input on that coach or program, the coach does not feel supported if the chain of command is broken, and the student athlete never learns to solve their own problems or advocate for themselves. These are important and highly marketable skills for students in life after high

school. In addition, if schools continue to allow parents and patrons to interfere and overstep in athletic programs, it can have a long-term effect on the athletic program. The less a school district decides to help protect a coach and emphasize the player-coach-administrator chain of command, the more turnover in that position could exist along with the possibility of an increased number of athletic coaching vacancies within that school district. As Hoch (2002) points out, there are several difficulties that cause coaches to leave the profession after a few years, including, "overbearing, obnoxious and meddlesome parents" as well as lack of administrative support (p. 30). These vacancies occur because the athletic coach does not feel supported. It is apparent that high school athletic coaching is in a vulnerable state with a high demand and low supply of people wanting to enter the high school athletic coaching profession. To comprehend this vulnerable state, the job of the high school athletic coach and the demands placed upon this position must be investigated.

Background of the Study

High school athletic coaches can be positive role models that have a huge impact on the student athletes they work with each day. High schools use athletic programs to help teach lifelong character traits such as teamwork, dedication, determination, etc. to their student athletes that can be applied to many areas of life after high school (Blackburn, 2007; Curry, 2012; Parsh, 2007). Leading these athletic programs are head coaches that use different teaching and coaching strategies to teach the content of their sport and develop successful athletic programs within their school (D'Alessio, 2011). In a society that sometimes takes a "winning at all costs" approach, many factors play a role in making a successful athletic program and the longevity of the head coach in that school system.

All head coaches in high school athletic programs face different adversities and have multiple roles within the school each year. Both positive and negative experiences affect the success of the athletic program and the success of the coach. To understand the effects of these experiences' researchers have investigated what factors play a role in the happiness of a head high school athletic coach and the likelihood that they will continue to stay in high school athletic coaching. According to Baltzell, Ahktar, Bowman, Hurley, Martin, and McCarthy (2014), high school coaches noted having multiple roles as a coach and contributing in a variety of ways to an athlete's individual success and a team's success as sources of joy in their job. Such roles included creating positive team culture as well as influencing, teaching, mentoring, and motivating their athletes. "Most coaches saw their greatest contributions as developing and reinforcing skills and lessons that were transferable off the field" (Baltzell et al., 2014, p. 12). These multiple roles that coaches mention as sources of joy describe the different roles that coaches fulfill within their head coaching position. It also highlights what coaches enjoy and find rewarding from their coaching position that encourages them to return to the profession year after year.

Negative experiences coaches face includes adversities such as parent pressure, student athlete discipline, lack of support from administration, and community pressure to be successful. These factors play a role in the level of success the athletic program attains and the amount of turnover within the coaching staff. Research conducted on the high stresses of high school athletic coaches and turnover rates in those coaching positions investigated the various reasons that coaches were non-renewed in schools. "While it is vital that interscholastic coaches have an in-depth knowledge of the sport and the education to teach it in order to win, it is apparent from

the results of this study that they need to prepare themselves in other ways" (Miller, Lutz, Shim, Fredenburg, & Miller, 2006, p. 45).

For coaches to be successful and retained yearly in high school athletic programs, they must be properly trained in additional areas other than their sport of interest. Knowing the x's and o's of a sport is not enough for a coach to overcome issues that may arise within a given season or school year. One additional area that may help in retaining athletic coaches is training and education on quality teaching strategies. Athletic coaching includes the teaching of the sport and most high school coaches are teachers. These teaching strategies may be used in the athletic coach's classroom and in preparing teams for athletic competition. It is also important for school administrators to understand that successful head coaches can be successful classroom teachers. It is important to not hinder the success of their classroom or team due to the high demands and stresses of each job. In fact, Egalite, Bowen, and Trivitt (2015) studied the effectiveness of athletic coaches as math and reading teachers and the balance of both roles as teacher and athletic coach along with student success. It was found that teachers who serve as coaches do not hinder their students in the classroom when they balance responsibilities properly (Egalite et al., 2015). This supports the concept that successful athletic coaches can also be successful teachers in the classroom. Egalite and colleagues (2015) concluded, "hiring teacher coaches does not appear to harm student achievement but doing otherwise may prove to be financially inefficient" (p. 19). This strengthens the idea that coaches are not taking away from their classrooms and they are not hindering the students in their classes by coaching outside of the classroom. It also supports the concept that schools benefit in their athletic programs by hiring teachers on staff to hold head athletic coaching positions due to their ability to effectively teach and build relationships with student athletes during the school day and throughout the entire school year.

Coaching can enhance the overall experience of teaching, therefore a focus on exploring if classroom teaching techniques enhance athletic coaching may be a key benefit. School administrators need to know and understand the importance of who they hire to fill both coaching and teaching positions and how those roles affect one another in the school setting. In addition, school administrators and athletic directors also need to determine if they are fairly evaluating head high school athletic coaches to make an informed recommendation to the board of education for the renewal or non-renewal of an athletic coaching contract.

Statement of the Problem

Each year public school systems evaluate their administrators, teachers, sponsors, and employees to determine areas of professional growth and whether to rehire such individuals. In the process of determining whether to renew or non-renew an athletic coach's contract, some school districts formally evaluate, and some do not (Anderson, 1999; Price, 2009; Pennsylvania State Athletic Directors Association [PSADA], 2015; Thielges, 2015). To date, minimal research has been conducted to examine the criteria that high school athletic directors use to evaluate high school athletic coaches. In addition, very few researchers have investigated the specific evaluation process that high schools use to determine the effectiveness of head athletic coaches in high school athletic programs. Currently most high schools use an informal evaluation process that is opinion-based and not supported by evidence or research to determine whether a school district should renew or non-renew an athletic coach's contract (Anderson, 1999; Belinko, 1999; Price, 2009; PSADA, 2015; Thielges, 2015). While many schools do use research-based evaluation tools for evaluating classroom teachers, there is not a formal evaluation tool supported by research for high school athletic directors to use to evaluate the effectiveness of high school athletic coaches.

Research Questions

The following research questions were proposed for this study:

RQ1: To what extent is Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching applicable to high school athletic coaching evaluations as viewed by high school athletic directors?

RQ2: What dimensions exist among athletic director views?

RQ3: How do the factors of school size, years of experience, and gender affect the athletic directors' views of high school coaching evaluations?

Hypotheses

Research question one relied on descriptive statistics and did not require a hypothesis. Research question two sought to find what dimensions existed among athletic director views by using exploratory factor analysis. Research question three was informed by the literature review, noting that school size and years of experience can affect an athletic director's role in a school (Anderson, 1999; Flannery & Swank, 1999; Turner, 2009). Although there was no clear pattern that gender of the athletic director is affected, gender has been proven to affect the longevity of an athletic coach (Thorngren, 1990), and as such was explored in this study to investigate if an anticipated relationship existed. The hypotheses for research question three was tested quantitatively and are stated as follows:

Ho: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and school size, years of experience, and gender.

Alternative hypotheses addressing each independent factor are as follows:

Ha_1: There will be a statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and school size.

Ha_2: There will be a statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and years of experience.

Ha_3: There will be a statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and gender.

Purpose of the Study

This quantitative study sought to determine Kansas high school athletic directors' perceptions of effective high school athletic coaching and possible underlying dimensions in such perceptions. It was hypothesized such dimensions would be similar to Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching, for coaching, as the research argues, is a form of teaching. A secondary but relevant purpose of the study was to identify if demographic variables, namely, school size, years of experience as athletic director, and gender of the athletic directors would affect such perceptions.

Rationale

Coaches in high school athletics experience many adversities and levels of success. The teaching and coaching strategies used to develop players and programs affect the adversities and successes experienced. Baltzell et al. (2014) concluded that, "a large group of coaches placed high value on the holistic development of their athletes" (p. 21). But along with this approach came resistance if teams were not successful. "With such an approach, many coaches also reported a values conflict with administrators, the community, parents, and even athletes themselves, between holistic development of all student-athletes and winning" (Baltzell et al., 2014, p. 21). Baltzell et al. (2014) further pointed out that, "we recommend that researchers investigate the potential relationship between the environment coaches create and coaches' joy and unhappiness, given coaches have a powerful impact on the quality of athletes' experience

and development" (p. 21). In addition to looking at what makes coaching enjoyable and unenjoyable, researchers have also investigated why coaches get fired or leave the profession. Miller and colleagues (2006) investigated the reasons given for coaching dismissals and reasons given by coaches who voluntarily left their profession. Results found that reasons given for dismissal or resignation included, "not wanting to deal with parents, conflicts with athletes and parents, inability to maintain good player discipline and poor relations with administration and parents" (Miller et al., 2006, p. 45). From this study, it is recommended that high school athletic coaches learn to develop public relation and conflict solving skills (Miller et al., 2006). If schools know what makes high school athletic coaching enjoyable and what makes coaches want to leave the profession, then schools must be willing to help coaches improve and help them develop the characteristics of a successful athletic coach and help coaches remain in the teaching and coaching profession.

Not only have researchers investigated what makes coaching rewarding and what drives coaches out of the business, studies have also looked at characteristics of outstanding coaches. In a 2012 study, Miller, Lutz, and Fredenburg (2012) set out to explore, the various aspects of outstanding high school coaches. The goal was to magnify what outstanding coaches do to help new athletic coaches avoid mistakes that are career ending. The research concluded that outstanding coaches are an, "effective organizer, planner, hard worker, knowledge seeker, compassionate mentor, reflective practitioner and are clear about expectations for themselves, their assistants, their athletes and their athletes' parents" (Miller et al., 2012, p. 24). If schools know that outstanding coaches model these characteristics, why coaches are enjoying or not enjoying their job, and why coaches leave the profession, what makes them stay? What makes a coach successful over a long period of time? What must take place to avoid dismissal, enjoy their

position, and be successful? To investigate this, how coaches are evaluated and what factors are considered when administrations are deciding to renew or non-renew the contract of a high school athletic coach must be evaluated.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study was to determine which components of Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching high school athletic directors agreed are components of effective high school athletic coaching. From these findings it was determined which components are applicable and should be included in a school district's athletic coaching evaluation instrument and process that could be used to evaluate high school athletic coaches.

This study provided high school athletic directors the opportunity to give their opinion of each component as it related to effective high school athletic coaching based on their experience and observation of effective high school athletic coaching. From the results of the study, the perceptions of high school athletic directors can be used as part of an evaluation instrument that school districts could use to formally evaluate high school athletic coaches. When high school athletic directors give input and have a clear understanding of the evaluation process, they can then begin to have professional conversations with athletic coaches. Those conversations then can help lead to the professional development of athletic coaches, improvement of the athletic program, and ultimately provide documentation for the school district to use as evidence when making the decision to renew or non-renew a coaching contract.

Scholarly, this study builds upon the notion and scope of specialists associated with Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching but extends it to include high school athletic coaches. The current study addressed an understudied area in school personnel management and evaluation where systemic examination of athletic coaching is almost

nonexistent. The conceptualization of athletic coaching as a form of teaching and statistically testing such framing in the current study opens possibilities for further transferability of other teaching related constructs and instruments to school sports management and human resources research.

Assumptions

This study operated under two assumptions. The first assumption being made was that all high schools have an athletic director that makes recommendations to the building principal and local board of education for the renewal or non-renewal of an athletic coach within their high school. The second assumption in this study was that high school athletic directors play a role in the evaluation process of high school athletic coaches.

Limitations

Several limitations were present in this census study. First, since the definition of coach did not specify any specific sport, the athletic director had to reflect on all head coaches of all sports. The current study could have selected one sport to investigate and that could have potentially produced different results. Secondly, this quantitative census study was administered online with participants being human subjects that self-selected to participate, which means their perception could hold potential biases (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). Finally, not all high school athletic directors from Kansas had self-selected to complete the survey, as such the generalizability of the study's findings should take into considerations of such geographic and sampling confinements.

Definition of Terms

For this investigation of athletic director's opinions to hold value it requires the definition of terms used in the study. The following terms were used in this study:

Athletic Director- the school administrator that oversees a high school's athletic programs.

Coach-The head high school athletic coach.

Coaching-The skills used in serving as a head high school athletic coach.

Danielson's four domains-the complex activity of teaching within Danielson's Framework for Teaching divided into 22 components clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility: planning and preparation (Domain 1), classroom environment (Domain 2), instruction (Domain 3), and professional responsibilities (Domain 4).

Danielson's Framework for Teaching- identifies those aspects of a teacher's responsibilities that have been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research as promoting improved student learning (See Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1.

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	**Domain 2: The Classroom Environment**
1a Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	2a Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
1b Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	2b Establishing a Culture for Learning
1c Setting Instructional Outcomes	2c Managing Classroom Procedures
1d Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	2d Managing Student Behavior
1e Designing Coherent Instruction	2e Organizing Physical Space
1f Designing Student Assessments	
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	**Domain 3: Instruction**
4a Reflecting on Teaching	3a Communicating with Students
4b Maintaining Accurate Records	3b Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
4c Communicating with Families	3c Engaging Students in Learning
4d Participating in a Professional Community	3d Using Assessment in Instruction
4e Growing and Developing Professionally	3e Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
4f Showing Professionalism	

Charlotte Danielson's framework for teaching from "The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument" by C. Danielson, 2013, *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument, 2013 instructionally focused edition,* 5-42. Copyright 2013 by Princeton, NJ: Danielson Group.

Evaluate-the process a school uses to determine the effectiveness of a high school coach.

Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA)- a private/non-profit association of accredited member schools, whose purpose is to administer a program of interscholastic activities, festivals, clinics and contests among member schools. Of particular importance are efforts to elevate standards of good sportsmanship and to encourage growth of good citizenship among students and spectators.

Midwestern state- In this case study is defined as Kansas.

Non-renew-The decision to not renew a coaching contract for the following athletic season.

Player-coach-administrator chain of command- The process that players and parents should use to address an issue within a high school athletic program. The player should first meet with the coach, if not resolved then the parent and player should then meet with the coach, and if the issue is still not resolved, then a meeting is set up with the administration with the player, parent and coach attending.

Renew-The decision of renewing a coaching contract for the following athletic season.

Research-based-The concept based on the facts established by previous research.

Teaching- The skills used in serving as a high school classroom teacher.

Nature of the Study

A quantitative research methodology was used to answer the research questions. An adapted version of the "Framework for Teaching Survey" created by Sweeley (2004) was used as the survey instrument. The survey addressed the various components within the Danielson (1996) framework for effective teaching and learning. Athletic directors in the state of Kansas completed the online survey from which the researcher identified the underlying dimensions of

athletic director's perceptions of effective high school athletic coaching as a way to test the applicability of the Danielson's (1996) framework to athletic coaching. Each athletic director also provided demographic information such as school size, years of experience, and their gender through which the effects of such demographic variables on athletic director opinions were examined.

The modified survey was vetted statistically for validity and reliability first before the collected data were analyzed to answer the research questions. The design of the study allowed the researcher to make meaningful conclusions and recommendations to which components of Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching could potentially be used to evaluate high school athletic coaches.

Summary

Chapter one provides an introduction and statement to the problem. A total of five main chapters organizes this study. Chapter 1 also includes background information of the problem, the purpose of the study, along with limitations and assumptions. The literature review in Chapter 2 recounts the historical perspective of how high school athletics developed and why high school sports are what they are today. Chapter 3 emphasizes the methodology, design, and instrumentation used in the study. Chapter 4 includes the procedures used in data collection and the analysis. Chapter 5 focuses on the conclusion and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

Introduction

In high schools across our country, millions of students participate in athletic programs each year in a variety of high school sports at various levels of play. According to the National Federation of High Schools (NFHS, 2019) over 7,930,000 student athletes participated in high school sports in the 2018-2019 school year. Leading those athletic programs, are head coaches who use different teaching and coaching strategies to develop successful athletic programs within their school (D'Alessio, 2011). In a society that sometimes takes a "winning at all costs" approach, what factors play a role in creating a successful high school athletic program and contribute to the longevity of the head coach in that school system? Why is it some schools are considered "powerhouses" in specific sports year after year, while other schools have a new head coach every year?

A possible explanation is that good coaches are successful because of their experiences and ability to teach in the classroom. Sometimes you hear patrons or parents say that successful coaches get into education because their heart is in coaching and their paycheck is in teaching. In addition, it is also believed by some school administrators that, "coaches are integral to the educational setting and that the better coaches are usually the best teachers" (Langston, 2010, p. 62). If the most successful coaches are the most effective teachers in the school district, it is important for school districts and communities to understand this concept and to evaluate coaches to help create successful high school athletic programs. "With the impact that coaches can have on student-athletes' lives, it is imperative to prepare and maintain quality individuals to serve in this challenging profession" (Miller et al., 2012, p. 24).

In reviewing the literature, it is evident that researchers have identified qualities and characteristics of good athletic coaching (Miller et al., 2012) and have recognized that schools need to retain quality coaches (Miller et al., 2005, 2006, 2012). Studies that address high school athletic coaching fail to address how to design an evaluation tool for athletic directors to use easily and efficiently to evaluate high school athletic coaches (McFarland, 2001). Very few studies indicate what exactly an evaluation tool should measure. Professional literature and athletic directors in the profession do support the need for an evaluation tool and the need to evaluate high school athletic coaches (PSADA, 2015). If high school athletic coaches are not evaluated, then how can schools know they are keeping quality coaches to create quality programs? In addition, if athletic coaches are not evaluated, how will athletic directors and coaches know what areas of coaching in that specific program need to be improved and what the coach needs to develop as a professional?

Schools need a formal evaluation tool that allows for observation, reflection, and professional conversation (PSADA, 2015). Ultimately, schools have an obligation to ensure that they have quality coaches for their student athletes and quality athletic programs within their school. School administrators have a responsibility to make recommendations to local school boards concerning the renewal and non-renewal of athletic coaches and, "a duty to understand the legal implications of their roles regarding interscholastic athletics in secondary schools" (Baker, 2009, p. 299). School administrators also have a responsibility to the student athletes and parents to make sure that safe and effective coaches are working in their school as well as maintain responsibility to the athletic coach to help them develop as a professional (Belinko, 1999). Creating a research-based evaluation tool that schools can use to formally evaluate high

school athletic coaches will help improve the quality of instruction and experience that all high school athletes should have in their high school athletic programs.

To understand the needs of high school athletic programs, the history of how athletic programs developed must be investigated to understand why schools have what they have in place today. In addition, the history and development of teachers and coaches must also be comprehended to help us understand that athletic coaching, as I argue, is a form of teaching. Since high school athletic programs were developed from and are a part of the educational setting, the history of how teaching was developed and how high school athletic coaching became a form of teaching is an appropriate starting point. As such, the remaining of the chapter is organized as follows: The backgrounds of how high school athletic programs were developed is reviewed first. Then, the similarities between teaching and coaching are explored. Finally, the responsibilities that schools have today are discussed.

High School Athletic Directors, Coaches and Organizations: A Brief Historical Review

In the 1700s, education was not recognized as a professional discipline, but by the 1800s, as cities grew, the need for teachers grew (Marzano, 2011). "The period from the beginning of formal education in the United States up to the mid-1800s saw the dawning of the awareness that pedagogical skills are a necessary component of effective teaching" (Marzano, 2011, p. 13). As this growth took place across the country, the view of teaching as a profession was everchanging. "In the mid-1800s, the view of teaching was that it was a complex endeavor requiring complex feedback if expertise was to be fostered" (Marzano, 2011, p.13).

As the field of education expanded, key figures played integral roles in the development of schools. In the early part of the 20th Century, John Dewey and Frederick Taylor were major contributors to education. Dewey suggested progressive ideas that would teach students life

lessons that would help them become good citizens (Anderson & Major, 2001). Taylor (1911) suggested managing and measuring specific behaviors of teachers to improve production in schools. In 1916, Ellwood Cubberley, created a set of principles for schools that encouraged measuring and analyzing data to guarantee productivity (Cubberley, 1929). The idea of measuring and monitoring productiveness was to ensure that teachers, were in fact, teaching and schools were producing quality students who could succeed in society (Cubberley, 1929). As time progressed, a process was needed to help supervisors, known as principals, develop and guide teachers in the classroom. "One teacher within a building was often selected to assume administrative duties. This principal teacher ultimately grew into the role of the building principal" (Marzano, 2011, p. 13). Knowing that principals were to guide and mentor teachers in improvement, a system was needed. In 1969, Goldhammer developed a process of supervision created to encourage the participation of teachers and supervisors in reflective conversations (Goldhammer, 1969). This guide was to ultimately help generate professional conversations between the person supervising or evaluating and the teacher in the classroom (Goldhammer, 1969).

As schools progressed fundamentally, athletics within the school system also developed. In the 19th century, originating and developing at colleges, "games and sports were a diversion from the boredom of classroom work" (Sage, 1980, p. 171). High schools quickly began following colleges and attempting to organize school sports (Keller, 1984). However, athletics were popular before they became recognized as interscholastic activities within schools (Keller, 1984). "Athletic games between teams of high school students were played long before there were athletic directors and even before there were high school coaches" (Keller, 1984, p. 1). Despite having students who participated in sports, schools did not always offer official school

sports teams, and high school athletic programs developed over time. “Official high school athletic administration developed slowly and gradually. As secondary schools grew, interscholastic programs expanded” (Keller, 1984, p. 1). As these programs expanded and participation increased, schools had to meet the ever-increasing demand of hiring coaches and athletic directors. “The first directors of athletics were superintendents, principals, and assistant principals and assistant superintendents” (Keller, 1984, p. 2). School superintendents quickly realized the need for supervision of school sponsored athletics and the amount of time required to organize and supervise high school athletic programs. Many superintendents took these responsibilities and delegated them to other administrators on staff. But, as the responsibilities grew, it led to “the appointment of coaches or other faculty members as part-time athletic directors” (Keller, 1984, p. 2). To this day, some schools still use this model of having a faculty member or coach take on the role of athletic director, in addition to their other contractual duties. Other school systems, due to their size, must hire full time positions and support staff to effectively manage and supervise athletic programs. The size of the school, the number of programs offered, and student enrollment play a huge role in determining the amount of time spent on the responsibilities that the athletic director has within the school setting (Anderson, 1999; Turner, 2009). As the need for athletic directors and coaches grew, the need for a governing body to oversee high school sports programs also grew and thus was the beginning of state high school athletic organizations (Keller, 1984).

As school districts began hiring athletic directors to organize and manage high school athletics, states quickly realized the need for high school associations to supervise, support, and guide high school athletics. In 1895, the first statewide interscholastic athletic associations were formed in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois and shortly after, the state of Indiana established the

fourth high school athletic association in 1903 (Keller, 1984, p. 67). The establishment of these first few athletic associations helped lead to the continued trend to establish state athletic associations to help support high school athletics. Twenty-nine states had state high school athletic associations by 1920 (Keller, 1984). Also, in the year of 1920, there were efforts to establish a national organization for high school athletic programs (Keller, 1984). It began with the secretary of the Illinois High School Athletic Association inviting administrative representatives from other state athletic associations to discuss problems within high school athletics (Keller, 1984). A year later, representatives from Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin wanted to continue these types of discussions, and in 1922, the National Federation was established (Keller, 1984). These charter member states helped establish the National Federation which is now known today as the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS). Today, all state high school athletic associations are members of the NFHS (NFHS, 2018). The mission statement of the NFHS (2019) states that:

> The National Federation of State High School Associations serves it members by providing leadership for the administration of education-based high school athletics and activities through the writing of playing rules that emphasize health and safety, educational programs that develop leaders, and administrative support to increase opportunities and promote sportsmanship. (p. 1)

As participation in high school athletics increased, the number of schools and student athletes the NFHS serves has grown. Today the NFHS services over 19,500 high schools, over 12 million students in activities, and over 7.9 million students in athletics (NFHS, 2019).

As state associations grew and the popularity of high school sports increased, more and more school districts were hiring athletic directors to manage their high school athletic programs

and coaches. “By the 1960s most medium-sized and large high schools had athletic directors” (Keller, 1984, p. 2). These athletic directors, depending on the size of their school, had various responsibilities, and had diverse needs for professional support and development, for themselves and their coaches. In 1969, the National Council of Secondary School Athletic Directors (NCSSAD) was formed, and in 1977 the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association for Directors of Athletics (NIAAA) was established (Keller, 1984). The purpose of these organizations was to provide support and resources for high school athletic directors nationwide. In fact, several attempts were made to create such organizations beginning in 1962, but it was not until 1977 that the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association was formed. Today they now serve over 10,300-member athletic directors (NIAAA, 2013). In 1971, the NFHS started sponsoring conferences for athletic directors (Keller, 1984). As the number of programs and the popularity of high school athletics increased, the need for resources to assist high school athletic directors and coaches also increased.

Our society as a nation affected what schools were needing. The number of resources available to schools grew as laws changed and participation increased. The Civil Rights Movement brought several changes to high schools and their athletic departments. “The Brown vs Topeka decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1954 was the first blow in the battle to eliminate ‘separate but equal’ educational programs” (Spears, 1978, p. 297). Over the next twenty years, high schools would experience drastic changes in their athletic programs. Not only were schools becoming desegregated, they were also being required legally to provide more opportunities to female students. “Under Title IX high schools were allowed two years to comply with the law. The increased participation of girls at the high school level was more dramatic than at the college level” (Spears, 1978, p. 296). These law changes and increased opportunities for

female students drastically changed the number of student athletes for which schools were responsible. “In 1971, the year before Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 became law, less than 300,000 girls participated in high school athletics, which is only about 1 in 27” (Keller, 1984, p. 2). With the new law requiring equal opportunity, schools found themselves needing to expand their athletic departments and increase the number of teachers they hired to coach. This led to an increase in responsibilities as well. “No phase of secondary education has grown more in recent years than has interscholastic athletics” (Keller, 1984, p. 2) and “student participation in school sports has surged over the past half century” (Bowen & Hitt, 2016, p. 9). In the 2018-2019 school year alone, approximately 3,402,733 females participated in high school athletics nationwide (NFHS, 2019). In fact, the NFHS reported in 2018 that for the past twenty-nine consecutive years, students participating in interscholastic athletics had increased (NFHS, 2018), and in 2019, a slight drop in participation was noted (NFHS, 2019). Due to the high number of student participants, there is a need to better understand quality practices and procedures involving high school athletics. To truly understand the dynamics of high school athletic programs and the athletic coaches leading them, what high school athletic coaches do must be explored.

High School Athletic Coaching Is Teaching

One of the fundamental principles of athletic coaching is the teaching of the sport (Drewe, 2000). As the athletic coach is teaching the concepts of the sport, the coach is in fact teaching, and can be considered a teacher in the athletic classroom. “If teachers are the central figures in the classroom, it would only seem logical to identify the coach as the key figure in our athletic arenas” (D'Alessio, 2011, p. 22). While it is true that coaches are at the heart of high school athletic programs, what they do makes them, in many ways, teachers. “When sport

involves the acquisition of practical knowledge, coaches play the role of teachers" (Drewe, 2000, p. 86). In addition to coaching athletes, coaches also hold the responsibility of teaching game concepts as well as proper technique and strategy of the game (Drewe, 2000). Lifelong character traits such as sportsmanship, hard work, dedication, and commitment are just a few characteristics taught by coaches throughout the athletic process (Blackburn, 2007; Curry, 2012; Parsh, 2007). "Coaches are educators in that their role is to work with one or more athletes in order to move the latter's performance to an improved level" (Jones, 2006, p. 14).

Further, the similarities between athletic coaches and teachers have been observed. "Compare some of the best classroom procedures to the procedures used in the 'grass classroom' and the parallels are striking" (Paling, 2002, p. 54). As Paling (2002) emphasized the similarities between coaches and teachers, it is pointed out that strategies used in the classroom are also used in teaching athletics. Planning, use of time, decision making, setting goals and expectations, testing, and direct instruction are just a few that Paling (2002) highlighted as similarities. A 2000 study identified and compared coaching attributes of expert high school coaches and concluded that, "expert coaches are similar to expert teachers" (Hardin, 2000, p. 34). In another 2010 interview study of athletic directors from the largest high schools in Texas, it was found that the athletic directors did not consider that there really is any difference between a teacher and a coach except for "the venue where they do their teaching" (Langston, 2010, p. 60).

In addition, Boyd (2016) conducted a qualitative study of high school coaches in western Oklahoma to examine the leadership behaviors of effective high school coaches. It was concluded that, "participants shared that the attributes of good coaches often parallel those of good teachers" (Boyd, 2016, p. 86). As research in athletic coaching progressed, it also became clear that coaches need preparation before entering their career in the same way preservice

teachers need preparation (Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003; Lackey, 1994). Cushion and colleagues (2003) recognized similarities among coaches and teachers and suggested that teaching models used for evaluating teachers should be used as guidelines for athletic coaches. It was also recommended that coaching education programs at the college level should include a supervised field experience (Cushion et al., 2003). Like student teaching programs used to prepare teachers for the classroom, these coaching programs would help ensure that future coaches have proper training. Such programs could cover what good coaching looks like and how to attain it once a coach is employed in a school system.

The concept that athletic coaches are like teachers strengthens the need of proper training and continuing professional development once athletic coaches begin their career. However, very few assessment tools exist to help athletic coaches improve. "Teachers of excellence and coaches of excellence essentially do the same things. Being a teacher and being a coach is the same thing" (Huber, 2012, p. xi). Since the responsibilities of teaching and coaching are identified as the same, it would seem logical to assess them in the same way. Therefore, teaching models are suggested to be used as guidelines for evaluating coaches in the absence of a coaching evaluation tool (Cushion et al., 2003). With an emphasis on the need to help athletic coaches improve, and the recognition that athletic coaches are teachers, teacher evaluation models and what research has shown that teachers need to support their improvement and development must be considered.

Teachers and Athletic Coaches Need Growth to Improve

Teacher Improvement Models

The idea of focusing on teacher improvement and developing teacher improvement models to enhance student learning and school improvement has been addressed for many years. While the importance of teacher improvement has increased as state and federal mandates have

forced schools to focus on student and teacher expectations, many aspects of improvement have been explored. Bolton (1973) focused on improving teaching instruction by developing functions of teacher evaluations. The functions identified were improving teaching, gaining information, protecting students from incompetence, rewarding performance, validating school systems, and creating professional development (Bolton, 1973). In 1980, Madeline Hunter argued that schools evaluate teachers to help them grow and improve by using supportive evidence instead of subjective opinion (Hunter, 1980). It was believed that Hunter's argument revealed a need for improvement of instruction and evidentiary support for the teacher evaluation process to help teachers improve. McGreal (1982) found several issues wrong with traditional teacher evaluations and recommended training for teachers and administrators for evaluations to be effective. Following Hunter's model and McGreal's findings, "the RAND study focused on the actual operation of teacher evaluation procedures in school systems" (Wise, Darling-Hammond, Tyson-Bernstein, & McLaughlin, 1984, p.iii). It was found that for an evaluation system to be beneficial "to the district and credible to teachers," there should be "solutions given for the problems identified" (Wise et al., 1984, p. 73). In other words, the study found that evaluative processes needed to generate specific feedback to teachers to be helpful.

Another suggestion for monitoring and evaluating teacher improvement was the idea of teaching portfolios that could provide materials to show teacher growth and progress (Painter, 2001). As schools were looking for different teacher improvement models, researchers began looking at what teachers and schools could do to improve. Robert Marzano and his research team at Midcontinent Research for Education (McREL) analyzed data and identified nine categories that effect student learning (Marzano, Pickering, & Polluck, 2001). As time progressed, the connection between teacher effectiveness and student learning was realized. "It is important to

maximize the benefits and minimize the liabilities in the connection of student learning and teacher effectiveness" (Stronge & Tucker, 2000, p. 53). To enhance teacher effectiveness some researchers focused on teacher improvement by looking at how teachers are supervised. In his work on *Effective Supervision*, Marzano (2011) emphasizes focused feedback, noting that the five ways to provide focused feedback are: "(1) teacher self-rating, (2) walkthroughs, (3) observations, (4) cueing teaching, and (5) student surveys" (p. 55). Marzano's work contributed to effective instructional strategies and effective approaches improving teaching and student learning within public education. Another influential work comes from Charlotte Danielson, whose Framework for Teaching, as implemented across schools, has undeniable effects on how classroom instruction and evaluations are and should be viewed.

The Danielson Framework

Created in 1996, and updated in 2007, 2011, and 2013, Charlotte Danielson's model and framework for teaching included four domains: Planning and preparation, the classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. The Danielson model had three purposes: "to honor the complexity of teaching, to constitute a language for professional conversation, and to provide a structure for self-assessment and reflection" (Marzano, 2011, p. 24). The Danielson model provided guidance on what to look for in quality teaching and categorized those qualities into performance levels. Danielson's (2002) Framework for Teaching contains "22 components of the four domains and defines four fundamental levels of performance: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished" (p. 108). This model was a first of its kind and due to its research-based findings, quickly became respected and utilized. "The Danielson model provided the foundation for the most detailed and comprehensive approach to evaluation to that time" (Marzano, 2011, p. 24). The Danielson's Framework for Teaching has

been described as having "withstood the test of time and influenced countless other frameworks, evaluation rubrics and human capital policies" (The Danielson Group, 2019, p.1). As Marzano recognized the magnitude of Danielson's work, he correctly predicted it as a foundation for future teacher improvement. "Given its past and current popularity, the Danielson model must be the reference point for any new proposals regarding supervision and evaluation" (Marzano, 2011, p. 23).

As a research-based framework, the model was developed out of Danielson's research work with the Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments of the Praxis Series work that was conducted for the Educational Testing Service (ETS) for teacher licensure (Danielson, 2007). Danielson was able to expand her work and connect it with other research standards such as the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (Danielson, 2013). The framework was designed to help assess teachers and promote professional development, growth, and improvement. Danielson and McGreal (2000) developed a rubric system that can be used to measure the effectiveness of a teacher which now provides a framework and an evaluation tool for effective teaching to help teachers grow and improve. Considering that research-based evaluation tools have been developed to identify best practices used in teaching to help teachers grow and improve, it would seem appropriate that high school athletic coaches would also need best practices identified to help growth and improvement.

Athletic Coaching Improvement

Since high school athletic coaching is a form of teaching and it has been established that teachers need growth opportunities to improve, high school athletic coaches also need appropriate opportunities to grow and improve.

In an effort to help athletic coaches gain skills in their pedagogy, an examination of what characteristics and traits that quality athletic coaches exhibit has been explored. For athletic coaches to improve, they must know what traits and characteristics successful athletic coaches possess. A 2009 survey asked high school athletic coaches to rank their top five coaching characteristics. It was found that "quality of practice, communication with athletes, motivating athletes, developing skills of athletes and having strong knowledge of sport were the most valued" (Frost, 2009, p.1). But as Frost (2009) points out, a key factor that schools must keep in mind is that coaches can have specific qualities but if they do not see a need to improve, then success may not happen.

If successful characteristics of high school coaches have been identified, the next question is what exactly successful high school coaches do. A 2012 study of philosophies, practices, and views of successful high school coaching revealed that clarity and consistency of the head coach was the most important factor (Miller, et al., 2012). This emphasizes that for a coach to be successful they must incorporate identified best practices. The study found that, "coaches reported following commonly accepted best practices, and they display traditional leadership characteristics- effective organizer and planner, hard worker, knowledge seeker, compassionate mentor and reflective practitioner" (Miller et al., 2012, p. 29). In addition to the coaching characteristics observed, what successful coaches stress and emphasize was also identified. "They stress effective communication, consistency and character" (Miller et al., 2012, p. 29). Another study surveyed behavioral characteristics of the coaches which students viewed as their favorite. Stewart and Owens (2011) identified these positive behaviors as social support, training and instruction, positive feedback, autocratic behavior, and democratic behavior. This research concluded that coach behavior affects the overall program and, specifically, the athlete's

performance and motivation (Stewart & Owens, 2011). The study also pointed out that changes may need to occur in coaching behavior. “The combination of those desired behaviors might require basic changes in existing coaching behaviors” (Stewart & Owens, 2011, p. 96). Each of these studies indicates that good coaching behavior plays a role in the success of the program, the success of the students who participate, and affects the coach’s level of happiness, growth, and improvement (Frost, 2009; Miller et al., 2012; Stewart & Owens, 2011).

In addition to the athlete’s perceptions, what state organizations and associations value as good high school athletic coaching must be considered to help coaches grow and improve. According to the Montana High School Association, “in 2001 and 2005, athletic directors ranked the following as the top three characteristics they wanted in a coach: the ability to teach, fairness and honesty in dealing with athletes, and development of sportsmanship” (Stewart, 2006, p. 36). In a 2015 qualitative multiple case study conducted in New Hampshire, athletic directors and coaches, “indicated that the ability to teach and educate was a key characteristic of a qualified coach” (Watts, 2015, p. 147). As state athletic associations recognized the need to identify quality high school athletic coaching characteristics to help foster growth, national organizations began providing resources for public education. Resources from professional organizations, such as the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE), have been developed to help educate and enhance athletic coaching. Professional organizations have helped research and create coaching standards for schools and youth programs across the United States. “The *National Standards for Sport Coaches*, first published by NASPE in 1995 and revised in 2006, clearly provide educational benchmarks within a core body of knowledge for the professional development of coaches” (NASPE, 2008, p. 12). The National Coaching Standards were monumental in helping provide a foundation for schools and youth programs to reference and

use in the development and growth of athletic coaches. In Dils and Ziatz's (2000) study of the benefits and outcomes of the National Coaching Standards, "self-confidence, self-respect, self-discipline, circulo-respiratory efficiency, and the courage to act were highly valued learning outcomes" (p. 1). The two researchers argued that the student learning outcomes were just as important as the coaching standards being used and followed by coaches to grow and improve (Dils & Ziatz, 2000). This is similar to the importance of student learning outcomes in relationship to teacher growth in the classroom. This strengthens the concept of similarities between teaching and athletic coaching in that student achievement is equally impacted from high quality techniques used to teach and coach. To determine how athletic coaches can improve, how classroom teachers enhance their skills must be examined due to the similarities between teachers and athletic coaches.

Teachers and Athletic Coaches Improve by Learning Best Practices

If teachers need growth opportunities to improve, then it is important to understand what learning and changes need to take place, so that teachers can improve professionally and show growth and improvement in their performance. "The more skilled the teacher, the greater students' achievement" (Marzano, 2011, p. 10). To maximize student performance, we must maximize teacher performance. Marzano (2011) recommended five conditions for developing teacher expertise, that is, "1) A well-articulated knowledge base for teaching, 2) Focused feedback and practice, 3) Opportunities to observe and discuss expertise, 4) Clear criteria and a plan for success, 5) Providing recognition of expertise" (p. 10). As Marzano (2011) viewed it, supervision could be interpreted as observation and/or evaluation, either way the administrator is supervising the teacher and following up with reflective, professional conversation that will help encourage reflection and enhance the performance of the teacher.

If teachers grow and improve by learning best practices, then high school athletic coaches must also learn best practices to grow and improve. As Marzano (2011) suggested for teacher supervision, the supervision of athletic coaches must also take place to enhance the coach's performance and ultimately the student athlete's performance. As high school athletics have grown nationwide since the 1900s, research relating to the best practice of high school athletics has grown. Over time, the NFHS and state athletic associations have identified and addressed problems by implementing policies and procedures governing student athletes, state high schools, and state athletic coaches. As more research developed, state high school athletic associations were making procedural changes to keep up with the ever-changing needs within schools. A 1998 survey showed that 72% of all high schools in Virginia had no athletic coaching education program (Case, 2012). In 2009, the Virginia High School League began requiring that first time coaches take approved courses on best practices in coaching. The state also created a certification program in efforts to train individuals on best practice, knowing they needed additional resources for their schools to fill coaching positions. The state of Indiana also had a problem recruiting high school athletic coaches and educating them as well on best practices in coaching. In the 1990s, there were several liability lawsuits that caused the movement and the need to develop education programs for coaches. The Indiana High School Athletic Association helped develop the Program for Athletic Coaching Education (PACE) program (Johnson, 1992). The program was designed in efforts to educate and train coaches on best practice for teaching their sport.

These states were not alone, however, in 1999 the Montana High School Association teamed up with a university researcher to fix the need for a coaching education program in their state. School administrators needed to educate athletic coaches, but due to the size of the state

and resources, it was not always feasible to send coaches to trainings. It was found that the Montana High School Association needed a program "that was user friendly for coaches, up to date on their content and administrator friendly" (Stewart, 2006, p. 34). A ten-chapter online program was designed and implemented for coaching education and professional development. Prior to the development of this online course, a survey in Montana found that 50% of Montana coaches were not trained in Physical Education and needed up-to-date coaching education on best practices (Stewart & Sweet, 1992). In addition, this 1992 survey also pointed out that coaches need continuing education throughout their career.

In 2005, the state of Maine also noticed an increase in problems pertaining to high school athletic programs. "Sports Done Right: A Call to Action on Behalf of Maine's Student Athletes" is a state-wide initiative written and developed to serve as a guide for school athletic programs (Gehring, 2005). Shortly after that initiative, the Minnesota State High School League (MSHSL) began requiring all head coaches to be certified by completing the Head Coach Certification Program offered in the state (MSHSL, 2009). Following this lead, beginning in 2013, North Dakota began requiring coaches to be certified and obtain a North Dakota High School Activities Association Coaching Permit (North Dakota High School Activities Association, 2013). Other states have followed as well, requiring coaches to complete state courses and online courses offered by the NFHS to learn best practices in high school athletic coaching. These efforts to help coaches learn best practices have aimed to help improve the quality of coaching in high school athletics. Training, however, does not solve all problems and a coach's attendance at training does not imply that best practices will be applied in the coaching setting. Therefore, schools must provide follow up and observation on the implementation of best practices to effectively and fairly evaluate a coach's performance similar to the observation of classroom

teachers using best practice in the classroom as evidence to effectively evaluate teacher performance.

Observation, Walkthrough, and Feedback Help Teacher and Coach Improvement

The practice of observing teachers to collect performance data is an important part of teacher evaluation. “In order to conduct meaningful professional conversations, instructional leaders need data” (Gillespie & Jenkins, 2016, p. xv). Data collected from teacher observations can help provide feedback and that feedback in the classroom can help lead to teacher improvement. Marzano (2011) emphasized providing focused feedback instead of “a binary scale to evaluate teachers (i.e., evaluate teachers as Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory).” To replace the binary scale often used in evaluation, Marzano argued for a scale of “Innovating (4), Applying (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), Not using (0)” (Marzano, 2011, p. 111). This aligns with Danielson’s (2002) work that recommended four levels of performance to be used to evaluate and observe teacher improvement. By having school districts identify best practices, utilize observations, and provide feedback, a meaningful approach is taken to help teachers improve. As Gillespie and Jenkins (2016) pointed out, data are required for school leaders to assess teacher improvement, and the same approach is applicable for school leaders to assess athletic coaches.

Informal observations and walkthroughs can provide invaluable information for athletic directors and school administrators to help athletic coaches improve. Informal observations could include a few minutes observing a drill or portion of an athletic practice. Intentional walkthroughs could also consist of the athletic director walking through practice to specifically look for and identify characteristics or actions performed by the coach. These observations function like snap shots, but when used over time, can help give a clearer picture of what is taking place in the athletic program and how the coach is truly performing. As Hoch (2003)

argued, “Considering that the larger segment of coaching occurs in practice sessions, you don’t want to miss this opportunity to get a better and more complete picture of your coaches’ abilities and efforts” (p. 22).

If athletic directors are to help develop athletic coaches through effective instructional strategies, then athletic directors need to observe and walk through practices to obtain data needed to drive professional development conversations. “A traditional evaluation process that utilizes a single building administrator or athletic director may only offer minimal insights into the unique pressures and time constraints under which a coach must perform, and even less positive feedback for the coach” (McFarland, 2001, p. 14). Feedback is essential in the professional development of an athletic coach and can be obtained in many ways (Duncan, 2000; Durgin, 2003; Gould, 2016). An effective overall evaluation of an athletic coach should include multiple areas of information. The evaluation process should include informal observations, walkthroughs, and conversations throughout the season (DiColo, 2013). It is also important to understand that observations can also allow the administrator to see what is truly taking place at athletic practices. As Durgin (2003) stated, “there are many models one can utilize for constant assessments, potentially eliminating adversarial hearings. While attending practice, the athletic administrator has the opportunity to observe communication, interaction, involvement, organization and other details relative to job performance” (p. 17). Walkthroughs and observations can also help in the process of giving immediate or summative feedback. Athletic directors should visit practices as part of their routine to directly observe the coach’s performance (Duncan, 2000) and increase their understanding of what is taking place in everyday activities. By visiting a coach’s practice or attending a contest, you can quickly scan a list of behaviors and determine which ones a coach performed and which a coach did not

perform" (Kestner, 1996, p. 23). By conducting walkthroughs, information can be gained that helps you see the effectiveness of a coach and their use of best practices. Feedback and evaluation can help the athletic directors determine if a program is successful and if coaches are meeting goals (Gould, 2016, p. 17).

Like teaching observations in the classroom, school administrators must understand the role of observations and their differences from evaluations. "Observation and evaluation are separate processes. An observation is a compilation of nonjudgmental data recorded by the athletic administrator…an evaluation is a written document including specific conclusions, commendations and ideas for improvement based upon observable and measurable data" (NIAAA Publications Committee, 2010, p. 30). It is also suggested that administrators keep a record and copy of all observations and evaluations in case they need to defend or dismiss an athletic coach (NIAAA Publications Committee, 2010). Observation, walkthrough, and evaluation strategies can help improve coaching performance and lead to professional conversations that can target and promote professional development. Meaningful professional development for athletic coaches has benefits for all stakeholders involved.

Observations and walkthroughs can help identify the needs for improvement of athletic coaches and can prove to be extremely beneficial. As Green (2013) emphasized, there are several benefits to conducting athletic walkthroughs and the athletic director can become an instructional leader and mentor to coaches in this process. "The athletic director, through repeated walk-throughs, can gather specific data regarding a coaching staff's strengths and needed areas of improvement, and the athletic director is better equipped to defend a coach when challenged by a parent" (Green, 2013, p. 14). Observations and walkthroughs can help athletic directors advise

and guide athletic coaches in choosing appropriate professional development to enhance improvement.

Mentoring could be an option in the professional development and coaching education process. As Hoch (1998) pointed out, mentoring is not always used to solve a problem, "it is also a pro-active teaching technique, not only for the new and beginning (although they represent the largest segment) but for all coaches who can benefit from some advice and wisdom" (p. 8). For mentoring to be effective, professional conversations between athletic directors and coaches must exist to address the purpose and benefits of learning from peers within the coaching profession.

The fact remains that, "sport's popularity is not diminishing, yet the problems in coaches' preparation and their continued education are intensifying and must be addressed" (Stewart & Sweet, 1992, p. 79). Because of this, schools are continually looking for ways to improve professional development for coaches. Through observations and walkthroughs, areas that need improvement can be quickly identified. As MacLean (1993) stated, very few evaluation models allow for feedback that will ultimately help in dialogue and help the coach improve. High school athletic departments recognized the need to provide feedback to athletic coaches and several business models have provided guidance. One such model was the 360-degree feedback program which develops a person's professional development and evaluation (Antonioni, 2002). However, it is cautioned that, "a school district or an organization must have a culture that supports the use of feedback for development, not for evaluation" (Dyer, 2001, p. 37). While the 360-degree program approach allows staff members to use various sources of feedback, for it to be successful, one must use the feedback and learn from it. In other words, collected feedback

that is not addressed or used for teaching purposes is useless if staff members and coaches are never given the opportunity to reflect and set goals to improve in designated areas.

Researchers recognized that schools need to improve feedback, professional development, and evaluation of athletic coaches. To address this need, a study was conducted on what type of professional development athletic coaches preferred. In 1997, a study that included 100 successful high school athletic coaches concluded that, "those whom have accomplished success in the coaching profession favor on-the-job learning opposed to that which is done in the formal setting of a classroom" (Gentry, 1998, p. 27). These results indicated that athletic coaches preferred feedback and learning to be delivered and discussed on the job. If athletic coaches prefer on the job feedback and learning, then walkthroughs and observations would be beneficial. In addition, not only should coaching staff preference about their learning be considered, but how they learn best must also receive consideration for coaches to truly benefit from the observation and walkthrough processes.

In 2009, a study that looked at how coaches gained experience and learned from their coaching development, found that while coaches' profiles were similar to their players in how they learned the sport, they varied depending on the sports (Gilbert, Lichtenwaldt, Gilbert, Zelezny, & Cote, 2009). Coaches are relying on their playing experiences to support what they are teaching as opposed to relying on their professional development training and feedback received. In a 2010 Canadian study where 31 high school teacher/coaches were interviewed, Winchester (2010) concluded that "it would be beneficial to bring learning resources to them rather than have them seek out learning resources" (p. 59). In their follow up study of interviewing the same participants, Winchester, Culver, & Camire (2011) found that, "life experiences of each coach play a role in dictating the learning situations in which they choose to

engage" (p. 230). It was also noted that further research is needed to learn how to provide coaches with the information needed to develop professionally. These studies indicate that the coaches' background does affect their coaching style and that coaches need support more than ever before (Gilbert et al., 2009; Winchester, 2010). Indicating that how coaches learn and how they prefer their professional development depends on their coaching experiences and years of experience.

Professional development and athletic coaching education can come in many different forms including classes, clinics, conversations, feedback, and mentoring. Determining which method of professional development is needed or desired depends on the individual coach and what they want and or need. In 2015, to understand how coaches received professional development, 103 high school coaches were surveyed in the southeastern part of the United States. Most coaches in the survey had 10-15 years of experience and concluded that coaches preferred live courses and seminars for continuing education opportunities (Forester, Holden, & Keshock, 2015). Building upon the work in 2015, a 2016 case study in Florida looked at how high school coaches and athletic directors viewed coaching education. It was recommended in this study that coach education programs should have formal and informal learning opportunities (Peek, 2016). Such formal and informal opportunities could include observation, walkthrough, professional conversation, training seminars, or coaching education courses to aide in the development of athletic coaches. These opportunities are beneficial to athletic coaches, but if athletic coaches are never formally evaluated, effectiveness may never be recognized or measured.

Athletic Coaches Need Evaluation

It is important to understand that, like teachers, coaches need professional learning and development to improve their skills. **"**Quality coaching is developed through training and education-it does not happen overnight" (Lubisco & Birren, 2017, p. 18). Research concludes that evaluating high school athletic coaches to help them develop and become the best is important. Nash, Sproule, and Horton (2011) interviewed 10 coaches with 251 years of experience and concluded that, "there is a need to study the construction of coaching knowledge, with particular focus on how these skills are developed and applied" (p. 237). These skills need to be defined and evaluated to help high school athletic coaches develop their skills. Athletic directors in high schools recognize this need and understand that the benefits of evaluating athletic coaches outweigh the daily management requirements of the high school athletic director. As Belinko (1999) shared, most coaching evaluations are informal and subjective (p. 14). "More attention should be directed toward the implementation of evaluation procedures to access coaching effectiveness….an established coaching evaluation process would provide objective data to identify a coach's effectiveness in the total educational environment" (Belinko, 1999, p. 14). Belinko's (1999) argument supports the fact that there is more to coaching than winning and that an evaluation process would aide in the professional development of high school athletic coaches.

Hager and Torres (2007) agreed that "win-loss records often fail to reflect a team's true quality of performance" (p. 27). The purpose of high school athletic programs must not be forgotten. "If a program is evaluated only by wins and losses, great lessons and values will be lost in the pursuit of victory at the expense of the educational benefits of interscholastic athletic competition" (Evers, 2016, p. 27). As Hoch suggested, "the purpose of the evaluation process is

to increase professionalism, to recognize positive accomplishments, and to ultimately improve the competency of individual coaches" (Hoch, 2017, p. 18). Through the evaluation process, athletic directors can help coaches improve by offering professional development for coaches and ultimately improve the athletic program. Evaluation conducted in a strategic and meaningful way will help coaches reflect on their performance (Evers, 2016). This reflection then leads to the growth of the athletic coach and subsequently his or her progress and mastery of skill.

Evaluation can also help schools verify that good coaching and teaching skills are being practiced with student athletes. "While the proper training and knowledge provide important skills, training and certification, in and of itself, does not guarantee these skills will be practiced" (Cadorette, Kinley, & Freeze, 2003, p. 12). Through evaluation processes, schools can document that proper and safe coaching and teaching techniques are being demonstrated within their school system. This documentation is valuable to school districts in many ways. "Documentation serves many purposes: justification for salary increase, merit raises, dismissal, transfers, promotion, job improvement" (PSADA, 2015, p. 9). Documentation can also support the need for evidence if difficult or legal situations arise. School administrators have a responsibility to document and evaluate high school athletic coaches to substantiate data regarding any coaching personnel decisions.

Not only does evaluation help with renewing quality coaches and justifying why they should be retained, the evaluation can also help with firing and legal situations. "School administrators, athletic directors and interscholastic/athletic associations have a duty to understand the legal implications of their roles regarding interscholastic athletics in secondary schools" (Baker, 2009, p. 299). It is the administrator's job to make sure that quality coaches are kept and those who are not meeting expectations are released. It is also important to note that if a

legal situation does arise concerning athletics, often the athletic director and school administrators are included in the lawsuit due to their role in allowing unacceptable behavior or not taking proper action in preventing injury or accident. “By pointing to specifics, the athletic director cannot be accused of being arbitrary and capricious” (PSADA, 2015, p. 9). While there are many reasons schools end up losing lawsuits pertaining to athletic coaching, according to PSADA (2015), citing a source from the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the top reasons included inadequate documentation and lack of thorough evaluations conducted by administrators.

Athletic coaching is a form of teaching, therefore a comparison of high school athletic coaching evaluation processes to classroom teaching evaluation processes is reasonable. If high schools are to recognize athletic coaches as teachers and high schools are required to evaluate teachers, it is logical for high schools to evaluate athletic coaches. “Considering the close alliance which exists, it would seem to be a most appropriate starting point if the models which are used in teaching were adapted to coaching” (Potter & Wandzilak, 1982, p. 7). As McFarland (2001) concluded:

> Like classroom teachers, coaches must set goals, maintain the team, handle conflict and teach skills. A coach’s job description, although more visible than their classroom counterparts, is fundamentally that of a teacher. Based on this premise, application of educational research regarding supervision and evaluation of the classroom teacher makes a natural crossover to the athletic field. In its process, evaluating a coach should be no different than evaluating a classroom teacher. From a practical perspective, the process used to evaluate a coach may prove to be more crucial than those you use with your contracted teachers. (p. 4)

To date, very little research has been done on the evaluation process that high school athletic director's use to evaluate and what evaluation tool is being used. McFarland (2001) argued that schools should alter the evaluation process of interscholastic coaches based on alternative classroom teacher appraisal methods. The author's rationale was that the athletic arena was a type of classroom and that evaluation tools used for teachers of alternative classrooms could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of an athletic coach (McFarland 2001). This assertion is based on the concept that there is a need in high schools to evaluate athletic coaches since coaches are performing the role of teaching a sport.

Today, "there are an estimated 1,000,000 interscholastic coaches in the United States" (NFHS, 2015) working with student athletes. Some of these coaches are privileged enough to work in school districts that have evaluation procedures in place to provide feedback. However, some schools recognize the need but struggle to develop their own evaluation tool. There are also school districts that have never evaluated their athletic coaches within their school system (Anderson, 1999; Price, 2009; PSADA, 2015; Thielges, 2015). Athletic directors in today's high schools need a research-based evaluation tool that will allow them to observe, conduct walkthroughs, and effectively evaluate high school athletic coaches. These athletic directors need the flexibility to customize the tool to meet their individual school's mission statement and local standards set for good coaching and teaching. The tool must provide structure that supports existing, research-based, best practices used in teaching and coaching high school athletics. Currently schools are creating their own paper forms or versions of online paper forms to complete this task (PSADA, 2015; Thielges, 2015). Most coaching evaluation forms simply have a list of characteristics or expected behaviors with two outcome-based options to choose, met or unmet (Duncan, 2000; Hager & Torres, 2007). In addition, other forms may have a scale listed

next to a list of itemized expectations (Hoch, 2003). Anecdotally, the athletic director may randomly be selecting a number that they think is appropriate without evidentiary support.

It has been established that teacher evaluations are trending based off research-based best practices and that high school athletic coaches are like teachers, so a similar evaluative process is warranted. “Carefully designed evaluation systems can offer teachers valuable opportunities to reflect on their practice and enhance their skills” (Danielson, 2002). Since athletic coaches are teachers, they too could reflect and enhance their skills by using an evaluation system. “The best summative instruments list specific observable behaviors and include input form the individuals who will be evaluated on them” (Kestner, 1996). A comprehensive evaluation tool designed for athletic coaching, designed from research-based teacher evaluation methods may be beneficial. This tool, if created and used electronically, could serve to document actions that athletic directors take, whether those actions include professional development, evaluation, or provide evidentiary support in legal situations. Athletic directors in high schools need additional resources that are research based, user friendly, and time and cost effective.

Research Identifies the Need for Athletic Coaching Evaluations

Research has also identified a need to evaluate high school athletic coaches. Donald Lackey spent 40 years studying trends in high school athletics. In the 1970s, Lackey first surveyed Nebraska high schools and concluded that, “the high school coaching profession was unstable” (Lackey, 1994, p. 71). In the 1980s, surveying the same high schools, Lackey (1986) found that the major reason coaches were fired was due to their win-loss record. In another study of his focusing on stresses for high school athletic coaches, Lackey (1994) identified parents as the primary stressor. Based on the findings of the three studies, Lackey (1994) argued that universities must help prepare incoming coaches and that school administrators must mentor

coaches (Lackey, 1994). During the 2003-2004 academic school year, Lackey teamed with Scantling to see what trends were emerging in high schools in the early 2000s. During this school year, Nebraska had 305 high schools that had athletic teams, of those, 275 high school principals completed an online survey concerning trends in dismissals of coaches in high school athletics (Scantling & Lackey, 2005). It was indicated from this research that the coaching profession was in a hazardous state and that principals identified poor relationships as the number one reason coaches were dismissed (Scantling & Lackey, 2005, p. 26). Lackey's research denotes that high school coaching has been unstable for decades and has highlighted contributing factors which have laid the foundation for further research and developing best practices in high school athletic coaching.

Other researchers have made similar research efforts in other states. Miller, Lutz, Shim Fredenburg, and Miller (2005) discovered that "high school football coaches were fired the most of any sport in Texas high schools, and the number one reason that coaches were fired at small schools was due to lack of relationships" (p. 31). Wishnietsky and Felder (1989) found the top reason for coach dismissal in North Carolina was due to "inappropriate relationships and the need for more pay was the main reason coaches resigned" (p. 72). As such, Wichnietsky and Felder (1989) called for "formative evaluations of personnel and programs should be accomplished periodically" (p. 72).

With studies identifying reasons for coaching dismissals, questions continued to arise on how schools are determining dismissals and the process used. Not only did researchers look for answers as to why the coaching profession was unstable and why so many coaches were getting fired, researchers also began considering how these coaches were being evaluated. A 1979 study of evaluation procedures used for high school basketball coaches in Ohio investigated how many

schools were evaluating coaches. This survey found that basketball coaches were not formally evaluated (Bennice, 1979, p. 74). This research pointed out that many schools at this time were determining whether to retain or fire a coach based on factors other than those used in a formal evaluation process. As time progressed, it became evident that there may, in fact, be a need for a formal evaluation process to be used in high school athletic coaching. In 1989, researcher David Hoch sent questionnaires to 685 Pennsylvania athletic directors and their 685 boys basketball coaches. With a 53% return rate for athletic directors and 46% for coaches, Hoch (1989) concluded that, in general, both athletic directors and coaches, "felt that the individual evaluation's items and evaluation are valuable" (p.52). Hoch's work alluded to the fact that in the late eighties, coaches and athletic directors were beginning to recognize the value of having an evaluation tool which included specific items targeting coaching behavior and performance.

Despite many schools not having a formal evaluation process for many decades, the problems at the center of high school athletics remained evident. A 2002 case study in California concluded that athletic issues occurred in all high schools. "Principals found the common problem areas were: leadership of athletic program, communication, hiring of quality coaches, evaluation of the athletic program, eligibility, sportsmanship, recruiting, booster groups, district office support, and the need for athletic issue training for principals" (Plutko, 2002, p. 103). This study pointed out that common problems exist in all schools in the area of athletics. Schools also need to address these issues to improve their programs and limit problems administrators face. One main concern noted in this study was evaluation of the athletic program. This data helped extend further research by examining if coaches were currently evaluated and how schools determined if athletic programs were effective. A 2015 survey was conducted to see how athletic coaches were evaluated in the state of North Dakota. Seventy-seven percent of athletic directors

in North Dakota reported that they evaluated athletic coaches in their school and 23% did not. It was also reported that of those schools that did evaluate, 71% used their own form that they created (Thielges, 2015). It is evident that a formalized tool to evaluate high school athletic coaches is not currently being used to evaluate best practices.

In addition to investigating how and if schools formally evaluate their athletic coaches, the Coaching Efficacy Scale was also explored. The Coaching Efficacy scale is a tool that measures to what extent a coach affects the learning and performance of the athletes they work with. A 2005 study found that using the Coaching Efficacy Scale was reasonable, but there were validity concerns (Myers, Wolfe, & Feltz, 2005, p. 157). This study emphasized that new tools need to be created for coaches and that the Efficacy Scale should not be used for coaching evaluations. Since some schools do use an informal evaluation process, studies have considered what factors should be taken into consideration when evaluating. Gould (2016) suggested that player and parent surveys should be given at the end of seasons and that the feedback should be used in the evaluation process. It was also found that coaches and athletes agree that all coaches should be evaluated and that athletes should be a part of such an evaluation (Kuga, 1993). These studies support the belief that coaches should be formally evaluated yearly, and athlete insight should be considered in the evaluation process. “Student athletic representation in the evaluation process is imperative to acquire a well-rounded profile of a coach’s performance” (Kuga, 1993, p. 87). However, it is cautioned that the evaluator should take into consideration the level of the players and perceptions of parents giving feedback. As research progressed, a shift in emphasis was noted. In reiterating the importance of high school athletic programs and the benefit to students, a deeper understanding of the importance of the individuals that high schools have leading those programs have emerged. With this, an even greater responsibility is placed on the

athletic associations guiding these high schools and setting policies and procedures for high school athletic programs.

State Athletic Association Trends and Needs

Not only have researchers recognized a need for evaluating athletic coaches, state athletic associations have also recognized this need. In addition to coaching education trends and new requirements within different state athletic and activity associations, one state had an athletic director's organization publish guidelines for their schools to follow concerning coaching evaluations due to rising problems. Originating in 1991 and revised in 2015, PSADA created a guide for evaluating coaches, encouraging using multiple indicators or measurements. "The criteria for judging performance: Establishing of fair and specific standards for making judgements. A formal method for monitoring and reporting progress made relative to improving performance; and procedures for assistance to improve performance with a timeline" (PSADA, 2015, p. 4). PSADA also recognizes that athletic directors in schools are creating their own systems and paper forms to complete yearly performance evaluations. Not only did PSADA (2015) help establish guidelines for developing a system of evaluation, but they also stressed the importance of having such a system. A meaningful evaluation tool helps lead to professional growth and development of athletic coaches, while at the same time providing feedback to athletic coaches from athletic directors just as teachers receive feedback from administrators. However, before an athletic director can identify the appropriate method of professional development that a coach may need, they must truly understand their role and responsibility as an athletic director and the needs of their coaches.

School and Athletic Director Responsibilities

Knowing that coaches, like teachers, need professional development and structured evaluation procedures, athletic directors are responsible for meeting these professional needs. Ultimately, the athletic director serves as the leader of all athletic programs and this leadership should not be taken lightly. “Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2004, p. 3). In the case of high school athletics, the athletic director fulfills this role of leadership by guiding, advising, and supporting athletic coaches and programs within the athletic department to ensure the safety and success of all student athletes. The roles of the athletic director include to “hire, motivate, inform, supervise, train, and evaluate coaches and athletic trainers” (Turner, 2009, p. 12).

The athletic director also serves as an instructional coach who can observe, listen, and provide feedback to coaches concerning the strategies used to teach the sport. It is the athletic director who will help lead professional reflective conversation to help coaches improve, transform, and develop their teaching and coaching skills. “Organizations today are involved in profound levels of change that are transforming fundamental values and assumptions” (Adams, 1998, p. 280). High school athletics are no different than any other organization wanting to improve, but the program must be strategic and have a purpose to reach new levels of change.

Athletic directors must balance the responsibilities of leadership and management. “While leadership is concerned with the process of developing mutual purposes, management is directed toward coordinating activities in order to get a job done” (Northouse, 2004, p. 9). The leadership and managerial responsibilities of an athletic director can vary from contractual and legalities to student athletes, coaches, transportation, facilities, budget, administrative tasks, supervision, safety, and security (Turner, 2009). “The most challenging task of the athletic

director's job is to evaluate the performance of coaches and to help them improve weaknesses or build on strengths" (Leland, 1988, p. 21). The challenging part of this responsibility is that it takes time, intentionality, and often moves the coach and athletic director out of their comfort zone to talk about difficult issues that may need improvement (Leland, 1988). By having a strategic and purposeful evaluation, observation, and walkthrough process, athletic directors can help ease this burden and help produce effective professional development to benefit all athletic programs and athletic coaches.

The existing literature on high school athletic directors includes those that investigated what the group values and needs to be successful. In a survey study of Michigan high school athletics directors, Zdroik (2016) found that the respondents regarded the student athletes and the coaches as their top prioritized stakeholders. This was not surprising, given the number of student athletes in the school and the number of athletic programs offered affecting the demand on the athletic director. Likewise, in another study of 191 athletic directors in South Dakota, Anderson (1999) found "that school enrollment is an important variable determining the role, status, and job scope of the athletic directors" (p. ii). Typically, in smaller schools with a lower enrollment, an athletic director would also have other teaching and coaching duties, while in larger schools, the athletic director is a full-time position. It was also reported in this study that one-third of the 191 athletic directors did not evaluate coaches on their staff.

Knowing that the role of the athletic director is vital to the success of athletic programs within schools, researchers have taken it one step further and have investigated how the success of athletic programs effects the school. Research has been conducted on how the success of high school athletic programs affects student achievement and the climate of the school. A 2012 study of Georgia high schools concluded that there was a significant correlation between the athletic

programs' success and student achievement and the culture of the school (Giles, 2012). By ensuring quality athletic programs, school administrators can help with the overall achievement and culture within their school. To develop quality athletic programs, quality coaches must be hired and retained. To ensure that coaches are of quality caliber and worth keeping, athletic directors must observe, walkthrough, and evaluate coaching performance. Mach (1996) pointed out that "more often such evaluations are sugar-coated and neither tell the coach truthfully how he or she is doing, nor do they contribute much to improving performance" (p. 13). In having set procedures and purposeful conversations, athletic directors can help coaches improve as well as themselves. As Price (2009) pointed out, "coach evaluations and their accompanying procedures can certainly lead, not only to positive growth on the part of your coaches, but also can lead to an increased depth and understanding of what our role as athletic administrators should be" (p. 19). Included in the many roles of an athletic director is the responsibility of hiring and retaining athletic coaches. These coaching positions are often filled by licensed and non-licensed teachers within the school setting. Both licensed and non-licensed teachers place different demands and responsibilities on the athletic director. To truly understand these demands, each group must be investigated separately for the leadership they provide as a part of the high school athletic program.

Hiring and Retaining of Non-licensed and Licensed Teachers as Athletic Coaches

While athletic directors hold the responsibility of helping coaches develop professionally, they also hold the responsibility of hiring quality coaches. Different school districts and different states have a variety of guidelines for hiring coaches, but many guidelines overlap. It is suggested that programs should, "educate coaches through accredited programs, require a background check, require current certifications, and ensure continued development" (Murray,

Schoenstedt, & Zwald, 2013, p. 7). These practices along with school and state requirements can help athletic directors identify quality individuals worth hiring in their school system.

Ultimately athletic directors would like to hire coaches who hold a teaching license within their state, as it ensures the applicant has formal educational training in working with students. It also helps in building relationships with student athletes if the coach is a teacher within the school building. However, it is important to note that some states may structure their teaching and coaching contracts differently, making it possible for teachers to have a separate teaching contract from an athletic coaching contract. Specifically in Kansas, supplemental contracts of employment are issued for, "services other than those services covered in the principal or primary contract of employment of such employee, and shall include but not be limited to such services as coaching, supervising, directing and assisting extracurricular activities" (School District Employment, 1972). Because these contracts are separate documents, an employee's teaching and coaching contracts are handled separately, and a school district can't fire or non-renew a teaching contract due to a resignation of a supplemental coaching contract (*Hachiya v. USD NO. 307*, 1988). Due to the separation of contracts, it is not always possible to have a certified teacher as a head high school athletic coach. In fact, some applicants have no formal training in education, and it is increasingly common to have limited applicants. There are several contributing factors that have led to the lack of applicants wanting to be coaches. These factors include: an aging teaching staff, increased responsibilities for teachers, and pressure on the coach by parents (Hoch, 2008). Because of these reasons finding individuals qualified to coach is a major concern of athletic directors.

> To no surprise, finding qualified coaches is far and away the most concerning issue for high school athletic administrators. A popular complaint is that an increase in

> responsibilities, coupled with a smaller stipend, has driven teachers away from coaching. As a result, athletic directors are forced to search outside of the school, finding mostly candidates who might not be as familiar with the education-based philosophy. There are also problems with parents, which forced many good coaches away from their respective sport. (Hoffman, 2019, p.22)

This leads to the conundrum of who to hire. Is a warm body with no coaching or teaching experience better than leaving the vacancy open or eliminating the program? It also makes school districts question the legal responsibility when hiring an individual who is not certified to teach and has not had any formal educational courses. Historically, "the problem of employing unqualified and non-certified personnel to coach in our nation's interscholastic athletic programs is on the increase as is the number of suits being filed and won" (Conn & Razor, 1989, p. 164).

With the knowledge that schools must sometimes hire unqualified individuals for athletic programs to exist, state associations have begun making coaching qualification and certification changes to help schools fill positions.

> Certified teachers in other disciplines have become the norm in the coaching profession and an alarming trend has emerged: the practice of hiring non-teacher-certified full or part-time school district employees on the strength of their playing experience or interest in the area. (Knorr, 1996, p. 4)

When the only viable option is to hire non-certified personnel to coach it is important to, "provide system-wide workshops, clinics and individual counseling sessions for these individuals to facilitate an awareness of the opportunities and problems inherent in the coaching process" (Conn & Razor, 1989, p. 163). Currently, hiring individuals who are not licensed teachers may require additional management and development to ensure they are meeting the

demands of the coaching profession. Because these individuals do not have a teaching background, evaluation is even more crucial. As Hoch (1998) pointed out, "evaluation is instructional in nature, listing the areas in need of improvement as well as positive aspects of one's coaching. The better we instruct and guide our coaches, the better they will lead their teams" (p. 8). The evaluation process plays an even bigger role in identifying effectiveness when evaluating a coach that is a non-licensed teacher fulfilling a coaching duty.

In addition to the responsibilities of evaluating and guiding individuals that are non-licensed teachers hired to coach, the athletic director also holds responsibilities to licensed teachers hired to coach. While states have different guidelines and requirements, it is still the athletic director's job to help provide coaching education and professional development. According to the 2008 National Coaching Report, "84% of states have a coaching education requirement. Of those states, 15 exempt individuals who have a teaching credential, regardless of subject area" (New National Coaching Report, 2008, p. 29). This means that 84% of states require their coaches to hold a certificate or complete some sort of educational requirement. Fifteen of these states dictate that if one holds a teaching license in that state, he or she is not required to complete that requirement. The days are gone when all coaches were physical education teachers. Now many schools are hiring licensed teachers of other subject areas to coach who may not have had proper coaching courses in their background (Stewart & Sweet, 1992). This means that the need for coaching education and professional development is even more critical.

Not only do athletic directors have a responsibility to help provide professional development, they also play a role in how long coaches remain in their school system and even in the profession. "Athletic directors or principals usually exert a strong influence in hiring and

retaining coaches, and they are also the primary source of professional evaluation or feedback" (Thorngren, 1990, p. 60). By evaluating and observing, school administrators can help the coach develop their potential. In addition, by observing and evaluating, administrators can assist with retention in coaching positions, especially for coaching positions that are hard to fill, which include many female sports. Thorngren (1990) found that to retain female coaches, "they need to feel supported by their supervisor and that their supervisor knows what is taking place in the program" (p. 60). When, "adequate encouragement and support are not provided, women are more likely than men to retire prematurely from coaching" (Thorngren, 1990, p. 60). The findings have real implications for schools as filling coaching positions of female sports tends to be more challenging than finding coaches who want to coach male sports. If done properly, athletic directors can observe, guide, and give feedback on the common challenges that young coaches face as licensed teachers to prevent dismissal and keep them in the profession. However, observation and feedback do not always guarantee improvement, and in such cases, the athletic director holds the responsibility of recommending the termination of an ineffective athletic coach.

Firing and Dismissal

High school athletic directors hold multiple roles and responsibilities that include hiring and or firing of athletic coaches, including non-licensed coaches and licensed teachers. Despite continued professional development and collaborative conversation, sometimes the dismissal of a coach and the non-renewal of their contract is what is deemed best for the school and the athletic program. These decisions should not be taken lightly, and evidence should be documented that supports such a decision. "It is clear that the decisions principals and athletic directors make surrounding athletics are often charged with emotion and require a clear

understanding of their possible consequences" (Plutko, 2002, p. 4). Athletic directors and school administrators must have proper documentation in situations where coaches are non-renewed. "Failure to fire a coach could potentially place the athletic department at risk for lawsuits and bad press, an unhealthy environment and criticism from parents, students and observers" (Lubisco & Birren, 2017, p. 19). Due to the possible challenges that schools face when firing a coach, administrators must have proper documentation. To obtain proper documentation, the athletic director must be vigilant in monitoring and observing an athletic program. "An important step in determining the retention or dismissal of a coach is to keep a log of all conferences held with that coach" (Belinko, 1999, p. 17). These documents provide a source of objective observations and evaluation to aid in making recommendations. Collectively, observations and thorough documentation helps provide a clear picture of the coach and their performance. These objective observations help athletic directors make the recommendation to retain or dismiss a coach to administration rather than reliance on opinion and subjective bias. The responsibilities and roles of the high school athletic director highlight and emphasize the importance of evaluating high school coaches and what is needed to improve this process.

While athletic directors are aware of the different challenges that exist with hiring and retaining coaches, they must also be aware of the importance of evaluation and having evidence of evaluation. According to Flannery and Swank (1999), "as an evaluator (the athletic director) must design an evaluation plan aimed at improving the work that people do in the athletic program" (p. 7). In high school athletics, multiple stakeholders are attending public competitions and forming their own opinions of what should be taking place within the athletic department or within a specific program. It is imperative that the athletic director, when approached, understands stakeholders' viewpoints concerning issues pertaining to the athletic program. It is

critical that the athletic director has evidence of observation and evaluation. This evidence supports and defends programs and coaches if stakeholders begin to question their effectiveness. As Scantling and Lackey (2005) noted:

> No one is less objective in evaluating a coach's performance than a parent. Yet it is the parent (evaluating the team through the eyes of his or her child) that plays a dominate role in coaching survival. This appears to be especially true in a state with a strong rural orientation, where the community identifies with the success of high school sports programs and where small-town school boards can be influenced, particularly by community pressure groups. (p. 28)

Knowing the stakeholders and the community can also assist the athletic director in handling issues that arise from stakeholder input and requests for firing. Different communities tend to have different levels of support, tradition, and involvement concerning high school athletics.

The literature suggests that the varying levels of stakeholder involvement and administrative support of athletic coaches affects the tenure of a coach. For instance, Miller and colleagues (2006) found that "not wanting to deal with parents, conflicts with athletes and parents, inability to maintain good player discipline and poor relations with administration and parents" are the top reasons for leaving or dismissal (p. 40). Such findings indicate that topics other than knowledge of sport need to be addressed when coaches are formally evaluated. It was also found that burnout associated with the sport type also related to coaching turnover (Bradford & Keshock, 2011). Failure to win was another common reason for coach dismissal (Miller et al., 2005). This finding is interesting considering that the win-loss record is not recommended for inclusion in evaluating a high school athletic coach (Belinko, 1999; Hager & Torres, 2007).

When examining first year teachers and the coaching profession, Hoch (2005a) noted that "probably the greatest exodus of teachers occurs in their first three years when they feel overwhelmed, not supported and besieged by obnoxious parents whom the teachers can no longer endure" (p. 14). Similarly, Cauley (2011) found that peer relationships played a role in teacher satisfaction and helped keep teachers teaching in their classroom and coaching their team. What this means for practice is that athletic directors can work with first year teachers who coach and provide them with professional development opportunities that offer peer support and mentoring. In another study, Stewart (2014) found that, "the weaknesses of young coaches echoed the reasons for dismissal, naming challenges associated with teaching, knowledge, interaction with parents, interaction with players, communication problems and attitude" (p. 703). Since athletic directors hold the responsibility of firing and dismissing athletic coaches, they should be able to recognize and address weaknesses in coaches that could, if not addressed, lead to dismissal. Athletic directors have the responsibility to help coaches develop their skills and avoid dismissal to develop a quality athletic coach. As D'Alessio (2001) stressed,

> Today more than ever before, athletic directors must produce a quality athletic program within an ever-tightening budget. In these days of downsizing, accountability and increased parental involvement, a quality coach has become our program's most valuable commodity. And with the growing emphasis of athletics at the high school level, the need for knowledgeable and effective coaches is greater than ever before. (p. 22)

To develop the most valuable commodity within athletic programs, schools and athletic directors must recognize that they hold the responsibility of developing coaches within their school system. Schools must also realize that these athletic coaches need support and guidance to improve their skills and be retained yearly. To measure improvement, or lack of, evaluation is

needed for schools to make an informed decision regarding the retaining or dismissal of athletic coaches that are licensed or non-licensed teachers within their school district.

Chapter Summary

To truly understand the importance of an athletic coach within a school system, we must recognize the true purpose of high school athletics. **"**Done right, sports can be a shining example of good lessons taught by good people that cannot be learned in any classroom" (Curry, 2012, p. 38). If high school athletics are a tool in which schools can teach lifelong character traits to help produce responsible and contributing members of society, it follows that evaluating program effectiveness and the coaches leading those programs should be inevitable. "Sports are an integral part of the educational process because of all the life lessons that can only be learned in competition" (Parsh, 2007, p. 57). Athletic coaches are teachers of their sport and thus should receive feedback from being observed and evaluated.

Athletic directors, when evaluating athletic coaches, must keep in mind the priorities and concerns of all stakeholders, including athletes, parents, board of education members, community members, boosters, and school administration. It is important to remember the importance of how the athletic coach is viewed by stakeholders (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2002). The lens through which the coach is perceived by all stakeholders is valuable. Even though academics are the top priority, for schools, athletic programs are the most visible programs within the educational setting. "How often does a parent or taxpayer get to view a science lab in action or how instruction is being conducted in one of the many academic disciplines? Very seldom, but the parents do make judgements based upon athletics" (Hoch, 2005b, p. 14). Through observation and evaluation, schools can support and effectively convey the integrity

and daily practices of each coach to all stakeholders involved while at the same time helping the coach develop professionally.

McFarland (2001) stated, "using educational research to alter the traditional process of evaluating high school coaches can yield positive results for all involved. This insight will allow for more effective communication with coaches, teachers, school board members, athletes and parents" (p. 18). Such alterations and additions could include the use of observation by the athletic director in the coach's evaluation process. By conducting observation and evaluation, schools can equip administrators with evidence that will help support the development and retention of a coach and effectively provide data that stakeholders may request. In an era when stakeholders can be quick to jump to immediate requests of terminating a coach, it is important to remember that schools must observe and evaluate multiple aspects of the athletic program and the coach leading that program to determine their true effectiveness and success. It is imperative to understand that additional areas other than the win-loss record must be considered in an athletic coach's evaluation. "It is the obvious benchmark of the team record-the wins and losses as printed in the local papers. Other factors that demand consideration when measuring success include: communication, participation, attitude, community connection, and off-season opportunities" (Shea & Fleming, 2007, p. 47). All these added components used to determine a program's or coach's effectiveness could be observed and evaluated in a formal evaluation process. These areas, if evaluated, could help administrators provide support for keeping a coach on staff and renewing their contract or provide support and evidence for the non-renewal of a coach within a school's athletic program.

If support and evidence is needed for such a decision, then school athletic directors and administrators will need much more evidence than one informal evaluation given during the

year. Furthermore, those schools who choose not to formally evaluate yearly could be in desperate need of documentation to support the renewal or non-renewal of a coach and not have evidentiary support for those actions. To effectively evaluate an athletic coach and their program, athletic directors need to observe coaches in action and witness firsthand their practices and competitions on a regular basis. To achieve this, observations and walkthroughs must be utilized to ensure that quality athletic coaches are working with student athletes. Chapter three will address the methodology used in this study to explore the landscape of high school athletic coaching.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

Introduction

The methodology used in this quantitative census survey study is explained in this chapter. High school athletic directors' perceptions of the components and domains of Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching when applied to effective high school athletic coaching was investigated. Athletic director perceptions and the applicability of Charlotte Danielson's (2013) framework for effective teaching to athletic coaching were explored since athletic coaching is a form of teaching. The study examined the independent variables of school size, years of experience as athletic director, and gender of the athletic director within a Midwestern state, and their effects on athletic director opinions of effective high school athletic coaching. The remainder of the chapter is organized as follows: The research questions are reviewed first. Then, the hypotheses tested in the study are stated followed by the research design, population and sample, survey design, survey construction, and the validity and reliability of the survey instrument. Lastly, the data collection, data analysis procedures used, and limitations are discussed.

Research Questions

The research questions that guided the current study were:

RQ1: To what extent is Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching applicable to high school athletic coaching evaluations as viewed by high school athletic directors?

RQ2: What dimensions exist among athletic director views?

RQ3: How do the factors of school size, years of experience, and gender affect the athletic directors' views of high school coaching evaluations?

Hypotheses

Research question one was addressed through descriptive statistics and as such did not require a hypothesis. To address research question two, exploratory factor analysis was used to identify the dimensions that existed among the athletic directors' views. Research question three was examined through inferential statistics, with its alternative hypotheses being informed by the literature review. As noted in the literature review, the size of the school plays a huge role in determining the responsibilities that the athletic director has within the school setting (Anderson, 1999; Turner, 2009). The literature also revealed that regardless of years of experience as an athletic director, the athletic director has a responsibility to the school's athletic programs (Flannery & Swank, 1999). The literature similarly indicated that without support, women are more likely to leave high school athletics earlier in their career than men (Thorngren, 1990). Although there was no clear pattern that gender of the athletic director affects their views on evaluation, it did lead to an anticipated relationship that differences may exist among athletic directors of different genders. Therefore, this study explored if a relationship existed between the athletic director's evaluation scores and school size, years of experience, and gender. The hypotheses for research question three was tested quantitatively and are stated as follows:

Ho: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and school size, years of experience, and gender.

Alternative hypotheses addressing each independent factor are listed as such.

Ha_1: There is a statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and school size.

Ha_2: There is a statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and years of experience.

Ha_3: There is a statistically significant relationship between the athletic director's factor scores and gender.

Research Design

Quantitative Methods

This non-experimental quantitative study was designed to examine the perceptions of high school athletic directors of Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching as it applies to effective high school athletic coaching by using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Furthermore, this study examined if a relationship existed among the athletic director's evaluation scores and school size, years of experience, and gender by using the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test. It was important to collect data from high school athletic directors and measure their perceptions of athletic coaching as they play a main role in supporting and evaluating high school athletic coaches.

This study used an online questionnaire to collect data to determine the views of high school athletic directors and examine relationships. The census survey explored opinions and perceptions of high school athletic coaching as viewed through the lens of the high school athletic director. As Dillman, Smyth, & Christian (2014) points out, "it is critical that web surveys be designed to make the response task as easy as possible while obtaining accurate measurement" (p. 305). To ensure an easy response task, an effort was made to make sure the design, flow, and vocabulary were simple to follow. The tailored design (Dillman et al., 2014) method was used to construct and deliver the online questionnaire. This design method is "a strategy that can be applied in the development of all aspects of a survey to reduce total survey error to acceptable levels and motivate all type of sample members to respond within resource and time constraints" (Dillman et al., 2014, p.16).

Study Population

The population for this census study was defined as all 353 Kansas High School Athletic Directors that worked in Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA) member schools for the 2019-2020 school year. KSHSAA members include PreK-12 public and private school districts. Since the population included all member high school athletic directors, an attempt was made to achieve, when possible, a maximization of the heterogeneity of the size of school, years of experience as an athletic director, gender of athletic director, and geographic location within the state of Kansas. "To select people to survey, surveyors need a list or frame that contains units or members of the population" (Dillman et al., 2014, p. 63). A list of athletic directors working in the state of Kansas was obtained via email from KSHSAA to get the contact information for all Kansas high school athletic directors.

Survey Design

As addressed in Chapter Two, no formal research-based instrument exists for athletic directors to use to evaluate high school athletic coaches. Since athletic coaching involves teaching student athletes, a teacher survey that addresses the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching was modified to form the questionnaire used in the current study. As Dillman et al. (2014) points out, "crafting good survey questions requires understanding each of the different question formats and how each component of the question conveys meaning independently to respondents, as well as how all the parts work together to convey meaning" (p. 109). Modifications were carefully made to ensure that the questions conveyed the correct meaning to the respondent.

Survey Item Construction

By taking the Sweeley (2004) survey that was designed to collect teacher perceptions of the Danielson (2013) framework, this study went one step further and altered the survey to collect the perceptions of athletic directors. Sweeley (2004) examined teacher's attitudes toward Danielson's framework (see Appendix A). The Sweeley (2004) instrument is a survey based on a 5-point Likert scale and the questions are based off Danielson's original Framework for Teaching developed in 1996. Though Danielson has updated the framework in 2007, 2011, and 2013, many researchers such as D'Alfonso (2006), Doerr (2012), and Olson (2015) utilized the Sweeley (2004) survey and all found similar results that Danielson's four domains in the framework do effectively measure teaching and learning. Because each of these studies asked different educators their perceptions about the Danielson framework and concluded similar results over different periods of time, the Sweeley (2004) survey was selected to modify for this study. Specifically, the questionnaire used in the current study was a modification of the Sweeley (2004) survey of Danielson's Framework for Teaching.

While Sweeley's (2004) purpose was to examine teacher attitudes towards the Danielson framework and compare those attitudes of teachers teaching different grade levels, the 66-question survey could be altered to use to determine attitudes of other education professionals. In this study, athletic directors are education professionals and were surveyed on their perceptions of athletic coaching by identifying survey items that are important to effective high school athletic coaching. Although the Danielson framework has been altered to evaluate school specialists, school nurses, and school librarians, it had never been refined to assess the teaching of athletics, known as athletic coaching.

According to Danielson (1996), “although some components [of her framework] are more important in some contexts than in others, the components apply to every setting [in teaching]” (p. 16). Given Sweeley’s (2004) survey instrument targeted teaching, it was appropriate to modify it for the current study, since athletic coaching is a form of teaching. As Danielson points out “because these specialists are teachers, they do the tasks of teaching as described in the framework for teaching” (Danielson, 2007, p.110). Each specialist framework “has four domains and each domain has the same emphasis as in the framework for teaching” (Danielson, 2007, p. 110). To alter the original Framework for Teaching, Danielson explains that “it is primarily a matter of emphasis” (Danielson, 2007, p. 110). To determine which components should be included in her frameworks for specialists, she only included those that the specialists emphasized in their work.

To narrow down the survey used in this study, the researcher selected only questions that athletic coaches are responsible for and emphasize in their teaching of the sport. To help the participant complete the survey with clarity, the researcher replaced the word “teacher” or “educator” with “coach” and replaced “student” with “student-athlete.” For the questions that used the word “lesson” or “classroom,” the researcher replaced with “practice” and in place of “instructional” the researcher substituted “athletic.” In addition, the questions that used “furniture” were replaced with “equipment.” The researcher hoped to eliminate any confusion of the participant completing the survey by adjusting the terms and adding examples where needed for clarification, as identified by a small pilot group.

Pilot Group

Since this survey instrument included adapted questions from the Framework for Teaching Survey (Sweeley, 2004), a pilot study with a small group of athletic directors was

conducted to gain feedback for item relevancy and clarity. The pilot group consisted of three males and one female, all of which were either former or retired Kansas high school athletic directors. All three males had worked in a school capacity with the researcher and the female was asked based on a recommendation by one of the males in the pilot group. The three males had experience working in 2A, 3A, and 4A high schools with each having 21-25 years of experience as an athletic director. The female had 35 years of experience as an athletic director at the 6A level. In Kansas, all member schools are divided into six classes: 6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, and 1A. Class 6A schools include the 36 high schools with the largest enrollment; followed by 5A with the next 36 schools; 4A the next largest 36 schools; 3A with the next 64 schools; 2A with the next 64 schools; and all remaining schools are 1A (Kansas State High School Activities Association [KSHSAA], 2020). The pilot group completed the online survey and each participant provided feedback to the researcher.

Feedback and suggestions from the pilot group included: numbering the questions to make it easier to read online, grouping questions instead of putting the same phrase in front of each question, and pointing out words that need more clarity and examples. Based off the feedback provided by the pilot group, the researcher removed question eight since it was pointed out that it was similar to question 23 and the remaining questions were renumbered. Questions were also grouped with the phrase, "To what extent do you agree that the following is important to effective high school athletic coaching?" at the top of each page of the online survey rather than in front of each question. These changes resulted in an online survey format that was much easier to read and follow for the respondent.

It was also discovered that examples were needed to help clarify what the researcher was asking with certain questions. As such, the researcher made the following additions as

recommended by the pilot group: An example of "current research" was given on question three by adding, "Example: The Coach is teaching the concept of their sport in the safest and most effective way." An example of "non-athletic information" was given on question 31 by adding, "Example: physicals, parent contact information, emergency action plans, and inventory check in/check out." An example of a coach "engaging families" was added on question 33 by providing, "Example: Coach invites families to parent meetings, games, team events, etc. and gets families to attend." An example of "a coach volunteering" was given on question 35 by providing "Example: The coach volunteers to run the clock or keep score at a home event. Just attending to watch would not be a substantial contribution." An example of "a coach volunteering with a district project" was also added on question 36 by providing, "Example: The school or district implements a new technology program and the coach volunteers to help." An example of "a coach serving student needs" was given on question 39 by stating, "Example: The coach directs the student-athlete to meet with the school counselor or other appropriate school resource to help student-athletes with individual needs." An example of "a coach providing a fair opportunity" was given on question 40 by adding "Example: The coach asks for JV and C team games added due to large numbers." In addition, one word was clarified on question 21 by putting an additional definition clarification in parenthesis after the "content" to indicate that "game knowledge" is the definition of "content" referred to by the researcher (see Table 3.1).

As a result, the original 66-question Framework for Teaching Survey (Sweeley, 2004) was shortened to a 41-question survey that directly related to only those components that emphasize what athletic coaches are responsible for in their teaching of the sport. Using these specific component questions, athletic director perceptions of good athletic coaching was obtained. The survey asked high school athletic directors to identify survey items that are

important to effective high school athletic coaching. The following crosswalk (see Table 3.1) illustrates the removal and altering of select Sweeley (2004) survey questions and the addition of the examples recommended by the pilot group that resulted in the development of the survey used in this study.

Table 3.1.

Crosswalk of Survey Questions Used

Current Survey Items	Changes Made on the FfT Survey Items *
1. *Coach* displays a solid content knowledge.	Replace "teacher" (question #1).
2. *Coach's practice and game* plans reflect an understanding among *player/coach* relationships and concepts taught.	Replace "Teacher's" (question #2). Insert "practice and game" and "player/coach" for clarification.
3. Pedagogical practices reflect current research. (Example: The Coach is teaching the concept of their sport in the safest and most effective way.)	No change (question #3). Added an example for clarification.
4. *Coach* displays an understanding of developmental characteristics of student-athletes.	Replace "teacher" and "students" (question #4). Question #5 not used.
5. *Coach* displays knowledge of *student-athlete's* skills and knowledge.	Replace "teacher" and "students" (question #6). Question #7 not used.
6. *Student athlete* goals are valuable in their level of expectation.	Replace "student" (question #8). Questions #9-#15 not used.
7. *Athletic* instructional groups are varied and appropriate.	Inserted "athletic" for clarification (question #16). Questions #17-#20 not used.
8. *Coach-student-athlete* interactions are friendly, demonstrate general warmth, caring and respect, and are appropriate to developmental and cultural norms of students.	Replace "Teacher-student" (question #21).
9. *Student-athlete* interactions with *coach* are generally polite and respectful.	Replace "Student" and "teacher" (question #22).
10. *Coach* conveys genuine enthusiasm for the subject, and *student-athletes* demonstrate commitment to its value.	Replace "Teacher" and "students" (question #23).

11. *Student-athletes* accept *coach's* insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.	Replace "Students" and "teacher" (question #24).
12. *Athletic* goals, activities, interactions, and *practice* environment convey high expectations for achievement.	Replace "Instructional" and "classroom" (question #25).
13. Tasks for groups are organized and *student-athletes* are engaged.	Replace "students" (question #26). Questions #27-#30 not used.
14. Standards of conduct are clear to all *student-athletes.*	Replace "students" (question #31).
15. *Coach* is alert to *student-athlete* behavior.	Replace "Teacher" and "student" (question #32).
16. *Coach* response to misbehavior is appropriate and respectful of the *student-athlete's* dignity.	Replace "Teacher" and "student's" (question #33).
17. The *practice* is safe and the *equipment* is a resource for learning activities.	Replace "classroom" and "furniture" (question #34).
18. *Coach* uses physical resources skillfully, and all learning is equally accessible to all *student-athletes*.	Replace "Teacher" and "students" (question #35).
19. *Coach's* directions and procedures are clear to *student-athletes* and contain an appropriate level of detail.	Replace "Teacher" and "students" (question #36).
20. *Coach's* spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to *student-athlete's* age and interests.	Replace "Teacher's" and "student's" (question #37). Questions #38-#40 not used.
21. Representation of content (game knowledge) is appropriate and links well with *student-athletes'* knowledge.	Replace "students'" (question #41). Inserted (game knowledge) for clarification. Question #42 not used.
22. *Athletic* instructional groups are productive and appropriate.	Inserted "Athletic" (question #43). Question #44 not used.
23. *Practices* have clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized.	Replaced "Lessons" (question #45).
24. *Coach* feedback to *student-athletes* is of high quality.	Replaced "Teacher" and "students" (question #46).
25. Feedback to *student-athletes* is provided in a timely manner.	Replace "students" (question #47).
26. *Coach* is able to make an adjustment to a *practice*, and the adjustment occurs smoothly.	Replace "Teacher" and "lesson" (question #48).
27. *Coach* accommodates *student-athlete's* questions or interests.	Replace "Teacher" and "student's" (question #49).

28. *Coach* persists in seeking approaches for *student-athletes* who have difficulty learning.	Replace “Teacher” and “students” (question #50).
29. *Coach* makes an accurate assessment of a *practice’s* effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its goal.	Replace “Teacher” and “lesson’s” (question #51).
30. *Coach* is able to make specific suggestions on how a *practice* might be improved.	Replace “Teacher” and “lesson” (question #52). Questions #53-#54 not used.
31. *Coach’s* system for maintaining information on *non-athletic* information is effective. (Example: physicals, parent contact information, emergency action plans, and inventory check in/check out.)	Replace “Teacher’s” and “non-instructional” (question #55). Example added for clarification.
32. *Coach* provides frequent information to parents about the *athletic* program.	Replace “Teacher” and “instructional” (question #56). Question #57 not used.
33. *Coach’s* efforts to engage families in the *athletic* program are frequent and successful. (Example: Coach invites families to parent meetings, games, team events, etc. and gets families to attend.)	Replace “Teacher’s” and “instructional” (question #58). Example added for clarification.
34. *Coach’s* relationship with colleagues is cooperative and supportive.	Replace “Teacher’s” (question #59).
35. *Coach* volunteers to participate in school events making a substantial contribution. (Example: The coach volunteers to run the clock or keep score at a home event. Just attending to watch would not be a substantial contribution.)	Replace “Teacher” (question #60). Example added for clarification.
36. *Coach* volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution. (Example: The school or district implements a new technology program and the coach volunteers to help.)	Replace “Teacher” (question #61). Example added for clarification.
37. *Coach* seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.	Replace “Teacher” (question #62).
38. *Coach* participates actively in assisting other *coaches*.	Replace “Teacher” and “educators” (question #63).
39. *Coach* is moderately active in serving student-athlete needs. (Example: The coach directs the student-athlete to meet with the school counselor or other appropriate school resource to help student-athletes with individual needs.)	Replace “Teacher” and “student” (question #64). Example added for clarification.
40. *Coach* works within *athletic* department to ensure that students receive a fair opportunity to succeed. (Example: The coach asks for JV and C team games added due to large numbers.)	Replace “Teacher” and “particular team or department” (question #65). Example added for clarification.

41. *Coach* maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision-making.	Replace "Teacher" (question #66).

Note. FfT=Framework for Teaching Survey *The numbers in the parenthesis indicate the initial numbering in the Sweeley (2004) survey instrument.

Measures and Demographic Information

For the 41 questions, a 4-point Likert scale was used since the Sweeley (2004) 5-point Likert scale included the choice, "do not understand," which indicated it could be considered a 4-point Likert scale. Items were scored on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) indicating that a higher score reflected a higher level of agreement. The survey began with demographic questions, in addition to the 41-question part to determine the size of the high school, the number of years of experience of the athletic director, the gender of the athletic director, and current practices in the school district. After the initial demographic questions, participants were asked if they formally evaluate their head athletic coaches and if they use formal walkthroughs and observations to support the evaluation procedure used in their school system. Participants were then asked as to what extent they agreed with the 41 survey items in the context of effective high school athletic coaching.

Validity

Since this survey instrument was derived from The Framework for Teaching Survey (Sweeley, 2004) based on Danielson's (2013) framework, its validity must be examined. Validity is, "whether an instrument actually measures what it sets out to measure" (Field, 2013, p. 12). The Framework for Teaching Survey was developed by Sweeley (2004) using each of the elements within the Danielson framework. Although no statistical testing or evidence is provided, Danielson (1996) stated, "the validity of the framework derives from the professional conversations that accompany its introduction into a school" (p. 12). According to Field (2013), criterion validity is "whether you can establish that an instrument measures what it claims to

measure through comparison to objective criteria" (p. 12). The criterion validity of the Framework for Teaching Survey (Sweeley, 2004) could be considered as established, for the Danielson Framework upon which the survey was developed was found to be a valid measurement of effectively measuring teaching in other studies (D'Alfonso, 2006; Doerr, 2012; Olson, 2015; Sweeley, 2004).

Reliability

To determine the reliability of the current survey instrument, also known as internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha was performed. Cronbach's alpha determines the overall reliability of a survey, with its values falling between .7 and 1 being considered acceptable (Field, 2013). Other studies (D'Alfonso, 2006; Doerr, 2012; Olson, 2015; Sweeley, 2004) have used the Framework for Teaching Survey, of which only one (Doerr, 2012) reported Cronbach's alpha values above .8 for all four of Danielson's domains, indicating an adequate internal consistency. D'Alfonso (2006), Doerr (2012), and Olson (2015) all used the existing survey instrument and added demographic questions for each of their studies. Danielson (1996) also noted the following about her framework, "such systems have shown high levels of interrater agreement, which is considered critical to demonstrate the reliability of the system" (p. 12). For this study, once the researcher identified the appropriate number of factors to extract in the exploratory factor analysis, Cronbach's alpha was performed on each of the factors extracted to determine the reliability.

Data Collection

IRB and Informed Consent Process

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Kansas State University. Prior to the start of this study, the KSHSAA was contacted via email to explain the

study and to ask for a list of athletic director email addresses. KSHSAA agreed to share a list of athletic director email addresses with the condition that the list would not be shared and that findings of the study would be reported back to their organization. Once email addresses of high school athletic directors were obtained, a letter (Appendix B) was emailed to athletic directors in Kansas explaining the purpose, time requirements, and significance of the study. The letter also included information from the IRB, participant rights, and request of participation. In addition, the letter explained that by responding to the survey (Appendix C) participants were giving their informed consent to participate in the study.

Survey Distribution

Prior to contacting respondents, the researcher used Qualtrics software to create the online survey. The survey allowed respondents to click to submit answers, click back to previous questions, and skip questions if needed. From the list of athletic directors obtained, an email was sent to the athletic directors from the researcher's Kansas State University email account. In the first email, a summary of the study was given, and participants were informed that by taking the survey, they were giving their consent to participate. Participants were able to click on the link and complete the survey at any time during the study from April 14, 2020 until May 12, 2020 (Appendix B). All surveys received were completed anonymously and were kept confidential; no personal identifiers were collected to prevent the possibility of gender and/or a school size revealing an identity. Reminders were sent weekly over a four-week period to encourage participation. At the end of the four-week period, a final email was sent to thank participants and inform them of the closing of the survey.

Data Analysis

To conduct data analysis, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 26.0 was used. Prior to analyzing, the data were cleaned and checked for missing values using Little's Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) test (Little & Rubin, 2019). Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to identify patterns to help answer the research questions. To determine to what extent athletic directors believed that Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching is applicable to high school coaching, research questions two and three had to be addressed first to fully answer research question one. Dimensions that existed among athletic director views had to be identified in research question two, with factor scores being calculated in research question three, prior to answering research question one. The analysis used to answer research question one is discussed later in this section, after research question three, as this was the sequence the researcher followed.

To identify what dimensions existed among athletic director views, that is, research question two, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted. EFA allows researchers to comprehend the structure of variables, measure underlying variables, and reduce a data set (Field, 2013) and was used to assess the construct validity of the survey developed in this study. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was performed to measure the sampling adequacy. The KMO test determined the patterns of correlations between variables, values closer to one are recommended and values below .5 indicate that EFA is not applicable (Field, 2013). Barlett's test of sphericity was conducted to determine if at least one significantly correlated factor existed. Bartlett's test of sphericity examined the variance-covariance matrix to determine if group variances were equal and the correlation of the dependent variables (Field, 2013). The variance inflation factors (VIF) were also examined to check for multicollinearity. The variance

table produced allowed the researcher to identify groups of variables, identified as components, and each group became identified as one factor. To determine which factors were kept, eigenvalues were examined and only those factors with eigenvalues larger than one were kept (Field, 2013). To determine the appropriate number of factors to extract, the researcher began by comparing different fixed number extractions. Principal axis factoring was the extraction method used with a direct oblimin oblique rotation for each fixed factor extraction comparison. The oblique rotation was chosen based on the expectation that the underlying factors were correlated (Field, 2013). The direct oblimin method was selected because if "there are theoretical grounds for supporting that your factors correlate, then direct oblimin should be selected" (Field, 2013, p. 681).

In the current study, eight factors had eigenvalues larger than one, however, two of those factors were barely above one with each having eigenvalues of 1.093. Due to this, the researcher used the literature review and previous research as a guide to select an appropriate number of factors to begin extracting. Since previous researchers such as D'Alfonso (2006), Doerr (2012), and Olson (2015) utilized the Sweeley (2004) survey and each concluded that Danielson's four domains effectively measured teaching and learning, the researcher began by extracting four factors. After conducting an EFA with four factors extracted, 18 questions loaded on Factor One, five questions loaded on Factor Two, six questions loaded on Factor Three, and one question loaded on Factor Four. After analyzing the component matrix, the researcher noticed that some of the questions that cross loaded all dealt with coach-student interactions. This led the researcher to believe that an extraction of five factors was needed for comparison.

After conducting an EFA with five factors extracted, 17 questions loaded on to Factor One, five questions on Factor Two, six questions on Factor Three, two questions on Factor Four,

and two questions on factor five. It was identified that two questions cross loaded with values below .4. The researcher also went back and reviewed the variance inflation factors (VIF) calculated and confirmed once again that multicollinearity did not exist. It was then determined to address the cross loading by comparing the loadings of each survey item. To do so under an oblique direct oblimin rotation, Field (2013) suggests, "noting the component for which each variable has the highest loading (by high I mean loadings above .4) in the table labeled pattern matrix" (p. 703). Using Field's (2013) recommendation of a benchmark of .4 or higher, the researcher then went back and conducted a three-factor extraction to compare loadings. It was found that 17 questions loaded onto Factor One, five questions on Factor Two, and six questions on Factor Three. Three questions cross loaded with values below .4 and eight questions loaded on one factor but had values below .4.

After comparison, the researcher knew that either a three or four-factor extraction would best fit the data. To determine which was the best fit, an EFA was ran an additional time with a three-factor extraction and a four-factor extraction. The researcher then checked the reliability of each factor by evaluating the Cronbach's alpha for each factor in each of the different fixed number extractions. For the four-factor extraction, the reliability for each factor was: Factor 1 Cronbach's alpha α=.939, Factor 2 Cronbach's alpha α=.814, Factor 3 Cronbach's alpha α=.808, and Factor 4 Cronbach's alpha was unable to be calculated due to only having one item. Since Factor Four was unable to be calculated, the researcher decided to go back and run a three-factor extraction using the .4 or greater loading criteria to compare the reliability of each factor. After conducting a three-factor extraction, the reliability of each factor was: Factor 1 Cronbach's alpha α=.934, Factor 2 Cronbach's alpha α=.814, and Factor 3 Cronbach's alpha α=.792. From these

results, a three-factor extraction method was selected using a .4 or higher loading criteria to determine the factor the survey items loaded under.

To answer research question three, given the validation of the survey instrument having been examined (as discussed on pages 73-74 regarding validity and reliability), the factor score for each participant was examined to determine if any relationships existed between the identified factors and the noted demographic variables as independent variables, namely, school size, years of experience as athletic director, and gender of the athletic director. To calculate the factor scores for each participant, the raw means for those survey items under each factor for each participant were calculated by computing the new raw mean variables within the SPSS program. After the raw mean scores were calculated, the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test was used to determine if any relationships existed among the demographic variables. MANOVA is a multivariate method used when there are two or more dependent variables (Brown et al., 2011).

After conducting the EFA to answer research question two and conducting the MANOVA test to answer research question three, research question one was then addressed. By calculating the raw mean score for each participant on each item that loaded onto one of the three factors extracted, each participant now had a factor score for each of the three factors. Descriptive statistics on each of the factor scores were analyzed looking for patterns among school size, years of experience, and gender. The general linear model of between-subjects factors was used to compare the means of athletic directors. Since the items were scored on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) indicating that a higher score reflected a higher level of agreement, the mean values had to be 3.0 or higher to indicate a level of agreement. In the current study, a response of 3 represented agree and a response of 4

represented strongly agree. To determine if Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching was applicable to high school athletic coaching evaluations as viewed by high school athletic directors, the data was re-coded into two groups for each of the variables. School size was recoded to reflect a small school group representing 1A-3A high schools and a large school group representing 4A-6A high schools. Years of experience was recoded to reflect one group with 0-15 years of experience and the other group to represent 16-30+ years of experience, and gender remained the same two groups. The overall mean for each independent variable subgroup was then examined as well as the overall mean for the entire group of participants.

Limitations

Several limitations were present in this census study. First, since the definition of coach did not specify any specific sport, the athletic director had to reflect on all head coaches of all sports. The current study could have selected one sport to investigate and that could have potentially produced different results. Secondly, this quantitative census study was administered online with participants being human subjects that self-selected to participate, which means their perceptions could hold potential biases (Dillman et al., 2014). Finally, not all high school athletic directors from Kansas had self-selected to complete the survey, as such, the generalizability of the study's findings should take into considerations of such geographic and sampling confinements.

Chapter Summary

This chapter addressed the methodology utilized in the current study. This study was a census survey that used a modified version of an existing instrument. Contact information of all Kansas high school athletic directors was obtained to determine the population for the study. A small group of participants participated in a pilot study and modifications were made as needed

to strengthen the survey used. To establish the construct validity, exploratory factor analysis was used. Exploratory factor analysis was also used to identify factors in the study. Eigenvalues determined which factors were kept. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the survey instrument. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data to answer the research questions. The remaining chapter, Chapter 4, will address the results of the study.

Chapter 4 - Results

Introduction

This study used a census survey approach to study the criteria and components of effective teaching used in the Danielson (2013) Framework for Teaching as it applies to effective high school athletic coaching. A sample of Kansas high school athletic directors responded to the survey. By examining the underlying dimensions in the athletic directors' perceptions, the study results tested the researcher's hypothesized relationship between athletic coaching and teaching where the former is a form of the latter. The study also identified if demographic variables (that is, school size, years of experience as an athletic director, and gender of the athletic director) affect athletic directors' views on effective high school athletic coaching. This chapter reports the results obtained using the methodology outlined in Chapter Three to answer each research question.

Method

Participants

Of the population of 353 Kansas high school athletic directors, 220 self-selected to respond to the survey participation request. However, in five cases, the participants clicked on the link to participate without providing any answers. As such, those five cases were removed resulting a total of 215 usable surveys for data analysis. The final sample contained participants who self-identified as being male (87%), having 0-5 years of experience (40%), working in a 1A school (30.2%), formally evaluating their coaches (72.6%), and not using walkthroughs and observations in their evaluation process (53.5%). Participants identified their school size by selecting their KSHSAA classification and responses were as follows: 30.2% self-identified as a 1A school, 17.7% as a 2A school, 22.3% as a 3A school, 9.8% as a 4A school, 11.2% as a 5A

school, and 8.4% as a 6A school. School sizes ranged from a 1A classification to a 6A classification (*M*=2.79, *SD*=1.632). Most participants (30.2%) identified as a 1A school. In terms of years of experience, participant responses were: 40% had 0-5 years of experience, 25.6% had 6-10 years of experience, 18.1% had 11-15 years of experience, 7% had 16-20 years of experience, 6% had 21-25 years of experience, .9% had 26-30 years of experience, and 2.3% had over 30 years of experience (*M*=2.26, *SD*=1.442). Years of experience ranged from 0 to over 30 years of experience, with the most participants having 0-5 years of experience. The mean of 2.26 indicated that the average participant had 6-10 years of experience. Participants also self-identified their gender as follows: 87% male and 13% female (*M*=1.13, *SD*=.337) (see Table 4.1).

It is important to note that all Kansas high school athletic directors were purposefully invited to get a sense of the landscape of the entire state. Also, to get a better understanding of current practices in school systems, two practice specific questions were asked. One asked if participants formally evaluate their head athletic coaches, and the participant responses were: 72.6% yes and 27% no. The other asked if walkthroughs and observations were used to help in their formal evaluation process, and the participant responses were: 45.6% yes and 53.5% no (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1.

Participant Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Frequency (*n=215*)	Percentage
KSHSAA Classification		
1=1A	65	30.2
2=2A	38	17.7
3=3A	48	22.3
4=4A	21	9.8
5=5A	24	11.2
6=6A	18	8.4

Years of Experience		
1=0-5 Years	86	40
2= 6-10 Years	55	25.6
3= 11-15 Years	39	18.1
4= 16-20 Years	15	7
5= 21-25 Years	13	6
6=26-30 Years	2	.9
7= 30+ Years	5	2.3
Gender		
1=Male	187	87
2=Female	28	13
Formally Evaluate		
1=Yes	156	72.6
2=No	58	27
Use Walkthrough & Observation		
1=Yes	98	45.6
2=No	115	53.5

Given that not all high school athletic directors participated in the survey, it is necessary to examine the representativeness of the resulting sample to the population. Of the 353 possible participants in the population, 117 were from 1A high schools. In other words, 55% (=65/117) of athletic directors in the population of 1A high schools participated in the survey. Of the possible participants in the total population, 64 were from 2A high schools, which is 59% (=38/64) of athletic directors in the population of 2A high schools. For the next school size category, the study sample contained respondents from 48 high schools with the 3A classification, which is 75% (=48/64) of 3A athletic directors in the population. The sample-to-population percentages for the remaining three categories are 58% (=21/36) for 4A, 66% (=24/36) for 5A, and 50% (=18/36) for 6A. It was not surprising that the highest number of participants in the study identified as 1A since over 33% of schools in the entire population are 1A. It was also not surprising that 151 participants (70.2%) represented small schools in classifications of 1A, 2A, and 3A since 69.4% of schools in the total population are under these classifications, whereas only 63 participants (29.3%) represented 4A, 5A, and 6A sized schools within the population.

Procedure and Results

Preliminary Analyses

Of the 215 returning surveys, it was further identified that 11 cases only had the demographic questions completed and as such were excluded from analysis for research questions two and three. Of the 204 remaining cases, another 11 had missing six or more responses. Little's Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) test (Little & Rubin, 2019) was conducted on those 11 items to determine if the missing values were in fact missing at random. The Expectation Maximization (EM) imputation method was used in this analysis. The Little's MCAR analysis discovered a significant statistic, χ^2 =304.324, p =.021. Since the p value was less than .05 it indicated that these missing values were not missing at random and the cases needed to be deleted (Little & Rubin, 2019). This resulted in a sample size of 193 for research questions two and three.

Research Question One Phase One

To address research question one, to what extent is Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching applicable to high school athletic coaching evaluations as viewed by high school athletic directors, the researcher had to complete question one in two phases. First, demographic information had to be collected on all participants to get the landscape of the population. All 215 cases were used to describe the landscape since all 215 cases responded to the demographic questions of the survey. To address research question one phase one, descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were generated to describe the population as explained in the participant's section. To determine to what extent athletic directors believed that Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching is applicable to high school athletic coaching, research questions two and three had to be analyzed first to effectively

examine the patterns to answer research question one. Phase two of research question one is addressed later in this chapter.

Research Question Two

To address research question two, what dimensions exist among athletic director views, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to identify the dimensions. Prior to conducting the EFA to measure sampling adequacy, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was conducted and reported a value of .923 indicating an adequate sample size. Next Bartlett's test of sphericity was examined and proved to be statistically significant ($p < .001$) indicating at least one significantly correlated factor. To check for multicollinearity, three procedures were performed. First, the variance inflation factor (VIF) was examined. The VIF "indicates if one predictor has a strong linear relationship with other predictors" (Field, 2013, p. 325). The VIF statistic for the independent variables of years of experience and gender was 1.005. For the independent variables of years of experience and school size, the VIF was 1.010, and for gender and school size, the VIF was 1.006. The EFA was then conducted and the R matrix confirmed that multicollinearity did not exist and that all assumptions of EFA were met (Field, 2013).

According to the total variance table, eight factors, identified as components, had an Eigenvalue greater than one. However, three of those factors were barely above the value of one. After analyzing the component matrices, the researcher conducted extractions of three, four, and five components to compare pattern matrices. Direct oblimin was the oblique rotation used with principal axis factoring as the extraction method for each. After carefully comparing the three, four, and five component extractions, it was discovered that a three-factor extraction best fit the data (more detailed discussion has already been provided in Chapter 3). Therefore, three factors were extracted with an oblique rotation and the small coefficients were suppressed to .3, meaning

that for any absolute values of coefficients below .3 they were not listed in the SPSS output (Field, 2013). After analyzing the pattern matrix, it was determined which questions fell under the new factors. Using Field's (2013) recommendation of determining the factor loading by using the highest loading score of .4 or higher, it was then determined which factor each question loaded under. If an item cross loaded and had a loading score of .4 or higher, the factor selected was the factor with the higher loading score for that item (see Table 4.2).

Next, a reliability test was conducted on each of the three factors extracted. For Factor One, 17 questions loaded with a Cronbach's alpha of .934. Five questions loaded onto Factor Two with a reported Cronbach's alpha of .814. For Factor Three, six questions loaded for a Cronbach's alpha of .792 (see Table 4.3). Factors One through Three indicated strong reliability and consistency (Field, 2013).

Naming the Factors

Component one which became Factor One, *Coaching Culture*, consisted of 17 items and accounted for 36.2% of the variance. This factor was named based on the domain that the items corresponded with in Danielson's framework. Most of these items corresponded with the items in Danielson's framework for school specialists titled, "*The Environment*" (Danielson, 2007, p. 110). Items in Factor One included the coach's procedures, responses to student behavior, interaction and feedback, expectations of high quality, making accurate assessments of effectiveness, varying instructional groups, using resources skillfully, making suggestions for improvement, and defined structure for activities.

Component two which became Factor Two, *Content Knowledge*, contained five items and accounted for 3.8% of the variance. This factor related to Danielson's domain of "*Planning*

and Preparation" (Danielson, 1996, p. 61). Items in Factor Two represented the coach's content knowledge, game plans and concepts taught, and knowledge of student athlete's skills.

Component three which became Factor Three, *Servant Leadership*, consisted of six items and accounted for 3.5% of the variance. The items for Factor Three related to Danielson's domain of "*Professional Responsibilities*" (Danielson, 1996, p. 61). Items in Factor Three included engaging and communicating with families, volunteering to help with school and district events, actively assisting other coaches, student athlete goals are valuable in level of expectation, and participating in team or department decision making. All three factors were identified as the dimensions that exist among athletic director's views and cumulatively represented 43.5% of the total variance.

Table 4.2.

Summary of Factor Loadings from Principal Axis Factoring with Oblique Rotation (N=193)

	Factor loading		
Items	1	2	3
Factor 1: Coaching Culture			
Student-athlete accepts coach's insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.	**.528**		
Athletic goals, activities, interactions, and practice environment convey high expectations for achievement.	**.597**		
Tasks for groups are organized and student-athletes are engaged.	**.716**		
Standards of conduct are clear to all student-athletes.	**.756**		
Coach is alert to student-athlete behavior.	**.786**		
Coach response to misbehavior is appropriate and respectful of the student-athlete's dignity.	**.705**		
The practice is safe and the equipment is a resource for learning activities.	**.629**		
Coach uses physical resources skillfully and all learning is equally accessible to all student-athletes.	**.445**		
Coach's directions and procedures are clear to student-athletes and contain an appropriate level of detail.	**.779**		
Coach's spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to student-athlete's age and interests.	**.700**		

Athletic instructional groups are productive and appropriate.	**.645**		
Practices have clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized.	**.714**		
Coach feedback to the student-athletes is of high quality.	**.723**		
Feedback to student-athletes is provided in a timely manner.	**.569**		
Coach is able to make specific suggestions on how a practice might be improved.	**.453**		.328
Coach's relationships with colleagues is cooperative and supportive.	**.512**		.304
Coach seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.	**.466**		
Factor 2: Content Knowledge			
Coach displays a solid content knowledge.		**.753**	
Coach's practice and game plans reflect an understanding among player/coach relationships and concepts taught.		**.644**	
Pedagogical practices reflect current research.		**.574**	
Coach displays an understanding of developmental characteristics of student-athletes.		**.623**	
Coach displays knowledge of student-athlete's skills and knowledge.		**.628**	
Factor 3: Servant Leadership			
Student-athlete goals are valuable in level of expectations.		.354	**.401**
Coach's efforts to engage families in the athletic program are frequent and successful.			**.463**
Coach volunteers to participate in school events making a substantial contribution.			**.653**
Coach volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution.			**.769**
Coach participates actively in assisting other coaches.			**.533**
Coach maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision making.	.352		**.414**

Note. Numbers in boldface indicate highest factor loading.

Table 4.3.

Factor Solutions with Eigenvalues

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance Explained	Cronbach's α
1	14.843	36.203	.934
2	1.576	3.845	.814
3	1.452	3.541	.792

Research Question Three

To investigate research question three, how do the factors of school size, years of experience, and gender affect the athletic directors' views of high school coaching evaluations, the factor scores for each participant were examined. The factor score for each factor was calculated by finding the raw mean for those items under that factor for each participant. To determine if any relationships existed between school size, years of experience, gender, and athletic directors' views of high school coaching evaluations, a MANOVA test was conducted on the three factors representing the three dimensions of athletic directors' views of high school coaching evaluations. Due to one participant not giving their school size, the MANOVA excluded this case with a missing value, resulting in a sample size of 192. Given that some subcategories of school classification size and years of experience had very small cell sizes, the researcher combined subcategories and recoded these two independent variables, school classification size and years of experience, into dichotomous variables. Classification of school size now had two groups, 1A through 3A sized schools (70.2%) and 4A through 6A sized schools (29.7%) to represent two contrasting (small versus large) groups. The variable, years of experience, was recalibrated to two groups as well, with 0-15 years of experience (84.5%) and 16-30+ years of experience (15.4%). No change was made to the variable, gender (male = 87.2%, female = 12.7%).

The hypotheses for research question three was tested by examining the significance of gender, school size, and years of experience on all three factor scores. School size, gender and years of experience did not show statistical significance on explaining the entire model with all three factors combined F (3,182) = .713, p =.545; Wilks' λ = .988. Furthermore, school size, gender, and years of experience were not statistically significant on each of the three factors.

School size was not significant at F (3,182) = .364, p =.779; Wilks' λ = .994. Years of experience was not significant at F (3,182) = 1.249, p =.293; Wilks' λ = .980 and gender was not significant with F (3,182) = .928, p =.428; Wilks' λ = .985. Since the analysis was not significant, it indicated that school size, gender and years of experience did not have a significant effect on the individual factor scores for each new factor. There were no statistically significant interaction effects between school size and years of experience, F (3,182) = 1.197, p =.313; Wilks' λ = .981. There were also no statistically significant interaction effects between school size and gender, F (3,182) = .443, p =.723; Wilks' λ = .993. Lastly there were no significant interaction effects identified between years of experience and gender, F (3,182) = .920, p =.432; Wilks' λ = .985.

Table 4.4.

Correlations Among Factors

Factor	1	2	3	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1	--			3.5614	.35819	193
2	.533**	--		3.6378	.39800	193
3	.619**	.410**	--	3.2758	.43003	193

Research Question One Phase Two

To answer research question one phase two, research questions two and three had to be completed first. Although phase one of research question one used 215 cases to describe the landscape of the population and comprehend current practices in schools, only 192 cases were used for phase two as it relied on the results of research question three. Since missing values were removed from the data set prior to answering research question two and the MANOVA test in research three removed any case with a missing value, the resulting data set included 192 cases. After factor scores were calculated for each participant in research question three, factor

scores were analyzed to look for patterns among school size, years of experience, and gender. The dichotomous variables created for school size and years of experience for addressing research question three were kept for the analytical purposes in this phase. The reclassified school size was analyzed by comparing 1A through 3A high schools as group one to 4A through 6A high schools as group two. The reclassified years of experience was analyzed by comparing the first group of 0-15 years of experience to the second group of 16-30+ years of experience. Gender remained the same with two groups.

The researcher began by segregating the data by years of experience and school size to compare the factor score means for each factor. The first set of factor scores analyzed included athletic directors with 0-15 years of experience working in 1A through 3A high schools (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5.

Factor Scores of Athletic Directors with 0-15 Years of Experience in 1A-3A High Schools

Factor		*M*	*SD*	*N*
1	Male	3.5550	.34456	101
	Female	3.5017	.42628	17
	Total	3.5473	.35591	118
2	Male	3.6198	.34584	101
	Female	3.6706	.33868	17
	Total	3.6271	.34385	118
3	Male	3.2762	.41073	101
	Female	3.3137	.52335	17
	Total	3.2816	.42640	118

It was apparent from comparing the factor score means of athletic directors with 0-15 years of experience working in 1A through 3A high schools that all factor score means were greater than 3.0, indicating that Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching was applicable to high school athletic coaching evaluations. To determine if the pattern continued, the researcher

then compared the factor score means of athletic directors with 0-15 years of experience working in 4A through 6A high schools. (see Table 4.6)

Table 4.6.

Factor Scores of Athletic Directors with 0-15 Years of Experience in 4A-6A High Schools

Factor		*M*	*SD*	*N*
1	Male	3.5358	.33842	37
	Female	3.5647	.66629	5
	Total	3.5392	.37943	42
2	Male	3.5838	.57034	37
	Female	3.6000	.69282	5
	Total	3.5857	.57661	42
3	Male	3.2162	.40419	37
	Female	3.2000	.70119	5
	Total	3.2143	.43754	42

The factor score means of athletic directors with 0-15 years of experience working in 4A through 6A high schools also suggested that Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching is applicable to high school athletic coaching evaluations since all means were greater than 3.0. The next step was to analyze veteran athletic directors with 16-30+ years of experience. The researcher began by analyzing athletic directors with 16-30+ years of experience working in 1A through 3A high schools (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7.

Factor Scores of Athletic Directors with 16-30+ Years of Experience in 1A-3A High Schools

Factor		*M*	*SD*	*N*
1	Male	3.6824	.37849	15
	Female	3.5882		1
	Total	3.6765	.36641	16
2	Male	3.7400	.28234	15
	Female	3.8000		1
	Total	3.7437	.27318	16
3	Male	3.3556	.47920	15
	Female	2.6667		1
	Total	3.3125	.49394	16

Likewise, the overall factor score means for high school athletic directors working in 1A through 3A high schools with 16-30+ years of experience were greater than 3.0, indicating the applicability of the Danielson framework to high school athletic coaching. To complete the analysis, the athletic directors working in 4A through 6A high schools with 16-30+ years of experience were also compared (see Table 4.8).

Table 4.8.

Factor Scores of Athletic Directors with 16-30+ Years of Experience in 4A-6A High Schools

Factor		*M*	*SD*	*N*
1	Male	3.6006	.32615	14
	Female	3.7647	.33276	2
	Total	3.6211	.32049	16
2	Male	3.7143	.30091	14
	Female	4.0000	.00000	2
	Total	3.7500	.29665	16
3	Male	3.3571	.39687	14
	Female	3.4167	.58926	2
	Total	3.3646	.40009	16

Total factor score means for high school athletic directors working in 4A through 6A high schools with 16-30+ years of experience were also greater than 3.0, indicating the applicability of the Danielson framework to high school athletic coaching. After analyzing factor score means for athletic directors with 16-30+ years of experience working in 4A through 6A high schools, the researcher then compared the factor score means as an entire group. A few patterns did emerge from this comparison. Firstly, the comparison of mean factor scores for each of the factors revealed that all factors had means above 3 indicating a strong level of agreement. While Factor 3, Servant Leadership, had a lower mean factor score of M=3.27. The mean score of M=3.27 was consistent for both males and females within the group. It was also observed that for Factor 3, Servant Leadership, that the athletic director's years of experience did slightly

affect their response. Athletic directors with 0-15 years of experience had similar means (1A-3A *M*=3.28, 4A-6A *M*= 3.21). Athletic directors with 16-30+ years of experience also had similar means, but they were slightly higher than those with less experience (1A-3A *M*=3.31, 4A-6A *M*=3.6). It was also noted that Factor 2, Content Knowledge, had the highest mean factor score for the entire group (*M*= 3.63). It was also observed that for Factor 2, Content Knowledge, that the athletic director's years of experience did affect their response. Athletic directors with 0-15 years of experience had similar means (1A-3A *M*=3.62, 4A-6A *M*= 3.58). Athletic directors with 16-30+ years of experience also had similar means, but they were slightly higher than those with less experience (1A-3A *M*=3.74, 4A-6A *M*=3.75). Since the items were scored on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), a higher score reflected a higher level of agreement, as such mean values greater than 3.0 indicated a level of agreement. Since the factor mean scores for all three factors for all athletic directors were greater than 3.0 (see Table 4.9), it was determined that Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching was applicable to high school athletic coaching evaluations as viewed by high school athletic directors.

Table 4.9.

Factor Scores of all Athletic Directors in 1A-6A High Schools

Factor		*M*	*SD*	*N*
1	Male	3.5660	.34405	167
	Female	3.5388	.45300	25
	Total	3.5625	.35881	192
2	Male	3.6305	.39830	167
	Female	3.6880	.40857	25
	Total	3.6380	.39903	192
3	Male	3.2768	.41313	167
	Female	3.2733	.54620	25
	Total	3.2764	.43108	192

Chapter Summary

In summary, this chapter first described the demographics of the participants in this study. Next, the results were provided concerning the validity and reliability of the modified survey instrument, followed by the findings of the underlying dimensions in the athletic director's perceptions and to what extent such dimensions were aligned to the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching as hypothesized by the researcher based on the notion that athletic coaching is a form of teaching. School size, years of experience, and gender demographics were also reported as to whether or not they affected the opinions of high school athletic directors. The next chapter, Chapter Five, discusses the findings in relation to the existing literature reviewed, the implications for future research, policy and practice, and the conclusions.

Chapter 5 - Conclusion

General Discussion

This study explored high school athletic directors' perceptions of Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching when applied to effective high school athletic coaching. The study also examined if selective demographic variables affect high school athletic directors' views of athletic coaching evaluations. By identifying the underlying dimensions (i.e., latent factors) within such perceptions, the researcher's initial argument that athletic coaching is a form of teaching and as such could be systemically assessed using Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Effective Teaching was tested. In general, the study's findings support such argument. The analyses revealed a three-factor underlying structure rather than a four-factor one, if fully aligned to the four domains outlined in Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching; the three factors were named as Coaching Culture, Content Knowledge, and Servant Leadership. The researcher did not find such findings surprising, given that practically, athletic coaching is a specialized form of teaching. The demographic variables examined (that is, school size, years of experience, and gender) were not found to be significant predictors to athletic directors' views of high school coaching effectiveness. Also discussed in this chapter are the implications for future research, practice, and policy, followed by the conclusions.

Underlying Dimensions

Through the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) eight factors were revealed to have an Eigenvalue larger than one, however, after comparing different models, a three-factor model was supported. The model suggested three underlying dimensions existed among athletic director views which were named as: Coaching Culture, Content Knowledge, and Servant Leadership. All three factors reported strong reliability within the analysis.

Coaching Culture

Factor One was comprised of 17 items that related to the coach's conduct and procedures, as well as their responses to student behavior. Other items also loaded on this factor were: the feedback of coaches and student-athletes, the coach's spoken and written language, the coach's expectations of high quality, the coach's relationships built with colleagues, the practice environment, athletic instructional groups, the coach seeking professional development, and the coach's defined structure for activities. When comparing the altered items to the original items in Danielson's Framework for Teaching they corresponded with Danielson's domain titled, "*The Environment*" (Danielson, 1996, p. 61). This correspondence logically made sense since the 17 items all reflect the type of environment the coach helps create through their expectations, actions, and relationships. With the 17 items accounting for 36.2% of the variance, these findings highlight the importance of the environment and coaching culture that the head coach creates within an athletic program. All items identified in Factor One are consistent with the literature review. As Miller et al. (2012) point out, a coach needs to be an, "effective organizer, planner, hard worker, knowledge seeker, compassionate mentor, reflective practitioner and are clear about expectations for themselves, their assistants, their athletes and their athletes' parents" (p. 24). In addition, Watts (2015) "indicated that the ability to teach and educate was a key characteristic of a qualified coach" (p. 147). McFarland (2001) also concluded, "coaches must set goals, maintain the team, handle conflict and teach skills" (p. 4). Stewart and Owens (2011) identified positive coaching behaviors as social support, training and instruction, positive feedback, autocratic behavior, and democratic behavior. They also concluded that coach behavior affects the overall program and, specifically, the athlete's performance and motivation (Stewart & Owens, 2011). Factor One encompasses some of the elements identified in Danielson's original Framework for

Teaching and corresponds with similar findings in previous studies (D'Alfonso, 2006; Doerr, 2012; Olson, 2015; Sweeley, 2004).

Content Knowledge

Factor Two, Content Knowledge, was composed of five items and related to Danielson's domain titled, "*Planning and Preparation*" (Danielson, 1996, p. 61). Items in Factor Two represent the coach's content knowledge, game plans and concepts taught, understanding student-athlete development, practicing current research, and knowledge of student-athlete's skills. These items emphasize the importance of the coach's knowledge and their ability to apply and appropriately teach to the level of their student athletes within their athletic program. This dimension echoes with what Frost (2009) found regarding the most important characteristics of a coach, that is, "quality of practice, communication with athletes, motivating athletes, developing skills of athletes and having strong knowledge of sport" (p. 1).

Servant Leadership

The six items under Factor Three, Servant Leadership, related to Danielson's domain of, "*Professional Responsibilities*" (Danielson, 1996, p. 61), such as, engaging and communicating with families, volunteering to help with school and district events, and maintaining an open mind in decision making. These items attend to the coach's effectiveness as a communicator, manager, and leader to serve the school and the athletic department, which is consistent with what Miller et al. (2012) have found about successful coaches, noting "they stress effective communication, consistency, and character" (p. 29). These six items are also consistent with the other findings noted in Miller et al.'s 2012 study related to philosophies, practices, and views of successful high school coaching. Miller et al. (2012) revealed that, "coaches reported following commonly accepted best practices, and they display traditional leadership characteristics- effective

organizer and planner, hard worker, knowledge seeker, compassionate mentor and reflective practitioner" (p. 29).

Factor Structure

The dimensions of Coaching Culture, Content Knowledge, and Servant Leadership represent the groupings of underlying components that represent athletic director views on good athletic coaching. As noted before, while this three-factor structure is different from the initially hypothesized four-factor structure based on the four dimensions in Danielson's Framework of Teaching, it made sense. Athletic coaches, while are part of the teaching force, are specialists because of the practical work and responsibilities involved. While the current study is the very first attempt to bridging athletic coaching to teaching formally in personnel management and assessment, such findings affirm the potentials of such direction in future studies and in practice, which will be addressed later in this chapter.

The three related factors capture the complexity of athletic coaching. As Danielson states, "The components of professional practice are a comprehensive framework reflecting the many different aspects of teaching" (p. 2), under the banner of athletic coaching, each factor, namely, Coaching Culture, Content Knowledge, and Servant Leadership, represents related yet still very different aspects of athletic coaching.

Factors and Demographic Variables

In terms of the demographic variables, while previous research suggested that the school size and years of experience can affect an athletic director's role in a school (Anderson, 1999; Flannery & Swank, 1999; Turner, 2009), the findings of the current study did not find the two being significant predictors of the athletic director views. Likewise, while previous research found that women are more likely to leave high school athletics earlier in their career than men if

not supported (Thorngren, 1990), the current study did not find gender playing a significant role in affecting the opinions of athletic directors. The possible causes for such disparities were beyond the scope of the data collected in the study.

Nevertheless, the nonsignificant results could be viewed as plausible in the sense that it suggested that the perceptions and attributes of good athletic coaching tend to be consistent, regardless of contextual factors, at least from the perspectives of athletic directors in Kansas. This may be advantageous to systemic personnel management and assessment where once a formal structure is established it is more likely to be sufficiently applicable to all designated personnel and produce fairly consistent results, despite of the differences in school size, years of experience, and gender. Nonetheless, a caution note on such relationships is necessary as further verification of the modified survey instrument and replication of studies are needed to test the findings revealed in the current study.

Applicability of Framework for Teaching to Athletic Coaching Evaluation

One of the key objectives of this study was to test the applicability of Charlotte Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching to high school athletic coaching evaluations. The findings suggest that as evident by the greater than 3.0 factor mean scores for all three factors. Furthermore, relative to "coaching culture" and "content knowledge," "servant leadership" had a lower mean factor score (M=3.27), and respondents with more years of experiences tended to score higher on this domain, regardless of school size. In other words, athletic directors with 16-30+ years of experience (1A-3A M=3.31, 4A-6A M=3.36) viewed "servant leadership" slightly more important for coach effectiveness than those with 0-15 years of experience (1A-3A M=3.28, 4A-6A M=3.21). Such findings are not expected; the literature has noted the effects that school size and years of experience can have on an athletic director's role in a school

(Anderson, 1999; Flannery & Swank, 1999; Turner, 2009), but have not specifically addressed how years of experience alter their view of athletic coaching over time.

Content Knowledge, had the highest mean factor score for the entire group (*M*= 3.63), and such findings were expected as the literature noted that a strong content knowledge of sport is needed for successful athletic coaching (Frost, 2009). However, the athletic director's years of experience did slightly affect their response. Athletic directors with 0-15 years of experience (1A-3A *M*=3.62, 4A-6A *M*= 3.58) had similar means and athletic directors with 16-30+ years of experience (1A-3A *M*=3.74, 4A-6A *M*=3.75) also had similar means, but they were slightly higher than those with less experience. A possible explanation for this increase could be that years of experience as the athletic director have highlighted over time the importance of content knowledge in the coaching position.

As noted above, the number of factors as the underlying dimensions identified was not necessarily the same as the researcher initially theorized. Based on the supportive literature that athletic coaching is a form of teaching (Drewe, 2000; Huber, 2012; Jones, 2006; Paling, 2002) the researcher anticipated four factors to be identified similar to Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013). However, the results led to three factors as the underlying dimensions of athletic director views. A possible explanation of this could be the delivery of the teaching provided. Meaning that athletic coaching is a form of teaching, but the delivery of the teaching is in a different format, therefore realigning some of Danielson's components in the Framework for Teaching (2013). Like Danielson's explanation of emphasis for her specialist's framework it is possible that some of the components within the Framework for Teaching (2013) are not emphasized as much in athletic coaching. This supports the concept that it is possible that one of the original domains in Danielson's (2013) work is comprised of components that either aren't

emphasized in athletic coaching as much or realigned under a different component within the delivery of teaching known as athletic coaching.

Implications for Research

The findings of this study have potential implications for future research for high school athletic coaching evaluation. The results are pointing in a promising direction but need further testing and research. Future research could examine if any other independent variables affect athletic director opinions by expanding the study to a larger sample size. Because the study modified the Framework for Teaching Survey developed by Sweeley (2004) to better understand athletic director's points of view, an expanded study could potentially identify additional underlying dimensions that exist among athletic director views. The larger sample size could also be used to specifically test different independent variables not addressed in this study that may affect athletic director perceptions.

Future research should also explore the effectiveness of the proposed evaluation instrument in a coaching evaluation study. Through piloting in high school athletic departments, future research could extend the study to identify if any other elements of high school athletic coaching could strengthen the evaluation instrument. Further investigation needs to be conducted to determine if the evaluation instrument effectively measures the evaluation of high school athletic programs and their head coaches. In addition, it will also need to be identified if the instrument effectively measures the evaluations of head coaches of all sports or if differences exist among evaluating head coaches of different sports.

To further develop the proposed evaluation tool, school districts would need to volunteer to implement the evaluation tool within their district. Athletic directors within those school districts would need training on the framework of the tool and the implementation process.

Collaborative conversations would need to take place for the athletic director as the evaluator to understand what they are looking for in the evaluation of the coach. In addition, the coach would need to understand the criteria for which they would be evaluated. A pilot study of the implementation of the proposed evaluation tool would be needed to determine the effectiveness of the proposed instrument and process.

Implications for Policy

The findings of the study have implications for policy for all parties involved in the practice. The need for an evaluation tool for schools to use to effectively evaluate high school athletic coaches derives from the duty schools must ensure quality coaches are working with students and the responsibility to help coaches develop professionally. This study provided evidence and a model to support the development of an evaluation tool to be used by administrators and athletic directors to effectively evaluate athletic coaches. This proposed model needs to be developed and implemented by school districts to promote growth and provide a meaningful evaluation process. By using the proposed evaluation tool, schools can complete these tasks while at the same time providing evidence and documentation for renewing or non-renewing the annual athletic coach's contract.

As indicated by participants, many schools are evaluating but not using observations and walkthroughs to support their evaluation process. Participant responses are consistent with previous findings. Most high schools are using an informal evaluation process that is opinion-based and not supported by evidence or research to determine whether a school district should renew or non-renew an athletic coach's contract (Anderson, 1999; Belinko, 1999; Price, 2009; PSADA, 2015; Thielges, 2015). With 72.6% of participants indicating that they do formally evaluate coaches and 53.5% of those reporting that they evaluate without walkthrough and

observation, an evaluation tool with performance level indicators is needed. Schools are evaluating without walking through athletic practices and making observations, therefore, performance level indicators with specific criteria listed for each level are needed. Participant responses for not evaluating high school athletic coaches are also consistent with previous research. With 27% of participants reporting they do not formally evaluate their athletic coaches, it confirms previous findings of school districts that have never evaluated their athletic coaches within their school system (Anderson, 1999; Price, 2009; PSADA, 2015; Thielges, 2015).

Despite the findings that some schools do not formally evaluate their head high school athletic coaches, schools are still responsible for the safety of their student athletes and what takes place within those athletic programs. School administrators also have a responsibility to recognize the legal implications of their decisions about athletic programming in their schools (Baker, 2009). School administrators hold the responsibility of making sure that safe and effective coaches are working in their schools (Belinko, 1999). However, most coaching evaluations are informal and subjective, and schools need to focus more on evaluation procedures (Belinko, 1999). Failure to evaluate coaches effectively, could put the school at risk for potential lawsuits (Lubisco & Birren, 2017). Because of this, administrators must have proper documentation. However, schools are creating their own paper forms or versions of online paper forms to complete this task (PSADA, 2015; Thielges, 2015). Most coaching evaluation forms simply have a list of characteristics or expected behaviors with two outcome-based options to choose, met or unmet (Duncan, 2000; Hager & Torres, 2007). When in fact, “the best summative instruments list specific observable behaviors” (Kestner, 1996). The development of an evaluation tool can improve the evaluation processes used and critically needed for athletic director’s supervision and assessment of athletic coach’s performances. In addition, school

districts creating policy for yearly formal coaching evaluations using an evaluation tool can strengthen the effectiveness of the evaluation process for all stakeholders. A quality tool for coaching evaluation may allow districts the opportunity to discuss and consider the tool and process into policy or the district's negotiated agreement for supplemental contracts, the procedure itself and information gathered can be instrumental to both the coach and the school district. An effective evaluation tool and defined process for the evaluation of athletic coaches can help support the district's decision when needing to terminate or not renew an athletic coach; it can be necessary and helpful when the district needs documentation to prove quality coaching is taking place to override parent or community complaints, ensuring fair treatment to the coach.

Implications for Practice

The findings of the study also have important implications for practice. As the literature has called for systematic evaluation of high school athletic coaches (Kuga, 1993; McFarland, 2001; PSADA, 2015; Wichnietsky & Felder, 1989), the fact that this researcher's argument of coaching being a form of teaching was supported by the findings has immediate relevancy for the profession. Given that the appropriate starting point was the Danielson (2013) model, this study used the Sweeley (2004) study survey as a launching point to determine athletic directors' perceptions to begin development of an evaluation tool (Marzano, 2011). First, the study identified the factors that influence high school athletic director's views of coaching evaluation and examined the characteristics and actions high school athletic directors believe represent good athletic coaching. The study also determined which components of Charlotte Danielson's (2013) framework are applicable to evaluating high school athletic coaches in order to determine if these components could be used in an evaluation tool for athletic coaches. By helping identify what good coaching looks like and what should be included in an evaluation tool, the findings of this

study can help schools develop their athletic coaches through professional support and improve their athletic departments by instituting an evaluation tool that encompasses the domains examined in this study.

Schools have a responsibility to help high school athletic coaches develop and to objectively evaluate their high school athletic coaches. Schools need evaluation to help with renewing quality coaches and justifying why they should be retained. However, community pressure groups and parents may not always agree with evaluations and school boards may be influenced heavily by community pressure (Scantling & Lackey, 2005). As Scantling and Lackey (2005) concluded, "no one is less objective in evaluating a coach's performance than a parent" (p. 28). By including specifics within an evaluation, it helps prevent the athletic director of being "accused of being arbitrary" (PSADA, 2015, p. 9). An evaluation tool that provides necessary and at times, critical, documentation to help address the complaints from community and parent pressure groups can provide the district with objective evidence to justify the decisions and recommendations made by the athletic director. Therefore, a proposed evaluation tool with specific performance level indicators outlining criteria for each level are needed for schools to effectively evaluate head high school athletic coaches. By using an evaluation process that is supported by observation and walkthroughs, it can lead to professional conversations that guide professional development and strengthen the athletic program. The literature substantiated that traditional evaluations fail to provide adequate feedback to athletic coaches (McFarland, 2001) even though feedback obtained from traditional evaluations in multiple ways is an essential component to supporting an athletic coach (Duncan, 2000; Durgin, 2003; Gould, 2016). Dicolo (2013) emphasizes the importance of including multiple elements in an effective evaluation. An evaluation tool with specific indicators, like Danielson's Framework for Teaching, would benefit

current practice. Observation, walkthrough, and evaluation strategies can help improve coaching performance and lead to development of targeted professional development (Green, 2013). Few evaluation models allow for feedback (McLean, 1993) and incorporate elements to look for during an observation within the evaluation process. Traditional coaching evaluation forms simply have a list with two outcome-based options to choose from that often fail to address specific elements that can lead to improved performance.

By taking the altered Sweeley (2004) survey used in this study and the findings of this study that reveal that Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching is applicable to athletic coaching, Danileson's evaluation framework could also apply to athletic coaching. By using the level of performance indicators identified in Danielson's (2013) evaluation framework for school specialists an evaluation tool of head high school athletic coaches could be developed. To alter the original Framework for Teaching Danielson explains that "it is primarily a matter of emphasis" (Danielson, 2007, p. 110). To alter the performance level indicators for athletic coaching, what coaches emphasize for each item could be altered (See Appendix D).

Conclusions

This study has an immediate impact in the practice of interscholastic athletic coaching, by providing a resource for all stakeholders involved. School districts can now begin conversations and review their evaluation process and policy while at the same time working to provide evidence to support personnel decisions. Athletic directors now have a possible reference for identifying important dimensions of athletic coaching and helping guide professional development for athletic coaches. It is apparent from this study that most high schools recognize the need to evaluate their head athletic coaches and provide professional development, however, the use of observation and walkthrough to support the evaluation process is not consistent.

Therefore, the study findings generally support that Kansas athletic directors agreed on the use of applying components of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching to the athletic coaching process. In addition, Danielson's performance level indicators noting specific criteria in the proposed evaluation instrument could have potentials in addressing the need of a systemic evaluation process of high school athletic coaches and improving current practice within the school setting.

References

Adams, J. D. (1998). *Transforming leadership*: Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.

Anderson, D. J., & Major, R. L. (2001). Dewey, democracy, and citizenship. Viewpoint of John Dewey, philosopher. *The Clearing House, 75*(2), 104.

Anderson, L. (1999*). Role, job scope, and status of high school athletic directors in South Dakota*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (9937186)

Antonioni, D. (2002). 360- degree feedback for a competitive edge. *Industrial Management* (Norcross, Georgia), *42*(3), 6-10.

Baker, J. M. (2009). An examination of court cases involving interscholastic athletics in secondary schools. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (304824217)

Baltzell, A. L., McCarthy, J. M., Ahktar, V. L., Hurley, D., Martin, I., & Bowman, C. (2014). High school coaches' sources of joy and unhappiness. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 6*(3), 5-24.

Belinko, R. (1999). Personnel matters: established evaluation process needed to determine coachs effectiveness. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 26*(2), 14-17.

Bennice, D. (1979). *A survey of evaluation procedures for basketball coaching in Ohios high schools.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (302960281)

Blackburn, M. (2007). *Athletic classrooms: Attitudes of participants toward the developmental value of athletics and the evolution of interscholastic sport in high schools.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations &Thesis Global. (8012838)

Bolton, D. L. (1973). *Selection and evaluation of teachers*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Pub. Corp.

Bowen, D. H., & Hitt, C. (2016). History and evidence show school sports help students win. *Phi Delta Kappan, 97*(8), 8-12.

Boyd, G. (2016). *Leadership behaviors of effective interscholastic athletic coaches*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations &Thesis Global. (10172354)

Bradford, S., & Keshock, C. (2011). Factors of burnout in high school coaches. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics, 5*(1), 43-53.

Brown, B., Smith, T., Hedges, D., Fabrigar, & L.,Wegener, D. (2011). *Multivariate analysis for the biobehavioral and social sciences: A graphical approach*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Cadorette, D., Kinley, J., & Freeze, J. (2003). Should public schools require coaches to be certified? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 74*(5), 12,14. doi:10.1080/07303084.2003.10608478

Case, B. (2012). Future trends and developments in coaching education for Virginia. *VAHPERD Journal, 33*, 17.

Cauley, W., (2011). *Beginning teachers that coach high school athletics: A case study*. (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations &Thesis Global. (3497192)

Committee, N. P. (2010). Constructive feedback and coaching: Tips and tools for practice observation. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 36*(3), 30-31.

Conn, J., & Razor, J. (1989). Certification of coaches: A legal and moral responsibility. *Physical Educator, 46*(3), 161-165.

Cubberley, E. P. (1929). *Public school administration, a statement of the fundamental principles underlying the organization and administration of public education*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Curry, T. (2012). The foundation of athletics. *The Exceptional Parent (Online), 42,* 36-38. Retrieved from http://www.eparent.com

Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest, 55*(3), 215-230. doi:10.1080/00336297.2003.10491800

D'Alessio, T. (2011). A quality athletic program begins with quality coaches. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 38*(1), 22-23.

D'Alfonso, C. (2006). *Practical concerns of suburban teachers towards Charlotte Danielson's four domains of teacher evaluation*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (304924812)

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: a framework for teaching*: Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing student achievement: A framework for school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

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

Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument, 2013 instructionally focused edition.* Princeton, NJ: Danielson Group.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Danielson Group. (2019). *Our story*. Retrieved from https://www.danielsongroup.org

DiColo, J. (2013). Evaluation of coaches starts with a model of good coaching. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 40*(1), 22-25.

Dillman, D., Smyth, J., & Christian, L. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: the tailored design method* (4th ed.) Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Dils, A. K., & Ziatz, D. H. (2000). The application of teacher education curriculum theory to interscholastic coaching education: Learning outcomes associated with a quality interscholastic athletic program. *Physical Educator, 57*(2), 1.

Doerr, S. E. (2012). *Charlotte Danielson's theory of teacher evaluations: A quantitative study of teacher's perceptions on the four domains.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (945731520)

Drewe, S. (2000). An Examination of the Relationship Between Coaching and Teaching. Quest, 52(1), 79-88.

Duncan, S. (2000). Evaluation of coaches should be daily management routine. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 26*(4), 18-22.

Durgin, G. (2003). The informal evaluation of coaches. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 30*(2), 17.

Dyer, K. M. (2001). The power of 360-degree feedback. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 35.

Egalite, A. J., Bowen, D. H., & Trivitt, J. R. (2015). Do teacher-coaches make the cut? The effectiveness of athletic coaches as math and reading teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*(54), 1-23.

Evers, J. (2016). Evaluating your athletic program with a purpose. *Interscholastic athletic administration*, 42, (26).

Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics: and sex and drugs and rock "n" roll* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Flannery, T. E., & Swank, M. (1999). *Personnel management for sport directors*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Forester, B., Holden S., & Keshock, C. (2015). High school coaches continuing education delivery preferences. *Sport Journal, 1* (1). Retrieved from

http://thesportjournal.org/article/high-school-coaches-continuing-education-delivery-prefereces/

Frost, J. L. (2009). Characteristics contributing to the success of a sports coach. *Sport Journal, 12*(1), 1.

Gehring, J. (2005). Maine rallies behind rules for athletics: State initiative billed as national model. *Education Week*, *24* (1).

Gentry, G. B. (1998). *Coaching motivation and efficiency*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Oregon, Eugene.

Gilbert, W., Lichtenwaldt, L., Gilbert, J., Zelezny, L., & Cote, J. (2009). Developmental profiles of successful high school coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 4*(3), 415-431.

Giles, P. (2012). *An analysis of the success of a high school athletic program on student achievement.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (3514674)

Gillespie, K., & Jenkins, S. (2016). *# E walk through: Digital system for instructional leadership*. Morrisville, NC: Lulu Press, Inc.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers*: New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gould, D. (2016). Quality coaching counts. *Phi Delta Kappan, 97*, 13-18.

Green, L. (2013). Walk-throughs. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 40*(1), 14-16.

Hachiya v. USD NO. 307, 785 P. 2d 383-Kan: Supreme Court (1988)

Hager, P. F., & Torres, C. R. (2007). Just evaluation systems in competitive sport: Win-loss records often fail to reflect a team's true quality of performance. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 78*(7), 27.

Hardin, B. (2000). Coaching expertise in high school athletics: characteristics of expert high school coaches. *Applied Research in Coaching & Athletics Annual, 15*, 24-38.

Hoch, D. (2008). Recycling coaches. *Coach and Athletic Director, 2,* 12.

Hoch, D. (1989). *The perceptions of Pennsylvania high school athletic directors and high school boys basketball coaches relative to the performance appraisal of the coach. (*Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (8920256)

Hoch, D. (1998). Coaching your coaches. *Coach & Athletic Director, 68*(3), 4.

Hoch, D. (2002). Retaining quality coaches. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 29*(1), 30-32.

Hoch, D. (2003). Preparing for coaching evaluations. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 29*(3), 22-24.

Hoch, D. (2005a). Protecting your coaches. *Coach and Athletic Director, 75*(1), 14-15.

Hoch, D. (2005b). Image is everything. *Coach and Athletic Director, 74*(6), 14-15.

Hoch, D. (2017). The key to a better evaluation is helping your coaches to understand it. *Interscholastic Athletic Administrator, 35*(2), 18-20.

Hoffman, K. (2019). 2019 State of the industry. *Coach & AD, 88*(4) 22-23.

Huber, J. J. (2012). Applying educational psychology in coaching athletes. *Reference and Research Book News*, *27*(6).

Hunter, M. (1980). Six types of supervisory conferences. *Educational Leadership, 37*(5), 408-412.

Johnson, D. (1992). Indiana pace-a state's response to a coaching education crisis. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 63*(7), 55.

Jones, R. L. (2006). *The sports coach as educator: Re-conceptualizing sports coaching*. London: Routledge.

Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M., & Potrac, P. (2002). Understanding the coaching process: A framework for social analysis. *Quest, 54*(1), 34-48. doi:10.1080/00336297.2002.10491765

Kansas State High School Activities Association [KSHSAA], (2020). *KSHSAA Handbook*. Retrieved from http://www.kshsaa.org/Publications/Handbook.pdf

Keller, I. A. (1984). *Administration of high school athletics* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Kestner, J. L. (1996). *Program evaluation for sport directors*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Knorr, J. (1996). The need to rethink coaching certification. *Coach & Athletic Director, 65*(6), 4.

Kuga, D. J. (1993). Evaluating high school coaches-Perceptions of coaches and student athletes. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 64*(6), 84.

Lackey, D. (1986). The high school coach: A pressure position. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 57*(3), 28-32. doi:10.1080/07303084.1986.10606063

Lackey, D. (1994). High school coaching - still a pressure cooker profession. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 65*(6), 68.

Langston, L. L. (2010). *Exploring interscholastic athletic coaches development: The athletic director's perspective.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (580658330)

Leland, T. (1988). Evaluating coaches- Formalizing the process. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 59*(9), 21.

Little, R.J., & Rubin, D.B. (2019). *Statistical analysis with missing data, 793*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lubisco, R., & Birren, G. F. (2017). The s.m.a.r.t strategy to recruiting and retaining high school coaches. *Strategies, 30*(1), 15-20.

Mach, F. (1996). Coaches corner: In addition to annual evaluation, regular communication sessions vital. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 22*(4), 13-14.

MacLean, J. C. (1993). Coaching evaluation: A guide for establishing job-specific criteria. *Applied Research in Coaching & Athletics Annual*, *1*, 44-60.

Marzano, R. J. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

McFarland, A. J. (2001). *Altering the evaluation process of interscholastic coaches based on alternative classroom teacher appraisal methods.* Retrieved from ERIC database. *(*ED465737)

McGreal, T. L. (1982). Effective teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership, 39*(4), 303-305.

Miller, G., Lutz, R., Shim, J., Fredenburg, K., & Miller, J. (2005). Dismissals and perceptions of pressure in coaching in Texas high schools. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 76*(1), 29-33. doi:10.1080/07303084.2005.10607316

Miller, G. A., Lutz, R., & Fredenburg, K. (2012). Outstanding high school coaches. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 83*(2), 24-29. doi:10.1080/07303084.2012.10598724

Miller, G. A., Lutz, R., Shim, J., Fredenburg, K., & Miller, J. J. (2006). A national study of nonrenewal in high school coaching. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 77*(7), 40-45. doi:10.1080/07303084.2006.10597906

MSHSL (2009). *Minnesota state high school league.* Retrieved from https://legacy.mshsl.org/mshsl/

Murray, Schoenstedt, & Zwald. (2013). Recommended requisites for sport coaches. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 84*(8), 7-12. doi:10.1080/07303084.2013.832968

Myers, N. D., Wolfe, E. W., & Feltz, D. L. (2005). An evaluation of the psychometric properties of the coaching efficacy scale for coaches from the United States of America. *Measurement in Physical Education & Exercise Science, 9*(3), 135-160. doi:10.1207/s15327841mpee0903_1

Nash, C., Sproule, J., & Horton, P. (2011). Excellence in coaching: The art and skill of elite practitioners. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport, 82*(2), 229-238. doi:10.1080/02701367.2011.10599750

National Association of Sport and Physical Education [NASPE]. (2008). NASPE releases national coaching report. *NAGWS Gazette, 34(2),* 12.

National Federation of State High Schools [NFHS], (2015). *Who we are- mission statement*. Retrieved from http://www.nfhs.org/who-we-are/missionstatement

National Federation of State High Schools [NFHS], (2017). *2016-17 High school athletics participation survey*. Retrieved from http://www.nfhs.org/ParticipationStatistics/ParticipationStatistics/

National Federation of State High Schools [NFHS], (2018). *NFHS handbook*. Retrieved from http://www.nfhs.org

National Federation of State High Schools [NFHS], (2019). *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.nfhs.org

National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association [NIAAA] (2013). *History of the NIAAA.* Retrieved from https://members.niaaa.org/

National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Publications Committee [NIAAPC] (2010). Constructive feedback and coaching: Tips and tools for practice observation. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 36(2),* 30-32.

New national coaching report stresses importance of qualified coaches for every athlete. (2008). *Pennsylvania Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 78*(3), 29.

North Dakota High School Activities Association [NDHSAA] (2013). *NDHSAA coaches education.* Retrieved from https://ndhsaa.com/

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olson, D. (2015). *Exemplary teachers perspectives on effective teaching elements in Danielson's framework for teaching.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (1747116912)

Painter, B. (2001). Using teaching portfolios. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 31-34.

Paling, D. (2002). Keeping coaches on track: evaluating coaches is a key part of your job. but exactly what criteria should you use? and how do you communicate these standards to your staff? *Athletic Management, 14*(2), 5-57.

Parsh, D. (2007). 8 steps to a coaching philosophy. *Coach and Athletic Director, 76*, 56-57.

Peek, D. (2016). *An exploratory comparison of needed components in coach education programs for high school coaches.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (1858816425)

Pennsylvania State Athletic Directors Association [PSADA] (2015). *A guide to evaluating coaches*. Retrieved from http://psada.org/documents/psada-guide-to-evaluating-coaches

Plutko, G. (2002). *Principals, high school athletics, and the CIF: A case study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (3045680)

Potter, G., & Wandzilak, T. (1982). Athletic evaluation assessment for survival. If these activities are to remain a viable part of education programs, work must be initiated immediately to justify their existence. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 8*(4), 6-9.

Price, D. (2009). Coaching evaluation: One of the critical components. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 35*, 18.

Sage, G. H. (1980). *Sport and American society: Selected readings* (3rd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Scantling, E., & Lackey, D. (2005). Coaches under pressure: Four decades of studies. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 76*(1), 25-28.

School District Employment Contracts, Kan. Stat. Ann. 72-2217 (1972 & Supp. 1980)

Shea, & Fleming. (2007). Checking up on the health of the athletic program. *Coach and Athletic Director77*, 47-50.

Spears, B. M. (1978). *History of sport and physical activity in the United States*. Dubuque, IA:Wm. C. Brown Company.

Stewart, C. (2006). Coach education online: The Montana model. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance (JOPERD), 77*(4), 3-36.

Stewart, C. (2014). Failure to rehire: Why coaches get fired. *Physical Educator, 71*(4), 699-710.

Stewart, C., & Owens, L. (2011). Behavioral characteristics of favorite coaches: Implications for coach education. *Physical Educator, 68*(2), 90-97.

Stewart, C., & Sweet, L. (1992). Professional preparation of high school coaches: The problem continues. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 63*(6), 75-79. doi:10.1080/07303084.1992.10606625

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation and student achievement.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Sweeley, T. M. (2004). *Teachers attitudes towards Charlotte Danielson's four domains of teacher evaluation.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (305057791)

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*: New York, NY: Harper.

Thielges, B. A. (2015). *Athletic director's perceptions of evaluation and supervision practices in North Dakota* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (1728802936)

Thorngren, C. (1990). A time to reach out- Keeping the female coach in coaching. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 61*(3), 57.

Turner, R. (2009). The importance of an athletic administrator. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 36*(1), 12-13.

Watts, S. (2015). *Exploring interscholastic coaches educational and professional development needs: Perceptions of coaches and athletic directors.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (1709243612)

Winchester, G. (2010). *Understanding how high school teacher- coaches learn to coach.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (870397532)

Winchester, G., Culver, D., & Camire, M. (2011). The learning profiles of high school teacher-coaches. *Canadian Journal of Education, 34*(4), 216.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., Tyson-Berstein, H., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1984). *Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices,* Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Wishnietsky, D., & Felder, D. (1989). Coaching problems are suggested solutions effective? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 60*(1), 69-72. doi:10.1080/07303084.1989.10603926

Zdroik, J. (2016). *Stakeholder management in high school athletics: An individual level analysis.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (10391849)

Appendix A - **Sweeley Survey 2004**

1. Teacher displays a solid content knowledge.

2. Teacher's plans reflect an understanding among relationships and concepts taught.

3. Pedagogical practices reflect current research.

4. Teacher displays an understanding of developmental characteristics of students.

5. Teacher displays solid understanding of different learning styles.

6. Teacher displays knowledge of students' skills and knowledge.

7. Teacher displays knowledge of students' interests or cultural heritage.

8. Student goals are valuable in their level of expectation.

9. Most goals are clear and permit viable methods of assessments.

10. Goals are suitable for most students in the class.

11. Goals reflect several different types of learning opportunities.

12. Teacher is aware of all resources available throughout the school or district.

13. Teacher is aware of how to gain access, for students, to school and district resources.

14. Learning activities are suitable for students and instructional goals.

15. Materials and resources support instructional goals and engage students.

16. Instructional groups are varied and appropriate.

17. Lessons and units have clearly defined structure that activities are organized around.

18. The teacher's instructional goals are assessed through his/her proposed lesson plan.

19. Assessment criteria and standards are clear and are communicated to students.

20. Teacher uses assessment results to plan for individuals and groups of students.

21. Teacher-student interactions are friendly, demonstrate general warmth, caring and respect, and are appropriate to developmental and cultural norms of students.

22. Student interactions with teacher are generally polite and respectful.

23. Teacher conveys genuine enthusiasm for the subject, and students demonstrate commitment to its value.

24. Students accept teacher insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.

25. Instructional goals, activities, interactions, and classroom environment convey high expectations for achievement.

26. Tasks for groups are organized and students are engaged.

27. Transitions occur smoothly.

28. Routines for handling supplies occur smoothly.

29. Efficient systems for performing noninstructional duties are in place.

30. Volunteers and paraprofessionals are productively engaged during class.

31. Standards of conduct are clear to all students.

32. Teacher is alert to student behavior.

33. Teacher response to misbehavior is appropriate and respectful of the student's dignity.

34. The classroom is safe and the furniture is a resource for learning activities.

35. Teacher uses physical resources skillfully, and all learning is equally accessible to all students.

36. Teacher directions and procedures are clear to students and contain an appropriate level of detail.

37. Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to students' age and interests.

38. Teacher's questions are of high quality and adequate time is available for students to respond.

39. Classroom interaction represents true discussion, with teacher stepping, when appropriate, to the side.

40. Teacher successfully engages all students in the discussion.

41. Representation of content is appropriate and links well with students' knowledge.

42. Activities and assignments are appropriate to students and are engaging.

43. Instructional groups are productive and appropriate.

44. Instructional materials and resources are suitable to instructional goals.

45. Lessons have clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized.

46. Teacher feedback to students is of high quality.

47. Feedback to students is provided in a timely manner.

48. Teacher is able to make an adjustment to a lesson, and the adjustment occurs smoothly.

49. Teacher accommodates students' questions or interests.

50. Teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning.

51. Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its goal.

52. Teacher is able to make specific suggestions on how a lesson might be improved.

53. Teacher's system of maintaining information on student completion of assignments is effective.

54. Teacher's system for maintaining information on student progress in learning is effective.

55. Teacher's system for maintaining information on noninstructional information is effective.

56. Teacher provides frequent information to parents about the instructional program.

57. Teacher communicates with parents about students' progress on a regular basis.

58. Teacher's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.

59. Teacher's relationship with colleagues is cooperative and supportive.

60. Teacher volunteers to participate in school events making a substantial contribution.

61. Teacher volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution.

62. Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.

63. Teacher participates actively in assisting other educators.

64. Teacher is moderately active in serving student needs.

65. Teacher works within a particular team or department to ensure that students receive a fair opportunity to succeed.

66. Teacher maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision-making.

Appendix B - **Invitation to Study Email**

Dear Kansas Athletic Director,

You are invited to participate in a statewide athletic director online survey about high school athletic coaching and evaluation. This is a doctoral dissertation research project at Kansas State University. The questionnaire will ask a few demographic questions, is only 41 questions long, and should take about 5-10 minutes to complete. Participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or exit the research survey at any time without penalty. You are free to not answer any question that you do not feel comfortable answering for any reason. You will not receive any direct benefits from participating in this study. However, your responses may help us better understand how high school athletic directors perceive quality high school athletic coaching and evaluation.

There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this study. The survey will be sent to all 353 Kansas high school athletic directors. The survey answers will be collected using a program called Qualtrics and it will not collect any identifiable information. Therefore, your responses will be anonymous, and no one will know if you participated in the study or not.

If you have any problems/questions about the study, you may contact me, Erin Oliver, at eoliver@ksu.edu. I am a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at Kansas State University and this project is part of my doctoral degree. Dr. Jia Liang and Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw are my dissertation advisors and principal investigators for the project.

Should you have any questions or want to discuss any part of the research with an official of the university or the IRB, please contact: Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224 or Cheryl Doerr, Associate Vice President for Research Compliance, 203

Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224. By clicking on the link to participate you are giving consent to be a participant.

Thank you,

Erin Oliver

Doctoral Student

Educational Leadership Department

Kansas State University

Appendix C - **Survey**

Please complete the following demographic information. At any point in the survey you may click to go back to previous questions or to skip a question before you submit your responses.

Demographic Questions.

1. What KSHSAA classification is your school? 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, 6A

2. How many years of experience do you have as a high school athletic director? 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 30+

3. What is your gender? M F

4. Do you formally evaluate head high school athletic coaches in your school district? Y N

5. Do you conduct formal walkthroughs and observations of head coaches during practice to support your evaluation?

Formal Walkthroughs and observations are defined as: Brief visits to practice that are scheduled by you the athletic director using an evaluation tool or checklist to mark specific "look-for" items that you observe.

Y N

Please indicate the extent to which you agree that the following components are important to effective high school athletic coaching.

To indicate your responses to the survey questions please select one of the following choices:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SA	A	DA	SD

To what extent do you agree that the following is important to effective high school athletic coaching?

1.Coach displays a solid content knowledge.

2. Coach's practice and game plans reflect an understanding among player/coach relationships and concepts taught.

3. Pedagogical practices reflect current research. (Example: The Coach is teaching the concept of their sport in the safest and most effective way.)

4. Coach displays an understanding of developmental characteristics of student-athletes.

5. Coach displays knowledge of student-athlete's skills and knowledge.

6. Student athlete goals are valuable in their level of expectation.

7. Athletic instructional groups are varied and appropriate.

8. Coach-student-athlete interactions are friendly, demonstrate general warmth, caring and respect, and are appropriate to developmental and cultural norms of students.

9. Student-athlete interactions with coach are generally polite and respectful.

10. Coach conveys genuine enthusiasm for the subject, and student-athletes demonstrate commitment to its value.

11. Student-athletes accept coach's insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.

12. Athletic goals, activities, interactions, and practice environment convey high expectations for achievement.

13. Tasks for groups are organized and student-athletes are engaged.

14. Standards of conduct are clear to all student-athletes.

15. Coach is alert to student-athlete behavior.

16. Coach response to misbehavior is appropriate and respectful of the student-athlete's dignity.

17. The practice is safe and the equipment is a resource for learning activities.

18. Coach uses physical resources skillfully, and all learning is equally accessible to all student-athletes.

19. Coach's directions and procedures are clear to student-athletes and contain an appropriate level of detail.

20. Coach's spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to student-athlete's age and interests.

21. Representation of content (game knowledge) is appropriate and links well with student-athletes' knowledge.

22. Athletic instructional groups are productive and appropriate.

23. Practices have clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized.

24. Coach feedback to student-athletes is of high quality.

25. Feedback to student-athletes is provided in a timely manner.

26. Coach is able to make an adjustment to a practice, and the adjustment occurs smoothly.

27. Coach accommodates student-athlete's questions or interests.

28. Coach persists in seeking approaches for student-athletes who have difficulty learning.

29. Coach makes an accurate assessment of a practice's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its goal.

30. Coach is able to make specific suggestions on how a practice might be improved.

31. Coach's system for maintaining information on non-athletic information is effective. (Example: physicals, parent contact information, emergency action plans, and inventory check in/check out.)

32. Coach provides frequent information to parents about the athletic program.

33. Coach's efforts to engage families in the athletic program are frequent and successful. (Example: Coach invites families to parent meetings, games, team events, etc. and gets families to attend.)

34. Coach's relationship with colleagues is cooperative and supportive.

35. Coach volunteers to participate in school events making a substantial contribution. (Example: The coach volunteers to run the clock or keep score at a home event. Just attending to watch would not be a substantial contribution.)

36. Coach volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution. (Example: The school or district implements a new technology program and the coach volunteers to help.)

37. Coach seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.

38. Coach participates actively in assisting other coaches.

39. Coach is moderately active in serving student-athlete needs. (Example: The coach directs the student-athlete to meet with the school counselor or other appropriate school resource to help student-athletes with individual needs.)

40. Coach works within athletic department to ensure that students receive a fair opportunity to succeed. (Example: The coach asks for JV and C team games added due to large numbers.

41. Coach maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision-making.

Appendix D - **Proposed Coaching Evaluation**

Table C.1.

Proposed Coaching Evaluation

Factor 1: Coaching Culture	**Unsatisfactory**	**Basic**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
1. Student-athlete accepts coach's insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.	□ Student-athletes show little or no pride in their team and participation.	□ Student-athletes accept some responsibility in producing quality work and pride in the athletic program.	□Student-athletes accept the coach's insistence of high-quality work and take pride in the athletic program.	□Student-athletes demonstrate high quality work, take pride, value the work of the athletic program, and buy in to the program.
2. Athletic goals, activities, interactions, and practice environment convey high expectations for achievement.	□High expectations for achievement are not present in the athletic goals, activities, interactions, or in the practice environment.	□Some high expectations are present in athletic goals, activities, interaction, and in the practice environment.	□Athletic goals, activities, interactions, and the practice environment all demonstrate high expectations for achievement.	□Athletic goals, activities, interactions, and the practice environment all demonstrate high expectations for achievement and all outcomes are directly connected to a high quality of work and the goals of the athletic program.
3. Tasks for groups are organized and student-athletes are engaged.	□Tasks for groups are not organized and little to no student-athletes are engaged.	□Tasks for all groups are organized and some student-athletes are engaged.	□Tasks for all groups are organized and all student-athletes are engaged.	□Tasks for all groups are organized, all student-athletes are always engaged, and student-athletes take ownership

				for the task at hand.
4.Standards of conduct are clear to all student-athletes.	□Standards of conduct are not clearly defined to student-athletes.	□Standards of conduct are defined to student-athletes.	□Standards of conduct are clearly defined to student-athletes and coach monitors student-athlete conduct.	□Standards of conduct are clearly defined to student-athletes, coach monitors conduct, and student-athletes participated in the development of the standards of conduct.
5.Coach is alert to student-athlete behavior.	□ Coach is unaware of student-athlete behavior.	□Coach is somewhat aware of student-athlete behavior but may not monitor all behaviors.	□Coach is always aware of all student-athlete behaviors.	□Coach is aware of student-athlete behavior and helps teach student-athletes to model and monitor behavior of teammates.
6.Coach response to misbehavior is appropriate and respectful of the student-athletes dignity.	□Coach does not react to student-athlete misbehavior.	□Coach will somewhat attempt to address student-athlete misbehavior but is inconsistent.	□Coach responds to student-athlete misbehavior immediately and appropriately.	□Coach response to student-athlete misbehavior is immediate, appropriate, and sensitive to student-athlete needs.
7. The practice is safe and the equipment is a resource for learning activities.	□The practice is unsafe and equipment is not a resource for all student-athletes.	□ The practice is safe but not all equipment is a resource for all student-athletes.	□The practice is safe and the equipment is a resource for all student-athletes.	□The practice is safe, the equipment is a resource for all student-athletes, and learning is taking place by all student-athletes.
8. Coach uses physical resources skillfully and all learning is equally	□Coach poorly uses physical resources for	□Coach uses physical resources but is	□Coach uses physical resources	□Coach and all student-athletes use physical

accessible to all student-athletes.	learning activities.	lacking effectiveness for all student-athletes.	efficiently for all student-athlete learning.	resources and all know to adjust resources to the level of the student-athlete.
9. Coach's directions and procedures are clear to student-athletes and contain an appropriate level of detail.	□Coach's directions and procedures are confusing to student-athletes.	□Coach's directions and procedures are further explained after student-athlete confusion is identified.	□Coach's directions and procedures are clear and direct to student-athletes.	□Coach's directions and procedures are clear and the coach addresses anticipated questions in the directions.
10.Coach's spoken and written language is clear and correct as well as appropriate to student-athlete's age and interests.	□Coach's spoken and written language is inappropriate or grammatically incorrect.	□Coach's spoken language is audible and written language is correct but not always appropriate.	□Coach's spoken and written language is clear and correct and appropriate for student-athletes and parents.	□Coach's spoken and written language is clear and correct and enriches their athletic program.
11. Athletic instructional groups are productive and appropriate.	□Student-athletes are not working with the coach and are not engaged in practice.	□Student-athletes in some groups are engaged.	□Student-athletes in all instructional groups are organized and engaged.	□Student-athletes in all instructional groups are organized, engaged, and productive at all times.
12.Practices have clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized.	□Practices are not structured, and activities are unorganized.	□Practices are structured, and activities are organized.	□Practices are structured, activities are organized, and student-athletes are engaged.	□Practices are structured, activities are organized, student-athletes are engaged, and activities in practice are adjusted to the level of the student-athlete.
13.Coach feedback to the student-athletes is of high quality.	□Coach's feedback to student-	□Coach's feedback to	□Coach's feedback is of	□Coach's feedback is of high quality,

	athletes is of poor quality and/or negative.	student-athletes is provided.	high quality and positive.	positive, and student-athletes learn from their feedback.
14.Feedback to student-athletes is provided in a timely manner.	□Coach's feedback to student-athletes is not provided in a timely manner.	□Coach's feedback to student-athletes is provided in a timely manner.	□Coach's feedback to student-athletes is provided immediately.	□Coach's feedback to student-athletes is provided immediately and connects student-athletes' knowledge and experience.
15.Coach is able to make specific suggestions on how a practice might be improved.	□Coach is unable to make specific suggestions on how a practice might be improved.	□Coach is able to make basic suggestions on improving a practice.	□Coach is able to make specific suggestions in detail on improving a practice.	□Coach is able to make specific suggestions in detail on improving a practice and creates new practice plans to address specific details or concepts taught.
16. Coach's relationships with colleagues is cooperative and supportive.	□Coach's relationships with colleagues are negative or non-existent.	□Coach works with colleagues to fulfill their coaching duty.	□Coach's relationships with colleagues demonstrate support and teamwork.	□Coach's relationships with colleagues demonstrate support, teamwork, and coach demonstrates leadership among colleagues.
17. Coach seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.	□Coach does not engage in professional development.	□Coach participates in professional development only when asked.	□Coach seeks out professional development to enhance content knowledge and improve their skills.	□Coach seeks out professional development to enhance content knowledge, improve their skills, and applies what they have learned.

Factor 2: Content Knowledge	**Unsatisfactory**	**Basic**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
1. Coach displays a solid content knowledge.	□Coach makes mistakes in teaching the sport and/or does not address student-athletes making mistakes.	□Coach is familiar with the most important concepts of the sport.	□Coach displays a solid content knowledge of the most important concepts of the sport and knows how they should be taught.	□Coach displays a wealth of content knowledge of the most important concepts of the sport, knows how they should be taught, and teaches how all skills and concepts are related.
2. Coach's practice and game plans reflect an understanding among player/coach relationships and concepts taught.	□Coach's practice and game plans reflect little understanding of player/coach relationships and previous concepts taught.	□Coach's practice and game plans reflect somewhat of an understanding of player/coach relationships and previous concepts taught.	□Coach's practice and game plans reflect an accurate understanding of player/coach relationships and previous concepts taught.	□Coach's practice and game plans reflect an accurate understanding of relationships, concepts taught, and link student-athlete understanding to athletic program goals.
3. Pedagogical practices reflect current research.	□Coach displays little or no comprehension of current pedagogical practices for their sport	□Coach's practices and game plans reflect a limited amount of pedagogical practices for their sport	□Coach's practices and game plans reflect a variety of pedagogical practices for their sport	□Coach's practices and game plans reflect a variety of pedagogical practices for their sport and they address anticipated student-athlete misconceptions
4. Coach displays an understanding of developmental	□ Coach displays no knowledge of	□Coach displays some knowledge of student-athlete development.	□Coach displays an accurate knowledge of	□ Coach displays an accurate knowledge of

characteristics of student-athletes.	student-athlete development.		student-athlete development.	student-athlete development and displays knowledge of the progression student-athletes should follow for development.
5.Coach displays knowledge of student-athlete's skills and knowledge.	□Coach is not aware of student-athlete's skills and knowledge.	□Coach is aware of student-athlete's skills and knowledge.	□Coach is aware of student-athlete's skills and knowledge and adjusts practice and game plans accordingly.	□Coach is aware of student-athlete's skills and knowledge, adjusts practice and game plans accordingly, and continually checks for understanding and/or improvement.
Factor 3: Servant Leadership	**Unsatisfactory**	**Basic**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
1. Student-athlete goals are valuable in level of expectations.	□Student-athlete goals reflect low expectations and do not emphasize improvement in the athletic program.	□Student-athletes goals reflect some high expectations and improvement in the athletic program.	□Student-athlete goals all reflect high expectations and improvement in the athletic program.	□Student-athlete goals all reflect high expectations, improvement in the athletic program, and emphasize the value of the student-athlete within the athletic program.
2. Coach's efforts to engage families in the athletic program are frequent and successful.	□Coach makes no attempt to engage families in the athletic program.	□Coach makes a few attempts to engage families in the athletic program.	□Coach engages families in the athletic program frequently.	□Coach engages families in the athletic program frequently and successfully gets family participation.

3. Coach volunteers to participate in school events making a substantial contribution.	□Coach does not become involved in or helps work school events.	□Coach participates/helps with school events when specifically asked.	□Coach volunteers to participate/help work school events making a substantial contribution.	□Coach volunteers to participate/help work school events making a substantial contribution and takes on a leadership role.
4. Coach volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution.	□Coach does not become involved in school and district projects.	□Coach participates in school and district projects when specifically asked.	□Coach volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution.	□Coach volunteers to participate in school and district projects making a substantial contribution and takes on a leadership role.
5. Coach participates actively in assisting other coaches.	□Coach does not assist other coaches.	□Coach will assist other coaches when asked.	□Coach participates actively in assisting other coaches.	□Coach participates actively in assisting other coaches and takes on a mentor or leadership role.
6. Coach maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision making.	□Coach makes decisions based on self-interests or the interests of only their athletic program.	□Coach makes decisions considering other athletic programs.	□Coach maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision making.	□Coach maintains an open mind, participates in team or departmental decision making, and displays professionalism.