Erasmus+ Programme – Strategic Partnership

TELESPA - **Te**aching **le**arning **spa**ces competence from early childhood education

Project No.:2018-1-RO01-KA201-049545

2019 National Research Report on Learning space practices and Teachers' competence in Romania

Primary school institutions

AUTHORS:

Gianina-Ana MASSARI, Education Sciences Department, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania

Loredana-Ruxandra GHERASIM, Psychology Department, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania

Alexandra MAFTEI, Education Sciences Department, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania

Florentina-Manuela MIRON, Education Sciences Department, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania

Abstract
Our primary aim in the current research report was to explore the quality of primary school institutions in Romania using the Marzano Protocol in a sample of 14 primary school education institutions (i.e., primary school classrooms). Given the extensive findings related to the importance of the school environments' physical conditions, the quality and frequency of interaction between children and teacher, in addition to other educational particularities for children's cognitive and socio-emotional development, we consider the present study highly important for both policymakers, parents and teachers alike. Our detailed, item-by-item analyses revealed that Romanian primary school classrooms are insufficient equipped to provide a qualitative learning environment (e.g., insufficient educational teaching materials for children, a rigid daily schedule with no opportunities for individual or small group work or play). The findings provide a multidimensional assessment of the learning environment and interaction in educational programs for children aged 6 to 11, and thus to gain a better understanding of what kinds of programming have been conducted to improve children's social and emotional competence according to the quality of learning environment.

Keywords: learning environment, daycare classrooms, preschool classrooms, health, quality environment

General framework

Marzano Teacher Evaluation Protocol was designed to increase teachers' development and to evaluate teachers' performance effectively. This protocol consists of three categories: Involving Routine Events, Addressing Content, and Enacted on the Spot. Each category has its own sub-categories, making all together 9 sub-categories, which are Communicating Learning Goals and Feedback, Establishing Rules and Procedures, Helping Students Interact with New Knowledge, Helping Students Practice and Deepen New Knowledge, Helping Students Generate and Test Hypotheses, Engaging Students, Recognizing Adherence to Rules and Procedures, Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships With Students, Communicating High Expectations for All Student. There are all together 41 items in the protocol. Each item was evaluated by taking into consideration 4 levels that are "not using level (0 point)", "beginning (1 point)", "developing (2 points)", "applying (3 points)", "innovating (4 points)".

Total average scores of sub-categories of Marzano Teachers' evaluation Protocol of 19 primary schools is given in the next table. When it is closely examined, it is seen that the scores are scattered between 1.16 and 4 points. Out of the 19 primary classrooms observed, none received innovating quality. When average scores of each **sub category of all schools** are considered, it appears that for all sub-categories the average scores were found. That means that teachers used educational games, response rate techniques through questioning processes,

physical movement, pacing techniques, and friendly controversy techniques to maintain student engagement. Additionally, they demonstrated intensity and enthusiasm by sharing a deep level of content knowledge in a variety of ways, provided students with opportunities to relate what was being addressed in a class to their personal interest. However, teachers did not adapt and created new strategies for individual needs of students and situations.

The findings gathered regarding 9 sub-categories are given below by comparing the scores of 14 schools.

I. Routine Strategies

1. Communicating Learning Goals and Feedback

This sub category evaluates how teachers provide rigorous learning goals and performance scales or rubrics and monitor students' understanding of the learning goal and levels of performance. Moreover, this item evaluates how teachers facilitate tracking of student progress on one or more learning goals and/or targets using a formative approach to assessment. Total score of this sub category is evaluated based on 19 schools. One classroom of these schools was observed as being at developing level (received 1.41 points) in this sub category. On the other hand, 12 classrooms' scores are at applying level and two schools have been assessed as to have a structuring at innovating level. This result shows that two classrooms adapt and create new strategies for unique student needs and situations.

2. Establishing Rules and Procedures

This sub-category evaluates how teachers establish expectations regarding rules and procedures that facilitate students working individually, in groups, and as a whole class. It also evaluates how teachers organize the physical layout of the classroom to facilitate movement and support learning. There are two classrooms as being at developing level in this sub category. Eleven classrooms' scores are at applying level and six of the classroom adapt and create new strategies for unique student needs and situations.

II. Addressing Content

3. Helping Students Interact with New Knowledge

This sub-category evaluates how teachers identify accurate critical content during a lesson or part of a lesson that portrays a clear progression of information that leads to deeper understanding of the content. The teachers organize students into appropriate groups to facilitate the processing of new content, engage students in previewing activities that allow students to access prior knowledge and analyze

information, engage student groups in processing new information to generate conclusions about new content, engage students in activities that require recording and representing knowledge emphasizing creation of a variety of types of models that organize and summarize the important content and that help them reflect on their learning and the learning process.

Four classrooms were observed as being at developing level (received 2 points) in this sub category, nine classrooms being at applying level and five at excellent levels. That means while some of the teachers prefer to use critical content, which is an accurate and clear progression of information, the other eight teachers also prefer to use signals to students critical versus non-critical content and monitor the extent to which students are attending to critical information.

4. Helping Students Practice and Deepen New Knowledge

This sub-category evaluates how teachers help students practice and deepen new knowledge. Two classrooms were observed as being at developing level (received 2 points) in this sub category. Twelve classrooms are observed as being at applying level. This means that most of the teachers engage students in a brief review that highlights the cumulative nature of the content and monitor the extent to which students can recall and describe previous content. Moreover, the teachers organize students into groups that appropriately facilitate practicing and deepening knowledge and monitor how much the group work learns. Five classrooms adapt and create new strategies for unique student needs and situations.

5. Helping Students Generate and Test Hypotheses

This sub-category evaluates how teachers appropriately organizes and guides groups to work on short- and long-term complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses. The teachers appropriately organize and guides groups to work on short- and long-term complex tasks that require them to generate and test hypotheses, engage students in the same tasks and act as resource provider and guide students to engage in short- and long-term complex tasks.

The scores obtained by the classrooms observed showed that four are at developing, fourteen at applying and only one at excellence level in this aspect. The findings showed none of the classrooms adapts and creates new strategies for unique student needs and situations at innovating level.

III. Enacted on the Spot

6. Engaging Students

This item evaluates how teacher engage students. The scores obtained by the classrooms observed showed that 4 classrooms were at developing, 13 at applying and two at excellence levels in this aspect. That means only two classrooms adapt and create new strategies for unique student needs and situations at innovating level. The results show that most of the teachers scan the room and be alert when students are engaged and take actions that use academic games, response rate techniques and physical movements.

7. Recognizing Adherence to Rules and Procedures

This item evaluates how teacher uses behaviors associated with "observing" to maintain implementation of the rules and procedures. The teachers consistently and fairly apply consequences for not following the rules and procedures, acknowledge implementation of the rules and procedures. Seven classrooms were at applying level and eight classrooms were at developing level and four classroom is graded as being at innovating level.

8. Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships With Students

This item evaluates how teacher uses students' interests and backgrounds to produce a climate of acceptance and community. The teacher uses verbal and nonverbal behaviors that demonstrate and foster respect for students' thinking and initiative. The teachers behave in an objective and controlled manner to demonstrate a commitment to students and academic rigor. Five classrooms are at developing and 12 at applying and two are at excellence levels.

9. Communicating High Expectations for All Student

This item evaluates how teacher exhibits behaviors that demonstrate value and respect for low expectancy students' thinking regarding the content. The teachers ask students questions about low expectancy with the same frequency and depth as with high expectancy students. The teachers probe incorrect answers of low expectancy students by requiring them to provide evidence for their conclusions and examine the sources of their evidence. Scores for this item ranges from developing (seven classrooms) to excellence levels (two classrooms).

Table X Average scores for Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model and its Sub-categories

	Public schools																	Private schools	
Average SUB Categories Scores of Marzono Protokol	1.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Communicating Learning Goals and Feedback	3.08	3.33	3.75	3.25	3.83	2.25	2.5	3	3.05	3.41	3.66	2.33	3.83	3.25	1.41	3	3.75	2.25	2.83
Establishing Rules and Procedures	3.75	3.75	2.75	2.87	4	3	2.25	2.75	2.75	3.25	3.5	2.87	4	3.25	2.62	3	3.5	2.12	3
Helping Students Interact with New Knowledge	3.12	3.59	3.53	2.43	3.5	2.06	2.37	3.20	3.06	3.40	3.56	2.84	3.71	2.96	2.25	3.03	3.4	2.75	3.31
Helping Students Practice and Deepen New Knowledge	3.32	3.57	3.07	2.46	3.92	2.85	3.07	2.90	2.95	2.85	3.53	2.75	3.82	2.98	2.28	3	3.57	3	2.75
Helping Students Generate and Test Hypotheses	3.33	3.41	2.25	2.16	3.41	2.41	2.75	2.83	2.66	3	3.25	2.58	3.75	3.16	1.58	3	2.91	2.66	3.25
Engaging Students	3	3.27	3.13	2.47	3.63	2.22	2.58	2.66	2.62	3.27	3.41	2.77	3.69	3.11	2.33	2.91	2.44	2.61	3.25
Recognizing Adherence to Rules and Procedures	3	2.66	3.50	2.50	3.83	2.25	2.5	1.83	1.61	3.08	3.66	2.33	3.75	2.58	1.58	3.08	3.58	2.91	3
Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships With Students	3.33	3.16	3.50	2.08	3.5	2.33	2.33	2.77	2.44	3.5	3.25	2.58	3.91	2.91	1.5	2.83	3.66	2.83	3.08
Communicating High Expectations for All Students	3	3.25	3.33	3.08	3.5	**2.25**	1.91	2.22	**2.05**	3.16	3.58	2.25	3.66	2.91	1.16	2.91	2.58	2.33	3.25
Total mean sub categories score	3.21	3.33	3.2	2.58	3.68	2.4	2.47	2.68	2.57	3.1	3.42	2.89	3.79	3.01	1.85	2.97	3.26	2.6	3.08

Note: 1. Sc. BP Hasdeu; 2. Sc. V Conta, 3. Sc Barsanescu, 4. Sc Cazimir, 5. Sc Simionescu, 6. Sc Teodoreanu , 7. Sc Creanga, 8. Sc Sturza, 9. Sc Silva, 10. Sc Asachi, 11. Sc Cosbuc, 12. Sc Carol I, 13. Sc Russo, 14. Sc Al cel Bun, 15. Sc Calinescu, 16. Sc O Bacila, 17. Sc Ibraileanu 18. Sc Junior, 19. Euoed 1

Acknowledgement: This research was created within Educational resource created within the Erasmus+ program, Strategic partnerships in the area of school education: ”Teaching learning spaces competence from early childhood education”, Ref. no. 2018-1-RO01-KA201-049545 Erasmus+