

Copyright © 2021 Lindsey Brook Wilkerson

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation, or instruction.

EVALUATING HIGH SCHOOL CHURCH CURRICULA VIA
THE DANIELSON FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING:
A QUANTITATIVE APPROACH

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Lindsey Brook Wilkerson
December 2021

APPROVAL SHEET

EVALUATING HIGH SCHOOL CHURCH CURRICULA VIA
THE DANIELSON FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING:
A QUANTITATIVE APPROACH

Lindsey Brook Wilkerson

Read and Approved by:

Anthony W. Foster (Chair)

Jeffrey M. Horner

Date _____

To Paul: my husband, my best friend, and my thinking partner. I could not have started or completed this work without your support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | viii |
| PREFACE | ix |
| Chapter | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| The Research Problem | 1 |
| Overarching Problem: Christianity in the U.S..... | 1 |
| Narrowing the Problem: Christian Education..... | 2 |
| Specific Problem: Church Curriculum | 4 |
| Significance of the Study | 9 |
| Research Purpose | 10 |
| Delimitations of the Proposed Research | 11 |
| Research Questions | 12 |
| Proposed Instrumentation..... | 12 |
| Procedural Overview..... | 13 |
| Conclusion | 15 |
| 2. LITERATURE REVIEW | 16 |
| Theological Foundation for Christian Education..... | 16 |
| Vision for Christian Education..... | 18 |
| Current Status of Christian Education | 21 |
| The Role of Curriculum in Christian Education | 22 |
| Constructivism Overview..... | 23 |
| Biblically Flawed Components of Constructivism..... | 25 |
| Biblically Cohesive Benefits of Constructivism..... | 28 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|-----------|
| Faith-Based Constructivism: A Biblical Integration..... | 31 |
| A Faith-Based Constructivist Approach for Transformational Teaching | 33 |
| Transformational Teaching: A Perspective Shift..... | 35 |
| Creating a Culture of Thinking and Discussion..... | 38 |
| Effective Questioning and Discussion..... | 41 |
| Deeper Learning | 42 |
| Assessment and Feedback | 44 |
| A Faith-Based Constructivist Curriculum for Transformational Teaching | 45 |
| Deficient Curriculum Design..... | 46 |
| Curriculum and Secular Education | 47 |
| Curriculum and Church Education | 48 |
| Curriculum Goals..... | 49 |
| Evaluating Church Curriculum | 51 |
| Church Curriculum Evaluation Components..... | 55 |
| Danielson Framework for Teaching: Addressing the Evaluation Gap | 58 |
| FFT: A Research-Based Evaluation Tool..... | 59 |
| FFT Components | 60 |
| FFT: Domains 1 and 3 | 61 |
| Conclusion | 62 |
| 3. METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN..... | 64 |
| Research Design Overview | 65 |
| Population | 65 |
| Sample and Delimitations | 65 |
| Limitations of Generalization | 66 |
| Research Method and Instrumentation..... | 66 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------------|
| Ethics Committee Process..... | 70 |
| Research Procedures | 70 |
| Scoring Criteria | 74 |
| Summary | 74 |
| 4. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS..... | 75 |
| Compilation Protocol..... | 75 |
| Phase 1 | 75 |
| Phase 2..... | 77 |
| Phase 3..... | 82 |
| Phase 4..... | 84 |
| Results by Research Question..... | 86 |
| Research Question 1..... | 86 |
| Research Question 2..... | 87 |
| Research Question 3..... | 89 |
| Research Question 4..... | 90 |
| Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness..... | 91 |
| Designing Student Assessments | 93 |
| Using Assessments in Instruction..... | 95 |
| Setting Instructional Outcomes..... | 98 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques | 99 |
| Research Question 5..... | 102 |
| Summary of Analysis..... | 104 |
| 5. CONCLUSION | 107 |
| Research Purpose | 107 |
| Research Questions | 108 |

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Research Conclusions | 108 |
| Research Question 1 Conclusions | 108 |
| Research Question 2 Conclusions | 109 |
| Research Question 3 Conclusions | 111 |
| Research Question 4 Conclusions | 112 |
| Research Question 5 Conclusions | 118 |
| Evaluation of the Research Design | 120 |
| Research Strengths..... | 120 |
| Research Weaknesses | 120 |
| Research Applications..... | 122 |
| Curriculum Design Reformation for Churches..... | 122 |
| Assessment Utilization for Churches..... | 126 |
| FFT Utilization for Churches..... | 126 |
| Contribution of Research to the Precedent Literature..... | 128 |
| Further Research | 128 |
| Conclusion | 129 |
| Appendix | |
| 1. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO THE DANIELSON FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING FOR CURRICULUM EVALUATION | 131 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 151 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. FFT domains and components..... | 60 |
| 2. Evaluation of each curriculum component..... | 70 |
| 3. Evaluation of overall curricula scores | 71 |
| 4. Evaluation of overall component scores..... | 72 |
| 5. Curriculum 1 scores..... | 76 |
| 6. Curriculum 2 scores..... | 77 |
| 7. Curriculum 3 scores..... | 78 |
| 8. Curriculum 4 scores..... | 79 |
| 9. Curriculum 5 scores..... | 80 |
| 10. Overall curricula scores | 82 |
| 11. Overall component Scores..... | 83 |

PREFACE

This project is not only a reflection of my own work and passion for improving Christian education but also the reflection of countless individuals who have taught me, encouraged me, challenged me, and supported me along the way. First and foremost, my wonderful husband, Paul, sparked my interest in pursuing a Doctor of Education. Without his encouragement and belief in my abilities, I would have remained content. He was also my motivator, thinking partner, and constant support when the work was hard and time consuming. He is my favorite teacher, my voice of reason, and my very best friend.

Second, Dr. John David Trentham persisted in answering my many questions, pushed me to persevere when I wasn't sure I could continue, and has always been such a kind encourager. Special thanks also go to Dr. Timothy Paul Jones, who wisely balanced the amount of challenge and productive struggle with the guidance and support that was essential for my learning and growth as a writer. Dr. Anthony Foster, my academic advisor, has not only offered wonderful insight and feedback for this project but also made a lasting impact on my knowledge for teaching, curriculum design, and effective instruction. I have been deeply impacted by his kind and encouraging words and his belief in me as a student and leader.

There are numerous people that have challenged me to become a critical thinker and to grow as a learner, teacher, and leader. Dr. Robert Lyons first inspired my love for learning and leading at Murray State University. Mrs. Pat Gold gave me an opportunity to serve in a challenging role that required much growth and quick learning, yet she always supported and encouraged me. An unexpected friendship was bestowed upon me by my supervisor of instruction, Mrs. Carla Whitis. She challenged me in ways that I didn't always recognize at the time, but that I feel certain she had purposefully masterminded. She stretched me to think, read, and grow as I slowly shifted from a shy

young professional into a more confident and compassionate leader. She was the perfect blend of coach and friend, and without her support, I would not be the learner or leader I am today.

I am so thankful for the love and support of my parents, Jeff and Carolyn Downing. They have provided constant support and encouragement. Jayden, Kanyn, and Kye, my three wonderful boys, have shown me support through their sacrifice, patience, and cheers. They are my happy place. My “Sunday school girls” first ignited my passion for teaching the Bible. They helped me see the overwhelming responsibility and impact of Christian education. I am so proud of the young ladies they have become and for their hearts for Jesus and his kingdom. While they believe I was pushing them to think and make the Bible come alive, they were simultaneously pushing me to see God’s greater plans and purposes and a new passion for impacting the world through Christian education. I would not have pursued this path if it weren’t for their kind encouragement and thankfulness that motivated me more than they will ever know.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, who has been so many things in my life: Savior, Lord, Rock, Fortress, Friend, Coach, and much more. He has blessed me more than I deserve, and I pray that my life can glorify him forever.

Lindsey Wilkerson

Mayfield, Kentucky

December 2021

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

How do our young people leave their Sunday School classrooms on Sunday morning? With eyes sparkling with new vision and insight? With serious determination to practice the will of God? With chin up ready to face an unbelieving world in the power of the spirit? With deep questions about God himself? Too often they are glad for the release from a dull, boring session.¹

While Scripture-based instruction is essential in molding young people into spiritual maturity and moving them toward Christlikeness, there is a significant difference in instruction and effective instruction. The research concern begins at the large-scale level by looking at Christianity in the U.S. and then narrows by examining Christian education and church curriculum specifically.

The Research Problem

Overarching Problem: Christianity in the U.S.

A Pew Research Center survey in 2018 and 2019 concludes that the number of Americans who describe themselves as Christians is now 65 percent, which is down twelve percentage points in the last decade.² “The Great Opportunity,” produced by the Pinetops Foundation, reports that thirty-five million youth raised in Christian homes will not call themselves Christians by 2050.³ The church is losing a future source of leaders,

¹ Lois E. LeBar, *Education That Is Christian* (Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 1995), 21.

² Pew Center Research, “In U.S., Decline of Christianity Continues at Rapid Pace,” Religion & Public Life Project (blog), October 17, 2019, www.pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/, 1.

³ Pinetops Foundation, “The Great Opportunity: The American Church in 2050,” 2018, www.greatopportunity.org, 9. This report is a collection of data from many surveys and research studies exploring religion in the U.S., along with fertility, mortality, and immigration, to predict how the U.S. church will look in the next thirty years. The Pinetops Foundation is a private foundation that looks to find

pastors, teachers, and parents, and the potential for a massive decline in the American church is a genuine concern.⁴ Research conducted by the Search Institute indicates alarming results.⁵ Only 11 percent of teens and 32 percent of professing Christians have a well-developed faith.⁶ Furthermore, while the U.S. population has grown by 27 percent, Sunday school attendance has dropped from forty-one million to twenty-six million since 1972, according to the *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches*.⁷

Narrowing the Problem: Christian Education

The U.S. is losing professing Christians, Sunday school members, church leaders, and spiritually mature church members. According to “Effective Christian Education,” a study conducted by Search Institute, Christian education plays a significant role in this decline. The study summarizes that “effective Christian education is the most powerful single influence congregations have on maturity of faith,” yet “many of the factors needed for effectiveness in Christian education are not currently operating in large numbers of congregations.”⁸ The authors call for a reform in Christian education, adding that “if congregations heed the call for strengthening Christian education, many of the

innovative solutions to long-term structural problems. It is founded and run by entrepreneurs; Pinetops seeks out extraordinary leaders and communities who have the potential to create a major impact. Pinetops approaches philanthropy through the lens of a Christian faith and generally affirms the principles found in the Lausanne Covenant.

⁴ Pinetops Foundation, “The Great Opportunity,” 9.

⁵ Search Institute, “Effective Christian Education: A National Study of Protestant Congregations” (Minneapolis: Search Institute, 1990), 2-5. This three-and-a-half-year project studied six Protestant denominations in the U.S., including 11,122 persons in 561 congregations. The Search Institute states that its mission is to partner with organizations to conduct and apply research that promotes positive youth development and advances equity. They generate knowledge through mixed-methods research, develop and disseminate resources based on research, and partner with others to improve outcomes.

⁶ Search Institute, “Effective Christian Education,” 25.

⁷ *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994) quoted in Tom Schultz and Joani Schultz, *Why Nobody Learns Much of Anything at Church and How to Fix It* (Loveland, CO: Group, 2004), 8.

⁸ Search Institute, “Effective Christian Education,” 3.

problems now plaguing mainline denominations may be arrested, including the highly-publicized loss of members and the equally troubling problem of member inactivity.”⁹

The “Effective Christian Education” study, along with other reports, indicates that Christian education has not evolved in appropriate ways to meet new challenges.¹⁰

“American Christians are woefully unprepared to be responsible agents of their faith. They know too little of its story, its teaching, and its moral framework to exemplify and testify to their faith in a pluralist society.”¹¹

“The Great Opportunity” calls for the transformation of youth discipleship, arguing that ministry models used for the past fifty years are becoming less effective.¹² It claims that youth need to be equipped to be missionaries to reach their peers and that youth ministry must be revamped in order to be “Gospel advancing and disciple-multiplying.”¹³ The report adds that youth are leaving the church because they are uninterested in the Christian life instead of due to a crisis of faith or intellectual rejection.¹⁴ Mark Rutter argues that the lives of Christians look very similar to those of non-Christians, pointing to the fact that although “we live in a culture where Christian literature, broadcasts, and churches abound, the lives of Christians are not necessarily being transformed.”¹⁵

Similarly, Dan Lambert claims that based on anecdotal and statistical evidence, we are losing our youth because we have done a poor job of making disciples of the teens

⁹ Search Institute, “Effective Christian Education,” 3.

¹⁰ David Schuller, *Rethinking Christian Education* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 1993), 20.

¹¹ Schuller, *Rethinking Christian Education*, 20.

¹² Pinetops Foundation, “The Great Opportunity,” 10.

¹³ Pinetops Foundation, “The Great Opportunity,” 10.

¹⁴ Pinetops Foundation, “The Great Opportunity,” 10.

¹⁵ Mark V. Rutter, “A Holistic Approach to Learning: The Key to Change,” *Christian Education Journal* 10, no. 3 (1990): 63.

in our care.¹⁶ He argues that the church has failed to teach teens effectively, but even more so, it has failed to raise effective teachers.¹⁷ Lambert adds, “But, this doesn’t have to be the case. We can teach teenagers not just what the Bible says, but why we trust the Bible and how the Bible should make a difference in our everyday lives. And we can equip almost any willing Christian to be a very good teacher.”¹⁸ He suggests that the best way to reach the next generation of Christians is to teach holistically by feeding the soul, challenging the mind, strengthening the emotions, and guiding actions.¹⁹

Lois LeBar also point to the ineffectiveness of Christian education by stating that there are not enough missionaries or monetary support for those willing to go because we have failed to reach those in our churches effectively.²⁰ She claims, “Thousands who have been *exposed* to the truth in our Sunday Schools have never been *enlisted* for Christ. They have been part of the crowd that thronged Christ but have never touched the hem of his garment for themselves (Mark 5:24-34).”²¹

Specific Problem: Church Curriculum

Many factors contribute to effective Christian education or a lack thereof, including leadership, programs, teachers, classroom dynamics, relationships, and curriculum. John Hattie recently completed a fifteen-year synthesis of over eight hundred meta-analyses relating to achievement among school-aged students and the influences of such achievement. Hattie concluded with six signposts toward excellence in education.

¹⁶ Dan Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference: How to Teach for Holistic Impact* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 13.

¹⁷ Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference*, 13.

¹⁸ Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference*, 13.

¹⁹ Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference*, 15.

²⁰ LeBar, *Education That Is Christian*, 24.

²¹ LeBar, *Education That Is Christian*, 24 (emphasis original).

Each signpost reflects the importance of a high-quality teacher, with five out of the six explicitly indicating what effective teachers should do. The first signpost simply states, “Teachers are among the most powerful influences in learning.”²²

Interestingly, however, Eugene C. Roehlkepartain reports that only 34 percent of youth Christian education teachers understand the educational theory and practice of classroom instruction.²³ Church teachers often have little background or experience in effective teaching. In fact, church attendees rate the teaching of the church among the bottom in quality of instruction.²⁴ In fact, only 39 percent of Christian education teachers reported having a mature, well-developed faith.²⁵ However, only 57 percent of congregations offer any training for education volunteers.²⁶ Only 21 percent of church teachers are evaluated annually, which adds to the potential for ineffective instruction.²⁷

Ineffective Christian education is highly possible when combining the lack of knowledgeable teachers, quality on-going teacher training, and frequent teacher observations. While the argument for more qualified teachers, more teacher training, and more teacher evaluation would be plausible, it is a daunting task for churches, especially those who struggle to recruit teacher volunteers. Many churches “hand a teacher the curriculum and hope for the best.”²⁸

²² John Hattie, *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement* (London: Routledge, 2009), 238.

²³ Eugene C. Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church: Moving Christian Education to Center Stage* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 102.

²⁴ Schultz and Schultz, *Why Nobody Learns at Church*, 8.

²⁵ Schultz and Schultz, *Why Nobody Learns at Church*, 20.

²⁶ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 102.

²⁷ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 105.

²⁸ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 31.

Sunday school authorities claim that curriculum is a critical factor in the success of Sunday school.²⁹ With Scripture as a central core, a curriculum can have transformational power in a Christian's life as well as throughout a congregation, community, and—ultimately—the world.³⁰ Curriculum requires teachers to use flexibility in methodology, have a vast amount of biblical knowledge, have a high level of expertise in instructional practices, and have the ability to conduct a classroom technically.³¹ Therefore, curriculum should be designed in a way that accounts for, reduces, or eliminates the deficiencies in uneducated, untrained teachers and the lack of teacher observations and coaching for improvement.

Hattie's third signpost states, "Teachers need to be aware of what each and every student is thinking and knowing, to construct meaning and meaningful experiences in light of this knowledge, and have proficient knowledge and understanding of their content to provide meaningful and appropriate feedback."³² A well-designed curriculum can assist teachers in this endeavor. Hattie also explains that three specific aspects of curriculum have a significant impact on student learning: (1) developing a curriculum with a balance of surface-level knowledge and deep understanding, (2) focusing on learning strategies to construct meaning, and (3) planned, deliberate strategies that explicitly teach specific skills and deeper understanding.³³

Roehlkepartain reports that over 70 percent of Christian educators are satisfied with their curriculum, yet he argues that the curriculum's effectiveness should be

²⁹ Winona Walworth, "Educational Curriculum," in *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education*, ed. Werner C. Graendorf (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), 283.

³⁰ James Estep Jr, "Supervising Tour Group Itineraries: Administering Curriculum," in *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church: Cartography for Christian Pilgrims*, ed. James Estep Jr., Roger White, and Karen Estep (Nashville: B&H, 2012), 222.

³¹ Estep, "Supervising Tour Group Itineraries," 233.

³² Hattie, *Visible Learning*, 238.

³³ Hattie, *Visible Learning*, 35.

questioned.³⁴ He adds that “satisfaction does not necessarily indicate effectiveness. For example, does the curriculum emphasize the elements of content and process that are vital to helping people grow in faith? Do they provide adequate guidance for teachers, who often are not familiar with educational theory and practice?”³⁵ Educating students for lasting, transferrable learning that promotes Christlikeness is difficult, and satisfaction cannot be the measurement of a curriculum’s effectiveness.

According to Robert Pazmiño, a packaged curriculum does not currently provide the extent of guidance necessary for teachers unfamiliar with instructional theory. He suggests that published curriculum often focuses on behavioral objectives, neglecting a holistic approach that teachers must adopt in planning for problem-solving and activities for students.³⁶ He adds that there should be a space in the explicit curriculum for students to create, express, and explore new ways to apply the content learned and transfer insights learned, creating meaningful integration.³⁷ Pazmiño states, “The most common experience in teaching is that so much content is shared at the metaphoric table that students have little or no time to chew and digest the food – that is, to discuss and connect the content.”³⁸

Similarly, Robert Zais concludes that depth of learning is necessary, but due to the chronological framework of curriculum, it is often void of essential deep learning.³⁹ He argues for a balance of content-centered and student-centered education, with a focus

³⁴ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 82.

³⁵ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 82.

³⁶ Robert W. Pazmiño, *Principles and Practices of Christian Education: An Evangelical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 101.

³⁷ Pazmiño, *Principles and Practices of Christian Education*, 111.

³⁸ Pazmiño, *Principles and Practices of Christian Education*, 111.

³⁹ Robert S. Zais, *Curriculum: Principles and Foundations* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 440.

on student understanding and not merely content coverage. Zais adds, “A great deal of work still remains to be done in the development of [curriculum] designs that respects the logic and authority of knowledge and at the same time provide for the humane development of learners.”⁴⁰ Lambert also speaks on the need for depth of learning, stating, “We can’t assume that real learning has happened just because a student can accurately restate what was taught. Learning results in changed lives, not just knowing more info.”⁴¹

According to Roehlkepartain, youth programs often fall into one of two categories. Some programs are designed to promote having fun, making friends, and—only somewhat—growing in one’s faith, while others tend to be passive lecture-style programs reliant on telling students what to believe so they will not have to think. Roehlkepartain argues that “neither option is good if our goal is to nurture a vibrant, life-changing, life-shaping faith in young people. Youth whose intellectual capacities are growing exponentially, need a setting where they are challenged to think and ask the tough questions about their faith.”⁴²

Zais states that “problems of curriculum development in particular, are mainly the result of decisions based on unexamined assumptions, encapsulated perceptions, and cursory and superficial thinking and planning.”⁴³ While this statement was written several years ago, there is no current research insinuating that the dilemma has been resolved. Lambert claims that while commercial curricula have benefits for Christian education, there are many issues involved, and therefore one should evaluate the purpose of the

⁴⁰ Zais, *Curriculum*, 442.

⁴¹ Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference*, 79.

⁴² Eugene C. Roehlkepartain, “The Thinking Climate: A Missing Ingredient in Youth Ministry,” *Christian Education Journal* 15, no. 1 (1994): 53.

⁴³ Zais, *Curriculum*, 500.

curriculum, know how to decide if it is good or not, and know how to implement it.⁴⁴ According to Lambert, while curricula in the 1980s appeared to be “dumbed-down,” in the 1990s, publishers began producing curricula that helped teachers understand the learning process, the content, and how to best apply the curriculum to students. However, this information is mostly found in the curriculum’s introduction, which teachers often skip in order to quickly look over the lesson to be taught.⁴⁵ Lambert adds, “Publishers intend for teachers to adapt the materials for their own classes, not to teach it word-for-word as printed.”⁴⁶

What if it were no longer the untrained teacher’s responsibility to adapt the curriculum and design his or her own instruction? What if designers wrote the curriculum as a guide to effective instruction based on student exploration, deep thinking, and understanding about Scripture instead of a passive lecture-style “information dump”? Would this account for uneducated, minimally trained volunteer teachers and positively impact curriculum, Christian education, spiritual maturity among Christians, and the spread of the gospel among all nations?

Significance of the Study

As evident in the research problem, there are many recent studies on the condition of Christianity in the U.S. Several books have been written as a response to these studies offering suggestions for improving the state of Christianity, improving spiritual maturity among church members, and increasing the effectiveness of Christian education. There are claims that youth programs have swayed too much toward content and lecture or too far toward student-centered fun and games. However, there is a void in

⁴⁴ Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference*, 107.

⁴⁵ Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference*, 107.

⁴⁶ Lambert, *Teaching That Makes a Difference*, 108.

the research evaluating packaged curricula purchased and used in churches. Karen Estep and James Estep claim, “Evaluative assessment becomes the catalyst for change or improvement, the means for discovering strengths and areas that need strengthening.”⁴⁷ While there are guides for churches on evaluating curriculum for purchasing purposes, none specifically addresses the instructional quality of the curriculum. In fact, there is not currently a measurement tool, nor is there existing research on the evaluation of the instructional quality of curriculum available for purchase. Therefore, how do we know the curriculum we are handing teachers, often untrained and spiritually immature themselves, includes sufficient instructional practices and strategies for effectively educating our young people and growing them into Christlikeness?

I propose the use of the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) as an evaluation tool for assessing effectiveness of curriculum. The FFT was developed by Charlotte Danielson in 1996 based on her research of effective teaching and learning reflective of scientific, theoretical, and experiential findings.⁴⁸

Research Purpose

The purpose of this quantitative study was to evaluate select church curricula for effective instructional practices and the potential for student learning. Domains 1 and 3 of the Danielson Framework for Teaching provided evaluation criteria characteristics, and examples for assessing each curriculum, specifically in the areas of planning, preparation, and instruction.

The FFT was utilized to analyze, critique, and suggest improvement in the selected church curricula. This information was then generalized to all Sunday school or

⁴⁷ Karen Lynn Estep and James Riley Estep Jr, “Checking the Legend and Assessing the Journey: Curriculum Evaluation,” in Estep, White, and Estep, *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church*, 203.

⁴⁸ Charlotte Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd ed. (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007), 6-7.

small group curricula for high school students. Findings included strengths of the selected curricula as well as implications and suggestions for improvement, which also serve as guidelines for other high school small group materials. Next, modifications to curriculum design and recommendations for teacher evaluations were offered in order to increase student learning, spiritual maturity, and Christlike transformation.

Delimitations of the Proposed Research

Due to a large number of high school curricula in circulation, the quantitative study focused on evaluating high school discipleship and small group curricula from five of the best-selling published curricula among evangelical churches. This initial delimitation assisted in narrowing the curricula from the many publishing companies used among evangelical churches to five of the best-selling high school curricula. Although delimiting the evaluation process to only five curricula, the best-selling curricula delimitation purposively offered the largest representation of student learning experiences.

The Danielson Framework for Teaching was designed for use in classroom observations; however, since this study focused narrowly on the effectiveness of the curricula, the FFT was used to review and evaluate curricula as opposed to classroom observation. This eliminates the effects of diverse levels of skill and ability among teachers. The FFT consists of four domains: (1) Planning and Preparation, (2) Classroom Environment, (3) Instruction, and (4) Professional Responsibilities. This study focused on Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) and Domain 3 (Instruction) in order to evaluate curricula in a standalone fashion. The FFT is not intended to evaluate theological views; however, Domain 3A could be used in this manner. For this study, the FFT was only used to evaluate instructional effectiveness. Although appropriate theological teaching is essential, it was not the sole purpose of this particular study.

By evaluating the curricula as opposed to classroom observations, this study ruled out the effects of teacher training and influence, classroom dynamics, positive or negative relationships, and any factor outside of the curriculum contributing to instructional effectiveness. This study evaluated the potential for student learning based solely on the curricula and the characteristics applicable from the FFT.

Research Questions

The overarching question for this study was “According to the Danielson Framework for Teaching, what are common strengths and weaknesses among high school small group curricula, and what could increase their effectiveness in promoting transferrable learning and spiritual growth?” The following qualitative research questions assisted in answering the overarching question of this study:

1. What are five of the best-selling curricula among evangelical churches for high school Sunday school classes or small groups?
2. How does each curriculum score according to Domains 1 and 3 on the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT)?
3. Is church curriculum presently written in a way that trained or untrained teachers can effectively follow to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical knowledge and understanding into Christlike living?
4. Based on strengths and weaknesses of curricula according to Domains 1 and 3 on the FFT, what are suggestions and further implications for improving church curricula designed for high school students?
5. What are suggested practices in church contexts using the FFT for evaluation?

Proposed Instrumentation

This study utilized the Danielson Framework for Teaching, which was initially developed over two decades ago by Charlotte Danielson. It has been revised several times, most recently in 2013. The FFT is a research-based tool that describes components of effective instruction. The FFT is the most widely used tool for the evaluation of teaching practice in the U.S. It has influenced many other frameworks, evaluation rubrics, and policies. “The FFT has been applied to a variety of contexts and has evolved to align

to the new standards, been updated to include content-specific applications, and has the potential to be applied to countless strategic priorities, instructional approaches, and innovations.”⁴⁹

Procedural Overview

In order to execute this study, five of the best-selling evangelical curricula were selected, as these represent the largest population of student experiences. Based on the literature reviewed and internet searches, this information was not readily available, so further investigation was required. While there is not a list of the most popular or best-selling curricula, Christian Book Distributors (Christianbook.com) is a distributor of many published curricula for evangelical churches. I contacted them to obtain the five most popular publishing companies of teen small group curricula. From their list of five publishing companies with the most sales on their site, I contacted each company to find their best-selling curricula for teens. Then, I evaluated these five curricula.

Ten lessons from each curriculum were evaluated based on criteria from Domains 1 and 3 of the latest version (2013) of the Danielson Framework for Teaching.⁵⁰ Each of the five sections under Domains 1 and 3 of the FFT received a score ranging from 1 to 4 (1 = Ineffective; 2 = Developing; 3 = Accomplished; 4 = Exemplary). Each level of scoring has critical attributes to look for as well as possible examples.

Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) consists of five areas that are all applicable to this study:

Domain 1A: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy

Domain 1B: Demonstrating knowledge of students

⁴⁹ The Danielson Group, “Our Story,” accessed February 17, 2020, www.danielsongroup.org/our-story.

⁵⁰ The Danielson Group, “The Framework for Teaching,” accessed February 17, 2020, [www.http://2013_FfTEvalInstrument_Web_v1.2_20140825.pdf](http://2013_FfTEvalInstrument_Web_v1.2_20140825.pdf).

Domain 1C: Setting instructional outcomes

Domain 1D: Demonstrating knowledge of resources

Domain 1E: Designing coherent instruction

Domain 1F: Designing student assessments

Domain 2 (Classroom Environment) involves creating an atmosphere of respect and rapport, establishing a culture for learning, managing classroom procedures, managing student behavior, and organizing physical space. Evaluating curriculum alone using this domain is impossible due to the importance of student and teacher observation to score each criterion.

Domain 3 (Instruction) consists of five different areas that were applicable to this study:

Domain 3A: Communicating with students

Domain 3B: Using questioning and discussion techniques

Domain 3C: Engaging students in learning

Domain 3D: Using assessment in instruction

Domain 3E: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness

Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities) focuses solely on the teacher's professional responsibilities. This study did not include Domain 4 because it does not relate to curriculum evaluation. Domain 1 and Domain 3, including all components within each domain, were utilized to evaluate each of the five curricula selected.

All five curricula were rated from 1 to 4 for each component under each evaluated domain for each of the ten sample lessons. The ten sample lessons were averaged for one overall score for each domain per curricula. This rating system provided a potential for twenty points for each domain, a total of forty points overall. Each curriculum received an overall score, a score for each domain, a score for each component within each domain, and overall strengths and weaknesses according to results within each domain.

All five curricula evaluated were combined to find overall strengths and weaknesses per domain component. These results were then generalized to all high school Sunday school or small group curricula among evangelical churches. Based on the results for all five curricula, suggestions for improvement were made for each curriculum individually and for a generalization of all church curricula for high school students. Standard practices for teacher evaluation within churches were also discussed.

Conclusion

Many factors have prompted this study, including the research-based prediction that the number of U.S. teens claiming to be Christians will drop significantly by 2050. Likely contributing to this decline, Christian education has not proven itself effective, and evangelical churches are reliant upon curriculum to make up for the fact that many teachers are untrained, not observed or coached regularly, and often spiritually immature themselves. Can small group curriculum for teens effectively carry this burden? If curriculum bears this weight, can designers strengthen curriculum enough to bear the load effectively? These explorable questions rely on the utilization of the Danielson Framework for Teaching to reveal common strengths and weaknesses among high school Sunday school or small group curricula as well as factors that may increase their effectiveness in promoting transferrable learning and spiritual growth. Chapter 2 further explores the current literature on church curriculum, evaluation, and effective instruction.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

To further explore the literature supporting the concepts found in the research question (“According to the Danielson Framework for Teaching, what are common strengths and weaknesses among high school small group curricula and what could increase their effectiveness in promoting transferrable learning and spiritual growth”), I begin with the theological foundation and vision for Christian education, a literature review of the current status of Christian education, and the role of curriculum in Christian education. Next, I present the main components of constructivism, including biblically flawed and biblically cohesive constructivist principles, and formulate a constructivist educational approach from a biblical worldview. I then discuss a faith-based constructivist model for transformational teaching, a culture of thinking and discussion, and curriculum design. Next, I explore the evaluation of church curriculum and the specific components involved. Lastly, I present the Danielson Framework for Teaching, specifically Domains 1 and 3, in order to effectively evaluate church curriculum for the purposes established in the vision for Christian education.

Theological Foundation for Christian Education

First and foremost, Christian education must be grounded theologically in biblical truth. Christian educators, as all Christians, are charged with the chief purpose of bringing glory to God and fulfilling the Great Commission. According to Michael Anthony, “Theology and education become the means to accomplishing the Great

Commission of Matthew 28:18-20.”¹ He adds, “At its core, its innermost component, education is based primarily on a worldview, a philosophical or theological system of understanding reality, truth, and values. As such, education is ultimately a practical expression of one’s philosophical convictions.”² Therefore, the belief in absolute truth and the reliance upon its premises must be placed at the center of curriculum.

How shall we know and teach absolute truth? According to George Knight, “Epistemology is a primary determinant of educational beliefs and practices.”³ Furthermore, Christian education, founded upon the belief in “revelation as a source of knowledge, will undoubtedly have a curriculum and role for the Bible in that curriculum that differ in substantial ways from an institution based upon naturalistic premises.”⁴ Christian educators are dependent upon the epistemological view that knowledge is revealed from God. This revelation comes through general and specific means.⁵

General revelation comes to all people continuously through creation, God’s care, conscience belief in right and wrong, and a sense that there is a God.⁶ Special revelation, on the other hand, comes to specific people at specific times through Scripture, God’s acts, and the work of Jesus.⁷ Gregg Allison and Michael Anthony summarize that Scripture continues to make God’s revelation available because “Scripture—which is itself special revelation—is the inspired, truthful, authoritative,

¹ Michael J. Anthony, “The Nature of Theology and Education,” in *A Theology for Christian Education*, ed. James R. Estep Jr., Michael J. Anthony, and Gregg R. Allison (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2008), 16.

² Anthony, “The Nature of Theology and Education,” 18.

³ George R. Knight, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2006), 26.

⁴ Knight, *Philosophy and Education*, 26-27.

⁵ Gregg R. Allison and Michael J. Anthony, “Revelation, Scripture, and Christian Education,” in Estep, Anthony, and Allison, *A Theology for Christian Education*, 73.

⁶ Allison and Anthony, “Revelation, Scripture, and Christian Education,” 73.

⁷ Allison and Anthony, “Revelation, Scripture, and Christian Education,” 73-74.

clear, sufficient, necessary, and powerful Word of God.”⁸ Therefore, Christian educators must ground their beliefs and work in the emphasis on, reliance upon, study of, and meditation of Scripture because as we believe and interact with Scripture, we are interacting with God himself.⁹

It is also paramount that Christian educators understand the creation and redemptive plan of God as a basis from which they work. Although humankind was created in the image of God, this image was deeply marred as a result of sin and the fall. Therefore, the need for restoration to God through justification and sanctification has set the precedent and vision for Christian education. Christian education must rely on this foundational purpose.

Vision for Christian Education

In Christian education, there must be a biblical philosophy of education centered on a vision to reach and disciple students to create Christlike transformation. Jim Wilhoit argues that “the question of how to teach can be adequately answered only after settling the question of the goal of teaching.”¹⁰ According to Anthony, “Christian education is distinct from other kinds of education in that its goal is the transformation of the whole person into the likeness of Christ (Col. 1:28).”¹¹

Therefore, the goal of Christian education is the promotion of faith development and spiritual formation. Timothy Paul Jones and Michael Wilder suggest that faith development should be “centered in content that is both particular and personal,” “inseparable from the theological construct of sanctification,” and “should

⁸ Allison and Anthony, “Revelation, Scripture, and Christian Education,” 79.

⁹ Allison and Anthony, “Revelation, Scripture, and Christian Education,” 79-80.

¹⁰ Jim Wilhoit, *Christian Education and the Search for Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991), 10.

¹¹ Anthony, “The Nature of Theology and Education,” 21.

reflect the crucial role of the faith community.”¹² Robert Pazmiño explains the challenge educators face when assessing their efforts related to this goal; he suggests that educators hold a vision of Christian education that encompasses a thorough understanding of conversion and teaches how to walk in the new way.¹³

The ultimate goal of development is that God is glorified as we become more like Christ in all facets of life.¹⁴ Julie A. Gorman describes this process as “growing up in Christ,” which is reflected in “knowing the meaning of increasing surrender to His lordship, discovering widening dimensions of His guidance, becoming aware of the broadening subtleties of sin.”¹⁵ John M. Dettoni similarly states, “Thinking, feeling, and doing, however, are not the ends of knowledge. The end of knowledge is to BE someone transformed by the written Word, to become more like the living Word.”¹⁶ He concludes, “Teaching is not for transmission of information alone, but for transformation of the person. We teach for growth, maturity, and development of learners, not so they can merely pass a test nor to satisfy some administrative body. . . . We teach that people will become mature and complete, being transformed more and more into Christ’s likeness.”¹⁷ As educators strive to design and deliver effective instruction, the overarching goal and the following details should continually reflect this vision for education.

¹² Timothy Paul Jones and Michael Wilder, “Faith Development and Christian Formation,” in *Christian Formation: Integrating Theology and Human Development*, ed. James R. Estep and Jonathan H. Kim (Nashville: B&H, 2010), 191.

¹³ Robert W. Pazmiño, “A Comprehensive Vision for Conversion in Christian Education,” *Religious Education* 87, no. 1 (1992): 92.

¹⁴ James E. Plueddemann, “The Power of Piaget,” in *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, ed. James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 59.

¹⁵ Julie A. Gorman, “Children and Developmentalism,” in Wilhoit and Dettoni, *Nurture That Is Christian*, 143.

¹⁶ John M. Dettoni, “On Being a Developmental Teacher,” in Wilhoit and Dettoni, *Nurture That Is Christian*, 250.

¹⁷ Dettoni, “On Being a Developmental Teacher,” 262.

Therefore, it is paramount that Christian educators are mindful of this vision and the evident results of an educational model indicative of the pursuit of Christlike transformation among students. High student attendance, compliant listening, and the occasional student response to a question posed by the teacher are not indicators of successful teaching and learning, nor are they appropriate goals for a Christian educator. Yet, these characteristics often represent the unconscious or unarticulated goals of teachers and churches. Spiritual maturation involves far more than listening, reading, and cognitive acquisition.¹⁸ Howard Hendricks plainly states, “The name of the game in Christian education is not knowledge—it’s active obedience.”¹⁹

The goal of all Christian educators should be to facilitate spiritual development by influencing students’ mental and spiritual growth into the likeness of Christ. To promote this type of learning, teachers must use a combination of proper biblical exegesis and effective instructional practices to increase students’ knowledge in a way that transforms their lives. Curriculum must be designed with the understanding that in order for students to learn, information cannot be handed to them. Students cannot be fed information; they must instead be equipped to feed themselves.²⁰ Scriptural knowledge must be understood and transferred to students’ lives as they make connections and applications.²¹ The question then becomes “How do we best accomplish this task, and how will we know if it is effective?”

¹⁸ Ted Ward, foreword to Wilhoit and Dettoni, *Nurture That Is Christian*, 12.

¹⁹ Howard Hendricks, *Teaching to Change Lives: Seven Proven Ways to Make Your Teaching Come Alive* (Colorado Springs: Multnomah Books, 1987), 60.

²⁰ Frances Anderson, “Adolescent Development,” in Wilhoit and Dettoni, *Nurture That Is Christian*, 167.

²¹ Karen Lynn Estep, “Following Topographical Details: Learning Theory and Curriculum,” in *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church: Cartography for Christian Pilgrims*, ed. James Estep Jr., Roger White, and Karen Estep (Nashville: B&H, 2012), 107.

Current Status of Christian Education

The “Effective Christian Education” study identified six factors essential in nurturing faith, with an effective Christian education program being the most influential by far and a thinking climate that challenges thinking being the second most impactful.²² A climate that encourages thinking and questioning actually stimulates a deeper, more personal faith.²³ Youth who experience this type of thinking climate are “twice as likely as youth who do not to say that faith is the ‘most’ or ‘very important’ influence on their lives.”²⁴ Yet, the same study also found that only 42 percent of youth said church challenges their thinking, and many indicated that their church is boring.²⁵ Interestingly, youth who reported that their congregation has a thinking climate also saw their church as doing a better job of facilitating spiritual growth; teaching about God, the Bible, and prayer; and knowing and loving Jesus.²⁶

While many students indicated that their church is boring, many churches seem to find success with charismatic leaders, entertaining music, fun activities, and messages that require minimal thought or challenge on behalf of listeners, which ensures student attendance and attention. However, these students often have no ownership over their learning or their faith. When they graduate from high school, they are left without true faith or spiritual maturity.²⁷

Eugene Roehlkepartain claims that many churches have an overdependence on passive learning styles, such as lectures and one-way communication, which has become

²² Eugene C. Roehlkepartain, “The Thinking Climate: A Missing Ingredient in Youth Ministry,” *Christian Education Journal* 15, no. 1 (1994), 54.

²³ Roehlkepartain, “The Thinking Climate,” 53.

²⁴ Roehlkepartain, “The Thinking Climate,” 53.

²⁵ David Schuller, *Rethinking Christian Education* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 1993), 14.

²⁶ Schuller, *Rethinking Christian Education*, 58-60.

²⁷ Schuller, *Rethinking Christian Education*, 94-95.

“customary” and “overwhelming” in Sunday school classes and training.²⁸ He adds that one person is the “expert” in a typical church setting while others passively listen. Roehlkepartain suggests that in order “for Christian education to be effective, it must not only transmit insight and knowledge but also must allow insight to emerge through students’ self-discovery and experience.”²⁹ Most often, teachers rely heavily on attractively packaged curriculum or readily available resources. Often, these sources rely on poor theology, inferior teaching methods, and insufficient discussion methods.³⁰

Roehlkepartain adds that churches often focus exclusively on *what* is taught, with very little emphasis on *how* content is being taught or how people learn best, which results in a reliance on one-way lecture-style communication.³¹ According to research, churches often do better with content than with process. Only 41 percent of churches “exhibit the qualities of an effective-education process for youth, and 38 percent for adults.”³² In fact, only 34 percent of youth education teachers claim to know educational theory and practice.³³ Is Christian education currently effective, and how do we know?

The Role of Curriculum in Christian Education

Curriculum is a primary vehicle by which Christian educators attempt to reach their goal, and the effectiveness of curriculum is an essential component of students’ transformational success.³⁴ Growing intimacy with God and maturing faith transforms

²⁸ Eugene C. Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church: Moving Christian Education to Center Stage* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 31.

²⁹ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 31.

³⁰ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 32.

³¹ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 137.

³² Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 137.

³³ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 137.

³⁴ Winona Walworth, “Educational Curriculum,” in *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education*, ed. Werner C. Graendorf (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), 283.

through internalization. Pazmiño suggests that Christian curriculum should merge biblical content and student experience in an impactful way that transforms students.³⁵ He adds that “Christians must translate their values into the purposes and goals of the curriculum.”³⁶ According to Cynthia Jones Neal, this internalization is achievable when teachers assist students in obtaining and expressing “meaning in ways that would enable them to make this knowledge and meaning their own.”³⁷ Therefore, she suggests that “curriculum should be carefully scrutinized” for students to build conceptual understanding, learn and experience Christlike concepts, discuss and interact with each other, and answer thought-provoking questions.³⁸

Gorman adds that since the Scriptures are the main modes of shaping our reasoning, the goal of Christian education is to teach the Word in such a way that it becomes the “personal inner reality out of which the learner operates.”³⁹ Essentially, students must construct a Christian worldview and perspective from which they operate. Therefore, “we must translate the great Truths of faith into thought units that can be experienced by boys and girls.”⁴⁰

Constructivism Overview

To meet the established goals of Christian education and curriculum for Christian education, a faith-based constructivism model provides students an opportunity to understand and apply Scripture in a transformative way. Constructivism is a

³⁵ Robert W. Pazmiño, “Curriculum Foundations,” *Christian Education Journal* 8, no. 1 (1987): 31.

³⁶ Pazmiño, “Curriculum Foundations,” 38.

³⁷ Cynthia Jones Neal, “The Power of Vygotsky,” in Wilhoit and Dettoni, *Nurture That Is Christian*, 130.

³⁸ Jones Neal, “The Power of Vygotsky,” 130.

³⁹ Gorman, “Children and Developmentalism,” 152.

⁴⁰ Gorman, “Children and Developmentalism,” 152.

combination of the concepts of many developmental theorists, including the cognitive work of Jean Piaget, the social constructivism of Lev Vygotsky, and the transactional constructivism of John Dewey.⁴¹ Within constructivist perspectives, the prevailing views are divided among cognitive constructivism and social constructivism.⁴² “Cognitive constructivists view learning as a cognitive effort to construct understanding while social constructivists focus on the social effort to construct understanding from the culture or group setting.”⁴³ Both forms of constructivism support active learning wherein students use environmental factors to construct knowledge or understanding.⁴⁴ A blend of cognitive and social constructivism reflects an image of constructing understanding in a communal setting where students struggle together to understand rich, transformational concepts.

Constructivism focuses on constructed knowledge and application of principles instead of memorizing facts, internal as opposed to external student motivation, and content integrated with students’ experiences and real-world situations as opposed to delivered in a content-driven manner.⁴⁵ Osmo Kivinen and Pekka Ristela state, “Reacting to the naïve view of learning as remembering and learners as empty vessels that shall be filled with knowledge, or to the behaviourist view of education that is said to treat the learner merely as a recipient of external stimulation, constructivists stress the active

⁴¹ Gert Biesta, “Receiving the Gift of Teaching: From ‘Learning from’ to ‘Being Taught By,’” *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 32, no. 5 (2012): 450.

⁴² Estep, “Following Topographical Details,” 107.

⁴³ Estep, “Following Topographical Details,” 107.

⁴⁴ Debra Espinor, “Overview of Learning Theories,” in *Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, ed. HeeKap Lee (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 15.

⁴⁵ Dave S. Knowlton, “Shifting Towards a Constructivist Philosophy for Teaching Biblical Principles in K-12 Christian School,” *Christian Education Journal* 1, no. 3 (2004): 120.

nature of learning.”⁴⁶ Constructivism asks students to create big questions and learn through reflection on experiences and exploration.⁴⁷ According to Charlotte Danielson, “constructivism is now acknowledged by cognitive psychologists as providing the most powerful framework for understanding how children [and adults] learn.”⁴⁸ Scripture supports many aspects of constructivist methodology yet rejects much of constructivist philosophy and theology.⁴⁹

Biblically Flawed Components of Constructivism

Constructivism cannot be wholly adopted as an approach acceptable for Christian education without being sifted through a biblical foundation supported by the beliefs that Scripture is the true authoritative Word of God, the effects of sin are potent in the realm of development, God is the source of all wisdom and knowledge, and sanctification is the ultimate purpose for understanding and growth. Philosophically and theologically, constructivism, especially radical constructivism based on a postmodern worldview, is mostly at odds with a biblical worldview.

Constructivism, especially in its radical form, is founded on the idea that knowledge and truth are not pre-existing or in need of being discovered but created. According to Jack Fennema, in constructivism, “truth is viewed as being subjective and relative—found ‘in the eye of the beholder.’”⁵⁰ True constructivism would go beyond the

⁴⁶ Osmo Kivinen and Pekka Ristela, “From Constructivism to a Pragmatist Conception of Learning,” *Oxford Review of Education* 29, no. 3 (2003): 365.

⁴⁷ HeeKap Lee, ed., introduction to *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, 3.

⁴⁸ Charlotte Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd ed. (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007), 15.

⁴⁹ Calvin G. Roso, “Constructivism in the Classroom: Is It Biblical?,” in Lee, *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, 43.

⁵⁰ Jack Fennema, “Constructivism: A Critique from a Biblical Worldview,” in Lee, *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, 27.

hermeneutical faux pas of accepting multiple interpretations of Scripture to even suggesting that the biblical text does not possess its own inherent (or intended) meaning but means whatever a reader interprets and intends it to mean.⁵¹ Clearly, from a biblical stance, this aspect of constructivism must be rejected. As opposed to constructing *truth*, a Christian educator would strive to lead students in constructing understanding *about* truth found in general and specific revelation.

While secular scientists often accurately summarize an individual's development, they also often neglect the impact of sin's effect on humans and their development. Therefore, any secular theory is incomplete without a biblical-theological understanding of the effects of sin as applied to development.⁵² While truth leads us to knowledge, because of the fall and the effects of sin, we now see "through a glass," with a distorted and inadequate picture of reality and understanding.⁵³

Scripture and constructivism have differing views on the source of knowledge. Whereas the Bible states that the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord and that the source of all knowledge and wisdom is God (Prov 9:10; Isa 28:26-29), constructivists believe that knowledge is constructed internally.⁵⁴ Philosophically, constructivism is founded on the belief that "knowledge and truth do not exist beyond a student's perception of that knowledge and truth," and some constructivists reject the idea of absolute truth.⁵⁵ In a constructivist definition of internally constructed knowledge, Fennema suggests that by replacing the term "knowledge" with "understanding," this

⁵¹ Estep, "Following Topographical Details," 110.

⁵² John M. Dettoni and James C. Wilhoit, eds., introduction to *Nurture That Is Christian*, 38.

⁵³ HeeKap Lee, preface to *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, xii.

⁵⁴ Fennema, "Constructivism: A Critique," 32.

⁵⁵ Dave S. Knowlton, James A. Thorne, and C. Harry Harriss, "A Selective Defense of 'Introduction to Christian Doctrine' Online: Disputatious Perspectives and Propitiating Pedagogy," *Christian Education Journal* 6, no. 1 (2002): 113-17.

semantic adjustment may bridge the divide.⁵⁶ Therefore, a Christian views constructivist education not as construction *of* truth but as construction of understanding *about* the truth.

The Bible states that God reveals knowledge and wisdom; however, the postmodern or radical constructivist would state that knowledge is constructed.⁵⁷ Whereas a radical constructivist may believe that truth does not exist beyond what a student perceives as truth, Jesus declared to his disciples, “You will know the truth, and the truth will set you free” (John 8:32).⁵⁸ In fact, Jesus said that he *is* the truth (John 14:6). Therefore, according to Scripture, individuals know truth if they know Jesus, and knowledge and truth are connected to belief.⁵⁹ According to James A. Thorne, cognitive-focused constructivism would allow “for an objective reality where knowledge of truth is possible, allowing reality can only be partially and subjectively understood.”⁶⁰

Based on John David Trentham’s “principle of inverse consistency,” Christians may approach social science research and theory analysis through a proper perspective based on the divine image and common grace. He articulates that humankind was created in the image of God and therefore equipped with the capacity of observational insight and reflective judgment.⁶¹ Due to the effects of the fall, secular science research and theory interprets meaning through a “teleological and soteriological orientation that is inverted from the inherent purpose and redemptive hope prescribed by the gospel and biblical

⁵⁶ Fennema, “Constructivism: A Critique,” 32.

⁵⁷ Fennema, “Constructivism: A Critique,” 27.

⁵⁸ Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations come from the *English Standard Version*.

⁵⁹ James A. Thorne, “Biblical Education: Contributions from Constructivism,” *Christian Education Journal* 10, no. 1 (2013): 105.

⁶⁰ Thorne, “Biblical Education,” 104.

⁶¹ John David Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 1): Approaching and Qualifying Models of Human Development,” *Christian Education Journal* 16, no. 3 (2019): 468.

worldview.”⁶² However, human observations and insights as seen in social science research and theory may be legitimate observations of human reality and may bear consistencies with “redemptive patterns of human development.”⁶³ Trentham also asserts that due to common grace, or God’s favor extended to all people, nonbelievers are “capable of legitimate insights, and that those insights may have qualities that are God-honoring and profitable.”⁶⁴ Therefore, believers can find meaningful interaction with and qualified affirmation of secularly generated research and insight, though such insight may be limited due to the distorted image of God.⁶⁵ Although constructivist theory does not completely align with biblical theology and philosophy, its methodology through research observation and insight may be qualified on the grounds of God’s general revelation, the *imago Dei*, and common grace.

Biblically Cohesive Benefits of Constructivism

Whereas constructivist philosophy and theology can find minimal commonalities with Scripture, learning theory finds not only commonalities with but also scriptural support of constructivist methodology.⁶⁶ Constructivist theories have strengthened Christian education by “emphasizing self-directed students, the teacher as facilitator, and well-organized learning experiences.”⁶⁷ As modeled in his life and

⁶² Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 1),” 470.

⁶³ Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 1),” 470.

⁶⁴ Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 1),” 470.

⁶⁵ Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 1),” 471.

⁶⁶ Fennema, “Constructivism: A Critique,” 31.

⁶⁷ Lee, preface to *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, xi.

teachings, Jesus believed in the learner's active engagement, deep thinking, and application of understanding as opposed to memorization of facts or laws.⁶⁸

Ted Ward supports a constructivist view of Christian education based on recent studies of human perception and the brain. He states, "The learner is now seen in terms of discovering, building, and reorganizing. The learning process is not just a matter of input and filing or mechanical connections; it is better described as a matter of construction and discovery."⁶⁹ Additionally, Ward argues that "the perceptual grasp of anything new is always constructed of bits and pieces of previous experience and understandings."⁷⁰ Thus, the teacher's or curriculum designer's role is to create a learning experience for students that facilitates their construction of scriptural understanding.

In creating a learning experience as mentioned, a constructivist classroom should be student-centered and focus on the following teaching practices:

Improving student thinking, using questions to allow students to identify their own theories, promoting classroom dialogue between and among students and teachers, encouraging student collaboration, enabling students to elaborate on their individual ideas, challenging thinking by presenting contradictions to students' ideas, promoting analysis and inquiry through questioning, allowing *wait time* during discussions and questioning, providing ample time for student thinking and processing of ideas, encouraging self-reflection and metacognition, and organizing classroom curriculum around real-life problems.⁷¹

In Scripture, we see Jesus implementing many of these concepts. For example, he allowed listeners to think and investigate to discover answers, he served as a guide allowing for (student) voice, listeners were required to assign meaning to parables, listeners were involved in the learning process, he expected change based on new

⁶⁸ Lee, preface to *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, xi.

⁶⁹ Ward, foreword to *Nurture That Is Christian*, 9.

⁷⁰ Ward, foreword to *Nurture That Is Christian*, 9.

⁷¹ Roso, "Constructivism in the Classroom," 39-40 (emphasis original).

learning, and he was involved in collaborative dialogue.⁷² Christian educators should seek to utilize many of these constructivist methods for design and instruction.

A Piagetian aspect of constructivism focuses on social interaction and disequilibrium. According to Piaget, “People learn when they struggle with problems in a social setting.”⁷³ In a church setting, interacting with people who have differing perspectives can lead to an interesting disequilibrium, and in turn, they will see and learn things they never realized in Scripture based on these tensions.⁷⁴ Jesus often avoided truth declarations. He used the concept of disequilibrium or “perspective transformation” to enable listeners to wrestle with the dissonance between cultural norms and values compared with those of the kingdom of God and move them toward a kingdom mindset.⁷⁵

James E. Plueddemann notes three constructivist based principles for Christian educators: (1) “people do not learn the most important things by sitting in a pew and taking notes from one-way communication”; (2) “education that merely fosters passive reception of information will seldom develop people”; and (3) “we grow as we wrestle with the issues and problems of life in light of the Word of God.”⁷⁶ Similarly, Thorne states that “constructivism calls for individually transformed information. The information must be engaged. All forms of Constructivism argue that the learner must individually discover and transform information in order to make it the individual’s

⁷² Rhonda Sommers-Johnson, “Did Jesus Utilize Constructivist Teaching Practices?,” in Lee, *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, 136.

⁷³ Plueddemann, “The Power of Piaget,” 51.

⁷⁴ Plueddemann, “The Power of Piaget,” 51.

⁷⁵ HeeKap Lee, “Three Faces of Constructivism,” in Lee, *Faith-Based Education That Constructs*, 58.

⁷⁶ Plueddemann, “The Power of Piaget,” 59.

own.”⁷⁷ He adds, “Biblical education also says that the learner must individually discover and transform information in order to make it personal.”⁷⁸

Ron Ritchhart echoes many of these ideas as he discusses creating cultures of thinking within classrooms. He proposes that “transformative learning—that is, learning that cultivates the development of the whole person and strives for more than simple transmission of information—is more likely to happen in community than in isolation.”⁷⁹ In Christian education, this community not only includes the church and small groups within the church but also involves ensuring that within such a community there is discussion and wrestling with valuable ideas and scriptural understating to promote the transformative goal of Christlikeness.

According to Richard E. Butman and David R. Moore, there are several signs of a constructed knower: they are known by their humility and empathy, passion, and compassion; possess “firm yet flexible commitments”; put beliefs into action; strive to serve and empower others; and find value in community and diversity.⁸⁰ A constructivist Christian is capable of living a life transformed through the work, understanding, and power of Christ by the Holy Spirit.

Faith-Based Constructivism: A Biblical Integration

While Christian education seems to lean toward two extremes (mindless memorization of facts or emotion-based activity that neglects Scripture), effective Christian education is true to Scripture and relevant to the individual’s interests and

⁷⁷ Thorne, “Biblical Education,” 105.

⁷⁸ Thorne, “Biblical Education,” 105.

⁷⁹ Ron Ritchhart, *Creating Cultures of Thinking: The 8 Forces We Must Master to Truly Transform Our Schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2015), 203.

⁸⁰ Richard E. Butman and David R. Moore, “The Power of Perry and Belenky,” in Wilhoit and Dettoni, *Nurture That Is Christian*, 116.

needs.⁸¹ Scripture is not only the final authority but also the filter to examine all other truths.⁸² As discussed, constructivism seeks to meet the learner’s needs, interests, and mode for creating understanding that is transferrable and transformative. Therefore, in creating a faith-based model of constructivism, these positive aspects must be filtered through a reliance on the Word of God, a belief in the authority and truthfulness of Scripture, and God’s revelation of truth.

Trentham states, “The social sciences must be approached and qualified with theological conviction, clarity, and wisdom. And they must be engaged and appropriated accordingly.”⁸³ Trentham’s “principle of inverse consistency” provides Christian scholars and educators with a hermeneutical framework to “engage and appropriate social science models of human development” through a four-step protocol:⁸⁴ scholars and educators (1) envision redemptive maturity, (2) read for receptivity, (3) apply reflective discernment, and (4) identify appropriate outlets.⁸⁵ James R. Estep Jr. agrees that Christian educators “cannot be just students of theology; we also must be students of the social sciences.”⁸⁶ We cannot reject the value of social science in understanding faith and spiritual development. As Ward argues, “No one has the picture altogether fully formed yet, but the future of theory for Christian education seems sure to be an informed synthesis of theological rudiments and scientific evidences.”⁸⁷ In providing a similar suggestion with

⁸¹ Plueddemann, “The Power of Piaget,” 47.

⁸² Robert W. Pazmiño, *Foundational Issues in Christian Education: An Introduction in Evangelical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 58.

⁸³ Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 1),” 458-75.

⁸⁴ John David Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 2): Engaging and Appropriating Models of Human Development,” *Christian Education Journal* 16, no. 3 (2019): 476-77 (emphasis original).

⁸⁵ Trentham, “Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 2),” 488-93.

⁸⁶ James R. Estep Jr., “Developmental Theories: Foe, Friend, or Folly? The Role of Developmental Theories in Christian Formation,” in Estep and Kim, *Christian Formation*, 58.

⁸⁷ Ward, foreword to *Nurture That Is Christian*, 14.

additional structure, John Dettoni and Jim Wilhoit assert that “biblical and theological reflection must be the means to ascertain Truth and meaning from empirical data.”⁸⁸ They recommend learning from developmental theories yet reading critically to discern proper contributions for growth into Christlikeness.⁸⁹

As an example of the previous beliefs in integrating social sciences with biblical theology, Karen Estep claims that “the general notion of constructivism need not be rejected wholesale, since it does provide insight into how the individual within a given social context facilitates the learning process, and provides methods whereby learners can teach themselves.”⁹⁰ Dave S. Knowlton states that from a biblical form of constructivism, “construction is not creating something new; it is putting together ideas in a personally meaningful and honest way.”⁹¹ The basic premise of faith-based constructivism is the ideology that we are constructing a kingdom heart, a Christlike perspective, a life transformed into the image of Jesus through the understanding of Scripture. Constructivists understand and rely on differing perspectives among individuals. From a biblical stance, Scripture also supports the idea of multiple perspectives. In fact, transformation begins with awareness of one’s own perspective (self-centered by nature) and—through the understanding of Scripture and the power of the Holy Spirit—changes into a Christlike perspective.

A Faith-Based Constructivist Approach for Transformational Teaching

Although constructivist methodology promotes and fosters the end goal of transference of knowledge and understanding, the intention is ultimately to transfer

⁸⁸ Dettoni and Wilhoit, introduction to *Nurture That Is Christian*, 41.

⁸⁹ Dettoni and Wilhoit, introduction to *Nurture That Is Christian*, 41.

⁹⁰ Estep, “Following Topographical Details,” 111.

⁹¹ Knowlton, “Shifting Towards a Constructivist Philosophy,” 121.

learning across content areas or to create truth. Biblical transformation differs from this sense of a transfer goal: the goal is to read and interpret Scripture not for the sake of information but transformation.⁹² This difference is illuminated in the Christian's pursuit of spiritual transformation involving personal and joint engagement with Scripture for transformation.⁹³ Mark Rutter notes that although we live in a culture with an abundance of churches and Christian literature, "the lives of Christians are not necessarily being transformed."⁹⁴ He states that learning is not just knowing but acting on knowledge, and the goal of a Christian educator is to teach for this transformation through holistic means.⁹⁵

David Setran and fellow Wheaton College professors share the results from a Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) report on spirituality among collegians. The HERI study claims that spiritual growth is best facilitated when students are involved in self-reflection and contemplation, or "inner-work," along with the teacher's encouragement in the spiritual transformation process.⁹⁶ In response to this finding, the authors suggest creating assignments for students that engage them in "inner-work" that fosters engagement with God and spiritual formation.⁹⁷

Setran et al. also recommend that learning should be reflected upon, enacted on, prayed over, and discussed so that it begins to shape student habits, commitments, and desires. For this reason, educators must be intentional about designing instruction

⁹² Mark A. Maddix, "Spiritual Formation and Christian Formation," in Estep and Kim, *Christian Formation*, 256.

⁹³ Maddix, "Spiritual Formation," 257.

⁹⁴ Mark V. Rutter, "A Holistic Approach to Learning: The Key to Change," *Christian Education Journal* 10, no. 3 (1990): 63.

⁹⁵ Rutter, "A Holistic Approach," 63, 71.

⁹⁶ David P. Setran et al., "Spiritual Formation Goes to College: Class-Related 'Soul Projects' in Christian Higher Education," *Christian Education Journal* 7, no. 2 (2010): 401.

⁹⁷ Setran et al., "Spiritual Formation Goes to College," 401.

that not only transmits information and content but also seeks to influence lasting desires and attitudes through the learning process.⁹⁸ Likewise, Pazmiño warns of the dangers in an educational approach that imposes truths yet does not allow students the opportunity to wrestle with the implications of such truths.⁹⁹

Similarly, Mark A. Maddix discusses instruction focused on biblical understanding for spiritual formation:

In reading the Bible: we seek to allow the text to become the intrusion of the Word of God into our lives, to address us, encounter us. We allow the text to inform us rather than inform the text. Formational reading allows the text to master us instead of us mastering the text. We come to the text with an openness to hear, receive, respond, and be a servant of the Word rather than a master of the text.¹⁰⁰

Pazmiño adds,

Such an imposition is manipulative indoctrination, and it does not result in personal appropriation, internalization, and the transfer of learning to other situations. Such an authoritarian stance in education demands mindless compliance and obedience at the loss of personal integrity and rationality. It reduces the response of loving obedience to God to a superficial conformity that is contrary to a biblical understanding of persons. A mindless and spiritless focus on the written Word may not result in vital contact with the living Word, Jesus Christ. The spirit of the Word can be lost in haggling over the letter of the Word with a subsequent loss of vitality and joy.¹⁰¹

Transformational Teaching: A Perspective Shift

For transformational learning to lead students through sanctification into Christ's likeness, students must be led by lessons designed to explore the perspective of Jesus. Jack Mezirow describes transformational learning as a change of perspective centered on three main themes: critical reflection of assumptions, awareness of one's

⁹⁸ Setran et al., "Spiritual Formation Goes to College," 407.

⁹⁹ Pazmiño, *Foundational Issues in Christian Education*, 59.

¹⁰⁰ Maddix, "Spiritual Formation," 257.

¹⁰¹ Pazmiño, *Foundational Issues in Christian Education*, 59.

current perspective, and rational discourse in determining validity in other assertions.¹⁰² A humanistic worldview is inherited from our culture, and Christians must begin to reject this worldview, embrace biblical concepts and purpose, and learn to evaluate life from a biblical perspective.¹⁰³ In faith-based education, transformational teaching and learning similarly promote these three phases as students learn to see and reflect on their original perspective compared to that of Jesus as they discover meaning in Scripture.

According to Stephen Brookfield, a main component of the critical thinking required for true learning is realizing that alternative ways of thinking exist.¹⁰⁴ Brookfield refers to the idea of a “perspective transformation,” as he describes this realization of new perspectives. He advocates for teaching geared toward critical thinking and adds that critical teaching helps students to “acquire new perceptual frameworks and structures of understanding.”¹⁰⁵ As Christian educators aim to promote student thinking that leads to the enlightenment of a Christlike perspective and student transformation into Christlikeness, this concept of “perspective transformation” in learning is especially true.

Curriculum designers must understand the goal of Christian formation and the profile of a mature believer, help students envision where they stand concerning that profile, encourage the spiritual disciplines involved in developing into the desired profile, and develop a curriculum that intentionally ministers to Christian formation in this manner.¹⁰⁶ Gregory C. Carlson adds, “A major element in transformation of ideas, of attitudes, of behavior patterns is the personal interactive involvement of the one being

¹⁰² Jack Mezirow, “Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice,” *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 1997, no. 4 (1997): 11.

¹⁰³ Anderson, “Adolescent Development,” 168.

¹⁰⁴ Stephen D. Brookfield, *Developing Critical Thinking: Challenging Adults to Explore Alternative Ways of Thinking and Acting* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987), 18.

¹⁰⁵ Brookfield, *Developing Critical Thinking*, 82.

¹⁰⁶ Gregory C. Carlson, “Adult Development and Christian Formation,” in Estep and Kim, *Christian Formation*, 221-23.

transformed”; “we must focus on internal life change rather than just external behavior change.”¹⁰⁷ For this to occur, Carlson suggests that our teaching must be more than merely telling; it must include actively involving students in learning.¹⁰⁸

More than seeking pieces of information to understand the Christian faith, we must engage students by challenging and confronting their current life in comparison to the desired life of Christ.¹⁰⁹ Mezirow discusses the importance of critical reflection assumptions (CRA) in the learning process, which involves reflecting on current life assumptions in order to promote change. Although he specifically addresses adult learning in a secular manner, this concept is applicable to teen learning as well as Christian education. CRA plays an important role in decision-making, validating beliefs, and transformational learning.¹¹⁰ Mezirow states, “When the object of critical reflection is an assumption or presupposition, a different order of abstraction is introduced, with major potential for effecting a change in one’s established frame of reference.”¹¹¹ Essentially, this is the essence of Christian education—to promote awareness and transformation into Christlikeness and adopting his perspective. Mezirow concludes by arguing, “The professional task ahead is to find ways to translate the concept of CRA and discourse into curricula or programs, instructional methods, material development, and evaluation criteria.”¹¹²

Correspondingly, Pazmiño proposes that curriculum should provide students time and space to explore, discuss, and connect the content in order to transfer and

¹⁰⁷ Carlson, “Adult Development and Christian Formation,” 226.

¹⁰⁸ Carlson, “Adult Development and Christian Formation,” 226.

¹⁰⁹ Carlson, “Adult Development and Christian Formation,” 255.

¹¹⁰ Jack Mezirow, “On Critical Reflection,” *Adult Education Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (1998): 185.

¹¹¹ Mezirow, “On Critical Reflection,” 185.

¹¹² Mezirow, “On Critical Reflection,” 185.

meaningfully integrate new insights.¹¹³ He states, “The most common experience in teaching is that so much content is shared at the metaphoric table that students have little or no time to chew and digest the food.”¹¹⁴ Research on adult learning, which can also be beneficial for understanding teen learning, suggests that learning occurs when the learner feels respected, can relate new learning to experiences in life, and can use the new learning immediately.¹¹⁵ Research also shows that learning comes from 20 percent of what is heard, 40 percent of what is heard and seen, and 80 percent of what is done or discovered by the learner.¹¹⁶ Curriculum must be designed with the intentionality of purposefully placing time and space for students to process important content through meaningful tasks and questions.

Creating a Culture of Thinking and Discussion

Creating a thinking climate is essential for growth and Christlike transformation. Roehlkepartain states, “When people come to church, do they shut off their brains? Are they spoon-fed simple answers to tough questions? Can people come and just sit passively? Or are they challenged to think about faith in new ways? Unless the latter is true, it’s likely that people will stagnate in their faith.”¹¹⁷

Transference of learning is dependent upon a classroom culture centered on quality thinking and discussion. Yvonne Botma presents a conceptual framework for instructional design that promotes a learning-centered classroom culture and transferrable learning. This framework involves first providing a real-world scenario to increase

¹¹³ Robert W. Pazmiño, *Principles and Practices of Christian Education: An Evangelical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 111.

¹¹⁴ Pazmiño, *Principles and Practices of Christian Education*, 111.

¹¹⁵ Jane Vella, *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach: The Power of Dialogue in Educating Adults* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994), 34.

¹¹⁶ Vella, *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach*, 34.

¹¹⁷ Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 61.

student interest. Next, students are introduced to inquiry, and they begin to incorporate prior knowledge. In the next phase, students are viewed as a community of learners with an emphasis on discussion-based practices involving “productive struggle” for students and active intellectual engagement.¹¹⁸

In order to promote a classroom dynamic that is discussion-based and thought-provoking, Daniel Haase presents the phrase “death of the professor” to illustrate the concept of a learning-centered approach to education whereby the teacher uses his or her knowledge and wisdom to become a lead learner and creator of dialogue as opposed to the deliverer of information.¹¹⁹ Haase adds that “the design bears the burden,” as he describes the teacher’s shifting role in creating lesson designs in a way that values the learners and the learning more than the lecture.¹²⁰ This design includes lessons built for dialogue, which is not merely for the sake of conversation but also to create “rigorous and thoughtful engagement built around structured tasks designed for learning.”¹²¹ Haase argues, “Too often the design defaults to lecture with the assumption that if the teacher speaks it, it is known,” which turns students into “containers” or vessels “to be filled by the teacher.”¹²²

Ritchhart similarly describes a classroom atmosphere where “a group’s collective as well as individuals’ thinking is valued, visible, and actively promoted as part of the regular, day-to-day experiences of all group members.”¹²³ He provides a list of

¹¹⁸ Yvonne Botma, “A Conceptual Framework for Educational Design at Modular Level to Promote Transfer of Learning,” *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 52, no. 5 (2015): 504-6.

¹¹⁹ Daniel T. Haase, “The Death of the Professor: A Case for Dialogue Education,” *Common Ground Journal* 11, no. 2 (2014): 45.

¹²⁰ Haase, “The Death of the Professor,” 47.

¹²¹ Haase, “The Death of the Professor,” 47.

¹²² Haase, “The Death of the Professor,” 46.

¹²³ Ritchhart, *Creating Cultures of Thinking*, 31.

“shapers” in creating this culture of thinking: high student interest; a shared vision of learning; value and respect for all input; constant questioning; the teacher’s leading the engagement, learning, and monitoring the conversation; active listening; open communication; time for thinking, responding, and developing ideas; trust and safety for all; and valuable learning that is directly connected to life.¹²⁴ Teachers and curriculum designers should create opportunities for engagement “to challenge misconceptions, to delve deeply, to explore, to create meaning, to think,” and—in turn—to learn.¹²⁵ Haase adds that when learners are interested in the topic and discussion, they are empowered to participate as active learners and thinkers. They become internally motivated, benefitting from a sense of joy in the learning process.¹²⁶

According to Jane Vella, student “engagement is ensured by the immediacy of the learning task, which relates to the immediacy of the course objective that the task is implementing. Without this engagement, learners simply cannot learn. Our job is to design effective achievement-based objectives—and correspondingly learning tasks and materials.”¹²⁷ Contrast this image with Lois LeBar’s discouraging observations of many classrooms throughout her time of research:

How do our young people leave their Sunday School classrooms on Sunday morning? With eyes sparkling with new vision and insight? With serious determination to practice the will of God? With chin up ready to face an unbelieving world in the power of the spirit? With deep questions about God himself? Too often they are glad for the release from a dull, boring session.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ Ritchhart, *Creating Cultures of Thinking*, 4.

¹²⁵ Ritchhart, *Creating Cultures of Thinking*, 143.

¹²⁶ Ritchhart, *Creating Cultures of Thinking*, 45.

¹²⁷ Vella, *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach*, 37.

¹²⁸ Lois E. LeBar, *Education That Is Christian* (Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 1995), 21.

Effective Questioning and Discussion

A classroom culture based on engagement, thinking, and deep learning is dependent on excellent questioning and discussion techniques. Effective questioning and discussion are based on three elements: the quality of the questions or prompts, discussion techniques, and student participation.¹²⁹ However, effective discussion does not just happen but requires intentionality and commitment. It does not occur through the IRE (initiate, respond, and evaluate) recitation model where the teacher serves as the “pivot point” and is looking for one “right” answer, calls on only one student, and evaluates the student response.¹³⁰

Effective discussion is a result of excellent planning and creativity and the questioning skills of teachers and students. Jackie Acree Walsh and Beth Dankert Sattes state,

Ultimately, effective discussion depends on the knowledge and skills of those involved, which in classrooms are the students. However, most students do not come to school with the skills required for questioning and discussion. Therefore, teachers must plan for and model the use of questioning that leads to effective discussion.¹³¹

Walsh and Sattes add that effective questioning must involve questions capable of sustaining student thinking, promoting the participation and intellectual engagement of all students, scaffolding for deep thinking and understanding, and creating a culture that promotes and encourages respectful dialogue.¹³² Quality questioning empowers student engagement and is essential for quality discussion. Through quality discussions, teachers

¹²⁹ Jackie Acree Walsh and Beth Dankert Sattes, *Questioning for Classroom Discussion: Purposeful Speaking, Engaged Listening, Deep Thinking* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2015), 4.

¹³⁰ Walsh and Sattes, *Questioning for Classroom Discussion*, 8.

¹³¹ Walsh and Sattes, *Questioning for Classroom Discussion*, 16.

¹³² Walsh and Sattes, *Questioning for Classroom Discussion*, 17.

can transform classrooms into a community of “purposeful speaking, engaged listening, and deep thinking.”¹³³

Teaching through discussion improves learning by helping students explore and appreciate different perspectives, increasing student awareness of complexity, assisting students in acknowledging and investigating assumptions, increasing students’ intellectual agility, helping connect students to topics, developing collaborative learning, and helping students to empathize, synthesize, and integrate ideas—all of which leads to transformation.¹³⁴ Vella suggests utilizing small group discussions because small groups provide a safe sharing environment and remove the stereotypical “all-knowing” teacher and passive learners.¹³⁵

Deeper Learning

According to leading education expert Jay McTighe and Harvey Silver, educators must “make the critical shift from providing information to students (a knowledge consumption model) to empowering students to become active meaning-makers who seek deep understanding and are able to transfer their learning.”¹³⁶ The authors describe the difference in *inert* knowledge that is acquired superficially, never understood, and forgotten quickly to deep learning that is truly understood and retained. McTighe and Silver describe deep learning as something that must be “earned” and cannot be transmitted by teachers simply telling; it must be constructed by the learner.¹³⁷

¹³³ Walsh and Sattes, *Questioning for Classroom Discussion*, 13.

¹³⁴ Stephen D. Brookfield and Stephen Preskill, *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999), 22-23.

¹³⁵ Vella, *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach*, 35.

¹³⁶ Jay McTighe and Harvey F. Silver, *Teaching for Deeper Learning: Tools to Engage Students in Meaning Making* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2020), xiii.

¹³⁷ McTighe and Silver, *Teaching for Deeper Learning*, 1.

Jay McTighe and Judy Willis clearly depict the difference in deep learning and knowledge without deep understanding. Evidence of knowledge without understanding includes that ability to repeat what was told, remember, plug in information, and provide correct answers. However, indicators of deep learning include the ability to explain thoroughly, teach others, transfer new learning, provide support and justification for arguments, interpret meanings, and produce new questions.¹³⁸

McTighe and Silver also suggest seven thinking skills that promote deep learning and meaning-making: conceptualization, note-making and summarizing (much different from note-taking), comparing, reading for understanding, predicting and hypothesizing, visualizing and graphic representations, and perspective-taking and empathizing.¹³⁹ These skills are essential to valuable thinking and high-achieving learners, they are often under-taught, and they provide teachers a manageable way to increase student learning.¹⁴⁰ McTighe and Silver recommend designing curriculum around big ideas using essential questions that relate to student interest and a focus on assessment that targets desired student understanding and the means by which students will demonstrate this understanding.¹⁴¹ LeBar combines progressive principles balanced with a biblical foundation to similarly argue for essential questions that are relevant to student need. She states, “If the pupils are genuinely concerned about it, they will put forth effort to find God’s solution. We can then direct them to the Scripture that provides the clearest answer and is closest to their experience.”¹⁴²

¹³⁸ Jay McTighe and Judy Willis, *Upgrade Your Teaching: Understanding by Design Meets Neuroscience* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2019), 13.

¹³⁹ McTighe and Silver, *Teaching for Deeper Learning*, 2.

¹⁴⁰ McTighe and Silver, *Teaching for Deeper Learning*, 3.

¹⁴¹ McTighe and Silver, *Teaching for Deeper Learning*, 114-16.

¹⁴² Lois LeBar, “Planning for Teaching,” in Graendorf, *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education*, 171.

Assessment and Feedback

While transference of learning is dependent upon a classroom culture centered on quality thinking and discussion, assessment and feedback must continually accompany such goals to ensure their effectiveness. Although assessment has always played a crucial role in education, it has typically come in the form of tests and grades—signaling the end of instruction. Educators have recently begun to recognize that assessment actually encompasses more than this, playing a much larger role in instruction.¹⁴³ Danielson states, “Rather than signaling the *end* of instruction, it [assessment] has become incorporated as an integral *part* of instruction. Teachers have found that assessment is a highly valuable tool in their instructional repertoire; through a skillful use of formative assessment, teachers promote learning.”¹⁴⁴ Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe similarly state, “Because understanding develops as a result of ongoing inquiry and rethinking, the assessment of understanding should be thought of in terms of a collection of evidence over time instead of an ‘event’—a single moment-in-time test at the end of instruction—as so often happens in practice.”¹⁴⁵

Assessment is now recognized as a teacher’s continuous monitoring of student engagement, effectiveness of materials, plans, and student understanding so that modifications and mid-course corrections can be made if necessary. More so, students can begin to assume responsibility for monitoring their own progress and understanding in order to take necessary action.¹⁴⁶ This type of student responsibility fosters life-long learning and the mind-set necessary for perspective transformation into the likeness of Christ.

¹⁴³ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 86.

¹⁴⁴ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 86 (emphasis original).

¹⁴⁵ Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, *Understanding by Design* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2005), 247.

¹⁴⁶ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 86.

Teachers should prepare specific forms of assessment into their lesson design to elicit evidence of student learning so that modifications can be made.¹⁴⁷ Effective formative assessments (viz., ongoing assessments *for* learning) must be intentionally planned in lesson design to provide vital diagnostic information.¹⁴⁸ This includes the use of timely, accurate, and specific feedback for all students through teachers, peers, activities, materials, problems, or technology.¹⁴⁹ Without proper assessment and feedback, teachers and students remain unaware of students' ability to achieve the targeted goals, misunderstandings remain hidden or unaddressed, and a lack of critical understanding and transformation may occur.

This shift from assessment signaling the of end learning to assessment as part of and for learning is reflected in the FFT in Domain 1 and Domain 3. Component 1E (Designing coherent instruction) and component 3D (Using assessment in instruction) both reflect the importance of assessment and feedback in effective teaching and learning. Although church curricula have typically steered away from assessment and feedback as it was previously regarded as tests and grades that are not utilized in church education, the continuous monitoring of student understanding as part of learning and essential feedback must be incorporated in lesson design and instruction. As Christian educators strive to promote transferable understanding for Christlike understanding, assessment and feedback must be included in curricula for church education.

A Faith-Based Constructivist Curriculum for Transformational Teaching

I have established the goal of Christian education and a faith-based constructivist approach for transformational learning. Next, a curriculum design method

¹⁴⁷ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 86.

¹⁴⁸ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 62.

¹⁴⁹ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 87.

must be established that delivers the necessary foundation for teachers and volunteers to follow as they instruct students in this manner. A balanced curriculum should be relevant to student engagement and rigorously designed for student understanding and transformation. According to Wilhoit, the goal of education is to promote meaningful learning, not simply learning meaningful material. He defines meaningful learning as being marked by three features: (1) students see the big picture and then form understanding of the individual lesson, which leads to an understanding of the big picture; (2) students understand the importance and significance of the information; and (3) students relate new learning to previous knowledge.¹⁵⁰ Furthermore, learning should be transferred beyond the initial information through deep learning, problem-solving, and application—or it is likely to be forgotten.¹⁵¹ Curriculum should be designed to promote this type of balanced and meaningful learning.

Deficient Curriculum Design

As opposed to a balanced approach, Christian education often has two unhealthy extremes: (1) mindless knowledge acquisition and fact-based learning or (2) an “emotion-filled philosophy” that neglects Scripture.¹⁵² Curriculum should promote a healthy balance of rigorous and relevant Christian education based on the Word of God. Pazmiño argues that “too many published curricula have relied exclusively upon behavioral objectives, assuming that they alone encompass the content of teaching.”¹⁵³ He recommends a holistic approach that includes problem-solving and expressive

¹⁵⁰ Jones Neal, “The Power of Vygotsky,” 133.

¹⁵¹ Mary Alice Gunter, Thomas E. Estes, and Susan L. Mintz, *Instruction: A Models Approach*, 5th ed. (Boston: Pearson, 2007), 5.

¹⁵² Plueddemann, “The Power of Piaget,” 47.

¹⁵³ Pazmiño, *Principles and Practices of Christian Education*, 101.

activities.¹⁵⁴ Jones Neal similarly suggests that curriculum for Christian education should be examined to promote conceptual understanding as opposed to rote memorization. As a reflection of Vygotskian theories, she adds that “collaborative participation in learning within the zone of proximal development” and appropriate scaffolding are essential tools for Christian education.¹⁵⁵

On the other side of the unhealthy pendulum, Gorman proposes that symbolism or so called “object lessons” may often hold students’ interest, but in the end students are more concerned with the visual or “magic” involved. They become more interested in the “how” of the activity than the principle it intended to teach, resulting in a lack of transformation.¹⁵⁶ Through both examples, Christian education falls short in propelling students toward the intended goal. Although Christian curriculum, like that of its secular textbook and workbook counterpart, “fails to engage students in cognitively demanding tasks, little has been done to alleviate this shortcoming,” and it continues to “embody a widely held misconception: that teaching is primarily the delivery of information and that learning is memorization of that information.”¹⁵⁷

Curriculum and Secular Education

Grant Wiggins labels the “sin” in curriculum design as taking a complex whole, separating it into small chunks, creating a rigid sequence of instruction based on these small pieces, and calling completion of this arrangement “mastery.”¹⁵⁸ He argues that this popular style of curriculum design leads to fractured, boring, and ineffective

¹⁵⁴ Pazmiño, *Principles and Practices of Christian Education*, 101.

¹⁵⁵ Jones Neal, “The Power of Vygotsky,” 131. Vygotskian theory plays a major role in constructive principles, specifically social constructivism.

¹⁵⁶ Gorman, “Children and Developmentalism,” 148-49.

¹⁵⁷ Ritchhart, *Creating Cultures of Thinking*, 151.

¹⁵⁸ Grant Wiggins, “How Good Is Good Enough?,” *Educational Leadership* 71, no. 4 (2014): 11.

learning that lacks the power of transference. Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe similarly argue that conventional curriculum is often “divorced from the ultimate accomplishments desired.”¹⁵⁹ In other words, curriculum is designed without an end in mind, lacking a constant eye on the overall vision for the unit and for transformation.

Wiggins and McTighe argue that traditional curriculum “is a chief impediment to effective schooling and school reform” and that, instead, curriculum should be designed from a different foundation and desired outputs and long-term accomplishments. The authors suggest a backward-design model reflective of transfer goals and worthy tasks requiring students to use content wisely.¹⁶⁰ Wiggins adds that reducing learning to facts and skills is “tempting, common, and harmful,” yet without a sound vision and criteria for effective curriculum design, change is unlikely.¹⁶¹

Curriculum and Church Education

While many teachers are responsible for curriculum design in secular education, Roehlkepartain state that a large percentage of untrained youth education teachers are relying strictly on packaged curriculum. Yet, is church curriculum currently designed in a manner worthy of bearing this load? Roehlkepartain suggests that it most likely is not. He claims that research indicates that teachers should become more like facilitators of learning who promote learning and growth in themselves and their students instead of being the “all-knowing” database. However, this is not how curriculum is written. Roehlkepartain adds that very few curriculum publishers emphasize this truth in their curriculum design. For example, most curricula written for Sunday school give the teacher detailed information on the topic and Scripture but give no instruction to the

¹⁵⁹ Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, *Schooling by Design: Mission, Action, and Achievement* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007), 42.

¹⁶⁰ Wiggins and McTighe, *Schooling by Design*, 37.

¹⁶¹ Wiggins, “How Good Is Good Enough?,” 12.

students.¹⁶² As a result, unless teachers are trained to recognize this deficiency and adapt lessons accordingly, the teacher becomes the “expert,” and students become passive listeners.

Robert Zais suggests that curriculum design should maintain an alignment and a positive “relationship among the four components of curriculum; aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation.”¹⁶³ James Wilhoit adds that curriculum could be improved by promoting better use of the biblical text without fearing interpretation and by bridging the text to the student’s life in a more powerful way.¹⁶⁴

Curriculum Goals

A curriculum designed for transformation with faith-based constructivist principles serving as its foundational pillars reflects a well-balanced mixture of student-centered interest and engagement with a content-focused understanding of Scripture, creating a learning-centered model of education. In a curriculum such as this, one would expect biblically cohesive aspects of constructivist methodology and intentional consideration of situations and topics relevant to students in order to build student understanding and transformation. This type of curriculum facilitates “the construction of knowledge by including opportunities for meaningful and authentic exploration, by designing engaging activities, and by utilizing interactive group work.”¹⁶⁵

This curriculum includes the aspects of community, collaborative participation, and dialogue.¹⁶⁶ It involves the aspect of productive struggle, which allows students to

¹⁶² Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 147.

¹⁶³ Robert S. Zais, *Curriculum: Principles and Foundations* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 439.

¹⁶⁴ James C. Wilhoit, “The Illusion of Change in Curriculum,” *Christian Education Journal* 8, no. 1 (1987): 29.

¹⁶⁵ Espinor, “Overview of Learning Theories,” 14.

¹⁶⁶ Jones Neal, “The Power of Vygotsky,” 131.

wrestle with concepts to build understanding, raises relevant problems that promote student inquiry, and gives students a purpose for reading or a task as they actively engage while Scripture is read.¹⁶⁷ While traditional classrooms are typically dominated by questions focused on procedures and review, to facilitate cultures of thinking, teacher questions should shift to constructive questions that guide and direct student understanding.¹⁶⁸ By writing questions into curriculum geared toward this type of constructivist thinking and allowing time for students to think and discuss in pairs or small groups, designers promote visible thinking and active intellectual engagement.

Curriculum design should reflect the desired outcomes of understanding and critical thinking.¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, assignments should clearly require students to question and thoughtfully pursue big ideas, not simply passively learn the content.¹⁷⁰ If basic content coverage is promoted in the curriculum design, then in-depth student thinking and inquiry will be optional at best and possibly even a distraction.¹⁷¹ According to McTighe and Wiggins, well-written curriculum should align with overall goals and vision, point to long-term transfer goals, focus on transferrable big ideas, involve relevant and thought-provoking essential questions, include authentic and transfer-reliant tasks, and align all activities and assignments with the overall unit goals.¹⁷² The authors also suggests that between 20 and 50 percent of class time should be devoted to in-depth collaborative inquiry discussion, and this time must be allocated for when designing

¹⁶⁷ Gorman, "Children and Developmentalism," 152-53.

¹⁶⁸ Ritchhart, *Creating Cultures of Thinking*, 222.

¹⁶⁹ Jay McTighe and Grant Wiggins, *Essential Questions: Opening Doors to Student Understanding* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2013), 82.

¹⁷⁰ McTighe and Wiggins, *Essential Questions*, 69.

¹⁷¹ McTighe and Wiggins, *Essential Questions*, 83.

¹⁷² McTighe and Wiggins, *Essential Questions*, 106-7.

curriculum and lesson plans.¹⁷³ Good discussion is currently a rarity, and discussion accounts for only 3 percent of K-12 classroom instructional time.¹⁷⁴ In describing the neuroscience behind these suggestions, McTighe and Willis explain that learning activities planned through a backward-design model using essential questions and authentic tasks “build and expand the cognitive networks needed for conceptual understanding and transfer.”¹⁷⁵

Evaluating Church Curriculum

I have presented a vision for Christian education: a faith-based constructivist approach to instruction and curriculum design, with curriculum and instruction designed for thinking and understanding, deep learning, and the transfer of learning for transformation. However, is curriculum for Christian education currently designed in the manner described, and how do we know? Is the current curriculum available to evangelical churches truly promoting the vision for Christian education and the thinking climate described? When looking at evaluation in education, assessments focus dominantly on student attainment of objectives, and rarely does evaluation consist of a comprehensive curriculum assessment.¹⁷⁶

Scholarly research reveals that a study and evaluation of curriculum used in churches is desperately needed and specifically calls for consideration of instructional issues that could lead to better learning experiences.¹⁷⁷ However, the research is limited regarding the evaluation of church small group curriculum and the instructional

¹⁷³ McTighe and Wiggins, *Essential Questions*, 93.

¹⁷⁴ Walsh and Sattes, *Questioning for Classroom Discussion*, 6.

¹⁷⁵ McTighe and Willis, *Upgrade Your Teaching*, 13.

¹⁷⁶ Zais, *Curriculum*, 369.

¹⁷⁷ Dennis E. Williams, “Curriculum Planning for Evangelical Churches” (unpublished manuscript, Denver, CO, 1992), 3-4; Stacie Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons: Evaluating Religious Education Curriculum” (PhD diss., University of Alberta, 2008), 12-13, 24.

effectiveness of existing published curricula. In fact, after reviewing a selection of books, articles, and dissertations in the area of curriculum and evaluation, I only discovered a very few studies that provide a foundation for this work.

The available research literature in this area fails to specifically address the research concern I have expressed. Although a few dissertations reference church curriculum evaluation, the work is mostly focused on creating a guidance tool for churches looking to purchase packaged curriculum. These evaluation tools focus on factors such as theological accuracy, specific church needs, ease of use, extra resources, and visual appeal.¹⁷⁸ Stacie Reck argues that while consumer-focused evaluations are available and valuable for some, critical evaluation of curriculum has been largely overlooked.¹⁷⁹ Dennis Williams similarly argues that “evaluation of curriculum resources too often has focused more on superficial features. Such items as cost, durability and aesthetic appeal have taken on more importance than the educational concerns like the principles of learning and the type of methodology promoted and suggested.”¹⁸⁰

Williams’s unpublished manuscript “Curriculum Planning for Evangelical Churches” discusses many aspects of curriculum, curriculum planning, and curriculum evaluation, and it culminates with a tool for evaluating factors relating to instructional effectiveness, design and physical appearance, philosophy, culture, society, content, and use of the Bible.¹⁸¹ A tool such as this is very exhaustive and beneficial; however, the instructional portion was specifically targeted for the purposes of this research study. To

¹⁷⁸ Burben W. Sullins III, “The Importance of Evaluating Children’s Small-Group Curriculum, Kindergarten-Sixth Grade at Churches in Albuquerque, New Mexico” (DEdMin project, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017) [this dissertation focuses on the evaluation of available published curricula according to specific church visions or needs]; Amanda Kathryn Cooley, “Curriculum Resource Evaluation in Southern Baptist Churches in the State of North Carolina” (EdD thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013), xv-4 [this dissertation also focuses on evaluation of curricula for meeting the needs of churches and developmental needs of students].

¹⁷⁹ Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 24-25.

¹⁸⁰ Williams, “Curriculum Planning for Evangelical Churches,” 89.

¹⁸¹ Williams, “Curriculum Planning for Evangelical Churches.”

address instructional effectiveness of a selected curricula, Williams created a nineteen-question assessment utilizing a 1-5 rating scale for each question. While this is helpful in addressing a breadth of curriculum factors, the scope of coverage limits the depth of information specifically to instruction. This type of assessment is subjective because there is no criteria or suggested examples for obtaining a certain score. Consequently, this assessment serves in a summative manner—similar to an autopsy report—instead of a formative manner—similar to a diagnostic preventative check-up. Therefore, the evaluation tool is limited to evaluating curricula for the purpose of evaluation only as opposed to formatively evaluating *for* curriculum improvement and guiding future curriculum development.

Reck’s dissertation “Colouring with Brown Crayons: Evaluating Religious Curriculum” focused on utilizing existing curriculum evaluation tools from Mary Boys, current research, and existing evaluation tools in order to create an overarching curriculum analysis tool.¹⁸² This tool evaluated curriculum in the following areas: religious and educational beliefs, appropriateness for a particular setting, and evaluation sensitivity to race and culture.¹⁸³ Reck concluded by testing this meta-analysis evaluation tool on a familiar curriculum and recorded findings as well as modifications. When utilizing the new evaluation tool, she noted several instructional deficiencies. First, the curriculum was teacher-centered, as the teacher served as the deliverer of facts and the students’ main task was to receive information.¹⁸⁴ Reck also noted that correct answers were provided to questions, insinuating that there was little room for student discovery and little attention to an atmosphere of discussion.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸² Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 49-51.

¹⁸³ Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 49-51.

¹⁸⁴ Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 134-35.

¹⁸⁵ Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 135-36.

Reck argues that “more attention to in-depth pedagogical questions might strengthen the material” and that “the application of educational theory to religious education is crucial and ‘should’ be included among the many possible components of an evaluation of Christian Religious Education curriculum.”¹⁸⁶ In conclusion, Reck notes that the lack of curriculum evaluation shows that Christians have been “uncritical” about their work, and it has “left us in some cases weaker and the curriculum products of our endeavor less that effective.”¹⁸⁷ She adds that “we have not yet utilized the knowledge of broader educational theories and critiques in ways that have shaped our own work for the better.”¹⁸⁸

Howard Hendricks suggests, “We test the effectiveness of your teaching not by what you do, but by what the student does as a result of what you do.”¹⁸⁹ Zais similarly argues that curriculum evaluation includes the written curriculum document as well as the implemented curriculum, such as the interactions with students, materials, and the environment. Because of the difficulties associated with an evaluation of the written curriculum, combined with the multiple interactions and factors involved in the instructional delivery using the curriculum, he concludes that a comprehensive curriculum evaluation cannot be proposed to measure all curricula.¹⁹⁰ Aligning with Zais’s beliefs, I have intentionally omitted an assessment of the instructional delivery and interactions from this study, and written curriculum will be evaluated based on content and suggested instructional strategies within the written curriculum. Assuming the

¹⁸⁶ Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 158.

¹⁸⁷ Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 162.

¹⁸⁸ Reck, “Colouring with Brown Crayons,” 162.

¹⁸⁹ Hendricks, *Teaching to Change Lives*, 88.

¹⁹⁰ Zais, *Curriculum*, 378-79.

content's theological accuracy, can students learn, transfer, and apply the content based on the learning experiences designed in the written curriculum?

Jane Vella, Paula Berardinelli, and Jim Burrow describe five characteristics of effective evaluation. First, the evaluation should be objective and provide clear evidence indicating if the desired change is being targeted. Second, the important elements of an educational program should be identified for evaluation. Third, the evaluation should match the philosophy of the organization—or, in this case, the philosophy of and vision for Christian education. Fourth, the evaluation measurement should be identifiable and accessible. Fifth, the evaluation should focus on the outcomes as well as the process, consider questions such as “Did we accomplish our objective?” and “Did we accomplish them in an effective and efficient way?”¹⁹¹

Research indicates that the content of curriculum resources largely determines the actual instruction and that the curriculum affects not only *what* students learn but also *how well* they learn it.¹⁹² While a small number of recent studies look at curriculum evaluation, an evaluative tool specifically targeting the transformational intent and vision of Christian education, potential for student understanding and transference of learning, and the potential for student engagement is necessary yet non-existent.

Church Curriculum Evaluation Components

To effectively assess whether curriculum has accomplished the main objectives in an effective and efficient way, evaluation methods must contain certain elements. First, curriculum evaluation should be directly linked to the intended purpose of Christian education.¹⁹³ Secondly, if the purpose of Christian education is to create Christlike

¹⁹¹ Jane Vella, Paula Berardinelli, and Jim Burrow, *How Do They Know They Know? Evaluating Adult Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998), 12.

¹⁹² Williams, “Curriculum Planning for Evangelical Churches,” 89-90.

¹⁹³ Karen Lynn Estep, “Charting the Course: Curriculum Design,” in Estep, White, and Estep, *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church*, 198.

transformation among students, does the curriculum provide learning opportunities that enable students to advance in the application of scriptural knowledge that is required for transformation?

Estep suggests that curriculum evaluation should present strengths and weaknesses in order to implement improvements.¹⁹⁴ He adds that in addition to evaluating what students know, as traditional models of evaluation suggest, it is also important that we use new forms of evaluation to assess students' progress developmentally.¹⁹⁵ Specifically for Christian education, this developmental progress would be spiritual maturity and Christlike transformation. An evaluation of the curriculum itself can offer insight into the curriculum's ability to assess students' developmental progress and, therefore, its ability to lead to spiritual maturity among students. Estep and Estep suggest that a curriculum's effectiveness can only be measured by life transformation, as it is often the connection between programs and people.¹⁹⁶ LeBar adds, "It is easy to feel successful when we have put on a smooth program, but the critical question is, what is happening to the people?"¹⁹⁷

Estep and Estep recommend six dimensions of an exhaustive curriculum evaluation: (1) theory and purpose, (2) student learning, (3) program facilities and resources, (4) instructional methodology, (5) content and materials, and (6) teacher ability.¹⁹⁸ Although each component is important, for the purposes of this narrowed research effort, (1) theory and purpose and (5) content and materials are only explored to

¹⁹⁴ Estep, "Charting the Course," 198.

¹⁹⁵ Estep, "Charting the Course," 198.

¹⁹⁶ Karen Lynn Estep and James Riley Estep Jr, "Checking the Legend and Assessing the Journey: Curriculum Evaluation," in Estep, White, and Estep, *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church*, 205.

¹⁹⁷ LeBar, "Planning for Teaching," 168.

¹⁹⁸ Estep and Estep, "Checking the Legend," 205-12.

a small degree, and some components are not specifically discussed. However, student learning and instructional methodology are the focal point of this investigation. As opposed to evaluating student learning itself, this study focuses on the curriculum's ability to lead to student learning and to discover what happens with students as an end product.¹⁹⁹ Instructional methodology "is the prescribed instructional method that connects the desired learning objective to the participant," and it is also explored in depth in this study.²⁰⁰

Curriculum must be researched and evaluated often so that we can ensure that teaching promotes an understanding of God's Word, is relevant to students' needs, and helps move students toward the fullness of Christ.²⁰¹ Plueddemann states, "One of the best ways to improve the practice of Christian education in local churches is to do better curriculum evaluation, and do it more often."²⁰² Estep and Estep add that we must evaluate curriculum to assess needs that remain unmet, determine current effectiveness, and decide how it might be improved to meet the vision established for Christian education.²⁰³ They describe curriculum evaluation as "the catalyst for change or improvement."²⁰⁴ Quoting Roehlkepartain, Estep and Estep add that "changing times and changing needs will continue to require changing curricula."²⁰⁵ While many authors argue for curriculum evaluations and suggest certain components of an evaluation, there is not currently an existing tool for such evaluation. Building on the work of Stacie Reck

¹⁹⁹ Estep and Estep, "Checking the Legend," 207.

²⁰⁰ Estep and Estep, "Checking the Legend," 209.

²⁰¹ Estep and Estep, "Checking the Legend," 203.

²⁰² James. E. Plueddemann, "Curriculum Improvement through Evaluation," *Christian Education Journal* 8, no. 1 (Autumn 1987): 55.

²⁰³ Estep and Estep, "Checking the Legend," 203.

²⁰⁴ Estep and Estep, "Checking the Legend," 203.

²⁰⁵ Estep and Estep, "Checking the Legend," 203; quoting Roehlkepartain, *The Teaching Church*, 95.

and her meta-analysis evaluation tool, I delve more deeply into the instructional component. I suggest that the Danielson Framework for Teaching offers an excellent evaluation of instructional effectiveness for Christian education curriculum.

Danielson Framework for Teaching: Addressing the Evaluation Gap

After establishing vision for Christian education (a faith-based model of constructivist education) and reviewing a compilation of research-based instructional practices, such as essential components for a culture of thinking, deeper learning, and effective questioning and discussion, Christian educators and curriculum designers need an evaluation tool that effectively assesses a curriculum's ability to incorporate these components. The Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) is a framework for evaluation based on data from empirical and theoretical research promoting student learning.²⁰⁶ Although mostly utilized in secular education settings, the FFT has the potential to evaluate curriculum using the established vision and essential components of a Christian education curriculum.

The FFT addresses the deficiencies in traditional evaluation systems, such as outdated criteria and checklists, simplistic comments like “satisfactory” without guidance for improvement, lack of evaluator consistency, and evaluation based on one-way communication that is “done to” teachers.²⁰⁷ Danielson suggests two main reasons to utilize the FFT for evaluation: (1) ensuring equality that consists of a consistent definition of effective teaching, a shared understanding of such definition, and highly skilled and

²⁰⁶ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 1.

²⁰⁷ Charlotte Danielson, “Evaluations That Help Teachers Learn,” *Effective Teacher* 68, no. 4 (2011): 35.

trained evaluators; (2) the benefits of promoting professional learning and development.²⁰⁸

FFT: A Research-Based Evaluation Tool

Danielson created the FFT from a compilation of Madeline Hunter’s work and research in process-product and cognitive science.²⁰⁹ The FFT is grounded in research, experience, and theory to ensure its validity and applicability to a large variety of instructional settings.²¹⁰ Danielson argues, “Without a framework, the structure is reduced to whatever the mentor, coach, or supervisor has in her head, and it thus reflects the personal beliefs that individual holds about teaching, regardless of whether these have ever been made explicit.”²¹¹ The same is true for evaluating curriculum. Without a framework to specifically evaluate components of a curriculum based on research in best practices and cognitive science, the curriculum’s effectiveness is left to individuals with biases to decide. Danielson adds, “With a framework for teaching in hand, however, participants can conduct conversations about where to focus improvement efforts within the context of shared definitions and understandings.”²¹²

The FFT is built on the principles required for “deep and flexible understanding of complex content, to be able to formulate and test hypotheses, to analyze information, and to be able to relate on part of their learning to another.”²¹³ The FFT is grounded in a constructivist approach to education, and the unifying theme running throughout every component of the FFT is student engagement in learning important

²⁰⁸ Danielson, “Evaluations That Help Teachers Learn,” 35-37.

²⁰⁹ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 6-7.

²¹⁰ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 19-20.

²¹¹ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 12.

²¹² Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 12.

²¹³ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 15.

concepts.²¹⁴ From a constructivist approach, teachers design curriculum with the recognition that students must do the intellectual work in order to understand a concept.²¹⁵ The FFT is built to evaluate teaching from this perspective. Danielson states, “It assumes the primary goal of education is for students to understand important concepts and to develop important cognitive skills, and that it is each teacher’s responsibility, using the resources at hand, to accomplish those goals.”²¹⁶

FFT Components

The FFT is divided into twenty-two components that are clustered into four domains: (1) Planning and Preparation, (2) Classroom Environment, (3) Instruction, and (4) Professional Responsibilities.²¹⁷ In an effort to evaluate curriculum only, as opposed to classroom instruction influenced by various teacher styles and abilities, only Domains 1 and 3 are explored and utilized in this research endeavor. Danielson argues that it is plausible to envision how teachers will engage students in learning by observing their plans.²¹⁸ This research aims to do just that: observe and evaluate curriculum plans to assess the means and likelihood of student engagement. The table below lists each FFT domain and the five or six components within each domain.²¹⁹

Table 1. FFT domains and components

| <i>Planning and Preparation</i> | <i>Classroom Environment</i> | <i>Instruction</i> | <i>Professional Responsibilities</i> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|

²¹⁴ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 26.

²¹⁵ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 16.

²¹⁶ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 17.

²¹⁷ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 1.

²¹⁸ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 27.

²¹⁹ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 3-4.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | Creating an environment of respect and rapport | Communicating with students | Reflecting on teaching |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | Establishing a culture for learning | Using questioning and discussion techniques | Maintaining accurate records |
| Setting instructional outcomes | Managing classroom procedures | Engaging students in learning | Communicating with families |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | Managing student behavior | Using assessment in instruction | Participating in a professional community |
| Designing coherent instruction | Organizing physical space | Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | Growing and developing professionally |
| Designing student assessments | | | Showing professionalism |

FFT: Domains 1 and 3

Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) focuses on how content is organized and instruction is designed in order to achieve student learning. The criterion for scoring Domain 1 recognizes that knowing the content is not adequate because “content must be transformed through instructional design into sequences of activities and exercises that make it accessible to students.”²²⁰ Danielson stresses the importance of Domain 1 by stating that one could “argue that a teacher’s role is not so much to *teach* as it is to *arrange for learning*.”²²¹ This reveals not only the importance of Domain 1 but also the importance of curriculum in Christian education.

Domain 3 (Instruction) contains the essential components for engaging students in content and learning. It reflects the chief mission of education: to improve student learning.²²² Domain 3 components are united through a vision of students working collaboratively and forming understanding.²²³ In order to score well (i.e.,

²²⁰ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 26-27.

²²¹ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 27 (emphasis added).

²²² Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 29.

²²³ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 29.

Accomplished or Exemplary) in Domain 3, students must be “engaged in meaningful work, which carries significance beyond the next test and which can provide skills and knowledge necessary for answering important questions or contributing to important projects. . . . The work is real and significant, and it is important to students as well as to teachers.”²²⁴ For Christlike transformation to happen, students must be engaged in important and meaningful learning.

Conclusion

To answer the research question (“According to the Danielson Framework for Teaching, what are common strengths and weaknesses among high school small group curricula and what could increase their effectiveness in promoting transferrable learning and spiritual growth?”), I have compiled the most up-to-date research on effective instructional practices. Due to a large gap in current scholarly research on the evaluation or effectiveness of high school small group curricula, I have provided strong rationale for this study, the research literature supporting effective instruction, and the need for evaluation. I have also demonstrated that the Danielson Framework for Teaching evaluates the targeted components of a faith-based constructivist approach to effective learning, facilitates the established vision for Christian education, and assesses curricula’s ability to provide instruction that promotes deep thinking and effective discussions, thereby increasing the likelihood of student learning, the transference of content, and Christlike transformation.

Curriculum for Christian education often holds an unbalanced learning approach, leaning too much on recitation and memorization or too much on fun activities with little rigor or deep learning. As the established vision for Christian education reflects, students must encounter a curriculum that does not simply convey knowledge

²²⁴ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 29.

but leads to Christlike transformation. The FFT was utilized to help educators and curriculum designers evaluate the effectiveness of existing curricula in reaching this goal. Chapter 3 discusses the specific methods proposed for utilizing the FFT in this manner.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

While there is very little research or evaluative measures for determining the effectiveness of Sunday school and small group curricula for churches, it is an area worthy of attention. I reflect again on an essential question from chapter 1, “How do we know the curriculum we are handing teachers, often untrained and spiritually immature themselves, includes sufficient instructional practices and strategies for effectively educating our young people and growing them into Christlikeness?”

This chapter describes the methodological design and procedures utilized in this research study as I sought to answer this essential question by analyzing current curricula. The purpose of this quantitative study was to utilize the FFT to find strengths and weaknesses among high school small group curricula and determine what could increase their effectiveness in promoting transferrable learning and spiritual growth. The FFT not only served in the role of a summative assessment of existing curricula but also as a formative assessment offering suggestions for improvement to existing curricula and as a guide for the development of future curricula. The following research questions were considered in this study:

1. What are five of the best-selling curricula among evangelical churches for high school Sunday school classes or small groups?
2. How does each curriculum score according to Domains 1 and 3 on the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT)?
3. Is church curriculum presently written in a way that trained or untrained teachers can effectively follow to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical knowledge and understanding into Christlike living?
4. Based on strengths and weaknesses of curricula according to Domains 1 and 3 on the FFT, what are suggestions and further implications for improving church curricula designed for high school students?

5. What are suggested practices in church contexts using the FFT for evaluation?

Research Design Overview

The main component of this research involves the use of the FFT in analyzing and evaluating church curricula for small groups. Therefore, these steps were followed:

1. Identify and download samples or purchase five of the best-selling high school small group curricula among evangelical churches.
2. Number each lesson from all five published curricula, and randomly draw ten numbers representing the three lessons to be evaluated from each curriculum.
3. Score each lesson from 1 to 4 according to all components of Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT.
4. Record and analyze the data from each component of each domain.
5. Find the average score from the ten combined lessons from each curriculum for each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3.
6. Create an overall score for each curriculum, including a summary of strengths and weaknesses.
7. Create an overall average score for each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3, including a summary of strengths and weaknesses of published curricula according to the domains and characteristics described in the FFT.
8. Write a research report that includes suggestions for improvement for each curriculum individually and for a generalization of all church curricula for high school students. Also discuss standard practices for teacher evaluation within churches.

Population

The research population for this study was all evangelical curriculum publishers of small group or Sunday school materials for high school students sold by Christian Book Distributors.

Sample and Delimitations

Samples were chosen from a list of all evangelical published small group or Sunday school curriculum for high school students provided by Christian Book Distributors. This sampling technique purposively targeted five of the best-selling curricula among this population in order to get a representation of high school curricula

that is most widely used among evangelical churches. While there is no list of best-selling curricula, Christian Book Distributors sells curricula from a wide variety of publishing companies. After obtaining a list of their five best-selling publishing companies, I attempted to find five of the best-selling products by calling the publishing companies on this list and finding their top-selling curricula for teen small group studies. The best-selling curricula from each of these five publishing companies were then evaluated.

After gathering the five curricula to evaluate, I carried out a random sampling of lessons to be evaluated for each curriculum. None of the curricula had ten lessons available as samples, so I purchased the latest quarterly issue of each and randomly selected ten lessons from each quarterly to evaluate using the FFT. However, in efforts to protect each publishing company, I did not label the findings according to publisher but as Curriculum 1 through Curriculum 5.

Limitations of Generalization

This study sought to evaluate only five curricula out of the many evangelical curricula in production. While I strived to find the five best-selling curricula for evaluation, those five are not fully representative of all published curricula for evangelical small groups and Sunday school classes for high school students. Curricula may be written in many different forms based on many different educational philosophies and methodologies. Since there is a large gap in the research of curriculum evaluation for instructional effectiveness, this study sought to provide a foundational representation of curriculum effectiveness as a whole while prompting further investigation and research.

Research Method and Instrumentation

This study relied on a content analysis utilizing Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT evaluation tool. The FFT is a constructivist framework built on research-based methodologies. In order for administrators to use the FFT for teacher evaluations in the

state of Kentucky, evaluators must complete an initial training and pass the final assessment. In order to maintain eligibility for observing and evaluating teachers, evaluators must also be recertified yearly by completing coursework and passing an exam. I have successfully passed this certification requirement each year since 2012 either through face-to-face instruction or Teachscape, an online FFT training and evaluation platform.

The FFT is both valid and reliable as it was compiled based on a multitude of research on effective instructional techniques and philosophies, much of which were discussed in chapter 2. According to Charlotte Danielson, “The framework for teaching is based on the Praxis III criteria developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) after extensive surveys of the research literature, consultation with expert practitioners and researchers, wide-ranging job analyses, summaries of the demands of state licensing programs, and fieldwork.”¹

Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) relies on the work of many leading researchers and educators. Research overwhelmingly points to the reliance of effective instruction and optimal student learning on well-organized, effective planning.² Component 1A is built upon research that teachers should understand the content they are teaching and how it relates to other ideas and content.³ Component 1B relies on research on the importance of teachers’ knowing students, their abilities, prior knowledge, and skills.⁴ Component 1C stresses the importance of teachers’ establishing clear goals and outcomes for student learning; many studies in the research literature support the link

¹ Charlotte Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd ed. (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007), 183.

² Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 184.

³ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 184-85.

⁴ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 185.

between effective student learning and teachers' learning goals.⁵ Component 1D is concerned with lesson designers' demonstration of their knowledge of resources, which relies on research addressing the need for multiple resources and collaboration.⁶ Component 1E is concerned with designing coherent instruction. This component is highly supported by research literature recommending that concepts should be the center around which content is organized in an effort to assist the brain in making patterns and connections.⁷ Component 1F (Designing student assessments) is built upon a multitude of research studies, including the work of Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe.⁸ They argue that a major shift in education requires teachers to utilize assessment and student feedback as teaching happens, not only as an audit of student work at the end of a unit, in order to improve student understanding and uncover any misunderstandings.⁹

Domain 3 (Instruction) is heavily reliant upon recent educational research emphasizing the importance of constructivist teaching and learning focused on teaching for conceptual learning and understanding.¹⁰ Component 3A (Communicating with students) is specifically supported by Susan Ambrose et al. in *How Learning Works: 7 Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. The authors conclude from their research that material must be connected to student interest in order get more student motivation

⁵ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 185.

⁶ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 186.

⁷ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 186.

⁸ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 186.

⁹ Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, *Understanding by Design* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2005), 247.

¹⁰ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 187.

and engagement.¹¹ Similarly, content must be related to and integrated with background knowledge and must be presented with clarity.¹²

Component 3b (questioning and discussion techniques) is grounded in effective questioning research and specifically connected to Lois LeBar’s work in the field of Christian education. LeBar states,

When students are trained to ask questions of the text, they see exciting things that they had no idea were there when they read superficially. Good teachers seek to become skilled in the art of asking good questions. Not only do we need to see how the Bible relates to students’ needs, but we need to help them think up good questions to discover the truths for themselves.¹³

Component 3C (Engaging students in learning) is also the product of a multitude of research. In particular, Peter Brown, Henry Roediger, and Mark Daniel refer to the science of learning as they explain that for new learning to stick in long-term memory, a process of consolidation is necessary. They state, “Durable learning, however, requires time for mental rehearsal and other processes for consolidation.”¹⁴

Component 3D (Using assessment in instruction) relies on research indicating not only that assessment should be utilized for effective instruction but also that “instructional support does not need to come directly from another person to be helpful.”¹⁵ This is reflected in the self-assessment criteria found in the Exemplary range of 3D. Teachers are not the only responsible persons in the assessment process. Students can learn to self-assess and reflect on their own learning for effective learning. Research

¹¹ Susan A. Ambrose et al., *How Learning Works: 7 Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010), 83.

¹² Mary Alice Gunter, Thomas E. Estes, and Susan L. Mintz, *Instruction: A Models Approach*, 5th ed. (Boston: Pearson, 2007), 11.

¹³ Lois E. LeBar, “Planning for Teaching,” in *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education*, ed. Werner C. Graendorf (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), 172.

¹⁴ Peter C. Brown, Henry L. Roediger III, and Mark A. Daniel, *Make It Stick: The Science of Successful Learning* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2014), 49.

¹⁵ Ambrose et al., *How Learning Works*, 132.

points to the importance of metacognition (i.e., students' ability to think about their thinking) for transferable learning to occur.¹⁶

Lastly, component 3e (demonstrating responsiveness and flexibility) is based on research by The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards that recognizes the value of lesson adjustments, responsiveness to students, and teacher persistence.¹⁷

The research literature supporting each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT is also in alignment with the literature review in chapter 2. The FFT aligns with the most current research on creating a culture of thinking and discussion, effective questioning and discussion techniques, and deeper learning. It also aligns with the research literature supporting evaluation and effective components of curriculum.

Ethics Committee Process

Since this study relied on content evaluation of published curricula, the research process did not require interaction with people. However, I obtained approval by The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Research Ethics Committee before proceeding with the research. All content was found online or purchased through the curriculum producer's website.

Research Procedures

The literature review revealed a large gap in the research concerned with evaluating church curricula, especially small group and Sunday school curricula. The majority of research on curriculum evaluation focused on guidance for churches in selecting curriculum from the available options based on specific church vision and needs. However, there was no research on evaluating curriculum for instructional

¹⁶ Gunter, Estes, and Mintz, *Instruction*, 11.

¹⁷ Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice*, 188.

effectiveness. Therefore, this research solely focused on evaluating curriculum for potential effectiveness.

After choosing five of the best-selling evangelical curricula for small groups and Sunday schools for high school students, I randomly selected ten lessons from each curriculum. I evaluated and analyzed ten lessons from all five curricula using each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT. The following table was used to evaluate each of the five curricula.

Table 2. Evaluation of each curriculum component

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------------------|
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Setting instructional outcomes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Designing coherent instruction | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Designing student assessments | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average Score |
| Communicating with students | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 2 continued

| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average Score |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------------------|
| Engaging students in learning | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Using assessment in instruction | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | | | | | | | | | | | |

Next, the following table was utilized to record the overall scores for each curriculum. It included the overall score from each domain, the total score, the average rating (between 1 and 4), and the overall range (Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, or Exemplary) for each curriculum.

Table 3. Evaluation of overall curricula scores

| Curriculum | Domain 1 Score | Domain 3 Score | Total Score | Average Rating | Range (Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, Exemplary) |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |

I utilized the following table to record a score for each component in Domains 1 and 3 for all five curricula in order to find an average score and range for each individual component.

Table 4. Evaluation chart for overall component scores

| | Curriculum 1 Average Score | Curriculum 2 Average Score | Curriculum 3 Average Score | Curriculum 4 Average Score | Curriculum 5 Average Score | Average Score | Range (Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, Exemplary) |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|---|
| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | | | | | | | |
| Setting instructional outcomes | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | | | | | | | |
| Designing coherent instruction | | | | | | | |
| Designing student assessments | | | | | | | |
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | | | | | | | |
| Communicating with students | | | | | | | |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | | | | | | | |
| Engaging students in learning | | | | | | | |
| Using assessment in instruction | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | | | | | | | |

Scoring Criteria

The qualitative research involved in this study relied on the utilization of the FFT for content analysis of ten lessons from each of the five published curricula. Each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT were scored from 1 to 4 (1 = Ineffective; 2 = Developing; 3 = Accomplished; 4 = Exemplary). A score was calculated for each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3. Next, a combined total score was given for each curriculum. By dividing the total score by the number of components in each particular domain and then dividing that number by two because there are two domains scored, an average score would reflect an overall score in the Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, or Exemplary range.

Next, after scores were collected for each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3 for each curriculum, an overall average was calculated for each component based on the scores from all five curricula. This provided an overall picture of the ability of curricula to provide effective material in each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3. After an average score was calculated, it was then translated to an overall Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, or Exemplary rating for each component among all curricula analyzed.

Summary

This chapter outlined the research methodology utilized in answering the research question. The research design, instrumentation, and procedures were thoroughly explained. Samples, delimitations, and generalizations were also explained. The following chapter describes research results following the methodology explained in this chapter.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this research study was to utilize the FFT to find strengths and weaknesses among high school small group curricula and determine instructional practices that could increase the curricula effectiveness in promoting transferable learning and spiritual growth. To complete this study and answer the research questions, I utilized Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT to evaluate ten randomly sampled lessons from five of the best-selling curricula for small groups of high school students. This study presents the evaluation results for each lesson, for each curriculum, and for each component of Domain 1 and Domain 3. The resulting data is reported and analyzed in this chapter.

Compilation Protocol

Before completing this study, I received several years of FFT training through Teachscape, an online learning platform designed to prepare administrators and learning coaches to evaluate and grow teachers professionally by utilizing the FFT. After the initial training, evaluators must be recertified yearly to be qualified to use the FFT to evaluate teachers. I have completed this training once a year for the past seven years.

Phase 1

After having difficulty finding a list of or method of identifying the five best-selling high school curricula for small groups with certainty, I contacted Christian Book Distributors, which distributes most all curricula from a variety of evangelical publishers. They directed me to the filter and sort features on their website. I found the top-selling publishers of teen small group curricula from Christian Book Distributors' website by limiting my search to high school curricula for small groups and using their best-selling

sort feature. There were two publishing companies that had more than one curriculum in the top five best-sellers, so I counted that company only once and used the top seven in the best-selling list to find the top five best-selling publishing companies.

Next, I contacted the publishing company represented in this list of five best-sellers to find their best-selling curricula for high school small groups, and then I purchased the latest teacher and student books from each company. For each curriculum purchased, I used an online number generator to limit the number of lessons in each curriculum to evaluate only ten. I entered the total number of lessons provided into the number generator and recorded the first ten numbers that it generated. If a number was duplicated, I did not count the duplicate and continued until I had ten different numbers. For example, Curriculum 1 had thirteen lessons in the teacher and corresponding student books. After putting numbers one through thirteen in a random draw generator (random.org), individual numbers were generated until there were a total of ten. If a number was generated for the second time, it was skipped, and numbers were generated again.

For Curriculum 1, the following numbers were generated: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13. Therefore, these lessons were selected to be evaluated in Curriculum 1. For Curriculum 2, the following numbers were generated: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. Therefore, these lessons were selected to be evaluated in Curriculum 2. For Curriculum 3, the following numbers were generated: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Therefore, these lessons were selected to be evaluated in Curriculum 3. For Curriculum 4, the following numbers were generated: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13. Therefore, these lessons were selected to be evaluated in Curriculum 4. For Curriculum 5, the following numbers were generated: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Therefore, these lessons were selected to be evaluated in Curriculum 5.

Phase 2

After the lesson numbers for each curriculum were generated and lessons were selected to evaluate, Domains 1 and 3 of the FFT were used to evaluate each lesson of each curriculum. The teacher edition and student edition of each curriculum were reviewed in order to evaluate each component of both domains. The scores for each curriculum were recorded per randomly selected lesson in the tables below. The following scores are recorded for the corresponding label (1 = Ineffective; 2 = Developing; 3 = Accomplished; 4 = Exemplary). Domain 3 component E (3E; Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness) relies heavily on the evaluation of a teacher's ability to be flexible and respond effectively in moving students toward deeper understanding. While it is more difficult to assess this component due to evaluating the curricula instead of teacher performance, this component was scored based on the written advice or guidelines for teacher flexibility and responsiveness. If a score of 1 (Ineffective) is received, it might be possible for a teacher to make adaptations, but they are not explicitly written into the curricula.

Table 5. Curriculum 1 scores

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.5 |
| Setting instructional outcomes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1.6 |

Table 5 continued

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| Designing coherent instruction | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| Designing student assessments | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Average Score |
| Communicating with students | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.6 |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Engaging students in learning | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.7 |
| Using assessment in instruction | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |

Table 6. Curriculum 2 scores

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | Average Score |
|---|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|------------------|
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.0 |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Setting instructional outcomes | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.7 |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2.9 |

Table 6 continued

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | Average Score |
|---|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|------------------|
| Designing coherent instruction | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1.9 |
| Designing student assessments | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1.9 |
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | Lesson 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | Average Score |
| Communicating with students | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2.9 |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1.4 |
| Engaging students in learning | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Using assessment in instruction | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |

Table 7. Curriculum 3 scores

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Setting instructional outcomes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.1 |

Table 7 continued

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| Designing coherent instruction | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.8 |
| Designing student assessments | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Average Score |
| Communicating with students | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.1 |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.3 |
| Engaging students in learning | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.1 |
| Using assessment in instruction | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |

Table 8. Curriculum 4 scores

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Setting instructional outcomes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Table 8 continued

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| Designing coherent instruction | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Designing student assessments | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | Lesson 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Average Score |
| Communicating with students | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Engaging students in learning | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Using assessment in instruction | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Table 9. Curriculum 5 scores

| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Average Score |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.0 |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.2 |
| Setting instructional outcomes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |

Table 9 continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------------|
| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | Lesson 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Average Score |
| Designing coherent instruction | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.8 |
| Designing student assessments | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | Lesson 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Average Score |
| Communicating with students | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.0 |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Engaging students in learning | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2.6 |
| Using assessment in instruction | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.4 |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |

Phase 3

Using the existing data, I calculated an overall score for Domain 1 and Domain 3 for each curriculum. Next, I used this information to find an overall score for each of the five curricula based on Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. Since the highest possible score for each component is 4.0, the average rating for each curriculum is reported out of a total possible score of 4.0. To find the range, Ineffective must start at 1.0, since 1.0 is the lowest possible score, and end at 1.49, since 1.50 and above would be closer to a score of 2.0, which is Developing. Therefore, Developing begins at 1.50 and ends at 2.49, Accomplished includes 2.50-3.49, and Exemplary includes 3.5-4.0.

Table 10. Overall curricula scores

| Curriculum | Domain 1 Score | Domain 3 Score | Total Score | Average Rating | Range (Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, Exemplary) |
|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| 1 | 12.00/24.00 | 7.50/20.00 | 19.50/44.00 | 1.77 | Developing |
| 2 | 14.40/24.00 | 9.30/22.00 | 23.70/44.00 | 2.15 | Developing |
| 3 | 9.90/24.00 | 7.70/20.00 | 17.60/44.00 | 1.60 | Developing |
| 4 | 6.00/24.00 | 5.00/20.00 | 11.00/44.00 | 1.00 | Ineffective |
| 5 | 12.00/24.00 | 10.00/20.00 | 22.00/44.00 | 2.00 | Developing |

Curriculum 1 had a score of 14.40 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 7.50 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 19.50 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in an average rating of 1.77 out of 4.00 and fell within the Developing range.

Curriculum 2 had a score of 14.40 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 9.30 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 23.70 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in an average rating of 2.15 out of 4.00 and fell within the Developing range.

Curriculum 3 had a score of 9.90 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 7.70 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 17.60 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in an average rating of 1.60 out of 4.00 and fell within the Developing range.

Curriculum 4 had a score of 6.00 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 5.00 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 11.00 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in an average rating of 1.00 out of 4.00 and fell within the Ineffective range.

Curriculum 5 had a score of 12.00 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 10.00 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 22.00 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in an average rating of 2.00 out of 4.00 and fell within the Developing range.

Phase 4

Lastly, I calculated an overall score for each individual component of Domain 1 and Domain 3 by combining and averaging the results of all five curricula in order to gain a better understanding of strengths and weaknesses according to the components within Domain 1 and Domain 3. The average score was based on 1.00 being the lowest and 4.00 being the highest possible score. To find the range, Ineffective must start at 1.00, since 1.00 is the lowest possible score, and end at 1.49, since 1.50 and above would be closer to a score of 2.00, which is Developing. Therefore, Developing begins at 1.50 and ends at 2.49, Accomplished includes 2.50-3.49, and Exemplary includes 3.5-4.0.

Table 11. Overall component scores

| | Curriculum 1 Average Score | Curriculum 2 Average Score | Curriculum 3 Average Score | Curriculum 4 Average Score | Curriculum 5 Average Score | Average Score | Range (Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, Exemplary) |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| <i>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</i> | | | | | | | |
| Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.20 | Developing |
| Demonstrating a knowledge of students | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 1.74 | Developing |
| Setting instructional outcomes | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.34 | Ineffective |
| Demonstrating knowledge of resources | 1.6 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.92 | Developing |
| Designing coherent instruction | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 1.70 | Developing |
| Designing student assessments | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.18 | Ineffective |

Table 11 continued

| | Curriculum 1 Average Score | Curriculum 2 Average Score | Curriculum 3 Average Score | Curriculum 4 Average Score | Curriculum 5 Average Score | Average Score | Range (Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, Exemplary) |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| <i>Domain 3: Instruction</i> | | | | | | | |
| Communicating with students | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.32 | Developing |
| Using questioning and discussion techniques | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.38 | Ineffective |
| Engaging students in learning | 1.7 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.88 | Developing |
| Using assessment in instruction | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.32 | Ineffective |
| Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 | Ineffective |

In Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation), component A (1A; Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy) received an average score of 2.20 out of 4.00, falling within the Developing range. Component B (1B; Demonstrating a knowledge of students) received an average score of 1.74 out of 4.00, falling within the Developing range. Component C (1C; Setting instructional outcomes) received an average of 1.34 out of 4.00, falling within the Ineffective range. Component D (1D; Demonstrating knowledge of resources) combined for an average of 1.92 out of 4.00, falling within the Developing range. Component E (1E; Designing coherent instruction) received an average score of 1.70 out of 4.00, falling within the Developing range. Component F (1F; Designing student assessments) received an average of 1.18 out of 4.00, falling within the Ineffective range.

In Domain 3 (Instruction), component A (3A; Communicating with students) received an average score of 2.32 out of 4.00, falling within the Developing range.

Component B (3B; Using questioning and discussion techniques) received an average score of 1.38 out of 4.00, falling within the Ineffective range. Component C (3C; Engaging students in learning) received an average of 1.88 out of 4.00, falling within the Developing range. Component D (3D; Using assessment in instruction) received an average of 1.32 out of 4.00, falling within the Ineffective range. Component E (3E; Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness) received an average score of 1.00 out of 4.00, falling within the Ineffective range.

Results by Research Question

The overarching research question sought to utilize the FFT in order to evaluate the current best-selling curricula for high school small groups in order to better understand curricula effectiveness, including strengths and weaknesses. In order to thoroughly understand and answer this question, five research questions were established and explored. The first question helped to identify the five best-selling curricula for high school small groups. The second question sought to discover how each curriculum scored according to Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT. The third question explored the effectiveness of curricula if provided to untrained teachers who could not easily make adaptations and additions. The fourth question helped to offer suggestions for improvements to curricula based on the evaluation results and common areas of weakness. The fifth question explored the potential of using the FFT in church contexts.

Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked, “What are five of the best-selling curricula among evangelical churches for high school Sunday school classes or small groups?” This information was not easily accessible. I eventually decided to use Christian Book Distributors to help identify the best-selling curricula. Christian Book Distributors sells most all evangelical curriculum from their website. They advised me to use the filter function on their website to limit search results to only high school curricula for small

groups. After I obtained the results, they suggested using the sort feature that sorted the results by listing the best-selling resources in order from greatest to least. An unanticipated result was finding that two publishing companies had more than one curriculum in the five best-sellers. After obtaining supervisor consent, I used the top five publishing companies instead of the top five curricula. Since most curriculum publishing companies produce similar products, I decided to evaluate five different publishers. I contacted the five best-selling publishing companies and asked for their best-selling curriculum for high school small groups. Lastly, I purchased the latest issues of each of the five curricula, including the student workbooks.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 asked, “How does each curriculum score according to Domains 1 and 3 on the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT)?” Overall, four curricula scored within the Developing range, one scored within the Ineffective range, and no curricula scored within the Accomplished or Exemplary ranges according to a combined average score for Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT.

Curriculum 1 had a score of 14.40 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 7.50 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 19.50 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in an average rating of 1.77 out of 4.00 and fell within the Developing range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 1 averaged a score of 1.62, which narrowly fell within the Developing range. The highest scoring component in Domain 1 was component A (1A; Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy), and the lowest scoring components were component C (1C; Setting instructional outcomes), component E (1E; Designing coherent instruction), and component F (1F; Designing student assessments), all of which scored a 1.00 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 1 averaged a score of 1.50, which narrowly fell within the Developing range. The highest scoring component in Domain 3 was component A (3A; Communicating with students), and the

lowest scoring components were for component D (3D; Using assessment in instruction) and component E (3E; Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness).

Curriculum 2 had a score of 14.40 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 9.30 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 23.70 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in an average rating of 2.15 out of 4 and fell within the Developing range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 2 averaged a score of 2.40, which fell at the high end of the Developing range. The highest scoring component in Domain 1 was component A (1A; Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy), and the lowest scoring components were component E (1E; Designing coherent instruction) and component F (1F; Designing student assessments), both of which scored a 1.00 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 2 averaged a score of 1.90, which fell within the Developing range. The highest scoring component in Domain 3 was component A (3A; Communicating with students), and the lowest scoring component was (3E; Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness).

Curriculum 3 had a score of 9.90 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 7.70 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 17.60 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in average rating of 1.60 out of 4 and fell within the Developing range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 3 averaged a score of 1.70, which fell within the Developing range. The highest scoring component in Domain 1 was component D (1D; Demonstrating knowledge of resources), and the lowest scoring components were component C (1C; Setting instructional outcomes) and component F (1F; Designing student assessments), both of which scored a 1.00 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 3 averaged a score of 1.50, which narrowly fell within the Developing range. The highest scoring components in Domain 3 were component A (3A; Communicating with students) and component C (3C; Engaging students in learning), and the lowest scoring component was component E (3E; Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness).

Curriculum 4 had a score of 6.00 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 5.00 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 11.00 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in average rating of 1.00 out of 4.00 and fell within the Ineffective range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 4 averaged a score of 1.00, which fell at the lowest point of the Ineffective range. All six components of Domain 1 (components A-F) scored an average of 1.00 (Ineffective). In Domain 3, Curriculum 4 averaged a score of 1.00, which also fell at the lowest point of the Ineffective range. All five components of Domain 3 (components A-E) scored an average of 1.00 (Ineffective).

Curriculum 5 had a score of 12.00 out of 24.00 in Domain 1, 10.00 out of 20.00 in Domain 3, and an overall score of 22.00 out of 44.00 in Domain 1 and Domain 3 combined. This resulted in average rating of 2.00 out of 4.00 and fell within the Developing range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 5 averaged a score of 2.00, which fell within the Developing range. The highest scoring component in Domain 1 was component A (1A; Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy), and the lowest scoring components were component C (1C; Setting instructional outcomes) and component F (1F; Designing student assessments), both of which scored a 1.00 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 5 averaged a score of 2.00, which fell within the Developing range. The highest scoring component in Domain 3 was component A (3A; Communicating with students), and the lowest scoring component was component E (3E; Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness).

Research Question 3

Research question 3 asked, “Is church curriculum presently written in a way that trained or untrained teachers can effectively follow to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical knowledge and understanding into Christlike living?” The FFT is designed in a way that Accomplished and Exemplary scores, or scores of 3.00 and 4.00, respectively, on each component, are considered effective at promoting student

thinking, application, and transfer of learning and understanding. The highest overall score or range for any curriculum as a whole was 2.15 (Developing). The highest score for Domain 1 among all five curricula was 2.40 (Developing), and the highest score for Domain 3 was 2.00 (Developing). After reviewing all scores from Domain 1, Domain 3, and a combination of Domain 1 and Domain 3, I found that there were no scores of 2.50-4.00, meaning there were no scores within the Accomplished or Exemplary ranges. According to this data, none of the five curricula evaluated was written in a way that teachers can effectively follow to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical knowledge and understanding leading to Christlike living. Trained educators may have the knowledge and ability to apply their understanding of effective instructional practices in a manner that could potentially increase the scores on many components in Domain 1 and Domain 3. However, if curricula are followed explicitly and conducted instructionally exactly as prescribed, none of the evaluated curricula would promote high levels of student thinking, application, and transfer of learning that is indicative of effective instruction according to the FFT. It is highly probable that if any of these five curricula was provided to uneducated volunteer teachers for high school small groups without training or adjustments, then effective instruction—according to the FFT—would not occur.

Research Question 4

Research question 4 asked, “Based on strengths and weaknesses of curricula according to Domains 1 and 3 on the FFT, what are suggestions and further implications for improving church curricula designed for high school students?” There were five components from Domain 1 and Domain 3 that had an average score in the Ineffective range. Each of the five Ineffective components will be discussed.

Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

Component 3E (Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness) had an average score of 1.00 among all five curricula. In fact, each of the five curricula had a score of 1.00, indicating that each curriculum scored Ineffective. The Ineffective criteria for this component on the FFT are as follows: (1) The teacher adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or lack of interest. (2) The teacher ignores student questions; when students experience difficulty, the teacher blames the students or their home environment. The critical attributes under Ineffective are as follows: (1) The teacher ignores indications of student boredom or lack of understanding. (2) The teacher brushes aside student questions. (3) The teacher makes no attempt to incorporate students' interests into the lesson. (4) The teacher conveys to students that when they have difficulty learning, it is their fault. (5) In reflecting on practice, the teacher does not indicate that it is important to reach all students. A score of 1.00 for each curriculum suggests that these Ineffective indicators and critical attributes best fit all five curricula.

This component (3E) is definitely more evident and valid to score in a classroom as opposed to evaluating only the curricula; however, it was included in the evaluation process because curricula can suggest, recommend, or encourage certain behaviors or responses that could assist teachers in meeting this criteria. For the curricula evaluated, there were no suggestions or encouragement that would aid teachers in the area of Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness, thus resulting in the score of 1.00.

For a curricula to score at the highest level (Exemplary) in Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness (3E), the curricula would need to promote the following: (1) The teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interest, or successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual misunderstandings. (2) The teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and

soliciting additional resources from the school or community. The critical attributes under Exemplary are as follows: (1) The teacher's adjustments to the lesson are designed to assist individual students. (2) The teacher seizes on a teachable moment to enhance the lesson. (3) The teacher conveys to students that she will not consider a lesson "finished" until every student understands and that she has a broad range of approaches to use. (4) In reflecting on practice, the teacher can cite others in the school and beyond whom she has contacted for assistance in reaching some students.

Although it is difficult to address this component of the FFT through written curricula, since Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness (3E) is heavily based on a teacher's response and skill, it would be possible and helpful to list certain suggestions to aid teachers in flexibility and responsiveness during each lesson. In order to move curricula from an Ineffective range more toward an Exemplary range, the curricula should include at least three things.

First, the curricula could state that it is important that teachers look for opportunities to enhance learning by building on ideas or inquiries presented by students as well as adjusting instruction if misconceptions are identified. It would be helpful to list common misunderstandings or misconceptions to be watchful of. Second, curricula could specify that if student answers suggest misconceptions, then teachers should address these issues as they arise. A list of resources or instructional strategies for utilization could be provided. Third, the curricula should indicate to teachers that lessons are not complete just because students have finished the reading, answered the questions, or completed certain tasks. Instead, a lesson is considered complete when all students understand the instructional goals without lingering misconceptions or misunderstandings. This may conclude by the end of a teaching session, but supplemental instruction to address these misconceptions may need to be offered as a follow-up lesson. Suggestions for this type of follow-up lesson could be provided based on potential

misconceptions or misunderstandings. This would include additional resources beneficial for instructional assistance or building conceptual understanding.

Designing Student Assessments

Component 1F (Designing student assessments) had an average score of 1.18 among all five curricula, falling within the Ineffective range. Average scores for this component for each of the five curricula were 1.00, 1.90, 1.00, 1.00, and 1.00, indicating that four curricula scored an average of Ineffective and one scored an average of Developing. The Ineffective criteria for this component on the FFT are as follows: (1) Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes; the proposed approach contains no criteria or standards. (2) The teacher has no plan to incorporate formative assessment into the lesson or unit nor any plan to use assessment results in designing future instruction. The critical attributes under Ineffective are as follows: (1) Assessments do not match instructional outcomes. (2) Assessments have no criteria. (3) No formative assessments have been designed. (4) Assessment results do not affect future plans. The five curricula evaluated were best represented by these indicators and critical attributes in Designing student assessments (1F).

For a curriculum to score at the highest level (Exemplary) in Designing student assessments (1F), it would need to promote the following: (1) The teacher's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes and has clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. (2) Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed. (3) The approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as teacher use of the assessment information. (4) The teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students. The critical attributes under Exemplary are as follows: (1) Assessments provide opportunities for student choice. (2) Students participate in designing assessments for their own work. (3) Teacher-designed

assessments are authentic with real-world application, as appropriate. (4) Students develop rubrics according to teacher-specified learning objectives. (5) Students are actively involved in collecting information from formative assessments and provide input.

It is worth considering the following: Since churches do not assess in the form of tests and grades and curricula for churches typically do not provide this type of assessment, should components addressing assessment be included in this research and evaluation critique? Understanding the shift in assessment from a focus simply on the end result to a focus on assessment as *for* learning, not just assessment *of* learning, causes one to view this differently. After closely examining the criteria and critical attributes in Domain 1E and Domain 3D, it is evident that they are reflective of this shift in the purpose and meaning of assessment in learning. Therefore, it is still a valid and accurate evaluation of church curricula, as assessment has more instructional value and less emphasis on simply a test or grade.

There are at least three suggestions based on FFT criteria and critical attributes for Designing student assessments that would help move curricula from the Ineffective range toward the Exemplary range. First, assessment must match the instructional outcomes. If there are not clear instructional outcomes established, this will not be possible. The Exemplary range criteria suggests that students play a role in developing assessments. At first thought, this seems almost impossible for packaged curricula; however, with some modifications, it can be accomplished. If the outcomes for the lesson are posed as an essential question for the students at the very beginning of the lesson, then they can ask questions about that question.

For example, if the essential question for a lesson is “Is an eye for an eye acceptable for us?” and the targeted outcome is to teach students how to understand the Old Testament compared to how to understand the New Testament, then students would ask questions about this essential question. They may ask questions like “What does the

Bible say?” “Does the Bible say an eye for an eye, and does this mean it’s okay for us?” “Why does the New Testament say to turn the other cheek?” and other possible questions. The curricula may suggest possible student questions, acknowledging that students may come up with questions not listed that should also be added. Using these questions, students can help create a rubric for evaluating their final responses to this question at the end of the unit or lesson. Basically, students are playing a role in deciding how a teacher would know if they thoroughly understand this concept or not. The role of the curriculum would be to state some common assessment criteria for student answers to this essential question while also allowing for additional components that arise from student comments. Although this assessment is not for purposes of grades or pass/fail, it is essential for teachers to obtain information that reflects the students’ level of understanding, including any misconceptions that may remain. The Exemplary criteria also suggest giving students some choice in the final assessment. This could be as simple as providing an answer in written form, through illustration, through video, or other modes of communication.

Second, the curricula should include possible adaptations for students with special needs and accommodations. Curriculum should also offer recommendations on how teachers and students should be using the ongoing informal observation and formative assessment information to make adjustments to instruction.

Third, it is recommended, according to the Exemplary criteria, that assessments should relate to real-world application of the important concepts when appropriate. Assessments should require the student to utilize their understanding at that point in their lesson as it applies or connects to real-world situations.

Using Assessments in Instruction

Component 3D (Using assessments in instruction) had an average score of 1.32 among all five curricula, falling within the Ineffective range. Average scores for this

component for each of the five curricula were 1.00, 2.00, 1.20, 1.00, and 1.40, indicating that four curricula scored an average of Ineffective and one scored an average of Developing. The Ineffective criteria for this component on the FFT are as follows: (1) There is little or no assessment or monitoring of student learning; feedback is absent or of poor quality. (2) Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria and do not engage in self-assessment. The critical attributes under Ineffective are as follows: (1) The teacher gives no indication of what high-quality work looks like. (2) The teacher makes no effort to determine whether students understand the lesson. (3) Feedback is only global. (4) The teacher does not ask students to evaluate their own classmates' work. The five curricula evaluated were best represented by these indicators and critical attributes in Using assessments in instruction (3D).

For a curricula to score at the highest level (Exemplary) in Using assessments in instruction (3D), the curricula would need to promote the following: (1) Assessment is fully integrated into instruction through extensive use of formative assessment. (2) Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to them. (3) Students self-assess and monitor their progress. (4) A variety of feedback—from students' teacher and peers—is accurate, is specific, and advances learning. (5) Questions, prompts, and assessments are used regularly to diagnose evidence of learning by individual students. The critical attributes under Exemplary are as follows: (1) There is evidence that students have helped establish the evaluation criteria. (2) The teacher's monitoring of student understanding is sophisticated and continuous; the teacher is constantly "taking the pulse" of the class. (3) The teacher makes frequent use of strategies to elicit information about individual student understanding. (4) Feedback to students is specific and timely and is provided from many sources, including other students.

There are at least two suggestions based on FFT criteria and critical attributes for Using assessment in instruction (3D) that would help move curricula from the

Ineffective range toward the Exemplary range. First, Exemplary criteria suggest that formative assessment are used frequently throughout the lesson. The only way to make constant formative assessment possible throughout a lesson is to make student thinking visible either through written or spoken ideas or responses. Written curricula could promote this by the use of questions and performance tasks requiring all students to participate and discuss. Through the ensuing discussion, teachers would be advised on ideas and responses to specifically look for and on how to respond instructionally if those are not present.

Second, students should be included in the role of as assessor through student self-assessment and peer assessment with timely feedback. If students are aware of the essential question and the assessment criteria, then they can play a more active role in self-assessing their understanding toward meeting those expectations. Further, involving students in making their thinking visible through conversations with peers allows for peer assessment and feedback as well. In order to accomplish this, curricula must have questions and/or performance tasks that explicitly require all students to be involved through partner talk or small group discussion, with structures in place to hear from each and every student. The use of partner talk or Kagan-type structures for small group conversations requires all students to have a response and make it known to someone else. Kagan structures are “instructional strategies designed to promote cooperation and communication in the classroom, boost students’ confidence and retain their interest in classroom interaction.”¹ Through the use of partner talk or Kagan structures, the curricula would explicitly elicit thought from every student, therefore making student self-assessment and peer assessment more likely. Assessment tools for teachers and students could also be included for each lesson.

¹ Kagan Publishing and Professional Development, accessed June 1, 2021. https://www.kaganonline.com/about_us.php. Kagan provides training for educators and publishes many books that describe a large variety of instructional structures.

Setting Instructional Outcomes

Component 1C (Setting instructional outcomes) had an average score of 1.34 among all five curricula, falling within the Ineffective range. Average scores for this component for each of the five curricula were 1.00, 2.70, 1.00, 1.00, and 1.00, indicating that four curricula scored an average of Ineffective and one scored an average of Accomplished. The Ineffective criteria for this component on the FFT are as follows: (1) Outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor, and not all of them reflect important learning in the discipline. (2) Outcomes are stated as activities rather than as student learning. (3) Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand and are suitable for only some students. The critical attributes under Ineffective are as follows: (1) Outcomes lack rigor. (2) Outcomes do not represent important learning in the discipline. (3) Outcomes are not clear or are stated as activities. (4) Outcomes are not suitable for many students in the class. The five curricula evaluated were best represented by these indicators and critical attributes in Setting instructional outcomes (1C).

For a curricula to score at the highest level (Exemplary) in Setting instructional outcomes (1C), the curricula would need to promote the following: (1) All outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline. (2) The outcomes are clear, are written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment. (3) Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and, where appropriate, represent opportunities for both coordination and integration. (4) Outcomes take into account the varying needs of individual students. The critical attributes under Exemplary are as follows: (1) The teacher plans reference curricular frameworks or blueprints to ensure accurate sequencing. (2) The teacher connects outcomes to previous and future learning. (3) The teacher differentiates outcomes to encourage individual students to take educational risks.

There are at least two suggestions based on FFT criteria and critical attributes for Setting instructional outcomes (1C) that would help move curricula from the Ineffective range toward the Exemplary range. First, it was noted in the majority of the lessons evaluated that there were no clear written outcomes for student learning. There was often a topic or an idea, and although stated as the lesson title or underneath the title, most often it was not communicated to students or written in the form of student learning. Students should not only hear the instructional outcomes but also utilize this concept throughout the lesson. It must be an active component of the lesson, not simply written or stated at the beginning of the lesson.

Second, outcomes should not only be stated clearly in the form of student learning but also reflect rigorous and important learning. Each outcome should somehow play a role in a larger curricular framework or blueprint that allows lesson concepts to relate to and build upon each other. Learning should flow logically from one lesson to the next. The curricula could explain this entire curricular framework or blueprint at the very beginning and then describe how each lesson will play an important role in fulfilling this overall goal.

Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques

Component 3B (Using questioning and discussion techniques) had an average score of 1.38 among all five curricula, falling within the Ineffective range. Average scores for this component for each of the five curricula were 1.20, 1.40, 1.30, 1.00, and 2.00, indicating that four curricula scored an average of Ineffective and one scored an average of Developing. The Ineffective criteria for this component on the FFT are as follows: (1) The teacher's questions are of low cognitive challenge, require single correct responses, and are asked in rapid succession. (2) Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers. (3) A few students dominate the discussion. The critical attributes under Ineffective are

follows: (1) Questions are rapid-fire and convergent with a single correct answer. (2) Questions do not invite student thinking. (3) All discussion is between teacher and students; students are not invited to speak directly to one another. (4) A few students dominate the discussion. The five curricula evaluated were best represented by these indicators and critical attributes in questioning and discussion techniques (3B).

For a curricula to score at the highest level (Exemplary) in questioning and discussion techniques (3B), the curricula would need to promote the following: (1) The teacher uses a variety or series of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high-level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition. (2) Students formulate many questions, initiate topics, and make unsolicited contributions. (3) Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion. The critical attributes under Exemplary are as follows: (1) Students initiate higher-order questions. (2) Students extend the discussion, enriching it. (3) Students invite comments from their classmates during the discussion.

There are at least three suggestions based on FFT criteria and critical attributes for Using questioning and discussion techniques (3B) that would help move curricula from the Ineffective range toward the Exemplary range. The first issue present in the distinction between Ineffective and Exemplary is the type of questions, which can easily be addressed through curricula. Questioning requires a shift from questions presenting low cognitive challenge or requiring a single correct response to those that promote cognitive challenge, higher-order thinking, and metacognition. Questions should prompt the cognitive engagement necessary for true understanding and transference of learning into a Christlike perspective. Questions should direct students toward the established learning outcomes, assessment criteria, targeted student understanding, and real-world application.

The second issue for improving questioning and discussions is not concerned as much with the type of questions as with the way in which questions and answers are

explored and communicated. Students should be allowed time to think before they are required to answer a question. All students should be involved in the conversation, and students should speak directly to one another without teacher mediation. Although this is one aspect of the classroom culture and a teacher-influenced factor, it can be addressed and promoted through written curricula as well. For all questions, the curricula can specifically state the way in which students will answer in order to make their thinking visible. They may be instructed to write thoughts down on paper or simply be provided think time. Next, the curricula would instruct teachers to ask students to either discuss their ideas with a partner, ensuring that both partners have time to answer, or provide a Kagan-type structure for allowing all students in a small group to respond. If necessary, the question and conversation can then be brought to the whole group.

Once students have discussed their ideas with a partner or small group, they are more comfortable and willing to share in the whole group setting. In this whole group conversation, the goal would be for the teacher to start by asking the questions and allowing students to respond to each other and carry the conversation without teacher mediation. The teacher's role would be to challenge student thinking as the group discusses by asking probing questions about responses in order to deepen their understanding. This teacher role would need to be stated in the curricula, possibly including suggestions of a variety of responses and ways to probe student answers in order to promote higher-level thinking and understanding.

Third, students should formulate questions of their own and initiate topics that extend and enrich the conversation. The students themselves should ensure that all voices are heard and invite other students to share their ideas if necessary. Curriculum should explicitly state at certain points throughout the lesson that teachers should elicit questions from each student. A common instructional strategy to promote student inquiry and understanding is "Notice and Wonder," wherein teachers simply ask students to list or explain to a partner what they notice and what they wonder. This method could be used

after reading Scripture, after being presented a performance task, or after a large group discussion.

Group leaders are an effective way to ensure that each person in a small group has responded to a question or task. By assigning a group leader for each task or each lesson and asking group leaders to ensure that they have heard thoughts from each member of their group, it is more likely that all students will participate and that students will hold other students responsible for this participation. Group leaders and their expectations could be recommended and specified in each lesson of the curricula.

Research Question 5

The last research question asked, “What are suggested practices in church contexts using the FFT for evaluation?” Although the FFT was written specifically for evaluating teachers in the school setting, it was easily adapted for curricula evaluation using Domain 1 and Domain 3. After evaluating five curricula written for high school small groups in a church setting, the FFT was found effective using these two domains out of the four total. In order to use the FFT more effectively in the church setting, I would make three suggestions.

First, based on the data and reflection from this research, if the FFT were to be used to evaluate church curricula in the future, I would suggest only using Domain 1 and Domain 3. Some of the language in the criteria and characteristics would need to be adjusted to reflect the evaluation of written curricula as opposed to classroom observation. The majority of the language in the criteria, attributes, and examples uses “the teacher,” which would need to be changed to “the curricula.” In Domain 3, this language would need to be adjusted not only due to the wording “teacher” instead of “curricula” but also as a reflection of the criteria, attributes, and examples applying more to the *potential* for such instead of the *observation* of such. For example, in Domain 3B (Using questioning and discussion techniques), the second criterion under Accomplished

states, “Teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when appropriate.” An adjustment specifically for the evaluation of curricula might state, “Curriculum promotes a genuine discussion among students, providing the structure and adequate time for students to respond to each other.” If curricula are potentially provided to untrained educators, it is imperative that questioning and discussion strategies are explicitly stated within the curricula to provide the structure necessary to promote discussion among all students.

Second, and moving beyond evaluation of the curricula alone, I would recommend utilizing the FFT, or an adapted FFT specifically for a church setting, to observe classrooms or small groups. If churches choose to offer teacher observations or evaluations, it would be crucial to explain the purpose and goal of the evaluation. It would be essential that teachers viewed classroom observations as beneficial to their growth as a teacher and not as evaluative. The observer would need to be trained not only on how to utilize the FFT accurately but also on how to coach teachers using the FFT in a non-evaluative, growth-minded way. This could potentially be accomplished through some type of outside agency as opposed to church staff, if an evaluative teacher perception is a concern.

If using the FFT to evaluate church classrooms and small group sessions, Domain 2 and Domain 3 could be utilized with little to no adjustments. Domain 2 was not incorporated in this research because it is utilized to assess the elements of the classroom environment, such as respect and rapport, culture of engagement, procedures, behavior, and classroom arrangement. Since curriculum does not play a major role in classroom environment, Domain 2 was not included in this study. However, a church used the FFT for church observations, Domain 2 would be a beneficial addition. In addition to including Domain 2 and Domain 3 for classroom observations, content-specific goals that are applicable specifically for Christian education could be added.

Such goals could target aspects of hermeneutical accuracy, life application, and other areas specific to scriptural understanding and education.

It should also be noted that the utilization of the FFT for curricula evaluation or for church-setting evaluations would not be used in a similar manner as existing church curricula assessment tools. Curriculum assessment tools currently accessed and utilized by churches are primarily for purchasing purposes. These tools consider factors such as age appropriateness, multimedia options, attractiveness, cost, and church-to-home tools. The utilization of the FFT to evaluate curricula would not be for the use of all churches as they decide which curricula to purchase but more for curricula developers and publishers, those in higher education, and potentially church staff members who are knowledgeable about instructional practices and who are willing to invest the time necessary to learn and evaluate the curricula accurately.

Third, another aspect of this research that could be beneficial in the church context would be to offer trainings for small group teachers that focus on the Accomplished and Exemplary criteria for Domain 2 and Domain 3. Many teachers, especially volunteers, do not know or understand the instructional practices necessary for student engagement, understanding, and transferable learning that truly promotes Christlike transformation. Such trainings, provided by trained personnel with a thorough understanding of the FFT and constructivist learning principles, could potentially serve to improve instruction, student learning, and spiritual transformation.

Summary of Analysis

With respect to research question 1, the research revealed that there is not an existing list of best-selling curricula; however, Christian Book Distributors sells a wide variety of evangelical curricula. Using Christian Book Distributors' website, I was able to find their five best-selling publishers and contact each publishing company to find their best-selling curricula for high school small groups. I did not list the names of the best-

selling curricula or the publishing company out of respect and protection for the publishing companies.

With respect to research question 2, the research revealed the average scores and ranges for each curriculum. Curriculum 1 scored an average of 1.77 out of 4.00, which fell within the Developing range. Curriculum 2 scored an average of 2.15 out of 4.00, which fell within the Developing range. Curriculum 3 scored an average of 1.70 out of 4.00, which fell within the Developing range. Curriculum 4 scored an average of 1.00 out of 4.00, which fell at the lowest point of the Ineffective range. Curriculum 5 scored an average of 2.00 out of 4.00, which fell within the Developing range.

With respect to research question 3, the research revealed that church curricula are not presently written in a way that trained or untrained teachers can effectively follow to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical knowledge and understanding into Christlike living. Based on the scores of each individual component of Domain 1 and Domain 3 as well as the overall averages, curricula typically fell within the Developing or Ineffective range. While an Accomplished range score was achieved a few times for certain components, it was very infrequent. As the overall averages of Domain 1 and Domain 3 scores indicate, the five curricula evaluated range from Ineffective to Developing, with none scoring Accomplished or Exemplary.

With respect to research question 4, the research revealed that there were five components from Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT that scored in the Ineffective range based on an average score from the five curricula evaluated. These five components were as follows: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness (3E), Designing student assessments (1F), Using assessment in instruction (3D), Setting instructional outcomes (1C), and Using questioning and discussion techniques (3B). To move from Ineffective toward Exemplary based on the FFT indicators and critical attributes, curricula would need to (1) offer suggestions and encouragement for teachers when students struggle to understand or have misconceptions about certain concepts, (2) require the use of teacher

and student assessment during instruction and for further instruction, (3) include student-created or clear, well-understood outcomes for each lesson that are evident throughout the lesson, and (4) include questioning and discussion techniques that involve rigorous thinking and participation by all students and promote meaningful classroom discussion without constant teacher mediation.

With respect to research question 5, the research revealed that with adaptations, the FFT could be used for curricula evaluation. This would be best utilized by curricula designers and publishers, educators, and those in higher education—as opposed to church members looking to adopt a new curricula. The FFT would also be useful for teacher observation and coaching in churches, if performed by trained professionals.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This research study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of high school small group curricula in efforts to improve the quality and effectiveness of Christian education. In this concluding chapter, I first discuss the research conclusions and the implications of the overarching and supporting research questions. Next, I evaluate the research design by presenting the overall strengths and weakness. Then, I discuss the applications of the research findings, including the contribution of the findings to the precedent literature. Lastly, I propose recommendations for further research.

Research Purpose

The overarching question driving this study was “According to the Danielson Framework for Teaching, what are common strengths and weaknesses among high school small group curricula, and what could increase their effectiveness in promoting transferrable learning and spiritual growth?”

The literature review revealed a decline in Christianity in the U.S. potentially stemming from complications with Christian education within the church. More specifically, church curriculum was proven to be heavily relied upon by teachers in churches, yet the effectiveness of such curricula has not been proven or evaluated. While research exists and was extracted focusing on effective instructional practices, the need for evaluation, and the importance of curriculum in Christian education, research on the evaluation of such curricula was non-existent. In order to know whether the curriculum that church leaders are giving to teachers is effective in promoting transference of learning, true understanding, and transformation into Christlikeness, it was necessary to

conduct this research. This study serves to fill a void in the literature concerning the effectiveness of church curriculum, which provides a large majority of the guidance and instruction for Christian education within the church. The presentation of the findings of this study will lay a foundation for future research and improvements to the quality of curriculum design toward the promotion of Christlike transformation among church-goers.

Research Questions

The following research questions were answered in this study:

1. What are five of the best-selling curricula among evangelical churches for high school Sunday school classes or small groups?
2. How does each curriculum score according to Domains 1 and 3 on the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT)?
3. Is church curriculum presently written in a way that trained or untrained teachers can effectively follow to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical knowledge and understanding into Christlike living?
4. Based on strengths and weaknesses of curricula according to Domains 1 and 3 on the FFT, what are suggestions and further implications for improving church curricula designed for high school students?
5. What are suggested practices in church contexts using the FFT for evaluation?

Research Conclusions

The following research conclusions are organized by research question and based upon the findings presented in chapter 4. This section also explains the implications of the findings associated with each research question as appropriate. The research implications are also grouped by research question.

Research Question 1 Conclusions

Research question 1 asked, “What are five of the best-selling curricula among evangelical churches for high school Sunday school classes or small groups?” In order to evaluate a curriculum that represents the type of instruction to which the majority of high

school students are exposed in evangelical churches through small groups and Sunday school classes, an attempt was made to locate the five best-selling curricula designed for that particular population. This was a difficult task to accomplish with exact precision, as there was not an easy-to-locate list or a methodology of finding this information. After I attempted several different avenues, utilizing Christian Books Distributors became the most effective and accurate way of ascertaining the best-selling curricula.

Christian Books Distributors sell almost all of the curriculum developed for evangelical churches. According to their representative, their website has a sort feature allowing one to organize the search results specifically by curricula for high school small groups or Sunday school classes, and it will sort the results by their best-selling products. Based on this information, the five best-selling curricula were discovered. Due to the nature of this study and the evaluation implications, the curricula were not labeled by name.

Although I was unable to locate an official list of the five best-selling curricula for high school small groups and Sunday school classes, the five selected offer a broad scope of the instructional experience of a large majority of high school students in evangelical churches. Based on the results of the evaluation of these five curricula, implications can be generalized to the experience of the majority of high school students who are exposed to instruction based on curricula designed for high school small groups and Sunday school classes in evangelical churches.

Research Question 2 Conclusions

Research question 2 asked, “How does each curriculum score according to Domains 1 and 3 on the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT)?” Curriculum 1 had an overall range of Developing with a score of 1.77 out of 4.00. In Domain 1, Curriculum 1 fell within the Developing range with a score of 1.62 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 1 fell within the Developing range with a score of 1.50 out of 4.00.

Curriculum 2 scored an average of 2.15 out of 4.00, which fell within the Developing range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 2 fell within the Developing range with a score of 2.40 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 2 fell within the Developing range with a score of 1.90 out of 4.00.

Curriculum 3 scored an average of 1.70 of 4.00, which fell within the Developing range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 3 fell within the Developing range with a score of 1.70 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 3 fell within the Developing range with a score of 1.50 out of 4.00.

Curriculum 4 scored an average of 1.00 of 4.00, which fell at the lowest point of the Ineffective range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 4 fell within the Ineffective range with a score of 1.00 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 4 fell within the Ineffective range with a score of 1.00 out of 4.00.

Curriculum 5 scored an average of 2.00 out of 4.00, which fell within the Developing range. In Domain 1, Curriculum 5 fell within the Developing range with a score of 2.00 out of 4.00. In Domain 3, Curriculum 5 fell within the Developing range with a score of 2.00 out of 4.00.

Overall, four out of the five curricula scored within the Developing range in Domain 1, Domain 3, and a combined average of Domain 1 and Domain 3. One curriculum scored within the Ineffective range in Domain 1, Domain 3, and a combined average of Domain 1 and Domain 3.

Based on this information, there are important implications for Christians, especially the influencers of Christian education such as church leaders, higher education instructors, and curriculum developers, writers, and publishers. The four labels for the range of scores are Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, and Exemplary. One curriculum scored within the Ineffective range, and four fell within the Developing range. According to these findings, none of the curricula evaluated, representing the five best-

selling curricula among evangelical churches for high school small groups or Sunday school classes, scored within the Accomplished or Exemplary ranges.

The lack of Accomplished and Exemplary scores in Domains 1 and 3 displays the current state of ineffectiveness among curricula designed for small groups and Sunday school classes in evangelical churches, specifically for teens but potentially generalized to all students. Further implications of these results, specifically addressing the results of Domains 1 and 3 of the FFT, call for curriculum reform as pertaining to the components of Domains 1 and 3 of the FFT specifically. These components were addressed thoroughly in chapter 4, and each component analysis must be considered as part of a reformation of curriculum design.

Research Question 3 Conclusions

Research Question 3 asked, “Is church curriculum presently written in a way that trained or untrained teachers can effectively follow to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical knowledge and understanding into Christlike living?” Based on scores’ being in the Ineffective and Developing range, a simple answer to this question is “no.” After a thorough review of the literature on effective instructional practices in alignment with the requirements of the FFT, the curricula evaluated did not meet current instructional demands and benchmarks.

Scores falling within the Ineffective and Developing range are extremely alarming as they indicate that the majority of high school students are exposed to curricula that is subpar, not accomplishing or exemplifying the necessary instructional strategies and guidance that is essential for student learning. The overall scores of Ineffective and Developing imply that the curricula handed to church educators, often untrained and without knowledge of how to make modifications and incorporate additional learning strategies, are just that—ineffective and developing. Therefore, one can imply that the curricula provided for education in churches, specifically for teens,

combined with a lack of spiritual maturity and education among teacher volunteers, do not adequately provide the support and instructional guidance necessary for promoting student thinking, application, and transfer of knowledge and student understanding leading to Christlike transformation. As a result of ineffective education and therefore the lack of students who are being transformed through an understanding of biblical principles, the declining number of professing Christians in the U.S. will likely remain in a state of decline.

Research Question 4 Conclusions

Research question 4 asked, “Based on strengths and weaknesses of curricula according to Domains 1 and 3 on the FFT, what are suggestions and further implications for improving church curricula designed for high school students?” The strengths and weaknesses of curricula according to Domains 1 and 3 on the FFT provided insightful recommendations and further implications for improving church curricula designed for high school students, which can be generalized to students of all ages. While there were a few components of Domain 1 or Domain 3 of the FFT that scored Developing or Accomplished according to the FFT, there were five components that had an average score in the Ineffective range. Having analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the curricula, I can now offer several recommendations based on the areas of lowest scores and highest need. The components averaging Ineffective range scores were as follows: (1) Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness (3E), (2) Designing student assessments (1F), (3) Using assessments in instruction (3D), (4) Setting instructional outcomes (1C), and (5) Using questioning and discussion techniques (3B).

Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness (3E). Three recommendations for improving curriculum design were made in chapter 4 based on the scores and weaknesses observed in the Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness component. First, the curriculum should state common misunderstandings and misconceptions as well

as offer teachers opportunities to enhance student learning. Second, the curriculum should have potential resources or discussion topics that can help teachers address common misunderstandings and misconceptions. Third, the curriculum should indicate that a lesson is not considered complete until all students understand the content, which may include possibilities for supplemental follow-up lessons.

Although flexibility and responsiveness could be considered skills and characteristics of the teacher and therefore not addressed through written curricula, it has been proven that such skills or characteristics are possible to address through curriculum. This is extremely helpful for church teacher volunteers who are often untrained as educators. By listing common misunderstandings and misconceptions with additional resources for support, the curriculum makes teachers aware of what to look and listen for, and it equipped them to address those issues. Since curricula have scores in the Ineffective and Developing ranges, one can predict that curriculum design for a variety of ages would need to be evaluated and adapted based upon the Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness indicators, research findings, and recommendations.

Founded on the research findings in Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness as well as the recommendations based upon the Exemplary characteristics, the following implication can be made. Without specific guidance from the curriculum, teachers would be responsible for addressing misconceptions, locating and obtaining resources to address misconceptions, and ensuring that misconceptions are addressed before the lesson is considered complete. Based on the literature reviewed, many church volunteer teachers are not well trained in education, many churches do not offer observations or trainings, and many volunteers are not spiritually mature themselves. One could imply that if the curriculum does not specifically state that teachers should be looking for misconceptions, addressing misconceptions, and providing the necessary resources or text to do so, then these things are most likely not being done. This would allow misconceptions to remain and the lesson to be considered complete

whether students fully and correctly understood the lesson or not, possibly leading to errors in biblical understanding and foundations for life.

Designing student assessments (1F). Based on the scores and weaknesses observed in the Designing student assessments component, three recommendations for improving curriculum design were made. First, there must be clear instructional outcomes established, and the assessment must match these outcomes. Once again, assessments are not necessarily end-of-unit tests but some type of measurement of students learning throughout a lesson and at the completion of a lesson with the intent of ensuring student understanding. Second, based on ongoing observation and assessment throughout the lesson, curricula should include possible accommodations and adaptations for students with special needs if they struggle to obtain the targeted understanding. Third, assessments should require the utilization of understanding gained throughout the lesson in order to connect to real-world situations regarding the targeted outcomes.

Founded on the research findings in Designing student assessments and the recommendations based upon the Exemplary characteristics, the following implication can be made. Due to the long-held view that assessments were synonymous with tests and grades, churches and curriculum designers have often neglected the implementation of assessment as a tool for better instruction and student understanding. Based on the evaluation results, one can assume that if curriculum is not addressing assessments, then it is not addressed in small groups or Sunday school classrooms. This implies that students understanding is not evaluated, through formative or summative assessment, in light of the targeted outcomes, and therefore it is largely possible that students are not gaining the intended knowledge and application from lessons. If students are physically present yet intellectually absent, passive, or confused, then Christian educators are not able to obtain their goal of leading students to grow in their understanding of God and transform into the perspective and likeness of Christ.

A reformation of curriculum design must include assessment practices as they are now understood and utilized. This reformation, most likely applicable to curriculum written for all ages, also needs the inclusion of adaptations and accommodations based on assessment observations and the assessment's inclusion of real-world application concerning students' understanding gained from their learning throughout the lesson.

Using assessments in instruction (3D). Similar to Designing student assessments, the Using assessments in instruction component centers on utilizing the assessment information in order to direct instruction. Two recommendations for improving curriculum design were made in chapter 4 based on the scores and weaknesses observed in this component. First, curriculum design must require visible thinking among all students, and formative assessment should be utilized in light of this observable thinking. Curriculum should note specific concepts that should be reflected in visible student thinking as well as common misunderstandings and avenues for addressing these misconceptions. Second, curriculum should require students to self-assess as well as peer-assess, which includes offering feedback that moves others' thinking forward.

Founded on the research findings in Using assessments in instruction and the recommendations based upon the Exemplary characteristics, the following implication can be made. If these results are generalized to curricula for all ages, then one can assume that curriculum design does not currently utilize assessment in order to direct instruction. Therefore, one can also imply that whether students are understanding the content presented or not, instruction may likely carry on unaware of these misconceptions.

The short-term effect of ongoing instruction unguided by summative or formative assessment results would potentially be that students are present for each lesson yet are not completely understanding the concepts taught or—worse—are developing misunderstandings about those targeted outcomes. In Christian education, this

can potentially be devastating as the concepts taught are the only version of truth upon which students are building their foundational beliefs and perspectives.

The long-term effect of a series or years of instruction unguided by student understanding as apparent through assessment is the likelihood that students develop misconceptions about or have a lack of understanding, application, and transference of biblical truth that is required for a shift to a Christ-like perspective and therefore a life devoted to the pursuit and glory of God. Assessment is more than grades and tests. It is absolutely essential for the guidance and adjustments that must be present or made in instruction so that the identified outcomes are met among all students. Curriculum design must be reformed, accounting for this necessary adjustment in the utilization of assessment.

Setting instructional outcomes (1C). Based on the scores and weaknesses observed in the Setting instructional outcomes component, two recommendations for improving curriculum design were made. First, the majority of lessons evaluated did not include clear outcomes for student learning. Not only should students see or hear these outcomes for each lesson, but such outcomes should be an active component throughout the delivery of instruction, most likely included in formative or summative assessments. Second, the outcomes selected should reflect rigorous learning that plays an important role in a larger curricular framework plan. This implies that each lesson should be connected and flow logically, which is most easily accomplished by designing each lesson as part of a larger unit with separate but cohesive parts that build upon each other.

Founded on the research findings in Setting instructional outcomes and the recommendations based upon the Exemplary characteristics, the following implication can be made. Because the curricula evaluated reflected a lack of clearly stated outcomes, the absence of outcomes incorporated throughout each lesson, and often a disconnection among individual outcomes flowing from a larger goal, one can imply that this has

negatively affected student learning. Students must be not only aware of but also bought into the purpose of their learning in order to attend and engage with the instruction in a way that facilitates true understanding. These results imply that students may potentially passively attend to a lesson designed for a certain understanding yet by the end of the lesson are unaware of what they have learned, why it matters, or how it fits into a larger concept that applies to their life and sanctification. When teens or younger children are asked what they learned in small group or Sunday school, they often answer “nothing” or “I don’t remember.” An intentional use of student outcomes at the Exemplary level would increase their ability not only to focus and recall their learning but also to transfer that learning in order to cause a shift in perspective and Christlike living.

Using questioning and discussion techniques (3B). Three recommendations for improving curriculum design were made in chapter 4 based on the scores and weaknesses observed in the Using questioning and discussion techniques component. First, questions should promote a cognitive challenge, metacognition, and higher-order thinking. Second, all students should be given think to time before being asked to answer challenging questions. All students should be involved in the conversation and speak directly to each other without teacher mediation. This implies that the role of the teacher has shifted from that of knowledge provider, conversation mediator, and judge of right and wrong answers to that of intentional planner of questions requiring deep thinking, strategist who strategies ensures that all voices and ideas are heard, and facilitator of great conversation and thought. Third, a shift in student responsibility must be reflected in curriculum design. Students should be asked to formulate their own questions, initiate topics, and ensure that all voices are heard in conversations by inviting others to share ideas if necessary. This is a vital component of instruction that is often neglected by curriculum designers and by the teachers implementing the curriculum. While at first this may seem to be a student responsibility that is out of the control of teachers and

dependent upon certain types of students, curriculum can and must be written to promote this type of student behavior if it is expected to happen. Directions for partner talk, Kagan-type structures for specific conversation routines, and other tools intentionally eliciting visible thinking from all students must be utilized in curriculum design.

Founded on the research findings in Using questioning and discussion techniques and the recommendations based upon the Exemplary characteristics, the following implication can be made. In the history of education, behavior expectations have typically dominated the constituents of a successful classroom. The picture of still and quiet students politely raising their hand until called upon by a teacher was previously the norm. Not only were only a few students involved, but typically the question posed was designed with one single correct answer in mind, requiring low cognitive challenge. Based on the Ineffective and Developing scores in Using questioning and discussion techniques, one can imply that for the most part curriculum design continues to reflect this type of passive learning environment, which has now been proven ineffective. It also implies that students can remain passive in their small groups or Sunday school classes, only thinking at the basic recall level when called upon or when they choose to raise their hand to answer. If all students are not required to make their thinking visible through conversation or written expression based upon questions requiring cognitive challenge and metacognition, then one cannot assume that they are thinking about the content at all, much less at the level necessary for transference of learning or transformation into Christlikeness.

Research Question 5 Conclusions

Research question 5 asked, “What are suggested practices in church contexts using the FFT for evaluation?” Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations were made for utilizing the FFT for the church setting. First, if the FFT were to be utilized in evaluating curricula for churches, then it is recommended to only

use Domain 1 and Domain 3. Also, some of the language would need to be modified from specifically evaluating classroom instruction to focusing on curriculum only. A suggested version of Domain 1 and Domain 3 with language adjustments specifically for curricula evaluation is found in appendix 1.

Second, and moving beyond curriculum evaluation, it was recommended that the FFT is utilized by churches to observe and evaluate classroom practice in order to improve instruction. This would include Domain 2 of the FFT as well, as it focuses on the classroom environment and thus could not be utilized for this study yet offers valuable information for improving the classroom culture for effective learning. Evaluators and instructional coaches should be trained to use the FFT for church classroom observation, so it may be best practice to offer this service from an outside agency working to improve church small group and Sunday school instruction. Along with this concept, it was recommended that churches offer training for teachers, specifically in Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the FFT by looking at Accomplished and Exemplary characteristics and offering instructional tools and strategies to increase effectiveness in these areas.

Two implications stem from these suggestions. First, one can imply from these findings that curriculum reformation is necessary in order to meet the standards and research-based instructional practices of modern education. A modified version of the FFT Domain 1 and Domain 3 that is more specific to the evaluation of curriculum should be utilized for the evaluation of curriculum for small groups and Sunday school classes for evangelical churches in order to measure effectiveness and create a sense of urgency for change. Second, one can imply that it may be necessary for outside agencies to aid in the work of improving church education. This would be accomplished through the use of FFT observations and coaching by trained professionals and offering trainings for teacher volunteers in effective instructional practices based on the criteria established on the FFT.

Evaluation of the Research Design

The FFT is designed and typically utilized for classroom and teacher observation, but for this particular research, it was adapted to evaluate written curricula. Especially considering this adjustment, I was pleased with the application of the FFT, the validity of the results, and the potential use of the data collected and analyzed. In what follows, I address several strengths and weaknesses of this particular research design.

Research Strengths

One of the strengths of the research design was the ability to use an existing framework for evaluation that was research-based and widely recognized as an excellent tool for teacher evaluation. Also, I have been trained yearly to use this tool, and because I have used the FFT for several years, it has become very familiar. Second, the decision to use the FFT to look specifically at the curriculum itself as opposed to the curriculum taught in the classroom was helpful in that it did not have to account for teacher adjustments and various levels of teacher skill and effectiveness. Doing so provided a clearer picture of the potential that each curriculum provides for effective learning. The results were able to provide valuable information about the strengths and weaknesses of each curriculum that can be generalized to the majority of church curricula for high school small groups and Sunday school classes. The research design made it possible to provide valuable information about the potential for effective instruction and student learning based solely on the curricula, and therefore it provided valuable information for curriculum writers and publishers about the criteria for Accomplished and Exemplary curricula for Domain 1 and Domain 3 of the FFT and all components within each domain.

Research Weaknesses

Although the FFT was an existing research-based tool used for education evaluation, there are still some complications in utilizing this tool for research purposes.

Evaluating curricula utilizing the FFT instead of evaluating actual teaching was a strength of the design but also somewhat of a weakness. The FFT is intended to be used as a tool for evaluating classroom instruction; therefore, some of the wording does not completely fit the evaluation of curricula alone. Because I was very familiar with the FFT and the goal of each component in Domain 1 and Domain 3, I could accurately score each component even the language was written for classroom use. For example, Domain 3E (Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness) scored very low for each curriculum, and it is definitely better fit for evaluating teachers in classrooms than curricula. Although curricula can provide suggestions, recommendations, and encouragement for teachers to be flexible and responsive, it would be extremely hard to see flexibility and responsiveness in written curricula. This component perhaps should have been left out of curricula evaluation or at least should be modified for curricula evaluation in the future.

There were some modifications that need to be made if further research were conducted utilizing the FFT for curricula evaluation. In future research, it would be beneficial to score the curricula alone using an adapted version of the FFT and then utilize the original FFT to score a teacher using the curricula in the small group setting in order to get a bigger picture of the effectiveness and potential modifications that could be made to written curricula.

Also, as with any evaluation tool similar to the FFT, there is typically some subjectivity to the assessment. In the initial training for evaluation qualification using the FFT to observe teachers, there is a section on eliminating bias as a scorer. Although I have completed the training and understand the role of bias that could exist and how to best compensate for this potential, there continues to be some variation in how two scorers may rate the same component. I have passed the scoring assessment each year for the past seven years; however, there is still the potential for a slight variation in scoring among evaluators.

Research Applications

By addressing research question 2, 3, and 4, the findings suggest that curricula range from Ineffective to Developing; that they are not currently written in a way that teachers with various amounts of educational training can effectively follow in order to promote student thinking, application, and transfer of biblical understanding; and that there are deficiencies in curricula specifically in the areas averaging Ineffective ratings (Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness [3E], Designing student assessments [1F], Using assessments in instruction [3D], Setting instructional outcomes [1C], and Using questioning and discussion techniques [3B]). If findings suggest as much about the curricula evaluated, then it is highly likely that instruction in small groups and Sunday school classrooms in churches does not reflect or offer clear and connected outcomes, assessments designed for ongoing instructional guidance or end-of-lesson understanding, quality and thought-provoking questions and conversations, ongoing formative assessment that uncovers misconceptions, and additional resources to address misconceptions or to support students with special needs. Based on these findings and implications, three applications are suggested.

Curriculum Design Reformation for Churches

The research findings must apply to curriculum design reformation. The current design used in most curricula, including all five that were evaluated, is based on the way-truth-life method previously known as the boy-book-boy method that originated with Lois LeBar.¹ It is rightly based on the understanding that students must be interested before they can learn effectively. The goal is to present an entry activity or hook that leads students to the learning outcomes in an engaging way.

¹ Lois E. LeBar, *Education That Is Christian* (Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 1995), 101.

As findings suggest, learning outcomes are not typically stated or understood by students in written curricula. In addition, many curricula published today begin with a hook or activity to interest students that is time consuming and somewhat disconnected to the learning outcomes. If students are not invited to make the direct connection to the targeted learning outcome, then the connection not only falls short of the intended purpose but also wastes time that could be better spent delving into understanding and applying the concepts taught. It is necessary not to abandon the boy-book-boy method but to alter it based on new research on effective instruction and the importance of student inquiry in the learning process.

To address the deficiency of setting instructional outcomes and introducing the outcomes to students with engagement in mind, I recommend utilizing a faith-based Inquiry Design Model (IDM) approach to transformational learning based on the IDM approach developed by Kathy Swann, John Lee, and S. G. Grant.² Although it is not the only curriculum design method that would address the deficiencies uncovered through curriculum evaluation, it does address each deficiency and promote student inquiry. IDM builds upon LeBar's boy-book-boy method. However, it also incorporates student inquiry and ownership of learning while effectively establishing clear instructional outcomes, including ongoing formative assessment and summative, end-of-unit assessments to guide instruction, and incorporating intellectually engaging questions, tasks, collaboration, and discussion in which students enthusiastically participate in order to achieve the targeted understanding established in the beginning of the unit.

IDM is a backward-planning process that begins with selecting a unit topic that facilitates inquiry through a compelling question. IDM begins each unit with an

² Lindsey Wilkerson, "Constructivist Curriculum for Christian Transformation." *Christian Education Journal: Research on Educational Ministry* (January 2021), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739891320985870>. This article presents a faith-based constructivist model for Christian education and introduces the IDM unit planning model. It thoroughly explains the original IDM model and a faith-based modified version of IDM with examples. This will provide an in-depth explanation of IDM and how to utilize this method for curriculum design.

overarching compelling question. This compelling question is both rigorous and relevant, meaning that (1) it involves high levels of intellectual engagement and deep understanding of the learning outcomes and (2) it is interesting and thus sparks interest among students. Instead of beginning each lesson with an activity somewhat disconnected from the targeted outcomes and often lacking any intellectual engagement that ends up wasting instructional time, an IDM unit would begin with student inquiry. Students will list questions they would like to learn more about in order to effectively answer the compelling question. By doing this, not only are they engaging intellectually in the topic for exploration and beginning to think deeply about the concept, but they are also creating supporting questions that will later serve as assessment questions and set the course for lessons to follow.

In the initial IDM lesson, the curriculum would not only introduce the compelling question and provide time for students to develop the supporting questions but also include an entry event that would aid in sparking student interest and provoking student inquiry. The entry event, presentation of the compelling question, and the facilitation of student-created supporting questions would provide students with the goal for learning throughout the unit and for each individual lesson within the unit, staying rigorously aligned to the curriculum developer's intended learning outcomes.

The next phase of IDM includes creating a final assessment that is essentially the same as asking the original compelling question but allows students an opportunity to answer the compelling question through multiple avenues, such as writing, posters, videos, and presentations. Next, the designer uses supporting questions to facilitate the design of lessons within the unit. These supporting questions are pre-selected based on learning outcomes guided by the compelling question and targeted student understandings, but they are also based on the predictability of student questions that will

arise from students asking questions about the compelling question.³ The supporting questions will guide each lesson as the lesson designer will combine Scripture, learning tasks, and questions to create an opportunity for students to gain the understanding necessary to thoroughly answer the supporting question as they build their understanding of the compelling unit question. By the end of a unit, students have gained deep understanding of each supporting question, and in doing so, they have developed a thorough understanding of the compelling question so that it can be answered by each individual student.

IDM unit design would aid in improving curriculum design in a multitude of ways, including the five areas scoring Ineffective in this study. First, IDM would aid in the establishment, presentation, and student understanding of the learning outcomes. It would include Exemplary characteristics of assessment design and the utilization of assessment to guide instruction. IDM would also facilitate learning tasks and questions of high intellectual value that promote greater levels of thinking, metacognition, and student conversation. The last area identified as Ineffective pertained to teacher flexibility and responsiveness, which will be built into the unit design when utilizing IDM. While curriculum designers could prepare supporting questions that align with the compelling question and the established learning outcomes, they are relying on predictability for student questions that will be created about the compelling question. There must be some flexibility and responsiveness written into curriculum in order to combine student questions with the supporting questions pre-selected. This may include offering ways to include student questions that were not chosen as the supporting questions in the curriculum. In all, a faith-based IDM approach to transformational learning could offer

³ This procedure is based on the Question Formulation Technique (QFT). It is a strategy utilized to improve learners' ability to ask good questions that lead to enhancing their learning and understanding. It also promotes intellectual engagement and deep thinking about the topic.

curriculum developers the foundation necessary to move curriculum from Ineffective and Developing to Exemplary based on the FFT criteria.

Assessment Utilization for Churches

The next application of research findings relates specifically to assessment. Assessment in education has shifted from the concept of tests and grades to an instructional focus based on formative and summative assessment. Therefore, the findings of the research are valid for church curricula. Curriculum design for churches must adjust to comply with this new understanding and benefit of assessment. Ongoing and end-of lesson or end-of-unit assessment should be written into curriculum in order to promote, correct, and evaluate student understanding so as to accomplish the learning outcomes established for each lesson, each unit, and ultimately Christian formation. Furthermore, Charlotte Danielson suggests that when students are involved in creating assessments, they become more purposeful and engaged in their own learning.⁴ By implementing the IDM method, curriculum would lead students in the development of the assessment tasks and questions, which would become their guiding inquiry for the unit as well as their ongoing and final assessments through the use of an overarching compelling question and several supporting questions.

FFT Utilization for Churches

The FFT should be utilized in the church setting in two ways. First, curriculum designed for small groups and Sunday school classes of all ages should be evaluated using the FFT, using the model modified specifically intended for curriculum evaluation given in appendix 1. This modified model focuses specifically on Domain 1 and Domain 3 to ensure that curriculum is written for maximum instructional effectiveness and

⁴ Charlotte Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd ed. (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007), 62.

student understanding. This tool should not necessarily be used for purchasing purposes by untrained church members or leaders but by those in the field of curriculum design, higher education, or anyone influencing the development of curriculum and lesson materials. The purpose of this evaluation is not to separate poorly written curriculum from well-written curriculum but to lead the way in establishing standards for all curriculum so that drastic improvements are made in Christian education and Christian formation.

Second, the FFT should be utilized in the church setting for instructional evaluation, coaching, and training targeting the best instructional practices identified in the Accomplished and Exemplary ranges of the FFT. Observation and evaluation should be done by trained professionals. They must have training and experience in educational practices, and they should be qualified to utilize the FFT by attending online trainings and passing the required evaluations. Observing and coaching teachers requires not only a high level of knowledge about effective instructional practices but also the mentality of coach and partner as opposed to evaluator. To effectively coach and partner with teachers, one must be able to use the FFT as a guide to point to effective instructional goals, help the teachers being observed reflect on their own practices compared with the FFT targeted goals, and assist them in finding ways to shift their instructional practices accordingly. If this process feels to teachers more like an evaluation than a partnership and coaching session, then they will most likely feel threatened, distrusted, or less valuable. The observer must keep in mind the goal of the evaluation, which would be to assist teachers in improving their classroom culture and instructional effectiveness in order to aid students' growth into Christlikeness. Therefore, this process may be most effectively done by an outside agency.

Contribution of Research to the Precedent Literature

This research filled a void in the existing literature by utilizing the FFT to evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum designed for small groups and Sunday school classes in evangelical churches. While evaluation tools existed in order to guide churches in the purchasing of curriculum based on factors such as price, scope, materials provided, and other non-instructional factors, there was no existing literature on the effectiveness of curriculum focusing specifically on current instructional practices deemed effective. There was also a gap in literature concerning the use of the FFT in any capacity in churches. Therefore, this study presents foundational information on the effectiveness of church curriculum and offers insight into the effectiveness of church small group and Sunday school education.

Further Research

Based on the research findings, implications, and applications discussed above, there are several recommendations for further research pertaining to the evaluation of curriculum developed for small group and Sunday school classes in evangelical churches.

First, the research should widen to include the evaluation of curriculum designed for all ages. While this study specifically focused on small group and Sunday school curriculum for teens, curriculum from preschool to adults could also be evaluated, as the FFT can be utilized for all ages. Doing so would provide a more thorough scope of the effectiveness of curriculum within small groups and Sunday school classes within the church as a whole. The revised FFT in appendix 1 could be utilized for this work.

Second, although the FFT can be adapted for use in churches, it is not designed specifically for church use. The FFT could be modified by keeping the strong instructional focus based on recent research of instructional practices while additions are made in the inclusion and reliance upon Scripture and truth. Although several components of Domain 1 and Domain 3 mention knowledge of content and the teacher's appropriate use of content knowledge and vocabulary, those components could be further

specified for the rebalance of Scripture. This would require a literature review of common practices and beliefs concerning the reliance upon Scripture and the appropriate hermeneutical approaches within the evangelical church.

Third, a version of the FFT modified specifically for church observations could be utilized to evaluate instruction in small groups and Sunday school classrooms. This would focus specifically on Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the FFT. In fact, the curricula could be evaluated utilizing the new FFT for curriculum evaluation of Domain 1 and Domain 3, and then the FFT Domain 2 and Domain 3 altered for church evaluations could be used to evaluate the same curriculum actually being utilized in the classroom. Doing so would offer insight into the effectiveness of curricula, the ability of teachers to implement curricula, and the effectiveness of education in small groups and Sunday school classrooms in evangelical churches.

Conclusion

Several statements from chapters 1 and 2 are critically important as the focus shifts to further research in the area of curriculum evaluation. First, researchers must remember and focus on the main goal of Christian education presented in chapter 2 (see pp. 18-19): “The goal of Christian education is the promotion of faith development and spiritual formation” and “The ultimate goal of development is that God is glorified as we become more like Christ in all facets of life.” This must be the ultimate driving force of further evaluation and investigation.

Second, researchers must be mindful of the following statements from chapter 1 (see p. 15): “Christian education has not proven itself effective, and evangelical churches are reliant upon curriculum to make up for the fact that many teachers are untrained, not observed or coached regularly, and often spiritually immature themselves. Can small group curriculum for teens effectively carry this burden? If curriculum bears this weight, can designers strengthen curriculum enough to bear the load effectively?”

While the findings of this study revealed that curriculum is not effectively bearing this weight, the hope is that this study and further research would promote a reformation in curriculum design that reflects the research-based instructional practices evident in the Exemplary criterion of the FFT.

APPENDIX 1

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO THE DANIELSON FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING FOR CURRICULUM EVALUATION

The Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) can be modified to effectively evaluate curriculum instead of classroom instruction as it was originally designed.¹ The first modification that must be implemented in order to effectively utilize the FFT for curriculum evaluation is that the word “teacher” (or the teacher’s name) should be replaced with the word “curriculum,” and the word “teachers” should be replaced with the word “curricula.” The rest of the sentence would be rewritten if necessary to match the word “curriculum” or “curricula” grammatically. For example, if the criterion on the FFT states, “*Teacher understands* the active nature of student learning and attains information about levels of development for groups of students,” then the modified version would state, “*Curriculum displays* the active nature of student learning and *utilizes* information about levels of development for groups of students.” While this modification is simple, some areas require a more modified version of the listed criterion. The language requiring modifications beyond the words “teacher” or “teachers” (or a specific teacher’s name) are recorded by domain in the tables below.

¹ For the original (i.e., unmodified) FFT utilized in this study, see Charlotte Danielson, “Framework for Teaching,” Kentucky Department of Education, 2014, <https://education.ky.gov/teachers/PGES/TPGES/Documents/Kentucky%20Framework%20for%20Teaching.pdf>.

| Domain 1A | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Ineffective | In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students. | In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors. |
| Critical Attributes | Accomplished | The teacher answers student questions accurately and provides feedback that furthers their learning. The teacher seeks out content-related professional development. | Suggestions are made for effective feedback that furthers student learning. Curriculum recommends content-related professional learning. |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | The teacher says, "I don't understand why the math book has decimals in the same unit as fractions." | Omit |
| | Developing | The teacher plans to forge ahead with a lesson on addition with regrouping, even though some students have not fully grasped place value. | The curriculum forges ahead with a lesson on addition with regrouping, even though some students have not fully grasped place value, providing no recommendations for addressing student misconceptions. |
| | Accomplished | The teacher realizes her students are not sure how to use a compass, so she plans to practice that before introducing the activity on angle measurement. | The curriculum suggests that students may not know how to use a compass, so plans are provided to practice that before introducing the activity on angle measurement. |
| | Exemplary | Before beginning a unit on the solar system, the teacher surveys the class on their beliefs about why it is hotter in the summer than in the winter. | Before beginning a unit on the solar system, the curriculum suggests surveying the class on their beliefs about why it is hotter in the summer than in the winter. |

| Domain 1B | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Ineffective | Teacher does not try to ascertain varied ability levels among students in the class. Teacher is not aware of student interests or cultural heritages. Teacher takes no responsibility to learn about students' medical or learning disabilities. | Curriculum does not suggest avenues for ascertaining varied ability levels among students in the class. Curriculum does not promote utilizing student interests or cultural heritages. Omit |

| Domain 1B | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Developing | The teacher is aware of medical issues and learning disabilities with some students but does not seek to understand the implications of that knowledge. | The curriculum asks teachers to be aware of medical issues and learning disabilities with students but does not assist in applying that knowledge to instruction. |
| | Accomplished | The teacher knows, for groups of students, their levels of cognitive development. | The curriculum suggests that teachers learn students' levels of cognitive development. |
| | | <p>The teacher is aware of the different cultural groups in the class.</p> <p>The teacher has a good idea of the range of interests of students in the class.</p> <p>The teacher has identified "high", "medium", and "low" groups of students within the class.</p> <p>The teacher is well informed about students' cultural heritage and incorporates this knowledge into lesson planning.</p> <p>The teacher is aware of the special needs represented by students in the class</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>Curriculum prompts teachers to get a good idea of the range of interests of students in the class.</p> <p>Curriculum prompts teachers to identify and utilize "high", "medium", and "low" groups of students within the class.</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Curriculum prompts teachers to identify the special needs represented by students in the class.</p> |
| Exemplary | <p>The teacher seeks out information about their cultural heritage from all students.</p> <p>The teacher maintains a system of updated student records and incorporates medical and/or learning needs into lesson plans.</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>The curriculum prompts teacher to maintain a system of updated student records and incorporates medical and/or learning needs into lesson plans.</p> | |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | The teacher plans to teach his class Christmas carols, despite the fact that he has four religions represented among his students. | Omit |

| Domain 1B | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Developing | <p>In the unit on Mexico, the teacher has not incorporated perspectives from the three Mexican-American children in the class.</p> <p>The teacher knows that some of her students have IEPs, but they're so long that she hasn't read them yet.</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>The curriculum does not address the needs of students with IEP's.</p> |
| | Accomplished | <p>The teacher creates an assessment of students' levels of cognitive development.</p> <p>The teacher examines previous year's cumulative folders to ascertain the proficiency levels of groups of students in the class.</p> <p>The teacher administers a student interest survey at the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>The teacher knows that five of her students are in the Garden Club; she plans to have them discuss horticulture as part of the next biology lesson.</p> <p>The teacher realizes that not all of his students are Christian and so he plans to read a Hanukkah story in December.</p> | <p>The curriculum includes an assessment of students' levels of cognitive development.</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>The curriculum includes a student interest survey at the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Omit</p> |
| | Exemplary | <p>The teacher attends the local Mexican heritage day, meeting several of his students' extended families.</p> | <p>Omit</p> |

| Domain 1D | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Ineffective | The teacher does not seek out resources available to expand his or her own skill. | The curriculum does not point out resources available to expand the teacher's own skill. |
| | | Although aware of some student needs, the teacher does not inquire about possible resources. | The curriculum does not offer additional possible resources. |
| | Developing | The teacher participates in content-area workshops offered by the school but does not pursue other professional development. | The curriculum does not offer resources for professional learning for teachers. |
| | | The teacher locates materials and resources for students that are available through the school but does not pursue any other avenues. | The curriculum offers materials but does not point to resources outside of the curriculum itself. |
| | Accomplished | Teacher expands knowledge with professional learning groups and organizations. | The curriculum includes professional learning options including groups and organizations for teachers. |
| Teacher pursues options offered by universities. | | Omit | |
| Exemplary | The teacher has ongoing relationship with colleges and universities that support student learning. | The teacher pursues apprenticeships to increase discipline knowledge. | Omit |
| | | The teacher facilitates student contact with resources outside the classroom | The curriculum offers materials and resources for students to pursue outside of the classroom. |
| | | | |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | Mr. J is not sure how to teach fractions but doesn't know how he's expected to learn it by himself. | Curriculum does not support teachers in building their understanding of the concepts they are responsible for teaching. |
| | | A student says, "It's too bad we can't go to the nature center when we're doing our unit on environment." | Omit |

| Domain 1D | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Developing | <p>For a unit on ocean life, the teacher really needs more books, but the school library has only three for him to borrow.</p> <p>The teacher knows she should learn more about teaching literacy, but the school offered only one professional development day last year.</p> <p>The teacher thinks his students would benefit from</p> | <p>For a unit on ocean life, the teacher really needs more resources, but the curriculum suggests only three to use.</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Since students may benefit from hearing about health safety from a professional; the curriculum suggests contacting the school nurse to visit the classroom.</p> |
| | Accomplished | The teacher took an online course on literature to expand her knowledge of great American writers. | The curriculum provided an online course/tutorial course on literature to expand her knowledge of great American writers. |
| | Exemplary | <p>The teacher is not happy with the out-of-date textbook; his students will critique it and write their own text for social studies.</p> <p>The teacher spends the summer at Dow Chemical learning about current research so that she can expand her knowledge base for teaching chemistry.</p> <p>The teacher matches students in her Family and Consumer Science class with local businesses; the students spend time shadowing employees to understand how their classroom skills might be used on the job.</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>The curriculum recommends several options for teacher exposure to current research so they can expand their knowledge base for teaching chemistry.</p> <p>The curriculum suggests matching students in the Family and Consumer Science class with local businesses; the students will spend time shadowing employees to understand how their classroom skills might be used on the job.</p> |

| Domain 1E | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | <p>The teacher organizes her class in rows, seating the students alphabetically; she plans to have students work all year in groups of four selected on the basis of where they are sitting.</p> <p>The teacher's lesson plans are written on sticky notes in his grade book; they indicate lecture, activity, or test.</p> | <p>The curriculum recommends organizing the class in rows, seating the students alphabetically; plans recommend that students work all year in groups of four selected on the basis of where they are sitting.</p> <p>Curriculum indicates lecture, activity, or test.</p> |
| | Developing | <p>The teacher has found an atlas to use as a supplemental resource during the geography unit.</p> <p>The teacher always lets students select their own working groups because they behave better when they can choose with whom they wish to sit.</p> | <p>The curriculum suggests an atlas to use as a supplemental resource during the geography unit.</p> <p>The curriculum suggests students selecting their own working groups because they behave better when they can choose with whom they wish to sit or does not address this.</p> |
| | Accomplished | <p>The teacher reviews lesson plans with her principal; they are well structured with pacing times and activities clearly indicated.</p> | <p>Lessons are well structured with pacing times and activities clearly indicated.</p> |

| Domain 1F | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Exemplary | <p>Students participate in designing assessments for their own work.</p> <p>Students develop rubrics according to teacher-specified learning objectives.</p> <p>Students are actively involved in collecting information from formative assessments and provide input.</p> | <p>Curriculum requires students to participate in designing assessments for their own work.</p> <p>Curriculum requires students to develop rubrics according to teacher-specified learning objectives.</p> <p>Curriculum requires students to be actively involved in collecting information from formative assessments and provide input.</p> |

| Domain 1F | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | <p>The teacher marks papers on the foundation of the U.S. constitution on the basis of grammar and punctuation; for every mistake, the grade drops from an A to a B, a B to a C, etc.</p> <p>After the students present their research on globalization, the teacher tells them their letter grade. When students ask how he has arrived at the grade, he responds, “After all these years in education, I just know what grade to give.”</p> <p>The teacher says, “What’s the difference between formative assessment and the test I give at the end of the unit?”</p> <p>The teacher says, “The district gave me this entire curriculum to teach, so I just have to keep moving.”</p> | <p>The curriculum suggests marking papers on the foundation of the U.S. constitution on the basis of grammar and punctuation; for every mistake, the grade drops from an A to a B, a B to a C, etc.</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>The curriculum does not include or specify the use of formative and summative assessments.</p> <p>The curriculum promotes the concept of moving along, even when students do not understand.</p> |
| | Developing | <p>The teacher’s students receive their tests back; each one is simply marked with a letter grade at the top.</p> <p>A student says, “If half the class passed the test, why are we all reviewing the material again?”</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>Omit</p> |
| | Exemplary | <p>Mrs. T has developed a routine for her class: students know that if they are struggling with a math concept, they will sit in a small group with her during workshop time.</p> | <p>Curriculum promotes the use of small groups or workshop time to help students who are struggling with a math concept.</p> |

| Domain 3A | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Developing | The teacher’s attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion. | The curriculum’s attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified. |
| | Exemplary | Students contribute to extending the content and help explain concepts to their classmates. | The curriculum promotes students contribution to extending the content and help in explaining concepts to their classmates. |
| Critical Attributes | Ineffective | Students indicate through their questions that they are confused about the learning task. | Omit |
| | | Students indicate through body language or questions that they don’t understand the content being presented. | Omit |
| | Developing | The teacher must clarify the learning task so that student can complete it. | The learning task must be clarified so that students could understand and complete it. |
| | Accomplished | Students engage with the learning task, indicating that they understand what they are to do. | Omit |
| | Exemplary | All students seem to understand the presentation. | Omit |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | A student asks, “What are we supposed to be doing? But the teacher ignores the question. | Omit |
| | | The teacher states that to add fractions they must have the same numerator. Students have a quizzical look on their faces; some may withdraw from the lesson. | The curriculum states that to add fractions they must have the same numerator. |
| | | Students become disruptive, or talk among themselves in an effort to follow the lesson. | Directions are unclear and must be read multiple times for understanding. |

| Domain 3A | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Developing | <p>The teacher mispronounces some common words.</p> <p>A student asks, “What are we supposed to be doing?” and the teacher clarifies the task.</p> <p>Students ask, “What do I write here?” in order to complete a task.</p> <p>A number of students do not seem to be following the explanation.</p> <p>Students are inattentive during the teacher’s explanation of content.</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Teacher cannot easily follow the explanation in curriculum.</p> <p>Explanation in curriculum is lengthy, requiring long periods of teacher talk.</p> |
| | Exemplary | When help is needed a student offers clarification about the learning task to classmates. | Omit |

| Domain 3B | | | |
|------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Ineffective | <p>Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers.</p> <p>A few students dominate the discussion.</p> | <p>The curriculum offers no direction for teachers on how to promote discussion among students, possibly allowing the interaction between teacher and student to be recitation style.</p> <p>Curriculum does not provide strategies for effective student discussion where many students are heard.</p> |
| | Developing | <p>Alternatively, the teacher attempts to frame some questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding, but only a few students are involved.</p> <p>Teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion and to encourage them to respond to one another, but with uneven results.</p> | <p>Although questions are designed to promote student thinking and understanding, the curriculum does not contain strategies to ensure most students are involved.</p> <p>The curriculum encourages teachers to include all students in the discussion, but strategies are not in place to ensure it.</p> |

| Domain 3B | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Exemplary | Students formulate many questions, initiate topics, and make unsolicited contributions. | Curriculum encourages students to formulate many questions, initiate topics, and make unsolicited contributions. |
| | | Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion. | Curriculum presents instructional methods requiring all student voices to be heard in discussions. |
| Critical Attributes | Ineffective | A few Students dominate the discussion. | Curriculum does not discourage a few students from dominating the discussion in any way. |
| | Developing | Teacher frames some questions designed to promote student thinking, but only a small number of students are involved. | Curriculum frames some questions designed to promote student thinking, but does not provide instructional strategies to ensure many students are involved. |
| | | The teacher invites students to respond directly to one another's ideas, but few students respond. | The curriculum asks for students to respond directly to one another's ideas, but does not provide strategies to ensure all voices are heard. |
| Accomplished | Accomplished | Teacher calls on many students, but only a few actually participate in the discussion. | Curriculum does not provide strategies requiring participation from many students. |
| | | The teacher effectively builds on student responses to questions. | The curriculum offers examples for teachers to effectively build on student responses. |
| | | Discussions enable students to talk to one another without ongoing mediation by the teacher. | Curriculum includes instructional strategies that enable students to talk to one another without ongoing teacher mediation. |
| | | The teacher calls on most students, even those who don't initially volunteer. | The curriculum provides instructional strategies providing opportunity for all students to be heard. |
| | | Many students actively engage in the discussion. | Omit |

| Domain 3B | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Exemplary | Students initiate higher-order questions. | Curriculum provides opportunity and strategies to encourage students to initiate higher-order questions. |
| | | Students extend the discussion, enriching it. | Omit |
| | | Students invite comments from their classmates during a discussion. | Curriculum provides strategies or norms that encourage students to invite comments from their classmates during a discussion. |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | The teacher calls only upon students who have their hands up. | Curriculum does not specify how teachers should instruct students to answer questions, potentially allowing for only those called upon to answer. |
| | Developing | The teacher asks: “Who has an idea about this?” but only the usual three students offer comments. | Omit |
| | | The teacher asks: “Michael can you comment on Mary’s idea?” but Michael does not respond or makes a comment directly to the teacher. | Curriculum does not provide strategies or norms to encourage students to respond or make comments directly to each other. |
| Accomplished | Accomplished | The teacher asks, “Michael, can you comment on Mary’s idea?” and Michael responds directly to Mary. | Curriculum provides strategies or norms to encourage students to respond or make comments directly to each other. |
| | | After posing a question and asking each of the students to write a brief response and then share it with a partner, the teacher invites a few to offer their ideas to the entire class. | Curriculum suggests posing a question and asking each of the students to write a brief response and then share it with a partner, then suggests the teacher invites a few to offer their ideas to the entire class. |

| Domain 3B | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Exemplary | A student asks, “How many ways are there to get this answer?” | Curriculum encourages students to ask questions to better their understanding, such as prompting students to finish the statement, “I’m wondering . . .” |
| | | A student says to a classmate, “I don’t think I agree with you on this, because . . .” | Curriculum encourages students to discuss in groups by using prompts such as, “I agree because . . .” and “I disagree because . . .” |
| | | A student asks of other students, “Does anyone have another idea how we might figure this out?” | Omit |
| | | A student asks, “What if . . .?” | Omit |

| Domain 3C | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Ineffective | Few students are intellectually engaged or interested. | Curriculum does not require intellectual engagement or involve student interest. |
| | Accomplished | The learning tasks and activities are aligned with instructional outcomes and designed to challenge student thinking, the result being that most students display active intellectual engagement with important and challenging content and are supported in that engagement by teacher scaffolding. | The learning tasks and activities are aligned with instructional outcomes and designed to challenge student thinking, and curriculum offers guidance to teachers for scaffolded support of student learning. |
| | Exemplary | In addition, there is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry and of student contribution to the exploration of important content. | Curriculum includes prompts, questions, or tasks that require student initiation of inquiry and student contribution to the exploration of important content. |
| Critical Attributes | Ineffective | Few students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. | Student intellectual engagement is not required for learning tasks. |

| Domain 3C | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Developing | Some students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. Students are, in large part, passively engaged with the content, learning primarily facts or procedures. | Curriculum does not offer strategies that encourage all students to be intellectually engaged. Curriculum is written without engagement strategies, allowing student the opportunity to be passively engaged, learning primarily facts or procedures. |
| | Accomplished | Most students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. | Learning tasks and strategies require intellectual engagement from most students. |
| | Exemplary | Virtually all students are highly engaged in the lesson. Students take initiative to modify a learning task to make it more meaningful or relevant to their needs. Students suggest modifications to the grouping patterns used. Students suggest modifications or additions to materials being used. | Learning tasks and strategies require high intellectual engagement from virtually all students. Curriculum provides opportunities for students to suggest modifications to learning tasks to make them more meaningful or relevant. Omit Omit |
| Possible Examples | Exemplary | A student asks whether they might remain in their small groups to complete another section of the activity, rather than work independently. | Omit |

| Domain 3D | | | |
|------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Ineffective | Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria and do not engage in self-assessment. | Curriculum does not make students aware of the assessment criteria or engage them in self-assessment. |
| | Developing | Feedback to students is general, students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work, and few assess their own work. | Curriculum appears to make students only partially aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work and does not require all students to assess their own work. |

| Domain 3D | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Accomplished | Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria; some of them engage in self-assessment. | Curriculum appears to make students aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work and requires some to assess their own work. |
| | Exemplary | <p>Students appear to be aware of, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the assessment criteria. Students self-assess and monitor their progress.</p> <p>A variety of feedback, from both their teacher and their peers, is accurate, specific, and advances learning.</p> | <p>Curriculum appears to make students aware of the assessment criteria and provides students the opportunity to contribute to the assessment criteria. Students are required to self-assess and monitor their progress.</p> <p>Curriculum suggests the use of teacher and student to student feedback that advances learning through appropriate strategies to include all students.</p> |
| Critical Attributes | Developing | <p>There is little evidence that the students understand how their work will be evaluated.</p> <p>Feedback to students is not uniformly specific and not oriented towards future improvement of the work.</p> | <p>Curriculum does not provide students the opportunity to understand how their work will be evaluated.</p> <p>Curriculum does not offer opportunity for feedback to students that is oriented towards future improvement of the work.</p> |
| | Accomplished | Students indicate that they clearly understand the characteristics of high quality work. | Curriculum provides students an understanding of the characteristics of high quality work. |
| | Exemplary | <p>There is evidence that students have helped establish the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>Teacher monitoring of student understanding is sophisticated and continuous: the teacher is constantly “taking the pulse” of the class.</p> <p>Feedback to students is specific and timely, and is provided from many sources including other students.</p> <p>Students monitor their own understanding, either on their own initiative or as a result of tasks set by their teacher.</p> | <p>Curriculum promotes the inclusion of student involvement in establishing the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>Curriculum encourages teachers to monitor student understanding by constantly “taking the pulse” of the class.</p> <p>Curriculum offers opportunity for students to receive feedback from a variety of sources including other students.</p> <p>Curriculum offers the opportunity for students to monitor their own understanding through tasks or instructional strategies.</p> |

| Domain 3D | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | <p>A student asks: “How is this assignment going to be graded?”</p> <p>A student asks, “Does this quiz count towards my grade?”</p> <p>The teacher says: “Good job, everyone.”</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Curriculum does not offer examples of effective feedback to advance learning.</p> |
| | Developing | <p>When a student completes a problem on the board, the teacher corrects the student’s work without explaining why.</p> <p>The teacher, after receiving a correct response from one student, continues without ascertaining whether all students understand the concept.</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>Curriculum does not offer effective strategies for ascertaining student understanding from a variety of students.</p> |
| | Accomplished | <p>The teacher circulates during small group or independent work, offering suggestions to groups of students.</p> | <p>The curriculum encourages teachers to circulate during small group or independent work, offering suggestions to groups of students.</p> |
| | Exemplary | <p>While students are working, the teacher circulates, providing substantive feedback to individual students.</p> <p>Students offer feedback to their classmates on their work.</p> <p>Students evaluate a piece of their writing rubric and confer with the teacher about how it could be improved.</p> | <p>The curriculum encourages teachers to circulate during small group or independent work, offering examples of substantive feedback to individual students.</p> <p>Curriculum includes tasks or strategies requiring students to offer feedback to their classmates on their work.</p> <p>Curriculum provides opportunities for students to form or evaluate rubrics in order to improve them.</p> |

| Domain 3E | | | |
|------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Descriptors | Ineffective | <p>Teacher adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or lack of interest.</p> <p>Teacher ignores student questions; when students experience difficulty, the teacher blames the students or their home environment.</p> | <p>Curriculum offers no guidance to teachers on checking for or addressing a lack of student understanding or interest.</p> <p>Curriculum does not promote or offer opportunity for student questions and does not plan for student difficulty.</p> |
| | Developing | <p>Teacher attempts to modify the lesson when needed and to respond to student questions and interests, with moderate success.</p> <p>Teacher accepts responsibility for student success but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.</p> | <p>Curriculum offers occasional modifications if students are struggling to understand.</p> <p>Curriculum does not offer many strategies for ensuring student engagement and success.</p> |
| | Accomplished | <p>Teacher promotes the successful learning of all students, making minor adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs, and interests.</p> <p>Drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies, the teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning.</p> | <p>Curriculum promotes the successful learning of all students, suggesting minor adjustments to be made to instruction plans if necessary and promotes student questions, needs, and interests.</p> <p>Curriculum includes instructional strategies and resources for students who may have difficulty learning.</p> |
| | Exemplary | <p>Teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests, or successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings.</p> <p>Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school or community.</p> | <p>Curriculum builds on student interest and offers successful adjustments and differentiations for instruction to address individual student misunderstandings.</p> <p>Curriculum includes an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and additional resources for students who may have difficulty learning.</p> |

| Domain 3E | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Ineffective | <p>Teacher ignores indications of student boredom or lack of understanding.</p> <p>Teacher brushes aside student questions.</p> <p>Teacher makes no attempt to incorporate student interests into the lesson.</p> <p>The teacher conveys to students that when they have difficulty learning it is their fault.</p> <p>In reflecting on practice, the teacher does not indicate that it is important to reach all students.</p> | <p>Curriculum is boring and does not promote student understanding.</p> <p>Curriculum does not offer opportunity for student questions or comments.</p> <p>Student interest is not incorporated or considered in curriculum.</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Curriculum does not reflect the importance or strategies necessary for reaching all students.</p> |
| | Developing | <p>Teacher's efforts to modify the lesson are only partially successful.</p> <p>The teacher conveys a sense to students of their own responsibility for their learning but is uncertain about how to assist them.</p> <p>In reflecting on practice, the teacher indicates the desire to reach all students but does not suggest strategies to do so.</p> | <p>Curriculum offers modifications that are only partially effective.</p> <p>Curriculum conveys a sense to students of their own responsibility for their learning, but does not offer instructional strategies or norms to assist them.</p> <p>Curriculum does not include strategies or norms to effectively reach all students.</p> |
| | Accomplished | <p>When necessary, the teacher makes adjustments to the lesson to enhance understanding by groups of students.</p> <p>The teacher conveys to students that he has other approaches to try when the students experience difficulty.</p> <p>In reflecting on practice, the teacher cites multiple approaches undertaken to reach students having difficulty.</p> | <p>Curriculum offers adjustments to the lesson to enhance understanding by groups of students.</p> <p>Curriculum offers teachers suggestions for additional approaches or resources to try when students experience difficulty.</p> <p>Curriculum offers multiple strategies and resources for assisting teachers in ensuring all students reach understanding.</p> |

| Domain 3E | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Critical Attributes | Exemplary | The teacher seizes on a teachable moment to enhance a lesson. | Omit |
| | | <p>The teacher conveys to students that she won't consider a lesson "finished" until every student understands and that she has a broad range of approaches to use.</p> <p>In reflecting on practice, the teacher can cite others in the school and beyond whom he has contacted for assistance in reaching some students.</p> | <p>Curriculum conveys that teachers should not consider a lesson "finished" until every student understands and it supplies teachers with a broad range of strategies and resources to use.</p> <p>Curriculum offers a multitude of additional resources for reaching students.</p> |
| Possible Examples | Ineffective | The teacher says, "We don't have time for that today." | Omit |
| | | The teacher says, "If you'd just pay attention, you could understand this." | Curriculum encourages teachers to offer support and resources until students gain understanding. |
| | Developing | <p>The teacher says, "I'll try to think of another way to come at this and get back to you."</p> <p>The teacher says, "I realize not everyone understands this, but we can't spend any more time on it."</p> <p>The teacher rearranges the way the students are grouped in an attempt to help students understand the lesson.</p> | <p>Curriculum states that when teachers aren't sure how to address student questions or concerns, "I'll try to think of another way to come at this and get back to you."</p> <p>Curriculum does not help teachers understand that lessons aren't considered over until students understand.</p> <p>Curriculum recommends regrouping students in an attempt to help students understand the lesson.</p> |
| Accomplished | <p>The teacher says, "That's an interesting idea; let's see how it fits."</p> <p>The teacher illustrates a principle of good writing to a student using his interest in basketball as context.</p> <p>The teacher says, "Let's try this way and then uses another approach."</p> | <p>Omit</p> <p>Curriculum offers examples such as illustrating a principle of good writing to a student using his interest in basketball as context.</p> <p>Curriculum offers multiple approaches for helping students understand in case misconceptions arise.</p> | |

| Domain 3E | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Type of Guidance | Scoring Range | Original FFT Language | Modified FFT Language |
| Possible Examples | Exemplary | <p>The teacher stops midstream in a lesson, and says, “This activity doesn’t seem to be working! Here’s another way I’d like you to try it.”</p> <p>The teacher incorporates the school’s upcoming championship game into an explanation of averages.</p> <p>The teacher says, “If we have to come back to this tomorrow, we will; it’s really important that you understand it.”</p> | <p>Curriculum promotes teacher awareness and flexibility by giving this example: It’s okay to stop midstream in a lesson, and say, “This activity doesn’t seem to be working! Here’s another way I’d like you to try it.”</p> <p>Omit</p> <p>Curriculum states for teachers, “If you have to come back to this lesson next time, it’s okay. It’s really important that students understand it.”</p> |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, Gregg R., and Michael J. Anthony, "Revelation, Scripture, and Christian Education." In *A Theology for Christian Education*, edited by James R. Estep Jr., Michael J. Anthony, and Gregg R. Allison, 73-101. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2008.
- Ambrose, Susan A., Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPietro, Marsha C. Lovett, Marie K. Norman, and Richard E. Mayer. *How Learning Works: 7 Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Anthony, Michael J. "The Nature of Theology and Education." In *A Theology for Christian Education*, edited by James R. Estep Jr., Michael J. Anthony, and Gregg R. Allison, 5-24. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2008.
- Anderson, Frances. "Adolescent Development." In *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, edited by James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni, 159-70. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Biesta, Gert. "Receiving the Gift of Teaching: From 'Learning from' to 'Being Taught By.'" *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 32, no. 5 (2012): 449-61.
- Botma, Yvonne. "A Conceptual Framework for Educational Design at Modular Level to Promote Transfer of Learning." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 52, no. 5 (2015): 499-509.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. *Developing Critical Thinking: Challenging Adults to Explore Alternative Ways of Thinking and Acting*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Brookfield, Stephen D., and Stephen Preskill. *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.
- Brown, Peter C., Henry L. Roediger III, and Mark A. Daniel. *Make it Stick: The Science of Successful Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2014.
- Butman, Richard E., and David R. Moore. "The Power of Perry and Belenky." In *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, edited by James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni, 105-21. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Carlson, Gregory C. "Adult Development and Christian Formation." In *Christian Formation: Integrating Theology and Human Development*, edited by James R. Estep Jr. and Jonathan H. Kim, 209-35. Nashville: B&H, 2010.
- Cooley, Amanda Kathryn. "Curriculum Resource Evaluation in Southern Baptist Churches in the State of North Carolina." EdD thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013.

- Danielson, Charlotte. *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007.
- _____. "Evaluations That Help Teachers Learn." *Effective Teacher* 68, no. 4 (2011): 35-39.
- _____. "Framework for Teaching." Kentucky Department of Education. 2014. <https://education.ky.gov/teachers/PGES/TPGES/Documents/Kentucky%20Framework%20for%20Teaching.pdf>.
- The Danielson Group. "The Framework for Teaching." Accessed February 17, 2020. www.danielsongroup.org/our-story.
- _____. "Our Story." Accessed February 17, 2020. www.danielsongroup.org/our-story.
- Dettoni, John M. "On Being a Developmental Teacher." In *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, edited by James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni, 249-63. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Dettoni, John M., and James C. Wilhoit, eds. Introduction to *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, 19-43. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Espinor, Debra. "Overview of Learning Theories." In *Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, edited by HeeKap Lee, 5-22. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Estep, James R., Jr. "Developmental Theories: Foe, Friend, or Folly? The Role of Developmental Theories in Christian Formation." In *Christian Formation: Integrating Theology and Human Development*, edited by James R. Estep Jr. and Jonathan H. Kim, 37-61. Nashville: B&H, 2010.
- _____. "Supervising Tour Group Itineraries: Administering Curriculum." In *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church: Cartography for Christian Pilgrims*, edited by James Estep Jr., Roger White, and Karen Estep, 221-36. Nashville: B&H, 2012.
- Estep, Karen Lynn. "Charting the Course: Curriculum Design." In *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church: Cartography for Christian Pilgrims*, edited by James Estep Jr., Roger White, and Karen Estep, 181-200. Nashville: B&H, 2012.
- _____. "Following Topographical Details: Learning Theory and Curriculum." In *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church: Cartography for Christian Pilgrims*, edited by James Estep Jr., Roger White, and Karen Estep, 89-113. Nashville: B&H, 2012.
- Estep, Karen Lynn, and James Riley Estep Jr. "Checking the Legend and Assessing the Journey: Curriculum Evaluation." In *Mapping Out Curriculum in Your Church: Cartography for Christian Pilgrims*, edited by James Estep Jr., Roger White, and Karen Estep, 201-20. Nashville: B&H, 2012.

- Fennema, Jack. "Constructivism: A Critique from a Biblical Worldview." In *Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, edited by HeeKap Lee, 23-36. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Gorman, Julie A. "Children and Developmentalism." In *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, edited by James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni, 141-57. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Gunter, Mary Alice, Thomas E. Estes, and Susan L. Mintz. *Instruction: A Models Approach*. 5th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2007.
- Haase, Daniel T. "The Death of the Professor: A Case for Dialogue Education." *Common Ground Journal* 11, no. 2 (2014): 45-50.
- Hendricks, Howard. *Teaching to Change Lives: Seven Proven Ways to Make Your Teaching Come Alive*. Colorado Springs: Multnomah Books, 1987.
- Jones Neal, Cynthia. "The Power of Vygotsky." In *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, edited by James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni, 123-37. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Jones, Timothy Paul, and Michael Wilder. "Faith Development and Christian Formation." In *Christian Formation: Integrating Theology and Human Development*, edited by James R. Estep and Jonathan H. Kim, 161-207. Nashville: B&H, 2010.
- Kagan Publishing and Professional Development. Accessed June 1, 2021. https://www.kaganonline.com/about_us.php.
- Kivinen, Osmo, and Pekka Ristela, "From Constructivism to a Pragmatist Conception of Learning." *Oxford Review of Education* 29, no. 3 (2003): 363-75.
- Knight, George R. *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2006.
- Knowlton, Dave S. "Shifting Towards a Constructivist Philosophy for Teaching Biblical Principles in K-12 Christian School." *Christian Education Journal* 1, no. 3 (2004): 116-29.
- Knowlton, Dave S., James A. Thorne, and C. Harry Harriss. "A Selective Defense of 'Introduction to Christian Doctrine' Online: Disputatious Perspectives and Propitiating Pedagogy." *Christian Education Journal* 6, no. 1 (2002): 111-25.
- Lambert, Dan. *Teaching That Makes a Difference: How to Teach for Holistic Impact*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.
- LeBar, Lois E. *Education That Is Christian*. Colorado Springs: David C Cook, 1995.
- _____. "Planning for Teaching." In *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education*, edited by Werner C. Graendorf, 167-77. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981.
- Lee, HeeKap, ed. *Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.

- _____, ed. *Introduction to Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, xi-xiii. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- _____, ed. *Preface to Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, 3-4. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- _____. "Three Faces of Constructivism." In *Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, edited by HeeKap Lee, 45-63. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Maddix, Mark A. "Spiritual Formation and Christian Formation." In *Christian Formation: Integrating Theology and Human Development*, edited by James R. Estep Jr. and Jonathan H. Kim, 237-71. Nashville: B&H, 2010.
- McTighe, Jay, and Grant Wiggins. *Essential Questions: Opening Doors to Student Understanding*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2013.
- McTighe, Jay, and Harvey F. Silver. *Teaching for Deeper Learning: Tools to Engage Students in Meaning Making*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2020.
- McTighe, Jay, and Judy M. Willis. *Upgrade Your Teaching: Understanding by Design Meets Neuroscience*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2019.
- Mezirow, Jack. "On Critical Reflection." *Adult Education Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (1998): 185.
- _____. "Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice." *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 1997, no. 74 (1997): 5-13.
- Pazmiño, Robert W. "A Comprehensive Vision for Conversion in Christian Education." *Religious Education* 87, no. 1 (1992): 87-101.
- _____. "Curriculum Foundations." *Christian Education Journal* 8, no. 1 (1987): 31-44.
- _____. *Foundational Issues in Christian Education: An Introduction in Evangelical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- _____. *Principles and Practices of Christian Education: An Evangelical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Pew Center Research. "In U.S., Decline of Christianity Continues at Rapid Pace." Religion & Public Life Project (blog). October 17, 2019. www.pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/.
- Pinetops Foundation. "The Great Opportunity: The American Church in 2050." 2018. www.greatopportunity.org.
- Plueddemann, James. E. "Curriculum Improvement through Evaluation." *Christian Education Journal* 8, no. 1 (Autumn 1987): 55-60.

- _____. "The Power of Piaget." In *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, edited by James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni, 47-60. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Reck, Stacie. "Colouring with Brown Crayons: Evaluating Religious Education Curriculum." PhD diss., University of Alberta, 2008.
- Ritchhart, Ron. *Creating Cultures of Thinking: The 8 Forces We Must Master to Truly Transform Our Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2015.
- Roehlkepartain, Eugene C. *The Teaching Church: Moving Christian Education to Center Stage*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993.
- _____. "The Thinking Climate: A Missing Ingredient in Youth Ministry." *Christian Education Journal* 15, no. 1 (1994): 53-63.
- Roso, Calvin G. "Constructivism in the Classroom: Is It Biblical?" In *Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, edited by HeeKap Lee, 37-44. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Rutter, Mark V. "A Holistic Approach to Learning: The Key to Change." *Christian Education Journal* 10, no. 3 (1990): 63-72.
- Schuller, David. *Rethinking Christian Education*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 1993.
- Schultz, Tom, and Joani Schultz. *Why Nobody Learns Much of Anything at Church and How to Fix It*. Loveland, CO: Group, 2004.
- Search Institute. "Effective Christian Education: A National Study of Protestant Congregations." Minneapolis: Search Institute, 1990.
- Setran, David P., James C. Wilhoit, Donald Ratcliff, Daniel T. Haase, and Linda Rosema. "Spiritual Formation Goes to College: Class-Related 'Soul Projects' in Christian Higher Education." *Christian Education Journal* 7, no. 2 (2010): 401-22.
- Sommers-Johnson, Rhonda. "Did Jesus Utilize Constructivist Teaching Practices?" In *Faith-Based Education That Constructs: A Creative Dialogue between Constructivism and Faith-Based Education*, edited by HeeKap Lee, 124-38. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Sullins, Burben W., III. "The Importance of Evaluating Children's Small-Group Curriculum, Kindergarten-Sixth Grade at Churches in Albuquerque, New Mexico." DEdMin project, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017.
- Thorne, James A. "Biblical Education: Contributions from Constructivism." *Christian Education Journal* 10, no. 1 (2013): 99-109.
- Trentham, John David. "Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 1): Approaching and Qualifying Models of Human Development." *Christian Education Journal* 16, no. 3 (2019): 458-75.

- _____. "Reading the Social Sciences Theologically (Part 2): Engaging and Appropriating Models of Human Development." *Christian Education Journal* 16, no. 3 (2019): 476-94.
- Vella, Jane. *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach: The Power of Dialogue in Educating Adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.
- Vella, Jane, Paula Berardinelli, and Jim Burrow. *How Do They Know They Know? Evaluating Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
- Walsh, Jackie Acree, and Beth Dankert Sattes. *Questioning for Classroom Discussion: Purposeful Speaking, Engaged Listening, Deep Thinking*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2015.
- Walworth, Winona. "Educational Curriculum." In *Introduction to Biblical Christian Education*, edited by Werner C. Graendorf, 283-90. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981.
- Ward, Ted. Foreword to *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*, edited by James C. Wilhoit and John M. Dettoni, 7-17. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Wiggins, Grant. "How Good Is Good Enough?" *Educational Leadership* 71, no. 4 (2014): 10-16.
- Wiggins, Grant, and Jay McTighe. *Schooling by Design: Mission, Action, and Achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007.
- _____. *Understanding by Design*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2005.
- Wilhoit, James C. "The Illusion of Change in Curriculum." *Christian Education Journal* 8, no. 1 (1987): 25-30.
- Wilhoit, James C., and John M. Dettoni, eds. *Nurture That Is Christian: Developmental Perspectives on Christian Education*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Wilhoit, Jim. *Christian Education and the Search for Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.
- Wilkerson, Lindsey. "Constructivist Curriculum for Christian Transformation." *Christian Education Journal: Research on Educational Ministry* (January 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739891320985870>.
- Williams, Dennis E. "Curriculum Planning for Evangelical Churches." Unpublished manuscript, Denver, CO, 1992.
- Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994. Quoted in Tom Schultz and Joani Schultz, *Why Nobody Learns Much of Anything at Church and How to Fix It* (Loveland, CO: Group, 2004), 8.
- Zais, Robert S. *Curriculum: Principles and Foundations*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

ABSTRACT

EVALUATING HIGH SCHOOL CHURCH CURRICULA VIA THE DANIELSON FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING: A QUANTITATIVE APPROACH

Lindsey Brook Wilkerson, EdD
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2021
Chair: Dr. Anthony W. Foster

The purpose of this qualitative study was to evaluate current evangelical small group or Sunday school curricula for high school students using the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT). The literature review revealed large-scale problems with Christianity in the U.S., problems in Christian education, and finally deficiencies in church curricula. The literature review also revealed a faith-based constructivist curriculum that effectively supports active learning that leads to Christlike transformation.

The FFT was introduced and proven to be a valid and reliable tool for measuring student learning and the evaluation of curricula. By using Domains 1 and 3 of the FFT to evaluate curricula, strengths and weaknesses were discovered, analyzed, and reported in order to strengthen curricula and therefore Christian education in churches.

VITA

Lindsey Wilkerson

EDUCATION

BS, Murray State University, 2005
MS, Murray State University, 2010
Principal Certificate, Murray State University, 2013

PUBLICATIONS

“Constructivist Curriculum for Christian Transformation.” *Christian Education Journal* (January 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739891320985870>.
“Leadership Fueled by Glory: His or Mine?” *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership* 15, no.1 (2021): 96-109.

ORGANIZATIONS

Society of Professors in Christian Education
Evangelical Theological Society
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Kindergarten Teacher, Lowes Elementary School, Lowes, Kentucky, 2005-2006
Kindergarten Teacher, Mayfield Elementary School, Mayfield, Kentucky, 2006-2010
Guidance Counselor, Jonathan Elementary School, Benton, Kentucky, 2010-2014
Assistant Principal, Graves County Middle School, Mayfield, Kentucky, 2014-