



CENTER ON EDUCATION
AND LIFELONG LEARNING

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Indiana Institute

EDUCATION POLICY BRIEF

INDIANA TEACHER EVALUATION: AT THE CROSSROADS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Hardy Murphy, Cassandra Cole, Gary Pike, Jim Ansaldo, and James Robinson
Volume 1, Number 1, Winter 2014

CONTENTS

Introduction.....1
Survey Purpose and Methods.....2
Summary Results – Beliefs.....4
Summary Results – Confidence.....4
Summary Results: Analyses of
Respondent Demographics.....4
Discussion.....5
Recommendations.....9
Conclusion.....11

Policy Perspectives

Perspective Letter: INTASS
Consortium of Districts.....12
Perspective Letter: INTASS
Advisory Board.....13
Acknowledgements.....14
Authors.....14
References..... 14
Appendices.....15

INTRODUCTION

Implementing changes in teacher evaluation required by Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 001 (Public Law 90) represents another chapter in the state’s education reform dialogue. The requirements of the legislation, policy implications of the legislation, and an initial investigation into perceptions and beliefs of Indiana superintendents about its necessity and impact were the topics of previous briefs published by the Center on Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) and the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) at Indiana University (Cole, Robinson, Ansaldo, Whiteman and Spradlin, 2012; Cole, Murphy, Rogan and Eckes, 2013).

This policy brief is the first in a two-part series that continues the investigation of superintendent perceptions and expands upon previous work by including teachers and principals across the state in the survey sample. The second brief, to be released in early 2015, will present a comparison of the attitudes and beliefs of Indiana superintendents from the current survey with those of the 2012 survey.

Topics in the current survey concerning beliefs about teacher evaluation are part of a critical conversation moving teacher evaluation front and center of the national dialogue about educational accountability. Topics in this dialogue range from school choice and funding reform to national educational standards and bargaining unit limitations. Familiar themes – the advisability of using student test results to evaluate teachers, the degree of responsibility that teachers have for overcoming student out of school experiences, the instructional leadership capabilities of principals – are among a recurring array of topics in the continuing debate about the best way to improve student outcomes.

The critical elements of new evaluation systems – rubrics developed for evaluating teacher effectiveness, multiple observations that redefine the concept of instructional leadership for principals, the use of student growth as a component of the final rating process, multiple ways to measure student growth including standardized and locally developed assessments – are being scrutinized by all involved in the

transition of teacher evaluation from a process orientation to one focusing on the outcomes of instructional effectiveness and student learning.

A litany of questions is emerging in the current research agenda to identify best practices in the evaluation of teachers. Do teacher observation and evaluation rubrics represent valid indicators of effective teaching? Can these rubrics be used effectively with high degrees of validity and reliability? Can student growth and achievement be measured with high degrees of validity and reliability? Is student growth an appropriate indicator of instructional effectiveness? Should the evaluation of teachers be tied to compensation? Adequately answering these questions and others is essential to transforming teacher evaluation into a professional growth experience that develops teachers and ensures student learning.

Since most of the states in the country are now in the midst of teacher evaluation reform and many are in the third year and beyond, the time is opportune to determine the impact of these new systems. Researching questions concerning what is being accomplished, how the new systems are being implemented, whether there are aspects of the systems that are more problematic than others, and determining if there are lessons to be learned at this stage in the transformation of teacher evaluation may shed valuable light that will help in improving the design, implementation and sustainability of teacher evaluation systems going forward.

The current study and policy brief add to the growing body of research offering insights into the ongoing discussion of how to develop and implement plans that respond effectively to new teacher evaluation requirements.

The aftermath of the Indiana legislation, prior to and during the initial stages of implementation, were the timeframes of the previous surveys and briefs. This brief, and the survey responses serving as the central data for its discussion, gauge responses to the legislation's implementation over the past two years. Much has happened during this period of implementation and questions have been raised about how best to move forward with the implementation of the teacher evaluation requirements of the law. In this sense, teacher evaluation in the state of Indiana is at the crossroads of implementation. Hopefully, the results of this study will help to inform decisions for policy makers and those responsible for implementation.

Survey results and the relevance of the findings to the dialogue on teacher evaluation at the national level and in the state of Indiana, including implications for legislation and policy, will be presented in the following sections of the brief. The organization of this brief proceeds in the following sequence: 1) Survey purpose and method 2) Summary of survey results, 3) Discussion of the results/findings including implications for future research, and 4) Recommendations addressing policy, guidance, and implementation at the local level.

SURVEY PURPOSE AND METHODS

Purpose:

To determine the perceived impact of the Senate Enrolled Act 001 (Public Law 90) and the teacher evaluation plans developed in response to this legislation over the past three years, educators across the state were surveyed with questions concerning new teacher evaluation plans implemented in their districts.

This survey included two sets of questions for superintendents, principals and teachers. They were asked to respond to questions concerning their beliefs about teacher evaluation, the legislation mandating changes to the evaluation process, and the local district level impact of changes to their teacher evaluation process to comply with the legislation. Principals and teachers were also asked to respond to an additional set of questions concerning confidence in evaluator capabilities.

Methods:

Superintendents, teachers, and principals across the state of Indiana were asked to respond to survey questions aligned with the Indiana Teacher Appraisal System of Supports (INTASS) Rubric Components (INTASS, 2013), a field-tested instrument for developing and implementing teacher evaluation plans. Questions allowed responses on a 7 point Likert Scale with response values ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The first 11 questions of the survey were included in a previous survey of superintendents across Indiana in 2012 published in a brief by the Center on Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) and the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) at Indiana University. The current survey was constructed with questions addressing two aspects of educator perceptions: Participant beliefs about teacher evaluation and their confidence in their evaluation process. Questions related to participant beliefs addressed 1) the measurement of student growth and achievement, 2) the new teacher evaluation legislation, and 3) how changes in their teacher evaluation process have impacted teaching and learning at the local level. Questions were composed with prompts like the following:

- “I believe that teacher effectiveness ...”
- “I believe that student academic growth...”
- “I believe that instruction can be...”

Principal and teachers' confidence levels in the evaluation process were determined with questions addressing principals' confidence in themselves as evaluators, teacher confidence in their evaluators, and the confidence of both in the evaluation process. Confidence questions were composed with prompts like the following:

- “I am confident that evaluators in my district...”
- “I am confident that I...”

The survey was administered during the spring and early summer of the 2014 school year as a collaborative effort with the leading educator associations in the state. The Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (IAPSS), the Indiana Association of School Principals (IASP), the Indiana State Teachers Association (ISTA) and the AFT Indiana sent the survey link to their membership. In addition, the survey was distributed through the Indiana Department Of Education (IDOE) Learning Connections. The request for participation was introduced with a letter explaining the purpose of the survey and an assurance of confidentiality for participants. Although demographic information regarding region, urbanicity, years of experience, content area, role, and grade level was asked for in the survey, district membership was not requested in order to avoid raising participant concerns about anonymity.

One hundred sixty-five superintendents, 1586 teachers, and 261 principals responded to the survey. Table 1 illustrates the demographics of the respondents.

The survey analyses include a tabulation of frequencies to identify possible response patterns and a series of statistical operations conducted to address the significance of the observed patterns. These analyses were used to determine underlying constructs accounting for response patterns and to identify and substantiate the significance of differences in the responses of superintendents, principals and teachers.

Table 1: Participants Demographics

My teaching experience is/was at the:

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Elementary Level	55	32.7%	Elementary Level	156	60.2%	Elementary Level	649	40.8%
Secondary Level	112	66.7%	Secondary Level	103	39.8%	Secondary Level	939	59.2%
NA	1	0.6%						

The geographic region that best describes my districts:

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Northern Indiana	55	32.7%	Northern Indiana	93	35.9%	Northern Indiana	563	35.5%
Southern Indiana	34	20.2%	Southern Indiana	64	24.7%	Southern Indiana	392	24.7%
Central Indiana	79	47.0%	Central Indiana	102	39.4%	Central Indiana	633	39.9%

I would describe my district as:

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Rural	113	67.3%	Rural	133	51.4%	Rural	704	44.3%
Suburban	36	21.4%	Suburban	64	24.7%	Suburban	578	36.4%
Urban	19	11.3%	Urban	62	23.9%	Urban	306	19.3%

My district has been implementing Indiana’s teacher evaluation law for:

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
0 Years	16	9.5%	0 Years	26	10.0%	0 Years	130	8.2%
1 Year	27	16.1%	1 Year	45	17.4%	1 Year	373	23.5%
2 Years	125	74.4%	2 Years	188	72.6%	2 Years	1,085	68.3%

I have been in my role for:

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Less than 4 years	69	41.1%	Less than 4 years	73	28.2%	Less than 4 years	146	9.2%
4-10 years	62	36.9%	4-10 years	84	32.4%	4-10 years	328	20.7%
11-15 Years	24	14.3%	11-15 years	50	19.3%	11-15 years	238	15.0%
16-25 years	12	7.1%	16-25 years	37	14.3%	16-25 years	419	26.4%
More than 25 years	1	0.6%	More than 25 years	15	5.8%	More than 25 years	456	28.7%

Were you ever a teacher in a tested area (ISTEP, ECA)?

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Yes	71	42.3%	Yes	165	63.7%	Yes	827	52.1%
No	97	57.7%	No	94	36.3%	No	761	47.9%

Were you ever a teacher in special education?

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Yes	17	10.1%	Yes	32	12.4%	Yes	233	14.0%
No	151	89.9%	No	227	87.6%	No	1,365	86.0%

Table 1: Participants Demographics (cont.)

Were you ever a teacher of English Language Learners?

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Yes	18	10.7%	Yes	55	21.2%	Yes	315	19.8%
No	150	89.3%	No	204	78.8%	No	1,273	80.2%

SUMMARY RESULTS — BELIEFS

An analysis of response frequencies to survey questions showed that superintendents were more favorable in their responses than principals and teachers, and that principals were more favorable than teachers. These response frequencies by question are found in Appendix A, p. 15.

Factor analyses identified the following three factors that influence and explain response patterns of superintendent, principal, and teacher beliefs about teacher evaluation: 1) Measuring growth and achievement with validity, 2) Accurately judging teaching and learning in an evaluation, and 3) The new evaluation system, its relationship with professional development, and impact upon teaching and learning. Statistical analysis indicated that the mean differences among superintendents, principals, and teachers on the three beliefs factors were significant at the .05 level. Superintendents’ responses demonstrated consistently higher ratings with mean responses across the three variables ranging from 5.6-5.9. Principals’ mean responses fall between that of teachers and superintendents and range from 5.1-5.4. The mean response for teachers’ across the three factors (3.5-4.3) exhibited the greatest range of the three groups.

Table 2: Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers, Principals, and Superintendents

	MEASURE	TEACH_LRN	NEW_EVAL
Teachers, [N=1,585]	4.33 1.18	3.83 1.29	3.54 1.22
Principals [N=261]	5.13 0.99	5.41 1.02	5.11 1.30
Superintendents [N=167]	5.57 0.76	5.80 0.71	5.94 1.07
TOTAL [N=2,013]	4.53 1.20	4.20 1.41	3.94 1.45

SUMMARY RESULTS — CONFIDENCE

An analysis of response frequencies to survey questions showed that principals, in general, have more confidence in their ability to conduct effective evaluations and their knowledge of the technical aspects of the system than their teachers have in their ability to do so. These response frequencies by question are found in Appendix B, p. 19.

Factor analysis identified two underlying constructs explaining response patterns for the confidence questions: 1) Confidence in evaluators’ process knowledge or their ability to conduct an effective and valid evaluation and, 2) Confidence in evaluators’ procedural knowledge or their ability to understand the technical aspects of evaluation requirements. The differences between principals and teachers on the confidence factors were significant. The analyses determined that values for teachers confidence (mean=3.8) in their evaluators’ process knowledge was significantly lower than the confidence level of principals (mean= 5.8), and that teachers confidence (mean=3.9) in their evaluators’ procedural knowledge was significantly lower than the confidence level of principals (mean= 5.7). See tables 2 and 3.

Table 3: Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers and Principals

	PROCESS	PROCEDURES
Teachers	3.817 1.450	3.966 1.492
Principals	5.838 .575	5.701 0.826
TOTAL	4.097 1.531	4.211 1.541

SUMMARY RESULTS — ANALYSES OF RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

A series of analyses was conducted to determine whether there were significant relationships between the demographic characteristics of teachers, principals, and superintendents, and their beliefs about teacher evaluation. Analyses were also conducted to determine if years of implementing the new teacher evaluation plans had an impact upon respondent beliefs about teacher evaluation. A similar set of analyses was conducted to determine if demographic characteristics and experience were related to the teacher and principal responses on the confidence factors. The results below show that there were significant differences in two areas: Teachers in kindergarten through grade three had significantly more positive beliefs than middle and high school teachers for the validity of measure factor, and teachers with less than four years of experience had more positive beliefs than more experienced teachers for the new evaluation factor.

Additionally, respondents from districts using a new teacher evaluation system for two years were more confident their evaluators could follow procedures than were respondents from districts using a new evaluation system for one year. See tables 4 and 5.

Table 4: Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers by Grades Taught

	MEASURE	TEACH_LRN	NEW_EVAL
K-3 [N=384]	4.53 1.19	3.92 1.34	3.59 1.28
4-6 [N=264]	4.52 1.19	3.92 1.34	3.55 1.18
Middle School [N=342]	4.21 1.19	3.75 1.28	3.52 1.19
High School [N=595]	4.22 1.16	3.78 1.25	3.51 1.20
TOTAL [N=1,585]	4.32 1.18	3.83 1.29	3.53 1.21

Table 5: Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers by Teaching Experience

	MEASURE	TEACH_LRN	NEW_EVAL
Less than 4 years [N=146]	4.53 1.00	4.16 1.27	4.06 1.19
4-10 years [N=327]	4.21 1.16	3.82 1.32	3.55 1.24
11-15 years [N=237]	4.31 1.28	3.86 1.34	3.58 1.21
16-25 years [N=418]	4.25 1.20	3.74 1.25	3.46 1.18
More than 25 years [N=456]	4.43 1.17	3.80 1.28	3.41 1.19
TOTAL [N=1,584]	4.33 1.18	3.83 1.29	3.54 1.22

The number of respondents in districts using a new evaluation system for less than a year was not large enough to allow a valid interpretation.

No other statistically significant differences were observed. Other demographic factors investigated – residence, (i.e., location in the state), setting, (i.e., urban, suburban, rural), length of plan implementation, whether or not teachers were in a tested area, and whether or not they taught special education or ELL – were not associated with significantly different responses.

DISCUSSION

The general response patterns of this study with superintendents being more favorable in their responses than principals and teachers, and principals being more favorable than teachers are consistent with the literature concerning the new direction in teacher evaluation.

Similarly, the finding that a significant number of teachers view the new evaluation systems unfavorably is also documented in the teacher evaluation literature. However, as the discussion below will show there are some meaningful differences between the results of this study and previous research. The explanation for the results may provide useful insights into the challenges and opportunities presented in the transformation of teacher evaluation.

Firestone, Blitz, Gitmer, Krove, Shcherbakov and Nordon (2013), in a study conducted in ten New Jersey districts, had similar findings as the current study. Their study noted that administrators were more positive about the overall effects of teacher evaluation than were teachers. Uneven training and different access to information, involvement in the development phase and understanding of the evaluation

process may offer an insight for why teachers feel less positive about the evaluation process.

This characteristic of evaluator and teacher preparation during the development and implementation of a new evaluation process could explain why many teachers in the current study indicated that they did not believe that their plans enabled an accurate evaluation of instruction or their evaluators effectively recognized it.

For instance, in Indiana, evaluation training for principals is required, but not for teachers. Additionally, the new era in teacher evaluation represents, for many teachers, a significant change from the way their performance was evaluated in the past. This difference is underscored in our study which showed the newest teachers, those who have not known another form of teacher evaluation, are more positive on the questions comprising the factor accounting for participant responses to the new teacher evaluation system in Indiana than more experienced teachers.

A 2010 Public Agenda and American Institutes for Research (Coggshall, J.G., Ott, A., and Lasagna, M.) study suggests that the success of educational reforms focused on the evaluation of teachers rests in large part on the support of those most affected by the reforms. They investigated teacher perceptions of how best to identify effective teachers and found that teachers are actually divided on how teacher effectiveness should be measured; no one indicator of success was rated as an excellent measure by a majority of the teachers. Ovando (2001) found that teachers believe the levels of performance in the evaluation rating systems do not reflect the true ability of teachers. Specifically, teachers expressed concern with the meaning of the “Proficient” level and the four-point scale of the system. Teachers also felt that appraisal systems may be too subjective and may not accurately reflect teachers’ instructional performance. The teacher responses in the current study concerning the ability of instruction to be effectively determined by their local plans and

their evaluators' ability to recognize effective instruction are in some ways reflective of these findings in the research.

Sheppard (2013) investigated the perceptions of the teacher evaluation process held by teachers and administrators in southeast Georgia. The teacher response patterns mirrored those of the current study when looking at the overall quality of the evaluation process. Teachers in the Sheppard study (43.7%) rated the overall quality of the evaluation process as being above average in quality. A higher percentage (55.89) of teachers rated the impact of the evaluation on professional practices as having an above average to strong impact.

There were similarities and differences between the administrator responses in the Georgia study with the responses of administrators in the current study. Administrators in the Georgia study did not feel favorably about the impact of the evaluation process. Only 41.67% reported the process had more than an average impact that would lead to changes in teaching practices and attitudes about teaching and 58.3% rated the overall quality of the teacher evaluation process as being average in quality. In the current study, superintendent responses were somewhat different while principal responses were more like the administrator responses in the Georgia study.

Superintendents (86%) in the current study feel that the changes in the law improved teacher evaluation in their district. A majority of the principals (65%) in the current study have similar feelings. It is interesting to note that while a strong majority of superintendents (74%) felt that the change in teacher evaluation law in Indiana will improve teaching and learning, only 52% of principals feel that the law will have a favorable impact upon teaching and learning. They also differed in their feelings about the local impact of their plans on teaching and learning with 80% of superintendents, and 57% of principals feeling that improved teaching and learning resulted from their local plans.

An important observation in the results of the current study is that there were areas across survey questions where the beliefs and confidence for all three groups were generally more positive than in other areas. For instance, although there were differences in the strength of expressed beliefs among the groups, superintendents, principals and teachers appear to believe that teacher effectiveness affects student achievement and that student achievement and growth can be validly measured.

Similarly, there were areas of the survey where the three groups had less favorable views in general about teacher evaluation than they did for other areas. For instance, teachers and principals feel that it is inadvisable to link evaluation to compensation and only 60% of Superintendents feel that evaluation should be tied to compensation. In general the less favorable response of participants in this important area of teacher evaluation is lower than their ratings in other areas of the teacher evaluation process. This less favorable view of linking evaluation to compensation is consistent with research indicating that teachers do not support tying teacher rewards to student performance (Coggshall, et.al., 2010).

Another important pattern observed in the results are responses of the three groups concerning their local plans and their experience with local plan impact. These responses were generally less positive than their beliefs about essential evaluation concepts. Additionally, there were some differences among the three groups in their perceptions of the extent to which their local plans addressed evaluation concepts. In some areas the shift toward less favorable teacher responses concerning beliefs and confidence at the local plan level is greater than that of superintendents and principals. For example, 50% of teachers believed that teacher evaluation in Indiana needed improvement, but when asked whether the new law improved teacher evaluation in their district (local impact), only 19% indicated that it did.

Principal differences between their feelings about the relationship between evaluation concepts and how they are addressed in their local plans were also marked by some notable shifts. For instance when asked if they believed that an effective evaluation system drives professional development, 83% of the principals responded in the affirmative. However, when asked if their local district plan drives professional development, only 55% responded with affirmation.

Responses to questions concerning the impact of evaluation upon teaching and learning offer further insight into the manner that change is experienced by teachers in the implementation of new teacher evaluation requirements. Even though there is research that demonstrates teachers and their instruction can make significant differences in how much and what their students learn (Sanders & Rivers, 1996; Mendro, 1998; Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001) other research indicates that much of what influences student learning is beyond a teacher's control (Darling Hammond, 2012).

This pattern of contradicting research could help to explain why teachers in the current study believe that there is a relationship between effective teaching and student learning but that their evaluation plans do not effectively capture this relationship. On the questions related to the impact of teacher effectiveness upon student achievement and the ability to measure student growth and achievement with validity, both of which generate a great deal of tension in the national dialogue, a strong majority in all three groups responded positively that they held this belief. However, when responding to the quality of their local level plans and how well these plans address these critical issues, the three groups responded less positively. In other words, they believe that good teaching makes a difference, but their feelings about evaluating this difference is another matter. This point is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: Essential Concepts vs. Local Plan Impact

I believe that student achievement can be validly measured (Essential Concept)		
	Agree	Disagree
Superintendents	98.2	1.8
Principals	90.0	10.0
Teachers	70.1	29.9
Our district evaluation plan measures student achievement with validity (Local Plan Impact)		
	Agree	Disagree
Superintendents	91.7	8.3
Principals	73.4	26.6
Teachers	47.1	52.9
I believe that student academic growth can be validly measured (Essential Concept)		
	Agree	Disagree
Superintendents	93.5	6.5
Principals	85	15
Teachers	72.6	26.4
Our district assessments measure student growth with validity (Local Plan Impact)		
	Agree	Disagree
Superintendents	83.3	15.7
Principals	73.8	26.2
Teachers	49.5	50.5

The underlying reasons for the individual responses and the general response patterns were not within the scope of this study. However, understanding why superintendents, principals, and teachers feel as they do concerning their responses to these evaluation issues is an important question for future research. For the questions concerning the measurement and use of student growth in their evaluations, their responses may indicate feelings that they are better able to measure student growth with validity than standardized tests in general, or because they lack confidence in the tests used in their district plans. In either case, this is a significant issue that must be addressed.

One speculation for this difference between teacher perceptions and responses to questions at the conceptual level and their reactions to the same or similar questions at the local plan or district level is that reflection upon evaluation concepts does not have the personal impact and resulting

apprehensions about failing to meet the requirements in a teachers’ personal evaluation experiences. (It should be noted that this could be true for principals also because the responsibility of making judgments of colleague performance takes on very personal dimensions during the evaluation process). Another possible explanation for this divergence in teacher reactions between the conceptual and the personal level is that teachers have not been provided the same training opportunities as administrators. As a result, they may not feel that they are well informed about the details of their evaluation process and do not have an adequate understanding of the relationship between evaluation concepts and how they are operationalized in their local plans. They may not feel, as the responses to this study indicate, that instructional excellence will be recognized and that ratings of their instruction will be accurate and reliable.

To achieve acceptable levels of inter-rater reliability in the recognition and rating of effective instruction requires fairly extensive and ongoing training. This training should be provided in a systematic and recurring fashion to those responsible for evaluating teachers. Further, training both teachers and evaluators on the evaluation process could improve teacher and administrator experiences by enabling a clearer understanding of what is expected and the standards used to rate performance. However, as noted at the outset of the discussion, training teachers along with their evaluators is not commonplace. As a result, teachers may be less familiar with the rubrics used in their evaluation and they are not always aware of how much training, if any, their evaluators have received. The fact that teachers do not receive, generally, the same level of training as their evaluators could influence overall teacher perceptions about their confidence in the development and implementation of their plans at the local level.

The growing and often contradicting research literature on the validity and reliability of using standardized tests to measure growth and achievement, a predictably contentious issue, only creates more doubt among teachers in their evaluations. The appropriateness of including student growth as measured by the tests in teacher evaluations is a much debated concept in the teacher evaluation landscape. Coggshall, et.al, found only 12% of teachers felt that standardized test results were a good indicator of teacher performance. Teachers in the current study also have concerns about using student growth and the best way to measure it. However, the results of the current study and that of previous research studies beg the question of whether teachers, when responding to questions concerning the measurements of growth and achievement with validity are referring to the use of standardized tests for this purpose, or making a distinction between whether they could measure growth and achievement but are skeptical about

the effectiveness of commonly used instruments in their district. If there is a disconnect between how teachers view standardized tests and their use of assessments in the teaching and learning process, it is a question whose resolution could have an impact upon the implementation and sustainability of teacher evaluation changes and the use of student outcomes.

If there is skepticism about the measure being used, a starting point to address this skepticism and support the claim that higher test scores reflect more effective instruction, is a test that is both sensitive to effective instruction and represents valued outcomes. That is, given a fixed starting position, test scores should be higher for students who have received effective instruction on the desired outcomes than it will be for students who either have received ineffective instruction on the desired outcomes or who have received instruction (effective or not) on outcomes other than the desired ones (Popham, 2013).

A related issue in the ongoing discussion about how to appropriately incorporate student growth into the teacher evaluation process is the specification of its weight in the calculation of performance ratings. Although there is considerable research asserting the quantitative impact of good teaching and good teachers upon student learning, the exact weight that this data point should have in a teacher's summative rating is heavily debated. Compounding the confusion surrounding appropriate weights for student growth is how teachers are involved in the decision making process. The decisions for the requirements for weighting student growth in the evaluation process are not always accompanied with communications about how the decisions are made. This only heightens the emotional reaction to this significant change in the evaluation landscape and creates a barrier for understanding and implementing changes in the process.

It could be that the reactions by respondents in the current study to their local plans and student growth and achievement is a reaction to not being adequately informed of the research basis for the decision, nor being included in the processes and standards for the decision regarding student growth and their evaluation.

Good teaching is supposed to make a significant difference in student learning. Some researchers assert that this difference is as much as a year. However other descriptions of the relationship between teaching and student learning are couched in the more statistical terms of standard deviations, correlation coefficients, explanations of observed variance in test scores, and the like. Establishing the relationship between these indicators of teaching and its impact upon learning and specifying an appropriate weight in an evaluation is a difficult enterprise. Justifying the final decision in a way that is easily understood by those most impacted by it is also just as difficult. However, the successful implementation of changes in the evaluation of teachers may rest upon how well teachers understand these relationships between their instructional efforts and the measurement of student learning outcomes.

Further, defining the appropriate weight is not the same as identifying the appropriate use of student growth in an evaluation. For instance, should the weight change be based upon the percentage of expected growth that students achieve? Does achieving and exceeding the expected growth prioritize its use in the evaluation process? How should the contradiction between low growth and high rubric ratings be resolved? These are complex questions that should be prioritized with any mandated changes in the teacher evaluation process. And, just as importantly, helping those responsible for, and those most impacted by the evaluation process, to understand the decisions is critical for the credibility necessary for successful implementation.

The differences in this study between teacher and principals' confidence in evaluator capabilities for effectively conducting the process and technical aspects of their evaluation plans are consistent with a study conducted by Firestone et.al. in ten New Jersey districts. The results of this study indicated that administrators (94%) believe they have the knowledge and competencies to evaluate teachers while only 54% of teachers felt this way. This finding that principals have more confidence in their knowledge of evaluation processes, their ability to conduct effective evaluations, and their knowledge of the technical aspects of the system than the teachers have in them could be explained by the fact that the evaluation process has different expectations and impact for those responsible for implementation than for those being evaluated. One speculation for this difference of opinion, as mentioned earlier, is that while principals have been engaged in ongoing discussion about changes in the evaluation process and received training to enable them to implement district plans, teachers may not have received extensive preparation. This unevenness in preparation for the professionals who are at the heart of the changes leads to misunderstanding, confusion, and apprehension.

Although the discussed results in this study and those in the limited research review indicate that there are differences in the perceptions and experiences of teachers and administrators with current changes in the teacher evaluation process, there are indications that with time, perceptions and experiences can become more favorable and confidence in the system increased. The Tennessee Department of Education surveyed teachers and administrators who were entering the third year of a new teacher evaluation system about their perceptions of the state's teacher evaluation initiative.

The main points of their findings include: 1) an improvement in teacher perceptions, 2) evaluators and teachers becoming more favorable in their view of the evaluation process as helpful in improving teaching and learning, 3) a more favorable response for those teachers in districts that developed local models, 4) a significant improvement in teacher confidence in their ability to implement requirements in the evaluation process, and 5) more engagement in the process from teachers who felt that the process was for improvement rather than judging performance.

As we noted, the differences between the three groups in the present study are significant and sometimes strikingly so. Because teachers are definitely less pleased in general with the new evaluations, it is easy to adopt a pessimistic or “glass half empty” attitude about the development and implementation of these plans in Indiana. However, another way to see the results is that given the fact that there is a relatively even split between those who see the changes as positive and those who have unfavorable viewpoint of the changes, the “glass is half full” and suggests that there is an opportunity to effect meaningful change in the evaluation of teachers in Indiana.

As the review of research shows, the response patterns of the current study are similar in some respects with the research literature. These findings offer guidance for the continued implementation of new teacher evaluation requirements in the state of Indiana. In order for the transformation of teacher evaluation to happen as desired and achieve the intended results it will be important to plan and conduct implementation in a way that acknowledges and addresses educator concerns. Focusing the messaging of plan requirements as an effort to improve teaching and learning by supporting teachers will help the changes to be embraced more positively. Similarly, the local control model of plan development, when accompanied by additional resources with clear and consistent guidance, will be helpful in ensuring high quality plan development and implementation.

Differences in perceptions among the educators in the current survey and in the research literature suggest that addressing recurring issues of trust exacerbated by a lack of understanding of evaluation processes will be important for successfully implementing teacher evaluation plans in the future. Additionally, ensuring transparency in policy decisions at the state and local level will be necessary in order for the plans to be supported. In order to demonstrate that plans are based upon sound reasoning rather than political expediency, establishing a clear relationship between plan standards and reasonable expectations must become a priority. Given what is understood about the effective implementation of educational change, the results of the current study lead to conclusions and recommendations about how to move forward that may be helpful in the successful implementation of teacher evaluation reform. Moving forward with improvements in the evaluation process will result in the development of teacher evaluation plans that realize the intent of improving teaching and learning experiences in classrooms across Indiana. These recommendations are presented in the following section.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based upon the results of this study and address standards, procedures, resources, and strategies for consideration in discussions concerning policy and guidance for teacher evaluation in Indiana.

Provide clear standards for plan development and implementation that go beyond compliance.

Simply being compliant will not ensure that the system of evaluation develops shared understanding and acceptance among school personnel, a collaborative culture of shared responsibility, or a system of internal accountability. Rather, it will only be a system for external accountability.

District teacher evaluation plans that go beyond compliance are aligned to a set of standards that are grounded in research and focus on

- A shared philosophy of teacher evaluation;
- A strategic communication plan to ensure transparency;
- A clear process for observations;
- A structure for conferences that provide high quality feedback;
- A system for measuring student learning with validity and reliability;
- A data system that will provide feedback on professional development needs; and
- A standing committee to review anomalies and inconsistencies in the system (INTASS, 2013).

Using standards that reflect best practices in the development and implementation of teacher evaluations can help to ensure that districts adopt plans of the highest quality and implement them with fidelity.

Develop a differentiated rating system for district Teacher Evaluation Plans to recognize plan quality in addition to compliance.

Both compliance and quality implementation should be recognized by the state. Incentives could be established for districts to become model districts across the state that could continue to inform policy and research. Recognizing districts' for going beyond compliance would acknowledge their professionalism and help to ensure that the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plays an integral role in school improvement.

Provide resources to school districts that will support on-going professional growth for teachers and principals linked to evaluation data.

District resources and professional growth plans should all be linked to teacher evaluation data.

Using the results of teacher evaluation to inform district and school leadership on professional development needs that are individual and school focused links the supporting of teachers directly to their instructional efforts. Results should be used to target professional learning, gauge teacher growth, and identify potential master teachers who could serve as mentors to new teachers. To this end, it is imperative that resources are available to districts to provide the kinds of quality professional growth necessary to ensure that teacher evaluation plans continue to support teacher growth. Current dollars for professional growth in many districts is virtually non-existent and if one of the purposes of evaluations is to provide quality feedback for improvement, then teachers must be supported to learn new skills and apply new learning.

Provide resources and support the implementation of teacher evaluation plans with fidelity.

Because the results of teacher evaluations are used to make personnel and compensation decisions, the fidelity of implementation across the state is critical. The state of Indiana has given a great deal of flexibility to local districts as they develop and implement their teacher evaluation plans. On the one hand, this flexibility and local control allows districts to align their plans with local needs and cultures. On the other hand, allowing districts to determine their own unique plans may result in plans that may be compliant but which may vary in quality and will be implemented with varied degrees of fidelity. A hopeful outcome is that districts will have quality plans in place, implement those plans with fidelity, and monitor the data to continually improve their evaluation systems. In the end, the ultimate goal of teacher evaluation is to improve teaching and learning. Providing resources to districts to effectively monitor their implementation based on the key components of high quality plans will help to move districts beyond compliance to an understanding of high quality evaluation systems.

Using a rubric that includes the elements and components of high quality standards, the state could ensure the consistent development of effective teacher evaluation plans and their implementation with fidelity. This rubric could be used to determine model implementation sites, to review district plans, to inform future policy and to determine what practices are effective and should be scaled up. Additionally, school districts should have a clear process in place to evaluate their local teacher appraisal system.

Research plan development, implementation, and effectiveness across the state.

Appropriations at the legislative level and the state agency level should include funding for continued research on teacher and principal evaluation and the impact of Indiana's teacher evaluation law. Investigating the impact of new teacher evaluation systems upon student outcomes, climate and satisfaction at the district and school level, teacher mobility, and other professional aspects of the schooling process including the use of student teachers and participation in professional development could be very important in the ongoing evolution of teacher evaluation plans in Indiana. Gathering both qualitative and quantitative data across the state can inform changes in guidance and changes in policy and ensure that Indiana's teacher evaluation systems are equitable, efficient and effective systems. All decisions on teacher evaluations should be grounded in development and implementation data gathered through research.

Require and support the annual training of teachers as well as administrators in the evaluation process.

In order for evaluators' to achieve high levels of inter-rater reliability, consistent and on-going training is required. Additionally, the data from this study indicate that superintendents and principals responses were more positive on the changes in teacher evaluation than those of teachers.

Training on local district evaluation plans should be on going and should be collaborative in nature. Engaging evaluators and teachers in collaborative discussions about rubric language, student learning and evaluation process and procedures could provide teachers a greater understanding of the teacher evaluation process and would lessen a feeling of evaluation being done "to them." Including all involved increases understanding of evaluation expectations, processes, and standards. This enhances the chances that evaluation expectations and standards will be met and lessens the chance for confusion regarding the plan components and processes.

Support the development and testing of common assessments for "non tested" personnel, especially at the secondary level and explore the development and use of formative assessments that will inform instruction during the teacher evaluation process.

Regardless of the model a district adopts, it is clear that developing fair and valid assessments to determine student growth is the largest challenge for districts. Using multiple measures of student growth is important in determining student learning with validity. Local districts should be supported in the development of curriculum-aligned assessments for use across grade levels and content areas that cover pre-instruction to post-instruction growth. Districts should create other measures or opportunities to capture important information about teachers' contributions to student learning that go beyond student achievement score gains. This may mean developing protocols for review of artifacts related to student learning, and using both qualitative and quantitative data on student growth.

A review of the methodology, use and weights for student growth in the evaluation process should be undertaken.

Currently, the debate is centered upon the appropriate weight. However, the more important conversation could be about the appropriate and effective use of student growth rather than the "right" weight.

For instance, using student growth to resolve rating ambiguity could be accomplished in a couple of ways. A sliding scale could be employed which would give student growth a greater weight for teachers on the lower end of the effectiveness rating than for those at the upper end of the effectiveness rating. Another approach would be to use growth to resolve discrepancies and finalize ratings for teachers at a borderline position along the ratings continuum. With this methodology, finalizing a rating on the borderline between one level or the next could be facilitated by the use of student growth. Similarly weights could be developed to address the unique distribution of student growth potential in a classroom. These examples are only intended to be illustrative. And, any new methodologies would need to reflect research, best practices, and requirements at the state and federal levels. Further exploring ideas in the research literature should provide information that would be helpful in decision making around this important concept.

Anchoring the weight and measures for student growth in teacher evaluations in research.

Any specified requirement for weighting student growth in evaluation requirements should be tied directly to research concerning the measured impact of teachers upon student learning and explaining the basis for the weight in clear and transparent ways.

Review and revise how teacher evaluations are linked to compensation.

According to the data from this study, linking compensation to teacher effectiveness was not viewed positively by teachers and principals, and superintendents viewed this feature of teacher evaluation much less favorably than they did other aspects of the law and the policy guiding its implementation. Participants in this study could feel this way for a number of reasons.

The current framework could be seen as unfair and punishing for those rated improvement necessary but who have a chance to become effective or highly effective teachers with additional professional growth opportunities. Similarly, given concerns about accurately rating instruction and measuring student growth with validity and reliability, it could be that educators feel that there will be instances when a teacher's rating may not reflect their level of effectiveness. School districts enter into a "value proposition" with their employees that are broader than salary and include professional growth and career opportunities, work-life balance structures, work place climate and recognition (ERS, 2012). The intent of teacher evaluation should be to support a teacher's professional growth in ways that lead to higher levels of student learning. To that end, reframing the relationship between professional growth, compensation and teacher ratings so that it becomes a reward for commitment and performance could help to motivate and create greater educator support for the new evaluation expectations, standards and processes.

CONCLUSION

Since this study was limited to the perceptions of Indiana educators through survey, additional studies are needed to further identify and explain teachers' perspectives associated with teacher evaluation. Other studies of emerging teacher evaluation formats may shed light on the lessons learned and the conditions that foster effective implementation. As others have noted "until we know and understand a lot more about teachers and supervisors' beliefs, assumptions, values, opinions, preferences, and predispositions, our theoretical perspectives are indeed not very useful in and of themselves" (Zepeda&Ponticelli,1998, p.86). Furthermore, it is imperative to continue the search for knowledge and information about innovative and alternative processes to effectively evaluate and develop teachers so that success for all students can be realized.

POLICY PERSPECTIVE

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2014 INTASS CONSORTIUM OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

In November of 2011, twelve school districts from across the state of Indiana came together in Indianapolis to form the Indiana Teacher Appraisal and Support System (INTASS) Consortium. This new consortium was facilitated by the Indiana University Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) and was guided by the guiding principles of Equity, Effectiveness and Efficiency.

Over the past three years, INTASS school districts have worked in a collaborative process to design teacher appraisal systems that meet or exceed the requirements of Indiana legislation while intentionally developing the systems to best meet the unique needs of their local districts. As the INTASS districts have continued to meet and share their experiences in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation plans, several themes have surfaced as consistent challenges in addressing the requirements of the new legislation. These themes indicate a need for policy and guidance and serve as the basis for the recommendations below:

There is a need for continued research on educator evaluation systems. Clayton Christensen, in his book, *Disrupting Class*, points out that education, or in this case teacher evaluation, is unfathomably complex with unpredictable outcomes, which is not unique to education. The author recommends, and the INTASS Consortium concurs, that research on the process of teacher evaluation must move toward understanding what works for all educators and what ultimately works to improve student outcomes. The definition of student “outcomes” is complex and is much farther-reaching than the snapshot provided by high stakes test given once per year.

Policy should be based on this research. Questions continue to be raised about various evaluation concepts such as linking teacher evaluation to merit pay and the use of standardized test scores, including the Indiana Growth Model, to measure teacher effectiveness.

Answers to these questions and others, should have a sound footing in academic research.

School districts should be recognized for developing and implementing high quality teacher evaluation systems.

The state has been charged to monitor district plans for compliance with the legislation. Yet, compliance does not ensure quality and those districts with standards that exceed compliance are not recognized. What these districts have learned may inform policy and guidance in important ways. Using current research on effective educator evaluation systems, clear metrics to evaluate the development and implementation of district plans based on this research, and a collaborative process has resulted in experiences in INTASS districts that affirm trust, increase confidence, and a belief that the plans are effective, fair, and can be implemented with fidelity. Encouraging and supporting this kind of a plan development and implementation process could address many of the concerns and challenges being experienced by districts across the state of Indiana. Additionally, visiting INTASS districts to see first-hand how the teacher appraisal systems are working will provide valuable insights from those responsible for and those impacted by any changes in state requirements.

Include the voices of educator practitioners in policy discussions. INTASS Consortium districts continue to monitor their implementation and as a group, continue to gain new understanding of what it takes to ensure a highly effective teacher evaluation system. Incorporating the experiences of educators from districts who have moved forward with developing and implementing teacher evaluation plans in the policy making process can ensure that the policy recommendations are meaningful to the teaching and learning process.

Professional development should be better-funded and linked to evaluation data. As higher standards are set for educators throughout the state, it is crucial to do all that is possible to help all educators reach those standards through strategic, targeted, and relevant professional development. This capacity building strategy would be a good use of state funds and would ensure that teachers’ and administrators’ continuous improvement is supported.

Attention should be given to the assessment of student learning measures. There is a need to fund the development of reliable and valid measures of growth, particularly at the secondary level. Developing growth measures, beyond ECA and IGM and used consistently across the state would enable the use of multiple measures that can increase the validity of ratings.

Consider a moratorium on “negative impact” until the transition to the new assessment is complete. Calculating negative impact for teachers using two very different assessments does not seem fair due to the necessary statistical conversions and inherent variabilities in doing so. It would be advisable to consider waiting until the transition to new assessments is complete to identify teachers who have had negative impact.

INTASS Consortium Districts:

Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation, Fairfield Community Schools, Kokomo School Corporation, Monroe County Community School Corporation, MSD Washington Township, Northwestern School Corporation, Richland Bean Blossom School Corporation, South Bend Community School Corporation, South Harrison Community School Corporation, and Tipton Community School Corporation.

For information on the INTASS Consortium and INTASS visit <http://www.teacherevaluation.indiana.edu>

POLICY PERSPECTIVE

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF 2014 INTASS ADVISORY BOARD

The INTASS Advisory Board, consisting of representatives from the major education associations and state education organizations, provides a forum for the continued dialogue and discussion of teacher and principal evaluation in Indiana. Redesigning teacher evaluation has the potential to transform the profession by ensuring that the highest quality of instruction is occurring in every classroom. The board recognizes that reforms will not have this kind of impact unless they are designed to continually improve teacher and principal capacity so that all students are provided an opportunity to be college and career ready. The perspectives and ideas of individual board members are diverse and varied; however, as a collective group there is a strong desire to ensure that teacher and principal evaluation in Indiana becomes a meaningful experience, not just a pointless exercise. As a group, we have discussed the findings of the INTASS survey and offer the following:

Perspectives

- Good assessments to measure student growth, particularly at the high school level, are lacking.
- Teachers need and want a collaborative process that will provide quality feedback in a timely fashion.
- Teachers want the system to focus on growth, for themselves and their students.
- There exists a lack of resources and support for high quality professional development linked to evaluation data.

- There exists a lack of resources to provide increased compensation for Superintendents, principals and teachers.
- There is a need for an SLO process that is more consistent, efficient and fair.
- The timing of the release of the IGM data is not ideal.

Recommendations

In order to support school corporations to develop, implement, and evaluate their teacher appraisal system and to enhance teacher effectiveness and ongoing professional development, the following recommendations are offered to school districts:

- Provide more joint training of evaluators and teachers in order to promote better understanding, collegial decision-making, and more positive perspectives from teachers.
- Include teachers throughout the process. Their experiences and perspectives are critical.
- Build a stronger mentoring and support structure for new teachers during the induction years, including targeted professional development based on individual needs.
- Ensure that the evaluation system in districts is transparent.

The following recommendations are offered to policymakers:

- Indiana policy on teacher evaluation should be based on current research. A research agenda should be developed and supported to collect and gather quantitative and qualitative data on Indiana's teacher evaluation system.

Research on teacher evaluation must move toward understanding what works for all teachers and principals to improve student learning.

- Advocate and support funding for professional development to ensure that continuous improvement is the purpose and intent of Indiana's evaluation system.
- Support a research agenda to determine the impact of linking evaluation to compensation.
- Ensure the return of state IGM data to districts by the end of the school year.
- Revise the SLO process to facilitate consistent standards for development, implementation and growth targets.

This policy perspective was developed by the following members of the **INTASS Advisory Board**: Indiana School Board Association, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana State Teachers Association, AFT Indiana, IUPUI, Center for Education and Career Innovation, INTASS Consortium, and Charter Schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the following individuals and organizations:

The INTASS Advisory Board (members include: Indiana School Board Association, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana State Teachers Association, AFT Indiana, IUPUI, Indiana Department of Education, Center for Education and Career Innovation, INTASS Consortium, and Charter Schools) and the INTASS Consortium for their feedback on survey questions, review of study findings and supporting the administration of the survey.

Zachary Morgan, Graduate Research Assistant, Center for Urban and Multicultural Education, IUPUI for his support with data analysis.

Scott Myers, Information Systems Analyst at the Indiana Institute, Indiana University, Mindy King, Research Scientist and Mallory Rickbell, Research Associate at the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning at Indiana University for their support with the data analysis.

Joel Fosha, Communication Manager, Indiana Institute, Indiana University, for the layout, design, and printing of the brief.

Terry Mason, for his support of this research and the Office of Vice Provost for Research, Indiana University for funding this study.

AUTHORS

Hardy Murphy, Ph. D. (hamurphy@indiana.edu) is a Research Scholar at the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning, Indiana University and teaches courses at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. He is Co-Director of the INTASS project. Prior to joining Indiana University, Dr. Murphy was Superintendent in Evanston, IL.

Cassandra Cole, Ed.D. (cmcole@indiana.edu) is the Director of the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning at Indiana University and is Co-Director of the INTASS project.

Gary Pike, Ph. D. (pikeg@iupui.edu) is Executive Director of Information Management and Institutional Research at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, and an Associate Professor of Higher Education.

Jim Ansaldo, Ph.D. (jansaldo@indiana.edu) is a Research Associate at the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning at Indiana University and the INTASS project.

James Robinson (jarobins@indiana.edu) is a Research Associate at the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning at Indiana University and the INTASS project.

REFERENCES

Coggschall, J. G., Ott, A., & Lasagna, M. (2010). *Retaining teacher talent: Convergence and contradictions in teachers' perceptions of policy reform ideas*. Naperville, NY: Learning Point Associates and Public Agenda.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.

Firestone, W. A., Blitz, D. H., Gitomer, D. K., Shcherbakov, A., & Nordon, T. I. (2013). *New Jersey teacher evaluation, RU-GSE external assessment, Year 1 report*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

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

Mendro, R. L. (1998). Student achievement and school and teacher accountability. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12, 257-267.

Murphy, H., & Cole, S. (2013). *INTASS teacher evaluation plan rubric*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Indiana Institute on Disability and Community.

Ovando, M. N. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of a learner centered evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 15(3), 213-231.

Popham, W. J. (2013). *Evaluating America's teachers: Mission impossible?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Sage.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future academic achievement* (Research Progress Report). Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

Sheppard, J. D. (2013). Perceptions of teachers and administrators Regarding the teacher evaluation process. *Electronic Theses & Dissertations*. Paper 852.

Shields, R. A., & Lewis, C. (2012). *Rethinking the value proposition to improve teacher effectiveness* [white paper]. Watertown, MA: Education Resource Strategies (ERS). Retrieved from http://www.ersstrategies.org/library/rethinking_the_value_proposition

Tennessee Department of Education. (2013). *Survey captures teacher perceptions of evaluation system*. Retrieved from <http://tnclassroomchronicles.org/survey-captures-teacher-perceptions-of-evaluation-system/>

Zepeda, S. J., & Ponticelli, J. A. (1998). At cross-purposes: What do teachers need, want, and get from supervision? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14,(1), 68-87.

Appendix A: Frequency Response for Belief Questions

I believe that teacher effectiveness affects student achievement...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	136	81.0%	Strongly Agree	164	63.3%	Strongly Agree	400	25.2%
Agree	28	16.7%	Agree	73	28.2%	Agree	705	44.4%
Somewhat Agree	2	1.2%	Somewhat Agree	20	7.7%	Somewhat Agree	348	21.9%
Neither	0	0.0%	Neither	2	0.8%	Neither	38	2.4%
Somewhat Disagree	1	0.6%	Somewhat Disagree	0	0.0%	Somewhat Disagree	41	2.6%
Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	36	2.3%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.6%	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	20	1.3%

I believe that student achievement can be validly measured...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	39	23.2%	Strongly Agree	30	11.6%	Strongly Agree	47	3.0%
Agree	80	47.6%	Agree	109	42.1%	Agree	342	21.5%
Somewhat Agree	46	27.4%	Somewhat Agree	94	36.3%	Somewhat Agree	724	45.6%
Neither	0	0.0%	Neither	5	1.9%	Neither	90	5.7%
Somewhat Disagree	2	1.2%	Somewhat Disagree	13	5.0%	Somewhat Disagree	199	12.5%
Disagree	1	0.6%	Disagree	4	1.5%	Disagree	131	8.3%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	4	1.5%	Strongly Disagree	55	3.5%

Our district evaluation plan measures student achievement with validity...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	17	10.1%	Strongly Agree	14	5.4%	Strongly Agree	21	1.3%
Agree	67	39.9%	Agree	81	31.3%	Agree	209	13.2%
Somewhat Agree	70	41.7%	Somewhat Agree	95	36.7%	Somewhat Agree	517	32.6%
Neither	5	3.0%	Neither	23	8.9%	Neither	232	14.6%
Somewhat Disagree	5	3.0%	Somewhat Disagree	27	10.4%	Somewhat Disagree	254	16.0%
Disagree	4	2.4%	Disagree	15	5.8%	Disagree	238	15.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	4	1.5%	Strongly Disagree	117	7.4%

I believe that student academic growth can be validly measured...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	30	17.9%	Strongly Agree	29	11.2%	Strongly Agree	63	4.0%
Agree	71	42.3%	Agree	110	42.5%	Agree	441	27.8%
Somewhat Agree	56	33.3%	Somewhat Agree	81	31.3%	Somewhat Agree	648	40.8%
Neither	2	1.2%	Neither	12	4.6%	Neither	93	5.9%
Somewhat Disagree	9	5.4%	Somewhat Disagree	15	5.8%	Somewhat Disagree	192	12.1%
Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	10	3.9%	Disagree	110	6.9%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%	Strongly Disagree	40	2.5%

Our district assessments measure student growth with validity...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	20	11.9%	Strongly Agree	15	5.8%	Strongly Agree	21	1.3%
Agree	55	32.7%	Agree	81	31.3%	Agree	231	14.6%
Somewhat Agree	65	38.7%	Somewhat Agree	95	36.7%	Somewhat Agree	533	33.6%
Neither	15	8.9%	Neither	22	8.5%	Neither	212	13.4%
Somewhat Disagree	8	4.8%	Somewhat Disagree	26	10.0%	Somewhat Disagree	269	16.9%
Disagree	4	2.4%	Disagree	15	5.8%	Disagree	223	14.0%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.6%	Strongly Disagree	5	1.9%	Strongly Disagree	99	6.2%

I believe that teacher evaluation should be linked to student growth...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	25	14.9%	Strongly Agree	24	9.3%	Strongly Agree	30	1.9%
Agree	66	39.3%	Agree	60	23.2%	Agree	85	5.4%
Somewhat Agree	57	33.9%	Somewhat Agree	105	40.5%	Somewhat Agree	414	26.1%
Neither	3	1.8%	Neither	12	4.6%	Neither	108	6.8%
Somewhat Disagree	6	3.6%	Somewhat Disagree	24	9.3%	Somewhat Disagree	300	18.9%
Disagree	6	3.6%	Disagree	15	5.8%	Disagree	295	18.6%
Strongly Disagree	5	3.0%	Strongly Disagree	19	7.3%	Strongly Disagree	356	22.4%

Our district evaluation plan links teaching with student growth...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	20	11.9%	Strongly Agree	35	13.5%	Strongly Agree	211	13.3%
Agree	90	53.6%	Agree	122	47.1%	Agree	612	38.5%
Somewhat Agree	42	25.0%	Somewhat Agree	67	25.9%	Somewhat Agree	360	22.7%
Neither	7	4.2%	Neither	13	5.0%	Neither	158	10.0%
Somewhat Disagree	3	1.8%	Somewhat Disagree	10	3.9%	Somewhat Disagree	91	5.7%
Disagree	6	3.6%	Disagree	10	3.9%	Disagree	96	6.1%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%	Strongly Disagree	60	3.8%

I believe that instruction can be accurately and fairly evaluated and judged...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	44	26.2%	Strongly Agree	61	23.6%	Strongly Agree	48	3.0%
Agree	91	54.2%	Agree	134	51.7%	Agree	329	20.7%
Somewhat Agree	28	16.7%	Somewhat Agree	45	17.4%	Somewhat Agree	541	34.1%
Neither	1	0.6%	Neither	4	1.5%	Neither	88	5.5%
Somewhat Disagree	3	1.8%	Somewhat Disagree	11	4.3%	Somewhat Disagree	276	17.4%
Disagree	1	0.6%	Disagree	3	1.2%	Disagree	191	12.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	1	0.4%	Strongly Disagree	115	7.2%

Our district evaluation plan allows for an accurate and fair evaluation of instruction...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	30	17.9%	Strongly Agree	42	16.2%	Strongly Agree	20	1.3%
Agree	101	60.1%	Agree	113	43.6%	Agree	209	13.2%
Somewhat Agree	32	19.1%	Somewhat Agree	67	25.9%	Somewhat Agree	468	29.5%
Neither	2	1.2%	Neither	13	5.0%	Neither	155	9.8%
Somewhat Disagree	2	1.2%	Somewhat Disagree	14	5.4%	Somewhat Disagree	292	18.4%
Disagree	1	0.6%	Disagree	7	2.7%	Disagree	267	16.8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	3	1.2%	Strongly Disagree	177	11.2%

I believe that the relationships between teaching and learning can be accurately applied to an evaluation of teaching...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	27	16.1%	Strongly Agree	32	12.4%	Strongly Agree	24	1.5%
Agree	86	51.2%	Agree	105	40.5%	Agree	181	11.4%
Somewhat Agree	46	27.4%	Somewhat Agree	85	32.8%	Somewhat Agree	514	32.4%
Neither	3	1.8%	Neither	8	3.1%	Neither	155	9.8%
Somewhat Disagree	6	3.6%	Somewhat Disagree	17	6.6%	Somewhat Disagree	334	21.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	10	3.9%	Disagree	259	16.3%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%	Strongly Disagree	121	7.6%

Our district evaluation plan effectively reflects the relationship between teaching and learning...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	20	11.9%	Strongly Agree	20	7.7%	Strongly Agree	12	0.8%
Agree	77	45.8%	Agree	89	34.4%	Agree	119	7.5%
Somewhat Agree	57	33.9%	Somewhat Agree	96	37.1%	Somewhat Agree	404	25.4%
Neither	6	3.6%	Neither	13	5.0%	Neither	253	15.9%
Somewhat Disagree	6	3.6%	Somewhat Disagree	22	8.5%	Somewhat Disagree	329	20.7%
Disagree	2	1.2%	Disagree	16	6.2%	Disagree	309	19.5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	3	1.2%	Strongly Disagree	162	10.2%

I believe that teacher evaluation should be tied to merit/compensation...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	13	7.7%	Strongly Agree	12	4.6%	Strongly Agree	32	2.0%
Agree	39	23.2%	Agree	41	15.8%	Agree	73	4.6%
Somewhat Agree	49	29.2%	Somewhat Agree	65	25.1%	Somewhat Agree	230	14.5%
Neither	15	8.9%	Neither	26	10.0%	Neither	110	6.9%
Somewhat Disagree	11	6.6%	Somewhat Disagree	24	9.3%	Somewhat Disagree	177	11.2%
Disagree	22	13.1%	Disagree	39	15.1%	Disagree	290	18.3%
Strongly Disagree	19	11.3%	Strongly Disagree	52	20.1%	Strongly Disagree	676	42.6%

Our district evaluation plan fairly ties teacher performance to compensation...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	11	6.6%	Strongly Agree	9	3.5%	Strongly Agree	27	1.7%
Agree	62	36.9%	Agree	59	22.8%	Agree	120	7.6%
Somewhat Agree	37	22.0%	Somewhat Agree	51	19.7%	Somewhat Agree	209	13.2%
Neither	24	14.3%	Neither	61	23.6%	Neither	297	18.7%
Somewhat Disagree	10	6.0%	Somewhat Disagree	14	5.4%	Somewhat Disagree	208	13.1%
Disagree	20	11.9%	Disagree	39	15.1%	Disagree	338	21.3%
Strongly Disagree	4	2.4%	Strongly Disagree	26	10.0%	Strongly Disagree	389	24.5%

Prior to the new law, the teacher evaluation processes in Indiana needed improvement...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	74	44.1%	Strongly Agree	78	30.1%	Strongly Agree	105	6.6%
Agree	50	29.8%	Agree	81	31.3%	Agree	285	18.0%
Somewhat Agree	25	14.9%	Somewhat Agree	48	18.5%	Somewhat Agree	402	25.3%
Neither	2	1.2%	Neither	19	7.3%	Neither	250	15.7%
Somewhat Disagree	9	5.4%	Somewhat Disagree	6	2.3%	Somewhat Disagree	185	11.7%
Disagree	8	4.8%	Disagree	19	7.3%	Disagree	233	14.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	8	3.1%	Strongly Disagree	128	8.1%

The new law has improved teacher evaluation processes in my district...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	43	25.6%	Strongly Agree	31	12.0%	Strongly Agree	17	1.1%
Agree	76	45.2%	Agree	64	24.7%	Agree	71	4.5%
Somewhat Agree	23	13.7%	Somewhat Agree	74	28.6%	Somewhat Agree	221	13.9%
Neither	8	4.8%	Neither	34	13.1%	Neither	236	14.9%
Somewhat Disagree	7	4.2%	Somewhat Disagree	19	7.3%	Somewhat Disagree	224	14.1%
Disagree	10	6.0%	Disagree	17	6.6%	Disagree	334	21.0%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.6%	Strongly Disagree	20	7.7%	Strongly Disagree	485	30.5%

An effective teacher evaluation system drives professional development...

Superintendent			Principal			Teacher		
Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	48	28.6%	Strongly Agree	50	19.3%	Strongly Agree	93	5.0%
Agree	72	42.9%	Agree	102	39.4%	Agree	290	18.3%
Somewhat Agree	36	21.4%	Somewhat Agree	63	24.3%	Somewhat Agree	386	24.3%
Neither	6	3.6%	Neither	12	4.6%	Neither	204	12.9%
Somewhat Disagree	1	0.6%	Somewhat Disagree	13	5.0%	Somewhat Disagree	173	10.9%
Disagree	5	3.0%	Disagree	13	5.0%	Disagree	253	15.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	6	2.3%	Strongly Disagree	189	11.9%

Our district evaluation plan drives our professional development...

Superintendent

Principal

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	20	11.9%	Strongly Agree	20	7.7%	Strongly Agree	39	2.5%
Agree	71	42.3%	Agree	56	21.6%	Agree	141	8.9%
Somewhat Agree	51	30.4%	Somewhat Agree	68	26.3%	Somewhat Agree	306	19.3%
Neither	12	7.1%	Neither	29	11.2%	Neither	222	14.0%
Somewhat Disagree	8	4.8%	Somewhat Disagree	36	13.9%	Somewhat Disagree	221	13.9%
Disagree	6	3.6%	Disagree	34	13.1%	Disagree	343	21.6%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Strongly Disagree	16	6.2%	Strongly Disagree	316	19.9%

Indiana's law requiring teacher evaluation will result in improved teaching and learning...

Superintendent

Principal

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	20	11.9%	Strongly Agree	14	5.4%	Strongly Agree	8	0.5%
Agree	54	32.1%	Agree	45	17.4%	Agree	39	2.5%
Somewhat Agree	50	29.8%	Somewhat Agree	76	29.3%	Somewhat Agree	198	12.5%
Neither	12	7.1%	Neither	38	14.7%	Neither	185	11.7%
Somewhat Disagree	12	7.1%	Somewhat Disagree	26	10.0%	Somewhat Disagree	251	15.8%
Disagree	16	9.5%	Disagree	39	15.1%	Disagree	389	24.5%
Strongly Disagree	4	2.4%	Strongly Disagree	21	8.1%	Strongly Disagree	518	32.6%

Teaching and learning in my district has improved because of our district evaluation plan...

Superintendent

Principal

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent	Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	21	12.5%	Strongly Agree	21	8.1%	Strongly Agree	8	0.5%
Agree	65	38.7%	Agree	55	21.2%	Agree	42	2.6%
Somewhat Agree	48	28.6%	Somewhat Agree	72	27.8%	Somewhat Agree	170	10.7%
Neither	20	11.9%	Neither	46	17.8%	Neither	322	20.3%
Somewhat Disagree	7	4.2%	Somewhat Disagree	14	5.4%	Somewhat Disagree	208	13.1%
Disagree	6	3.6%	Disagree	37	14.3%	Disagree	423	26.6%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.6%	Strongly Disagree	14	5.4%	Strongly Disagree	415	26.1%

Appendix B: Frequency Response for Confidence Questions

I am confident that I understand and recognize effective planning for instruction...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	87	33.6%
Agree	139	53.7%
Somewhat Agree	27	10.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	1.9%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0.4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	45	2.8%
Agree	263	16.6%
Somewhat Agree	386	24.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	186	11.7%
Somewhat Disagree	218	13.7%
Disagree	261	16.4%
Strongly Disagree	229	14.4%

I am confident that I develop collegial relationships with teachers during the evaluation process...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	66	25.5%
Agree	143	55.2%
Somewhat Agree	36	13.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	2.7%
Somewhat Disagree	6	2.3%
Disagree	1	0.4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	36	2.3%
Agree	260	16.4%
Somewhat Agree	327	20.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	244	15.4%
Somewhat Disagree	224	14.1%
Disagree	246	15.5%
Strongly Disagree	251	15.8%

I am confident that I understand and recognize the effective application of classroom management procedures...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	132	51.0%
Agree	119	46.0%
Somewhat Agree	7	2.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	0.0%
Somewhat Disagree	1	0.4%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	60	3.8%
Agree	354	22.3%
Somewhat Agree	455	28.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	150	9.5%
Somewhat Disagree	210	13.2%
Disagree	193	12.2%
Strongly Disagree	166	10.5%

I am confident that I understand the forms and documents used in the evaluation process...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	76	29.3%
Agree	141	54.4%
Somewhat Agree	31	12.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	1.5%
Somewhat Disagree	2	0.8%
Disagree	3	1.2%
Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	90	5.7%
Agree	430	27.1%
Somewhat Agree	373	23.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	176	11.1%
Somewhat Disagree	204	12.9%
Disagree	184	11.6%
Strongly Disagree	131	8.3%

I am confident of my understanding of the requirements of the evaluation system...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	74	28.6%
Agree	142	54.8%
Somewhat Agree	33	12.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	1.2%
Somewhat Disagree	3	1.2%
Disagree	2	0.8%
Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	79	5.0%
Agree	432	27.2%
Somewhat Agree	407	25.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	181	11.4%
Somewhat Disagree	208	13.1%
Disagree	159	10.0%
Strongly Disagree	122	7.7%

I am confident that I clearly understand and can recognize all components of teaching that are described in the teacher appraisal rubric...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	59	22.8%
Agree	125	48.3%
Somewhat Agree	45	17.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8	3.1%
Somewhat Disagree	14	5.4%
Disagree	5	1.9%
Strongly Disagree	3	1.2%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	48	3.0%
Agree	287	18.1%
Somewhat Agree	367	23.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	197	12.4%
Somewhat Disagree	279	17.6%
Disagree	235	14.8%
Strongly Disagree	175	11.0%

I am confident that I provide clear feedback to teachers that is helpful in improving their teaching and learning...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	46	17.8%
Agree	157	60.6%
Somewhat Agree	47	18.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	1.2%
Somewhat Disagree	6	2.3%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	45	2.8%
Agree	246	15.5%
Somewhat Agree	373	23.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	187	11.8%
Somewhat Disagree	258	16.3%
Disagree	260	16.4%
Strongly Disagree	219	13.8%

I am confident that I clearly understand and communicate the teacher evaluation procedures...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	69	26.6%
Agree	141	54.4%
Somewhat Agree	41	15.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1	0.4%
Somewhat Disagree	3	1.2%
Disagree	2	0.8%
Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	50	3.2%
Agree	349	22.0%
Somewhat Agree	383	24.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	186	11.7%
Somewhat Disagree	239	15.1%
Disagree	221	13.9%
Strongly Disagree	160	10.1%

I am confident that I clearly understand and communicate the criteria for rating teachers performance...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	43	16.6%
Agree	152	58.7%
Somewhat Agree	51	19.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	1.9%
Somewhat Disagree	2	0.8%
Disagree	4	1.5%
Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	48	3.0%
Agree	270	17.0%
Somewhat Agree	356	22.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	179	11.3%
Somewhat Disagree	289	18.2%
Disagree	255	16.1%
Strongly Disagree	191	12.0%

I am confident that I use pre and post conferences for an effective evaluation process...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	41	16.2%
Agree	99	39.1%
Somewhat Agree	69	27.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	21	8.3%
Somewhat Disagree	16	6.3%
Disagree	7	2.8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	50	3.2%
Agree	295	18.6%
Somewhat Agree	353	22.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	236	14.9%
Somewhat Disagree	228	14.4%
Disagree	235	14.8%
Strongly Disagree	191	12.0%

I am confident that I effectively use both formal and informal settings to provide feedback and discussion in a constructive manner...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	45	17.4%
Agree	151	58.3%
Somewhat Agree	50	19.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	8	3.1%
Somewhat Disagree	5	1.9%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	66	4.2%
Agree	339	21.4%
Somewhat Agree	430	27.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	197	12.4%
Somewhat Disagree	199	12.5%
Disagree	197	12.4%
Strongly Disagree	160	10.1%

I am confident that I clearly understand the process for resolving inconsistencies in the data...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	11	4.3%
Agree	109	42.1%
Somewhat Agree	76	29.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	29	11.2%
Somewhat Disagree	19	7.3%
Disagree	9	3.5%
Strongly Disagree	6	2.3%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	28	1.8%
Agree	156	9.8%
Somewhat Agree	264	16.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	304	19.1%
Somewhat Disagree	285	18.0%
Disagree	308	19.4%
Strongly Disagree	243	15.3%

I am confident that I clearly understand how to communicate and use assessment results in the evaluation process...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	31	12.0%
Agree	142	54.8%
Somewhat Agree	58	22.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	14	5.4%
Somewhat Disagree	11	4.3%
Disagree	2	0.8%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.4%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	28	1.8%
Agree	247	15.6%
Somewhat Agree	342	21.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	291	18.3%
Somewhat Disagree	248	15.6%
Disagree	246	15.5%
Strongly Disagree	186	11.7%

I am confident that I know how to use appraisal data to guide teachers' professional development...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	25	9.7%
Agree	114	44.0%
Somewhat Agree	82	31.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	23	8.9%
Somewhat Disagree	9	3.5%
Disagree	3	1.2%
Strongly Disagree	3	1.2%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	23	1.5%
Agree	151	9.5%
Somewhat Agree	277	17.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	359	22.6%
Somewhat Disagree	263	16.6%
Disagree	299	18.8%
Strongly Disagree	216	13.6%

I am confident that I understand and can clearly explain how evaluation ratings are determined...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	47	18.2%
Agree	117	45.2%
Somewhat Agree	65	25.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	9	3.5%
Somewhat Disagree	11	4.3%
Disagree	7	2.7%
Strongly Disagree	3	1.2%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	48	3.0%
Agree	292	18.4%
Somewhat Agree	370	23.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	207	13.0%
Somewhat Disagree	245	15.4%
Disagree	244	15.4%
Strongly Disagree	182	11.5%

I am confident that I understand and can communicate the process for appeal of summative evaluation results...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	27	10.4%
Agree	89	34.4%
Somewhat Agree	71	27.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	18	7.0%
Somewhat Disagree	26	10.0%
Disagree	21	8.1%
Strongly Disagree	7	2.7%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	33	2.1%
Agree	201	12.7%
Somewhat Agree	288	18.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	382	24.1%
Somewhat Disagree	210	13.2%
Disagree	263	16.6%
Strongly Disagree	211	13.3%

I am confident that I can develop measurable and achievable student learning goals with my teachers...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	39	15.1%
Agree	147	56.8%
Somewhat Agree	45	17.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	11	4.3%
Somewhat Disagree	11	4.3%
Disagree	3	1.2%
Strongly Disagree	3	1.2%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	34	2.1%
Agree	252	15.9%
Somewhat Agree	402	25.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	249	15.7%
Somewhat Disagree	235	14.8%
Disagree	239	15.1%
Strongly Disagree	177	11.2%

I am confident that I understand and recognize the important features/characteristics of highly effective instruction as described in our teacher evaluation rubric...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	79	30.5%
Agree	136	52.5%
Somewhat Agree	35	13.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	0.8%
Somewhat Disagree	6	2.3%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.4%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	57	3.6%
Agree	322	20.3%
Somewhat Agree	404	25.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	187	11.8%
Somewhat Disagree	226	14.2%
Disagree	219	13.8%
Strongly Disagree	173	10.9%

I am confident that I recognize and understand how teachers contribute to a professional school culture...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	106	40.9%
Agree	139	53.7%
Somewhat Agree	14	5.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	0	0.0%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	110	6.9%
Agree	463	29.2%
Somewhat Agree	371	23.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	143	9.0%
Somewhat Disagree	176	11.1%
Disagree	166	10.5%
Strongly Disagree	158	10.0%

I am confident that I know how to develop plans of assistance that are clear and specific and identify the standards and elements for improvement and goals to be accomplished...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	52	20.1%
Agree	125	48.3%
Somewhat Agree	58	22.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	2.3%
Somewhat Disagree	13	5.0%
Disagree	4	1.5%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.4%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	36	2.3%
Agree	199	12.5%
Somewhat Agree	350	22.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	316	19.9%
Somewhat Disagree	238	15.0%
Disagree	234	14.7%
Strongly Disagree	157	10.0%

I am confident that I know how to plan for, advise, and use professional development activities to improve teacher practice...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	51	19.7%
Agree	144	55.6%
Somewhat Agree	51	19.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	1.2%
Somewhat Disagree	6	2.3%
Disagree	4	1.5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	35	2.2%
Agree	203	12.8%
Somewhat Agree	346	21.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	204	12.9%
Somewhat Disagree	277	17.4%
Disagree	291	18.3%
Strongly Disagree	232	14.6%

I am confident that I understand how to create a relationship in which the purpose of teacher evaluations are for continued growth and improvement...

Principal

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	61	23.6%
Agree	148	57.1%
Somewhat Agree	44	17.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	2.3%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

Teacher

Value	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	47	3.0%
Agree	244	15.4%
Somewhat Agree	376	23.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	189	11.9%
Somewhat Disagree	251	15.8%
Disagree	237	14.9%
Strongly Disagree	244	15.4%