

5-2018

# Teacher Evaluation—Study of Minnesota Secondary School Principals Related to the Amount of Time Necessary to Implement Common Teacher Evaluation Models

Todd Tetzlaff  
*St. Cloud State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/edad\\_etds](https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/edad_etds)



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Tetzlaff, Todd, "Teacher Evaluation—Study of Minnesota Secondary School Principals Related to the Amount of Time Necessary to Implement Common Teacher Evaluation Models" (2018). *Culminating Projects in Education Administration and Leadership*. 42.  
[https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/edad\\_etds/42](https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/edad_etds/42)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education at theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Culminating Projects in Education Administration and Leadership by an authorized administrator of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact [rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu).

**Teacher Evaluation—Study of Minnesota Secondary School Principals Related to the  
Amount of Time Necessary to Implement Common Teacher Evaluation Models**

by

Todd Tetzlaff

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Education

May, 2018

Dissertation Committee:  
Kay Worner, Chairperson  
Roger Worner  
Plamen Miltenoff  
John Eller

### **Abstract**

The study measured perceptions of select secondary school principals in Minnesota regarding the teacher evaluation model utilized in their schools and the amount of time principals commit to the process of evaluating their teachers.

Research questions were answered through analysis of data from a survey including principal demographics, the teacher evaluation model utilized in the principal's school, the volume of time principals' report devoting to teacher evaluation and principal perceptions related to the extent to which the teacher evaluation model improves teacher performance.

The responses received showed that 60.5% of respondents were using a model based on Charlotte Danielson and 20.2% of respondents were using a Robert Marzano based teacher evaluation model. Another 10.1% of respondents indicated their district had created their own model and 8.4% reported using a Kim Marshall based model. Principals reported spending between 0 and 10 or more hours per week on teacher evaluation with the most common response of 2-4 hours per week provided by 37.0% of respondents.

Based on the results of the study, it is recommended that schools in Minnesota examine the teacher evaluation practices in place to assure the time spent by principals is meaningful for teachers and leads to improved teacher performance.

### **Acknowledgement**

I would like to thank and acknowledge my dissertation committee members including Dr. John Eller, for the clarity he demonstrated in describing the dissertation process, Dr. Kay Worner, for sharing her wisdom and experience and for asking such insightful questions about my study, Dr. Roger Worner, for sharing his clever wit and wisdom and for his assistance in clarifying language and Dr. Plamen Miltenoff for sharing his global perspective and his technical expertise.

I would like to thank the Executive Director of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, David Adney, for his support and willingness to partner with me on my study.

My classmates in Cohort 7 at Saint Cloud State University were helpful and supportive through my coursework and dissertation journey. Thank you for your support.

Finally, I would like to thank and acknowledge my principal colleagues in Minnesota. The focus, determination, wisdom and grit you demonstrate on behalf of our children and their future is inspirational.

### **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife and best friend, Katherine Tetzlaff. Thank you for your support and encouragement through this process. Our frequent conversations about leadership in healthcare and education have made me a better person and a better leader.

## Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables .....	8
Chapter	
I. Introduction .....	10
Teacher Evaluation .....	10
Statement of the Problem .....	11
Conceptual Framework of the Study .....	12
Purpose of the Study .....	12
Significance of the Study .....	12
Research Questions .....	13
Delimitations of the Study .....	13
Definitions of Key Terms .....	14
Limitations of the Study .....	16
Organization of the Study .....	17
Summary .....	18
II. Literature Review .....	19
Theme 1: Brief History of Teacher Evaluation Including Key Legislation and Studies .....	19
Theme 2: Prevalent Teacher Evaluation Models .....	35
Theme 3: Common Challenges to the Effective Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Practices .....	45

Chapter	Page
Summary .....	56
III. Methodology .....	58
Introduction .....	58
Research Questions .....	59
Hypothesis .....	60
Research Design .....	61
Instrumentation .....	62
Participants .....	64
Human Subject Approval–Institutional Review Board .....	64
Data Collection Procedures .....	65
Data Analysis .....	65
Procedures and Timeline .....	66
Summary .....	66
IV. Results .....	67
Introduction .....	67
Purpose of the Study .....	67
Research Questions .....	67
Research Findings .....	68
Summary .....	85
V. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	86
Purpose of the Study .....	86
Research Questions and Conclusions .....	86

Chapter	Page
Discussion Related to Research Questions .....	91
Limitations of the Study .....	97
Recommendations for Further Research .....	98
Recommendations for Practice .....	99
Summary .....	100
References .....	102
Works Consulted .....	111
Appendices	
A. Survey .....	121
B. Correspondence to MASSP Principals .....	130

### List of Tables

Table	Page
1. The Instructional Framework That Best Describes the Teacher Evaluation Model used In Minnesota School Districts .....	68
2. During an Average 5-day Week, Number of Hours Principals Spend in Total on the Process of Evaluating Teaching Staff .....	69
3. Number of Hours to Complete a Full Observation for an Individual Teacher .....	70
4. Number of Full Teacher Observations Principals Complete for Each Teacher They are Evaluating during the School Year .....	70
5. Number of Teacher Observations Principals Complete during the School Year .....	71
6. Components Included in a Full Teacher Observation Process .....	72
7. Number of Assistant Principals or Other Staff That Complete Evaluative Observations and Work under the Principal's Supervision .....	73
8. Level of Agreement with the Statement, "The Teacher Evaluation Model Utilized in My School District Results I Improved Teacher Performance" .....	74
9. Level of Agreement with the Statement, "The Teacher Evaluation Model Utilized in My School District does not Result in Improved Teacher Performance" .....	75
10. Hours Spent by Principals on Teacher Evaluation during an Average 5-day Week Differentiated by Teacher Evaluation Model .....	77
11. Hours Spent by Principals to Complete a Single Observation of a Teacher Differentiated by Teacher Evaluation Model .....	79

Table	Page
12. Years of Service as a Principal .....	80
13. Cross Tabulation of Question 3, “How Many Years Have You served as a Principal?” and Question 9, “During an Average 5-day Week, How Many Hours Do You Spend in Total on the Process of Evaluating Teaching Staff?” .....	82
14. Cross Tabulation of Question 3, “How Many Years Have You served as a Principal?” and Question 10, “How Many Hours does I take to Complete a Full Observation for an Individual Teacher?” .....	84

## **Chapter I: Introduction**

### **Teacher Evaluation**

Teachers have a profound impact on the lives of their students (Danielson, 2007; Edmunds, 1982b; Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983; Marzano, 2001). In order to provide support for teachers to be more effective in the classroom, it is essential to create a clear path for their improvement and support their professional growth. The process of evaluating teaching staff and providing clear, meaningful and effective feedback from a supervisor has experienced transformations based largely on changes in policy and practice across the nation.

Historically, teachers were only provided the most basic forms of feedback from supervisors to improve their practices. For example, “During the late nineteenth century, New York City had a teacher evaluation system in which principals rated 99.5 percent of teachers as ‘good’” (Goldstein, 2014, p. 92). While the teacher observation model utilized in a school provides a clearer description of a teacher’s level of performance, principals must also have the time to commit to the process of evaluating their teachers. “Although working with teachers to improve student achievement is considered to be most important, this survey indicates that our leaders spend, at best, less than 30% of their time on professional activities, professional growth and classroom observations” (Gilson, 2008, p. 91). According to a study conducted in Minnesota, secondary school principals “Preferred devoting their time to instructional leadership tasks but in reality, management tasks took precedent. Classroom walk through / observations was rated by respondents as their highest priority preferred task, but it was rated fifth for actual time spent on task” (Lund, 2017, p. 85).

The purpose of the study was to gather data related to the teacher evaluation models utilized in select school districts in the state of Minnesota. The study further sought to gather information from principals as to the time they committed to the process of evaluating their teachers and their perceptions of the extent to which the teacher evaluation model resulted in improved teacher performance.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The state of Minnesota does not require all school districts use the same teacher evaluation framework when evaluating teachers. There appeared to be a lack of current, available data related to the extent common teacher evaluation models were utilized by school districts in the state of Minnesota. School district leaders were able to select the teacher evaluation models they prefer and the manner in which chose to implement those teacher evaluation models with their teachers.

According to the Institute of Education Services, school principals reported committing an average of 59 total hours per week to work-related activities (Gruber et al., 2006). Since this figure was an average, some principals devoted more than 59 hours per week, while other principals reported working less than 59 hours per week. As a result of the variation in the number of hours principals reported working during an average week, the study focused on the total number of hours principals allocated to the process of evaluating teachers rather than the percentage of time principals allocated to the evaluation process. The variation in the number of hours worked by responding principals could cause the overall percentage of time to be misleading if principals reported a percentage of their time allocated to teacher evaluation rather than the total number of hours allocated to teacher evaluation.

**Conceptual Framework of the Study**

The study gathered quantitative data through the administration of a survey of select secondary school principals in the state of Minnesota regarding teacher evaluation models they used in their districts. The conceptual framework for the study focused on teacher evaluation models that were in place in select Minnesota school districts at the time of the study which included the Charlotte Danielson model, Robert Marzano model, Kim Marshall model, a district-created model and the state of Minnesota model. All of these teacher evaluation models were operational in school districts in the state of Minnesota.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to gather information from select Minnesota secondary school principals related to the number of hours they committed to the evaluation of their teaching staffs during an average week, the model used for their evaluations, and their perceptions on the extent to which the teacher evaluation models in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance. The study also examined the relationship between hours spent in teacher evaluation per week, the model used by the principal and the relationship between the years of experience of principals and hours spent evaluating teaching their staff.

**Significance of the Study**

There appeared to be a lack of information in Minnesota related to the teacher evaluation models selected for use in school districts. At the time of the study, Minnesota allowed school districts to select the models that best met their needs and the methodologies regarding implementation of the teacher evaluation models. The study gathered information from school districts related to their selected teacher evaluation model.

The need to improve educational outcomes for students is pressing and principals' feedback to their teaching staffs can be an effective method for improving teacher practices. "At some level, principals always have been instructional leaders- but never before has their role been more prominent" (Finkel, 2012, p. 51).

### **Research Questions**

1. What teacher evaluation model did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they utilized when evaluating their teachers?
2. How many hours did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they committed to the process of evaluating their teachers during an average week?
3. To what extent did select Minnesota secondary school principals report the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance?
4. What was the relationship between the teacher evaluation model utilized in a school district and the hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal?
5. How did the time that select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function of their years of experience?

### **Delimitations of the Study**

For the purpose of the study, only secondary school principals who were members of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP) were invited to participate in the survey. During the 2015-2016 school year, 601 principals, over 95% of secondary school principals in Minnesota, were members of MASSP. Elementary school principals, assistant principals, curriculum directors, activities directors, and other district

office personnel, who may be assigned to the task of evaluating teaching staff members were not included in the survey. Data were gathered only from those principals who responded and must, therefore, be interpreted with caution.

The study was only focused on the teacher evaluation model in the responding principal's school. Although other factors may have contributed to each principal's perceptions of the extent to which the teacher evaluation framework improved teacher performance, including the length of time the teacher evaluation framework had been implemented, the level of background knowledge of the principal and the volume of inter-rater reliability training, the study was only focused on the teacher evaluation model.

### **Definitions of Key Terms**

*Academic Search Premier:* A multi-disciplinary research database with access to full text journals and magazine articles.

*Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching:* "The Framework for Teaching is a research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the INTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching" (Danielson, 2016).

*Coleman Report:* An abbreviated name for the Equality of Educational Opportunity Report in 1966 (Kavari, 2000).

*EBSCO:* A subscription-based service that allows access to databases, e-books, periodicals and journals.

*ERIC:* Education Resources Information Center is a subscription based service of education research and information, sponsored by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) of the U.S. Department of Education.

*Madeline Hunter's Model for Lesson Design:* A model for effective lessons created by the late teacher and principal, Madeline Hunter (Wilson, 2017).

*Measures of Effective Teaching Project:* A large scale research study funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation that convened leading academics, education groups and over 3,000 teachers to make recommendations for improvements to teacher evaluation practices (Kane, Kerr, & Pianta, 2014).

*Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP):* A professional organization representing principals and assistant principals in secondary schools in the state of Minnesota.

*Minnesota Teacher Development, Evaluation and Peer Support Model:* The state model for teacher evaluation developed in Minnesota by the Teacher Evaluation Work Group (Minnesota Department of Education, 2013).

*National Commission of Excellence in Education:* The National Commission of Excellence in Education produced “A Nation at Risk” in 1983. The commission consisted of between twelve and nineteen members. All members, including the chair, were appointed by the Secretary of Education (Gardner et al., 1983).

*New Teacher Project:* An organization with a mission to assure that poor and minority students received equal access to effective teachers (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2012).

*Robert Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model:* A teacher evaluation model that includes an identified set of practices that are directly related to student performance (Marzano & Toth, 2013).

*Saint Cloud State University Library:* Library Resource Center located on the campus of Saint Cloud State University in Saint Cloud, Minnesota.

*Stronge Teacher Evaluation Model:* A teacher evaluation model aligned with the InTASC and PSEL standards including six research-based professional standards (Stronge, 2012).

*Teacher Evaluation Model:* The formal process a school uses to review and rate teachers' performance and effectiveness in the classroom (Sawchuk, 2015).

*Value Added Measures:* The statistical isolation of variables in student achievement results, designed to measure the specific impact of teachers on the learning of their students (Sanders & Horn, 1998).

*Widget Effect:* A term utilized in the New Teacher Project to establish that teachers are not interchangeable parts, or widgets, and that school districts do not effectively differentiate between excellent, good, fair and poor teachers (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009).

### **Limitations of the Study**

The state of Minnesota did not require the use of a specific teacher evaluation model by all school districts. Consequently, there were multiple teacher evaluation models in use in the state and the study was intended to identify the extent to which each framework was used as a basis for teacher evaluation in select Minnesota school districts. The information gathered in the study was based on the self-report of respondents and must, therefore, be interpreted with caution.

Minnesota principals had varying levels of years of experience. A principal's years of experience may have had an impact on the amount of time he or she devoted to the process of

evaluating teachers. For example, a principal with greater experience may have been more confident or competent in the process of evaluating and providing feedback to his or her teaching staff members. Principals with more extensive experience may, therefore, have dedicated a greater amount of time to the process of evaluating and providing feedback to their staff. The study gathered perceptions of Minnesota secondary school principals and those perceptions may have been influenced by a wide range of personal and professional factors in the lives of those principals.

### **Organization of the Study**

The study was organized in five chapters. Chapter I includes a statement of the problem, conceptual framework of the study, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, delimitations of the study and definitions of key terms.

Chapter II contains a review of the relevant literature and provides background for the study. Chapter II was organized according to three themes: a history of teacher evaluation, including key legislation and studies in the area of teacher evaluation; an overview of common teacher evaluation frameworks utilized in the United States; and, common challenges to the effective implementation of teacher evaluation including assessing the essential purpose of teacher evaluation, the use of value-added measures and the time required to evaluate teaching staff.

Chapter III describes the methodology of the study and includes information related to the following: research questions, hypotheses, research design, instrumentation, study respondents, data collection procedures, data analysis, procedures and timeline, IRB review process and limitations of the study.

Chapter IV provides a detailed accounting and analysis of the data collected in the study survey.

Chapter V delineates a summary of the findings related to the study, conclusions drawn by the researcher based on the findings, recommendations for further study and highlighting of the key findings of the study that may have implications in the education community.

### **Summary**

The process of evaluating teachers to measure their current level of effectiveness and provide feedback necessary to make improvements in their practices has been given significant attention by educators, the media, elected officials and school leaders. The study gathered information related to the teacher evaluation framework being utilized in select school districts in the state of Minnesota and also measured the number of hours principals invested in the process of evaluating their teachers. Chapter II will present a review of the related literature including a brief history of key findings and legislation related to teacher evaluation, an overview of some common teacher evaluation models or frameworks that are utilized by school districts, and challenges principals and school leaders face when evaluating their teaching staff.

## **Chapter II: Literature Review**

The literature review identified three themes in teacher evaluation. First, a brief history of teacher evaluation including key legislation and studies will be reviewed. Second, prevalent teacher evaluation models currently utilized in the United States will be highlighted and briefly described. Third, common challenges to the effective implementation of teacher evaluation practices will be discussed. Efforts to increase accountability in education had far reaching implications that manifested in key legislative actions and studies. The emergence of current teacher evaluation frameworks and challenges they present to effective teacher evaluation practices are also manifestations of the movement to increase accountability in education that will be presented in this review of the related literature.

The research for this literature review was conducted by utilizing resources available through the St. Cloud State University Library. EBSCO, ERIC, and Academic Search Premier were utilized to locate peer-reviewed, scholarly articles and studies as a foundation for the research for this study. Search terms such as “Teacher Evaluation”, “Teacher Evaluation Policies”, “Teacher Evaluation Framework” and “Principal Role in Teacher Evaluation” yielded many resources. The bibliographies and works cited in the body of the many resources located in these searches were also very helpful in the process of locating additional sources of information.

### **Theme 1: Brief History of Teacher Evaluation Including Key Legislation and Studies**

Key studies and legislative actions related to education had implications regarding policies and teacher evaluation practices. Featured studies and legislation in this brief history of teacher evaluation included the Coleman Report, The School Effectiveness Movement, A

Nation At Risk, Goals 2000, No Child Left Behind, an Issue Brief to Governors, the Measures of Effective Teaching Project, and the Every Student Succeeds Act.

**Coleman report.** The Civil Rights Act of 1964 included a directive to conduct a large-scale survey of school districts that led to the publication of the “Coleman Report” in 1966. The “Equality of Educational Opportunity” document published by the National Center for Educational Statistics was also referred to as the *Coleman Report* and included information from more than 4000 schools across the nation that served more than 600,000 children. When juxtaposed with current philosophies, beliefs and findings, this study provided a stark contrast to the historical context regarding the importance of teacher effectiveness.

Several findings in the survey results pointed to factors contributing to successes in student achievement. Teacher quality was referred to as a contributing factor, yet was not considered a primary factor for student achievement. Two of these contributing factors included the student’s attitude toward learning and the culture of the school. These factors were thought to have more impact on student learning than the effectiveness of the teachers in the school. “For example, a pupil attitude factor, which appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than do all the “school” factors together, is the extent to which an individual feels that he has some control over his own destiny” (Coleman & Hopkins, 1966, p. 23).

According to their study, teaching staff had only a relatively insignificant impact on the overall achievement of their students. Their study further concluded that precipitating factors faced by students more directly contributed to gains or losses in the academic achievement of a student than any actions taken by teaching staff. The culture of the community in which the student lives and the “pupil attitude factor” were presented as the most significant contributors to students’ academic achievement.

Ordinarily, when one finds that the level of achievement in one school is much higher than the achievement in another, there comes to his mind these sources of differences: The different students with which the school begins, the different community settings, or student body climates which encourage or fail to encourage achievement, and the differences in the school itself. (Coleman & Hopkins, 1966, pp. 295-296)

In another section of the *Coleman Report* one of the more impactful statements about contributing factors to student achievement results occurred:

Taking all of these results together, one implication stands out above all: That schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context; and that this very lack of an independent effect means that the inequalities imposed on children by their home, neighborhood, and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of school. (Coleman & Hopkins, 1966, p. 325)

The *Coleman Report* was a stark contrast to the studies and policy statements that followed in the field of education. Whereas the *Coleman Report* indicated teaching staff have only a limited impact on the lives and overall achievement of their students, numerous studies and publications that followed the *Coleman Report* were largely supportive of the concept of teaching staff had significant roles in the lives and academic growth or achievement of their students. Teacher effectiveness and methods to improve teacher performance were considered key elements for educational reform in the aftermath of the *Coleman Report*. As a contrast to this report, the studies and initiatives that followed supported improving student achievement results by remaining focused on making improvements in teacher practices.

**The school effectiveness movement.** In 1982, Ronald Edmunds of Harvard University challenged the findings of the *Coleman Report*. If student learning was primarily attributed to precipitating factors outside the span of control of schools, he asserted American educators would be less empowered to positively impact the academic achievement results of their students. When family and societal issues were referred to as more responsible for the growth or lack of growth of student learning, the important role of the teacher in the academic progress of their students was minimized.

Ronald Edmunds was referred to as the “Figurehead of the school effectiveness movement” (Marzano, 2001, p. 15). He claimed, “The school is the major determinant of achievement” (Edmunds, 1982a, p. 6) and further stated, “The important point is that educators are increasingly persuaded that the characteristics of schools are important determinants of academic achievement.” (Edmunds, 1982a, p. 6). Edmunds believed, “Research on school effectiveness is complemented and reinforced by research on teacher effectiveness” (Edmunds, 1982a, p. 7). Edmund’s work to connect teacher effectiveness to student achievement results led to further efforts to increase schools’ success and to make improvements in student achievement results. The *school effectiveness movement* placed additional value on the role and impact teaching staff have in the lives of their students and in the achievement results of their students. The school effectiveness movement was presented as a contrast to the idea of society and families pre-determining the capacity and degree to which a student can be successful at school and offered a very different perspective than the “Coleman Report”.

Edmunds itemized the characteristics of an effective school as:

1. The leadership of the principal is notable for substantial attention to the quality of instruction,
  2. A pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus,
  3. An orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning,
  4. Teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least a minimum mastery,
  5. The use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation
- (Edmunds, 1982a, p. 8)

Edmunds created these characteristics of an effective school as a means to both communicate the need for high standards for teaching staff and school leaders and to empower those working in school settings. Ronald Edmonds further clarified in his comments about the history of reform initiatives, “Each of these changes was preceded by substantial criticism of the educational status quo. Thus is the public school constantly criticized even though the record shows that we teach increasing proportions of each generation better and more” (Edmunds, 1982, p. 3).

The work of Ronald Edmunds was significant to the field of education because it was instrumental to the process of solidifying the concept of teacher accountability for student achievement results, which was a key message of the school effectiveness movement. Until his sudden and unexpected death in 1983, “Edmonds, more than anyone, had been responsible for the communication of the belief that schools can and do make a difference (Brophy & Good, 1984, p. 582).

**A nation at risk.** *A Nation at Risk*, presented by members of the National Commission of Excellence in Education in 1983, sounded an alarm across the nation about

the lack of quality educational services offered to students in the United States. *A Nation at Risk* also highlighted the relatively poor results American students were achieving when compared to students from around the world. Goldstein refers to *A Nation at Risk* as “One of the most influential federal documents ever published” (Goldstein, 2014, p. 165). The document utilized specific language, designed to create a sense of urgency and spur educational policy makers into action:

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves... We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (Gardner et al., 1983, p. 5)

*A Nation at Risk* included recommendations in the areas of content, standards, expectations, time and teaching. According to teaching recommendations contained in *A Nation at Risk*, there was a need for a thorough and complete system to evaluate teaching staff in all schools across the country. “Salary, promotion, tenure, and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated” (Gardner et al., 1983, p. 38). *A Nation at Risk* effectively identified needs for changes to our education system among policy makers and political leaders in the areas itemized above. There were recommendations contained in *A Nation at Risk* that have still not been met, including significant increases to both the length of the school day and the length of the school year. However, increases in accountability around the nature of educator evaluations have become reality.

Prior to the 1980s and the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, teacher evaluation was largely left to local school districts with occasional guidance from state departments of education (Veir & Dagley, 2002). However, since the 1980s, policy activity related to the evaluation of teaching staff “Tended to ebb and flow with various national initiatives” (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009, p. 3) and in response to *A Nation at Risk*, some states targeted teacher evaluation methodologies as part of their strategy to upgrade teacher quality (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009).

In the 1990s, the models for instruction and expectations for teacher performance were beginning to formulate and emerge in small scale. For example, Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching was first published in 1996 and has been revised a number of times. Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching was also utilized in large scale studies and adopted in some cases by entire states (Dodson, 2015). Models for teacher evaluation will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, and the methods to increase accountability that were called for in *A Nation at Risk* will be embedded throughout the policies and action steps taken by school districts.

**Goals 2000.** The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was submitted to Congress in April of 1993 and signed into law by President Bill Clinton March of 1994. This legislation was designed to “Establish a framework to encourage state and local educational agencies to develop comprehensive plans that will provide a coherent framework to integrate and implement federal education programs” (Earley, 1994, p. 3).

By the Year 2000...

- All children in America will start school ready to learn.
- The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

- All students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, the arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our nation's modern economy.
  - United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.
  - Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
  - Every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.
  - The nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.
  - Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.
- (Earley, 1994, p. 3)

Goals 2000 represented an expansion of the influence of the federal government in education policy issues that were generally accepted to be the responsibility of the state and local government and “Cedes an unprecedented amount of control over education policymaking to the federal government” (Heise, 1994, p. 381). Goals 2000 also authorized grants for states and local agencies to apply for funding to create “systemic change” to their education systems in the areas of curriculum and assessment (Stedman, 1993).

**No Child Left Behind.** The George W. Bush Administration included strategic steps to improve teacher quality and effectiveness in the 2001 release of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Language utilized in the NCLB Act communicated expectations for state governments to have responsibility, and accountability, to improve the effectiveness of teaching in their states. Efforts to link student achievement results to teacher evaluations were contained in NCLB. “One percent of funding for this program is set aside for the Secretary of Education to award grants to states that develop teacher assessment systems that measure teacher performance using gains in student academic achievement” (Bush, 2001, p. 13).

Shifts in accountability for student achievement results were apparent in the NCLB Act. Teaching staff were subjected to a new level of accountability to the parents of their students when “Local districts, upon the request, will be required to disclose to parents information about the quality of their child’s teacher, as defined by the state” (Bush, 2001, p. 13).

This act placed a heavy emphasis on the use of standardized assessments to measure the growth of all students, and numerous assigned sub groups of students, in schools. “While the approach of NCLB was problematic, its intent was to ensure that the success of

traditionally underserved students mattered as much as that of other students” (Darling-Hammond, Jaquith, & Hamilton, 2016, p. 2). Sub groups included such categories as black students, white students, special education students, students receiving free or reduced lunch and students with limited English proficiency. Under the NCLB Act, schools were accountable for closing the achievement gap in each of these subgroups and were directed to work toward a goal of 100% proficiency on state mandated tests for all students and every subgroup of students.

**Issue brief to governors.** In 2002, one year after the release of *No Child Left Behind*, the National Governor’s Association published an *Issue Brief* containing a number of recommendations designed to improve teacher quality. The evaluation of teaching staff was specifically addressed in the Issue Brief and included numerous recommended actions for governors to enact in their respective states. A level of mistrust and lack of confidence regarding the effectiveness of current practices around teacher evaluation was also expressed. “Though evaluation serves as a mechanism for assessing job performance, in practice it is often cursory, subjective, and based upon insufficient observation. Moreover, it seldom results in the termination of truly poor educators” (Goldrick, 2002, p. 3). The National Governor’s Association targeted evaluation as “a tool for instructional improvement” (Goldrick, 2002, p. 3). At the time, the National Governor’s Association was one of the most influential organizations over the creation and implementation of educational policy in the United States, (Swanson & Barriage, 2006). “It is important to see how this organization has influenced teacher evaluation policy in the states during this era of accountability, especially since its

practice has been historically a matter of local judgement and discretion” (Hazi & Ruchinski, 2009, p. 3).

Strategies brought forward by the National Governor’s Association (NGA) had a significant impact on the education policy enacted in states across the country. The six essential strategies recommended by the NGA included:

1. Define teacher quality
2. Focus evaluation policy on improving teaching practice
3. Incorporate student learning into teacher evaluation
4. Create professional accountability
5. Train evaluators
6. Broaden participation in evaluation design (Goldrick, 2002, p. 3)

When a survey was conducted to gather information regarding the NGA recommendations, and the extent to which those recommendations had been implemented, “All but nine states have adopted at least one of the NGA’s strategies” (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009, p. 8). Training evaluators was “One of the most frequently adopted strategies with Texas requiring 36 hours in instructional leadership and 20 hours in evaluation instrument training” (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009, p. 8).

The definition of teacher quality adopted most frequently in states lacked specificity and was only moderately helpful to focus the work of teaching staff. “Most states have taken the approach of listing indicators of effective teaching, identifying standards, attributes or performance dimensions” (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009, p. 8). In 2009, Hazı and Rucinski also reported only 12 states had incorporated student achievement into teacher evaluation rankings. However, by 2015, the number of states that had passed legislation to incorporate

student achievement results into the evaluation of teaching staff had grown considerably. According to a 2016 publication by the Network for Public Education, “Presently, only eight states have either rejected the use of test scores in teacher evaluation or temporarily suspended their use” (p. 2).

“The No Child Left Behind Act provided Governors and other state policymakers an opportunity to enact or amend laws and regulations governing teacher evaluation, alongside other required reforms” (Goldrick, 2002, p. 3). In the National Governor’s Association Issue Brief, state policymakers were encouraged to take action in the six areas previously referenced.

One of the recommendations with far-reaching implications was, “States should transform evaluation from a traditionally input-based process into an outcome-driven one. They should consider measurable student achievement as the principal outcome on which teachers are evaluated” (Goldrick, 2002, p. 5). Recommendations to incorporate student learning into the evaluation of teachers resulted in actions in several states.

In 2009, only 16 states required an assessment of student learning as part of teacher evaluations. However, in 2013 all but 10 states required teacher evaluations to include objective evidence of student learning. There are several different variables that enter into objective measures of student learning. Forty-one states required multiple measures of student learning. Forty-six states review student achievement / growth. Of these, 25 states review academic achievement with non-standardized indicators, 18 states review achievement using growth preponderant criteria, and 25 states use multiple measures to review student achievement scores and growth. (Marchant, David, Rodgers, & German, 2015, p. 91).

The National Governor's Association has been instrumental in influencing the creation of policies and states' requirements as highlighted by the extent to which the recommendations in this *Issue Brief to Governors* have been carried forward and implemented in states.

**Measures of effective teaching project.** Beginning in 2009, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation funded the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study. The MET study was a large-scale effort intended to identify essential strategies needed to make improvements in outcomes for students. The practice of principals and supervisors inflating the evaluation scores of teachers and other certified staff they were evaluating was identified in the MET study as a particularly damaging practice. Inflated evaluation scores provided data that were contrary to the number of teaching staff who were identified by principals as having significant performance concerns. Recommended changes to teacher evaluations were based on the perceived need to provide more accurate scoring systems for the evaluation of teaching staff.

The Widget Effect, a study in 2009, (Weisberg et al.) was cited as evidence of inflated teacher evaluation scores. One thousand three hundred and thirty-three teachers from across the nation participated in the MET study. The majority of participants were scored as proficient because "A majority of teachers had mastered basic classroom management skills but struggled with more advanced instructional skills" (Weisberg, 2012, p. 2).

Nearly three-quarters of teachers observed using the Danielson Framework for Teaching were rated proficient or higher at "managing classroom behavior," and more than half were proficient or distinguished at "managing classroom procedures." But only about one-third were rated at least proficient in "using questioning and discussion

techniques,” and less than one-third were proficient or better in “communicating with students”—instructional skills that are essential to helping students master the content of the lesson. (Weisberg, 2012, p. 2)

The Widget Effect findings were based on survey data collected from over 15,000 teachers and over 1,300 administrators and it “Describes the tendency of school districts to assume classroom effectiveness is the same from teacher to teacher” (Weisberg et al., 2009, p. 4). However, the concept that all teachers perform at roughly the same level does not adequately address the unique strengths and growth areas of each teacher.

The New Teacher Project (TNTP), founded by Michelle Rhee in 1997, identified evaluating teachers in a meaningful and more complete manner as necessary to improve student achievement results. According to the basic premise of the Widget Effect, the quality of the teacher in the classroom was irrelevant. The Widget Effect predicted, as long as a licensed and properly qualified teacher was in the classroom, student achievement results would be the same or very similar across different classroom settings. TNTP refuted this statement and emphasized the value and importance of a high quality teacher in every classroom. “This simple premise—that teachers matter—has driven The New Teacher Project’s prior research and continues to drive our work today” (Weisberg et al., 2009, p. 9).

In another study conducted by Kraft and Gilmore at Brown University, the difference between the number of teaching staff identified by their principal as needing improvement and the number of teaching staff that are actually scored “at a level below Proficient” (Kraft & Gilmore, 2016, p. 10) was compared. According to the results from principals surveyed for this study, up to four times more staff needed improvement than were scored below proficient through the established evaluation process for teaching and other certified staff.

“Recent evidence from the final MET Project (2013) unequivocally states that using three metrics in combination—VAM (Value Added Measures) scores, classroom observation instruments and students’ surveys—reliably identifies ‘great teaching’” (Adams, 2013, p. 346). The use of multiple measures to evaluate teachers accurately and fairly, rather than relying on any single measure, was emphasized and supported as one of the key findings and recommendations for future implementation by the MET study.

Initially, the potential implications of the use of student achievement data, as part of the Value Added Measures process, used in the evaluation of teaching staff generated a level of interest by policy makers. However, a letter report to the U.S. Department of Education from the National Research Council’s Board on Testing and Assessment cautioned that “A test score is an estimate rather than an exact measure of what a student knows and can do” (Board of Testing and Assessment, 2009, p. 3).

Additionally, there were concerns regarding the validity and reliability of VAM scores used as a basis for teacher evaluation. In addition to VAM ratings, the MET study emphasized the use of observation data by multiple trained observers and the use of student surveys as an additional source of data to provide feedback to teaching staff. The MET study recommended the use of VAM scores, classroom observations and student surveys all be combined to provide the most accurate overall measure of the effectiveness of the teacher.

**Every student succeeds act.** Late in 2015, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was reauthorized by voters in both chambers of Congress and named the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). “States would still have to test students in reading and math in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school...and, in a big switch from NCLB waivers, there would be no role for the feds whatsoever in teacher evaluation” (Klein, 2015, p. 1).

According to the Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN), one of the key authors of the ESSA, “The law ends the federal waiver mandate on teacher and principal evaluation systems and returns decisions about how to identify and reward outstanding teachers and principals back to states and local school districts” (An interview with Lamar Alexander, 2016, p. 60).

When compared to *No Child Left Behind Act*, the *Every Student Succeeds Act* differs greatly in its definition of success for school districts. Definitions of success under the NCLB Act were far more narrow and based on math and reading scores in select grade levels and the specific performance of some sub-groups. This focused definition for school improvement was thought to have resulted in a narrowing of the curriculum and school success was defined more broadly under ESSA. Between 2000 and 2012, regarding student progress on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, “The rate of gain was about half that of the pre-NCLB era” (Darling-Hammond et.al., 2016, p. 1). On the Program for International Student Assessment—“A more open-ended test that evaluates how students apply their knowledge and demonstrate their reasoning—U.S. performance declined in math, reading and science between 2000 and 2012, both absolutely and in relation to other countries” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016 p. 1). This shift to a broader definition of success for schools under ESSA allowed states and local agencies to further clarify the efforts of school districts related to teacher evaluation in coming years and potentially give greater discretion to state and local agencies to create their own sets of standards related to teacher evaluation.

This has been a review of selected key studies and legislation related to education in the United States that had policy implications and affected the practices around teacher evaluation. Featured studies in this brief history of teacher evaluation included the Coleman Report, The School Effectiveness Movement, A Nation At Risk, No Child Left Behind, an

Issue Brief to Governors, the Measures of Effective Teaching Project, and the Every Student Succeeds Act. From the “Coleman Report” to our present age of accountability, there have been significant changes in perceptions and expectations for teachers and school staff.

Teacher evaluation systems are undergoing a remarkable transformation. Spurred by strong federal incentives, most states have adopted procedures that combine data from student tests and rigorous observation protocols into scores intended for use in teacher accountability systems. (Hill & Grossman, 2013, p. 371)

This history of teacher evaluation was intended to provide a brief historical perspective on the current status in the age of accountability in education, including key studies and legislative action that has impacted teacher evaluation practices. The second theme in the review of the related literature is prevalent teacher evaluation models.

## **Theme 2: Prevalent Teacher Evaluation Models**

The period of large scale efforts to improve teacher quality has resulted in the invention and subsequent marketing of models intended to improve teaching and teacher quality and to improve student learning outcomes. These models were marketed to school leaders and other decision makers for school districts by emphasizing “Teacher evaluation stands as a heralded means of improving the delivery of education” (Dagley & Veir, 2002, p. 124). To varying degrees, these models included an evaluative component and were used to measure the current level of proficiency of teaching staff.

Because of time constraints and other issues, most organizations will adopt a set of teaching performance standards that has already been developed and tested. In this age of increased accountability and pressure to improve the evaluation of teachers, many

teacher evaluation systems developed by researchers for large-scale use have emerged.

(Eller & Eller, 2015, p. 22)

Madeline Hunter's Model of Lesson Design, Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, the Stronge Model, Robert Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model and the teacher evaluation model developed by the Minnesota Department of Education were summarized in the next section, including prominent characteristics of each of these teacher evaluation models. Similarities that exist within these models were compared and some of the unique elements within these models were contrasted, including identifying the models most closely aligned to established standards for teaching evaluation criteria.

**Madeline Hunter's model of lesson design.** Madeline Hunter published *Knowing, Teaching and Supervising* in 1984, generating a seven step model of a lesson for teachers to use as they created learning activities in their classrooms. Hunter's model of lesson design contended that there are certain elements all effective lessons have, regardless of the teacher's presentation style or content area. If the teachers adhered to this model in the creation of classroom lessons, their students would benefit regardless of the student's socioeconomic status or grade level. This model for lesson design was "A major influence on supervision" (Marzano, Livingston, & Frontier, 2011, p. 6) and the seven elements included 1) an anticipatory set, 2) objective and purpose, 3) input, 4) modeling, 5) checking for understanding, 6) guided practice, and 7) independent practice.

As part of her approach to improve teacher professional practice, Hunter (1983) encouraged the strategy of script taking teacher lessons in the classroom. When script taking, the observer wrote as many of the statements the teacher makes in the classroom as they were able using a type of shorthand method. "To be useful, observations must be valid, objective

and recorded. A recorded observation enables observer and performer to ‘play back’ so that salient cause-effect relationships can be identified” (Hunter, 1983, p. 43). The recorded segments would seek to isolate teacher behaviors that, “promoted learning; those that used precious time and energy, yet contributed nothing to learning; and those that, unintentionally, actually interfered with learning” (Marzano et al., 2011, p. 20). When using her model to provide evaluative feedback, Hunter makes the firm recommendation,

Script taking should become a required proficiency for any educator who has responsibility for improving the performance of another. It is a necessary element in supervisory and administrative preservice training and a constant element in effective supervision performance. (Hunter, 1983, p. 43)

Another purpose for Hunter’s model was to identify, “less effective aspects of teaching that were not evident to the teacher” (Hunter, 1979, p. 63). Although Hunter’s model did not provide a rubric for the scoring of teaching staff, it was a basis for the creation of effective lessons and provided a high standard for the planning of effective lessons by teachers. “The person whose only assets were “loving kids” or “having a way with them” remained, at best, a promising amateur and was reduced to a ‘dullard’ when compared to a highly proficient, artistic professional” (Hunter, 1976, p. 167).

The most impactful attribute of Madeline Hunter’s model of a lesson was the creation of a common language in education that was widely accepted in the field. The terminology she provided served to create a common vocabulary that allowed teaching staff in the same building and teaching staff working in different locations to communicate and collaborate around the design of lessons.

We finally are turning to what we should have known in the first place was the critical ingredient, the professional competence of the teacher, the ability of that human to deliver quality professional service designed to increase the probability of successful learning. (Hunter, 1976, p. 162)

**Charlotte Danielson’s framework for teaching.** Charlotte Danielson’s framework for teaching included domains for planning and preparation, the classroom environment, instruction and professional responsibilities. There were twenty-two components under the four domains including items such as establishing clear learning goals, making the content comprehensible for the students, establishing clear expectations for behavior and extending the thinking of students.

Robert Marzano made the following comparative statement about the Hunter model and the Danielson model: “A well-articulated knowledge base for teaching is supported by the successes of the Hunter model and the utility of the Danielson model. Their specificity was their strength” (Marzano et al., 2011, p. 12).

Charlotte Danielson’s *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* was first published in 1996 and experienced four revisions since its original publication. Her framework for the evaluation of teaching staff was revised in 2007, 2011 and 2013 and has been utilized by many school districts and, in some cases, entire states have adopted this framework as they implemented Danielson’s model for the evaluation of their teaching and other certified staff (Dodson, 2015). Danielson remarked, “A framework for professional practice is not unique to education. Indeed, other professions—medicine, accounting, architecture, among many others—have well-established definitions of expertise and procedures to certify novice and advanced practitioners” (Danielson, 2007, p. 2).

In *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice*, Charlotte Danielson and Thomas McGreal addressed the challenge of the two purposes of teacher evaluation; quality assurance and encouraging professional growth. “Not only do different individuals and groups disagree about the relative importance of the two main purposes of evaluation, quality assurance and professional growth, but some even argue that they are incompatible with one another” (Danielson & McGreal, 2000, p. 8). The underlying belief of the perceived incompatibility regarding the dual purposes of a teacher evaluation, including lack of trust between teachers and administrators and differing expectations between the two groups were highlighted by Danielson and McGreal. When teaching staff believed they were measured and assessed for competency, they were less motivated and invested than they were when in situations where they believed they were receiving supportive coaching. Many teachers believed that, because of lack of quality feedback from their supervisor, evaluations did nothing to help them improve their teaching practices (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). The authors stated, “The principal argument of this book is that we can design evaluation systems in which educators can not only achieve the dual purposes of accountability and professional development, but can merge them” (Danielson & McGreal, 2000, p. 10).

There were four possible scores to assign in each of the identified categories of the Danielson teacher evaluation system. Although there was flexibility to modify the terms associated with the scoring of teaching staff, some common labels related to the level of teacher performance included: Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished. This flexibility provided “States and school districts with a guideline for developing their own evaluation system” (Marchant et al., 2015, p. 95).

In 2009, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation launched the large scale research project referenced in a prior section of this review of the related literature. The Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project utilized the 2011 Edition of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for teaching as the tool to evaluate the over 23,000 videotaped lessons. "In order to fulfill this obligation, it became necessary to supply additional tools to aid in the training of observers, so they could make accurate and consistent judgements about teaching practice" (Danielson, 2016, p. 22). This was accomplished by providing specific examples of teacher behavior in each of the performance levels in every domain beginning with the 2013 release of Danielson's framework. The rubric language was also revised so the differences between teacher levels of performance were easier for the evaluator to distinguish when making evaluative decisions.

**The Stronge model.** James Stronge believed that there was room in teacher evaluation systems for both accountability and performance improvement purposes. Evaluation systems that include both accountability for expected levels of performance and a clear path for making improvements are both desirable and necessary for evaluation to foster growth amongst teaching staff and throughout school systems (Moss, 2015; Stronge, 2006). "In recent years, as the field of education has moved toward a stronger focus on accountability and on careful analysis of variables affecting educational outcomes, the teacher has proven time and again to be most influential school-related force in student achievement" (Stronge, 2012, p. viii). Strong created his teacher evaluation framework in order to address some perceived shortcomings in other models and indicated, "The development of a new teacher evaluation system offers a pivotal opportunity to reproduce, resist, or transform power relationships in a significant manner" (Strong & Tucker, 1999, p. 340).

Stronge's Teacher Effectiveness Performance Evaluation System, developed by James Stronge, is supported by researchers and consultants at Strong and Associates Educational Consulting. "The Stronge central framework, ... delineates seven areas of teacher performance and includes several sample performance indicators for each" (Eller & Eller, 2015, p. 27). The seven areas of focus for the Stronge model included: 1) professional knowledge, 2) instructional planning, 3) instructional delivery, 4) assessment of / for learning, 5) learning environment, 6) professionalism, and 7) student progress.

**Robert Marzano's causal teacher evaluation model.** The Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model, released in 2013, was developed by Robert J. Marzano and is an expanded version of the model he presented in 2007 from *The Art and Science of Teaching*. This model "Contains 60 elements that build on each other in the domains of Classroom Strategies and Behaviors (41 elements), Planning and Preparation (8 elements), Reflection on Teaching (5 elements), and Collegiality and Professionalism (6 elements)" (Marchant et al., 2015, p. 96).

In the Marzano model, design questions are provided within several of the domain areas. These design questions give teachers an opportunity to reflect on the larger area and their efforts to impact student learning. This is a unique aspect of the Marzano model. (Eller & Eller, 2015, p. 23)

The Marzano model included an additional product that could be purchased by schools and school districts to assist in the process of managing teacher evaluation data, growth plans and professional discussions between colleagues. This product, called iObservation, also included resources in the form of links to supporting documents, video examples of elements implemented in the classroom and samples of work that provided greater direction and clarity in domain areas. When using iObservation, school staff created growth plans based on the

identified areas of focus in a school district. The action steps connected to each goal in a growth plan were monitored over the course of the school year by principals and supervisors.

“Nearly all new systems have expanded the range of performance ratings to include at least four categories defining a teacher’s summative performance” (Steinberg & Kraft, 2017, p. 3). There are five identified levels of performance in the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model:

- 0 - Not Using: Strategy is called for, but not used
- 1 - Beginning: Strategy is used, but pieces are missing
- 2 - Developing: Strategy is used, but in a mechanistic way
- 3 - Applying: Strategy is used and monitored to see if it has the desired effect
- 4 - Innovating: New strategies are created to meet needs of specific students or class as a whole. (Marchant et al., 2015, p. 96)

**Minnesota Department of Education teacher evaluation model.** In the state of Minnesota, legislation was passed that required all teaching staff to be evaluated beginning in the 2014-2015 school year. School districts had the opportunity to create their own model, to adopt an existing model, or to use the State Model. The State Model has domains that are similar to the Danielson Model, but the indicators were generated independently. The four domains of the Minnesota State Model include Planning, Environment, Instruction and Professionalism. There are 11 total indicators under the four domains that further communicate the desired teacher practices in this evaluation model. Under these 11 indicators, there are 34 total elements with scoring options of Unsatisfactory, Development Needed, Effective and Exemplary.

The Minnesota State Model was designed as a model for school districts to use if representatives from the teachers collective bargaining unit were unable to come to agreement with representatives from the school board. “If the two parties cannot come to an arrangement, they must use the Model outlined in this handbook by default” (Minnesota Department of Education, 2013, p. 5).

One of the unique characteristics of the Minnesota State Model is the level of specificity it contains regarding the Student Learning Goal Process. The student achievement results related to this learning goal account for 35% of a teacher's summative evaluation in the state of Minnesota (Minnesota Department of Education, 2013, p. 8). There were five steps identified to create effective Student Learning Goals:

1. Choose quality assessments
2. Determine students’ starting points
3. Set the student learning goals
4. Track progress and refine instruction
5. Review results and score. (Minnesota Department of Education, 2013, p. 11).

Student Learning Goals were included in three categories: a class goal, a targeted need goal and a shared performance goal. The class goal pertains to students assigned to a teacher’s classroom and needed to account for the students in the classroom that are considered “under prepared”, “prepared” or “highly prepared”. The class goal is constructed based on how many students will grow to meet established standards of performance. A targeted need goal is specifically designed for students that are underprepared or have a low level of readiness and focuses on targeted skills. Shared performance goals are typically connected to school-wide performance goals on standardized assessments (Minnesota Department of Education, 2013).

**Correlation to InTASC and FIT standards.** Both the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model and the Danielson's Framework for Teaching had aligned their components with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards. The InTASC standards, created through a collaborative effort of multiple agencies and education groups, specified standards for beginning teachers which were intended to provide guidance to states as they create and encourage the creation of meaningful standards for teachers.

The Marzano, Danielson and Stronge models were all cited in the Framework for Intentional and Targeted Teaching (FIT Teaching Framework) with identified favorable reviews related to their correlation to this FIT Teaching Framework (Hite, 2014, p. 4). The FIT Teaching Framework, based on the work of Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey, included action steps involving school and classroom culture, establishing purpose, gradual release of responsibility and formative and summative assessments. The FIT Teaching Framework attempted to provide a wider lens for study than merely focusing on the teacher evaluation model that was utilized in a particular school or district.

The teacher evaluation models referenced in this review of the related literature were not intended to create a framework for revision of the operations of an entire school or school district. They were intended to be focused tools to provide feedback and encourage growth within the area of teacher practices related to instruction in their classrooms. However, the components of the teacher evaluation models highlighted in this section included multiple actions steps and effective strategies that were essential to create positive change in the larger learning environment of a school or district within the larger FIT Teaching Framework.

This review of prevalent teacher evaluation models included brief introductions to Madeline Hunter’s model of lesson design, Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, the Stronge Model, Robert Marzano’s Causal Teacher Evaluation Model and the Minnesota Department of Education Teacher Evaluation Model. The established teacher evaluation models discussed were characterized by “Scales representing a range of quality” (Cohen & Goldhaber, 2016, p. 379) so that standards of performance and current levels of proficiency are clear to educators. The emergence of these highly defined teacher evaluation models was helpful to teachers and principals; however, significant challenges to evaluating teaching staff still exist for principals who conduct teacher observations and make high-stakes evaluative decisions for teachers.

### **Theme 3: Common Challenges to the Effective Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Practices**

According to the 2012 MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, more than half of teachers and principals surveyed indicated that evaluating teacher effectiveness is either a challenging or very challenging activity. This section highlights the lack of clarity around the essential purpose of teacher evaluations. This section also discussed the use of student achievement data, including the use of value added measures, as a means to evaluate teaching staff. Finally, one of the challenging barriers to the effective implementation of teacher evaluation practices, the time constraints of the principal, is explored.

**Essential purpose of teacher evaluations.** One of the common challenges of the effective implementation of teacher evaluation practices was the lack of an agreed upon purpose of teacher evaluation in legislation:

Thirty-nine reasons are provided in eighteen of the forty-two statutes as purposes for performing teacher evaluations. Fourteen statutes provide formative statements of purpose such as professional growth, constructive assistance for teachers, improvement of instruction, improvement of performance, curriculum enhancement, identification of behaviors that contribute to student progress, and improvement of educational services. Only the Ohio, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania statutes indicate a summative purpose. In those states, the purpose of the evaluation system is to aid in the dismissal of poor teachers. (Vier & Dagley, 2002, p. 7)

The distinction between the formative and summative purposes of teacher evaluation as referenced in state statutes was significant. Formative evaluations include “The process of analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the educator” (Vier & Dagley, 2002, p. 8). In a formative evaluation, next steps to facilitate growth and improvement were of primary importance and the resources used, the time-frame to implement the changes, and desired outcomes were all identified. In contrast, “The summative phase of the cycle shows whether the data, the documentation, and the observations demonstrate the improvements and changes sought” (Vier & Dagley, 2002, p. 8). Personnel decisions regarding the nonrenewal of teacher contracts were based on the summative evaluation and “The dominant statutory use of the evaluation system is for dismissal of problem teachers” (Vier & Dagley, 2002, p. 8). Only one state had language related to the formative use of teacher evaluation data; “North Carolina is the only state whose statute mentions that evaluation systems are to be used as a plan of action for improvements” (Vier & Dagley, 2002, p. 9).

According to Linda Darling-Hammond from the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education, “Existing systems rarely help teachers improve or clearly distinguish

those who are succeeding from those who are struggling” (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012, p. i). The need to clearly and accurately differentiate between the current levels of performance of teachers was a commonly expressed purpose for teacher evaluation.

A comprehensive system should address these purposes in a coherent way and provide support for supervision and professional learning, identify teachers who need additional assistance and—in some cases—a change of career, and recognize expert teachers who can contribute to the learning of their peers” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012, p. i)

Teaching staff were more likely to participate in professional development if they understood what was expected regarding both their current level of performance and the established levels of expected performance. If the outcome of the teacher observation and evaluation process was clearly defined prior to engaging in the observation process, both the trained observer and the teacher were more clear on the desired end result.

Although efforts to move quickly in designing and implementing more effective teacher evaluation systems are laudable, it is important to acknowledge a crucial issue—that “measuring” teachers and “developing” teachers are different purposes with different implications. An evaluation system designed primarily for measurement will look quite different from a system designed primarily for development. (Marzano, 2012, p. 15).

According to Cohen and Goldhaber, there was a significant challenge associated with implementing an evaluation system that will accurately differentiate between levels of performance. Although “48 states require some formal observations” (Cohen & Goldhaber,

2016, p. 379), in states with high accountability observations, where stakes such as loss of compensation or even potential loss of employment were involved, there was still a lack of anticipated variation in scores. This was true even in states where changes to increase rigor and expectations regarding the evaluation of teachers had recently been implemented. Cohen and Goldhaber speculated that principals had a tendency to view observations as a formative process and based the feedback they delivered within the framework of what teachers needed to do in order to improve. If there was also a need to have accurate summative scoring of teaching staff, they explored the possibility of outside observers conducting observations to more accurately meet that need (Cohen & Goldhaber, 2016).

Based on the fundamental decisions that were made about the purpose of the observation process, there were variations in the implementation of evaluation practices. According to Kim Marshall, there was a distinct difference between an announced and unannounced observation. This was identified as an important variable because “Teachers are likely to put on an especially good lesson when they know they are being observed” (Marshall, 2016, p. 4).

There was also a distinction to be made if the evaluation documentation was designed to provide evaluative feedback throughout the year or if the documentation was intended only for use at the end of the school year as a method of providing summative feedback. Kim Marshall indicated measuring levels of performance in the middle of a school year was identified as a very difficult and likely incomplete process. For example, if teaching staff worked to prepare a single lesson that exemplified best practices and highlighted the implementation of priority initiatives in their school, a principal or other evaluator may falsely assume those practices were occurring on a regular basis (Marshall, 2016).

Direct classroom observation has been the most common method of gathering data during the teacher evaluation process. All of the teacher evaluation models referenced in the prior section were based on the principal, a supervisor, or another trained observer, gathering data in the classroom during an observation. It was essential that the primary purpose of the evaluation was clear to all involved so that expectations and the locally accepted evaluation model could be implemented with fidelity to have the desired impact to improve instruction. There has been evidence of formal teacher classroom observations dating back to at least the 1950s (Brophy & Good, 1984). Although this practice has been in place for over 60 years, there continues to be a lack of an agreed upon central purpose.

**Student achievement results as a means to evaluate teaching staff.** The use of student achievement results as a component of the overall evaluation of teaching staff has been described in a prior section of this review of related literature. Value-added measures (VAM) were described as the statistical isolation of variables in student achievement results that allowed for the effectiveness of a teacher to be identified and more accurately reported (Sanders & Horn, 1998). The MET Project promoted the use of VAM scores of teachers as part of a process to most accurately measure teacher effectiveness. Essentially, this process attempted to isolate all other variables so the overall effectiveness of a teacher can be quantified. There were challenges to this approach of evaluating teacher effectiveness that need to be further explained. First, the unstable nature of VAM scores are presented. Second, some of the fundamental challenges of evaluating teachers based on the proficiency and progress of their students are addressed.

**Unstable nature of VAM scores.** There have been notable challenges to the application of VAM scores to measure student growth related to the unstable nature of student

achievement measures. “Conventional value-added estimates of teacher quality are attempts to determine to what degree a teacher would theoretically contribute, on average, to the test score gains of any student in the accountability population (i.e., district or state)” (Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013, p. 349). It was more appropriate and accurate to measure growth within the context of students with the same or similar needs and characteristics than it is to more broadly apply measures of growth across all populations of students and teaching staff. For example, if an intervention teacher or a special education teacher compared student achievement results of their students with all other students in the school district, it is unlikely that teacher would compare favorably when considering the percentage of students that were able to achieve a score of proficient on a standardized assessment.

These challenges compounded when compiling VAM scores over a number of years and across larger populations of students. As the body of evidence and data grew over time, some trends came into view that cast doubt on the reliability of VAM scores. One of these concerning trends included variations in scores from year to year for teaching staff who would then be incorrectly characterized as achieving poor results with their students (Baker, Oluwole & Green, 2013). Also, scoring from classroom observations conducted by principals was not often correlated to the value added scores assigned to teachers. This discrepant data created confusion and was a challenging message for teachers. In many cases, the process of assigning VAM scores to teaching staff was considered confusing and sent teaching staff mixed messages about the effectiveness of their practices (Kane et al., 2014).

Preliminary analyses from the MET Project found that “[W]hen the between-section or between-year correlation in teacher valued-added is below .5, the implication is that more than half of the observed variation is due to transitory effects rather than stable differences

between teachers” (Baker et al., 2013, p. 12). This kind of statistical analysis of VAM scores reinforced the lack of clarity regarding the messages teachers were receiving related to their effectiveness.

While recommendations were made to include student achievement results in teacher evaluations, The Board of Testing and Assessment at the National Research Council cautioned:

The use of test data for teacher and educator evaluation require the same types of cautions that are stressed when test data are used to evaluate students: “Tests are one objective and efficient way to measure what people know and can do, and they can help make comparisons across large groups of people. However, test scores are not perfect measures: they should be considered with other sources of information when making important decisions about individuals. (Board on Testing and Assessment, 2009, p. 10)

This cautionary statement about the use of student achievement results to evaluate teaching staff raised additional questions about the application of these scores across different populations of students.

**Evaluating teachers based on the proficiency and progress of their students.** The use of student achievement scores as a component of the evaluation of teaching staff results in a number of challenges. Utilizing Value Added Measures to gauge teacher effectiveness commonly compared student achievement in a specific classroom of students to the performance of a larger overall group of students. This process created a level of doubt regarding the reliability of this method to evaluate teachers. “In other words, the metric itself should not be a measure of how effective teachers are at teaching all students on average but,

rather, how effective teachers are at teaching their own classroom composition of students” (Adams, 2013, p. 347). Even though questions remain about the validity and reliability of measures, the use of VAM to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching staff was implemented in some states.

Spurred by the Race-to-the-Top program championed by the Obama administration and changing political climate in favor of holding teachers accountable for the performance of their students, many states revamped their tenure laws and passed additional legislation designed to tie student performance to teacher evaluations.

(Baker et al., 2013, p. 3)

There were many inherent challenges and problematic ethical applications attached to the process of coupling the evaluation of teaching staff to the achievement of their students. A related challenge was the level of collaboration demonstrated by teaching staff. In a 2016 Network for Public Education survey, “Seventy-two percent of respondents reported that the use of standardized test scores in teacher evaluation had a negative impact of sharing instructional strategies” (2016, p. 4). The collegiality and collaboration between teaching staff that was essential for making improvements to instruction were negatively impacted by the perception that assisting a colleague to make improvements to their instructional practices may allow a colleague to be scored higher regarding their teacher evaluation. If a colleague scored better, the relative score of the teacher providing assistance may drop below a certain threshold and may ultimately result in a lower evaluation for the teacher that was assisting a colleague.

Another problematic issue resulted from the realization that the majority of teachers cannot be accurately assessed through the use of VAMs because they teach in subject areas

that are not tested with annual standardized tests or they teach in grade levels that have no prior test scores available (Prince et al., 2006). Additional concerns related to logistical challenges included that the results of many state assessments were not available until the summer, after teacher evaluation processes are completed, the majority of teaching staff (including primary grades, art, music, phy. ed., social studies...) did not have standardized achievement assessments in their area and many standardized achievement tests did not measure higher level thinking skills adequately (Darling-Hammond, 2015; McCaffery et al., 2011)

**Time constraints of principals and supervisors.** A final challenge to the implementation of teacher evaluation systems were the demands on the time of principals and supervisors. The demands on the time of school leaders, highlighted in a study conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics during the 2011-2012 school year, has been acknowledged by current leaders in the field of education as a challenge facing school leaders. Further information gathered by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals will also be presented.

According to a survey by the National Center for Education Statistics, “Principals reported spending an average of 59 hours a week on the job, with most of their time spent on internal administrative tasks” (Lavigne & Greller, 2016, p. 1). This report from principals of regular public schools highlighted that principals spend, on average, far more time than the normal full time employee on work related tasks and regularly work before and after school and on weekends.

This study also highlighted a further breakdown of the principal’s use of time with 31% of their time being devoted to internal administrative tasks including working with

personnel and human resource issues, required reports and school budgets. Principals reported that 27% of their time was spent on curriculum and teaching related tasks including curriculum support, classroom observations and mentoring teachers (Maxwell, 2014).

MET researchers have suggested several enhancements around classroom observations including “Using a good rubric for observations, observing teachers four times a year, having more than one observer evaluate each the teacher, and improving administrator training” (Marshall, 2012, p. 50). Filling out extensive information on rubrics after each observation created a documentation burden for principals that was both unreasonable and not sustainable. The traditional model of principals conducting observations of teaching staff is “Grounded in the assumptions of traditional bureaucracy: Supervisors must monitor and inspect subordinates’ work to assure it meets standards” (DuFour & Marzano, 2009, p. 62). According to Kim Marshall, “Four observations aren’t nearly enough to sample what students experience daily, especially given the fact that most official classroom visits are scheduled in advance” (Marshall, 2012, p. 50). Marshall went on to make a clear distinction between observations that are pre-arranged with the teacher and observations that are not arranged in advance. The latter were considered much more accurate and meaningful because “Day-by-day teaching practices are what drive student achievement. If administrators don’t see those practices, their evaluations are inaccurate, dishonest in terms of quality assurance, and not helpful for improving mediocre and ineffective teaching practices” (Marshall, 2012, p. 51).

These concerns and challenges have been also addressed by national principal organizations. A February 2013 survey conducted by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) found that principals reported a substantive teacher evaluation requires 11-15 hours

per teacher over the duration of the school year. Principals in smaller schools reported they manage 10-40 staff members on average and principals from larger schools reported they manage nearly 60 staff members. As a contrast, “In business, for example, the appropriate span of control is generally considered to be 1 supervisor to 7 employees” (Darling-Hammond et. al., 2012, p. 16).

The volume of time necessary to conduct substantive teacher evaluations created a challenge for principals to manage conflicting responsibilities and a “Principal’s time is too often strained by other requirements of the job to make room for substantive instructional coaching” (Maxwell, 2014, p. 1). These demands on the time of principals were reported to have an impact on the longevity of a principal in a leadership role. According to the Executive Director of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, this workload has contributed to an increase in turnover of young principals, “While the average principal stayed ten years or more in a school a decade ago, the average stay is now three years” (Sparks, 2016, p. 11).

The 2017 Tennessee Educator Survey, conducted in partnership with the Tennessee Education Research Alliance, was given to teachers and administrators. The survey differentiated respondents that identified themselves as school administrators and requested information related to the volume time they spend each week on the process of observing and providing observation feedback to teachers. During an average week, 34% of principals in Tennessee reported 3 hours or less per week conducting teacher observations, 39% reported they spent 3 to 5 hours, 22% reported they spend 5 to 10 hours and 5% reported they spent more than 10 hours per week conducting teacher observations. Providing observation feedback to teaching staff took slightly less time from the school administrator with 10%

reporting they spend 5 to 10 hours and 2% reporting they spend more than 10 hours (Tennessee Department of Education, 2017, p. 5).

These time constraints, and their implications, had an impact on the capacity of the school principal or other supervisor to successfully attend to the evaluation of teachers and other certified staff. The New Teacher Project (2011) recommended that teacher evaluation paperwork be “Put on a diet” in order to remove some of the burden from principals. The turnover of principals has created additional need for training and support to grow the skills and capacity of principals as they move into a leadership role and become familiar with their responsibilities (Maxwell, 2014). Further, as principals transition into their roles, “Because administrators have existing relationships with the people they are observing and also multiple, competing demands on their time, they may make different strategic decisions about rating teachers that result in less accurate scores” (Cohen & Goldhaber, 2016, p. 383).

This section, common challenges to the effective implementation of teacher evaluation frameworks, highlighted the lack of clarity regarding the essential purpose of teacher evaluations. Second, this section discussed the use of student achievement data, including the use of value added measures, as a means to evaluate teaching staff. Finally, this section explored challenging barriers to the effective implementation of teacher evaluation practices and the time constraints of the principal.

## **Summary**

This review of the related literature focused on three themes of the evaluation of teaching staff in the United States. First, a brief history of teacher evaluation that included key legislation and studies was provided. Second, common teacher evaluation models and some of their prevalent characteristics were spotlighted, and, finally, some of the challenges to the

effective implementation of teacher evaluation practices were presented. Policy makers and recent studies have provided greater direction and clarity regarding teacher evaluation and the movement to increase accountability in education has significantly impacted all three of these areas.

### **Chapter III: Methodology**

#### **Introduction**

One of the challenges identified in the review of the literature was a lack of available research data on the time required by principals to provide accurate, meaningful and relevant evaluative feedback to teachers. Although there was a general acknowledgement of the role of the principal in teacher evaluations and the other duties and responsibilities of the principal in schools, there appeared to be a scarcity of specific data reported about the actual time principals devoted to the evaluation of teaching staff.

An additional challenge in the state of Minnesota was the autonomy provided to school districts to select a teacher evaluation model for use in evaluating their teaching staffs. Multiple teacher evaluation models were in use by Minnesota school districts at the time of the study. The study sought to determine which teacher evaluation models were used in the select Minnesota school districts.

An additional focus of the study was an examination of the perceptions of select Minnesota secondary school principals regarding the time they committed to conducting and completing evaluations of teachers, including the documentation they employed in teacher evaluation. The study also examined the perceptions of select Minnesota secondary school principals regarding the extent to which the teacher evaluation models used in their school districts improved teacher performance.

The study also gathered data related to the teacher evaluation frameworks that were utilized when evaluating teaching staffs in select Minnesota school districts. The study intended to identify the frequency of the use of teacher evaluation models in Minnesota school districts, the time invested by secondary school principals in conducting teacher

evaluations and the number of hours secondary school principals devoted to the process of evaluating their teaching staff members as a function of the principals' years of experience and as a function of the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school district.

Chapter three presented the research questions and a hypothesis statement, the research design, instrumentation, the study respondents, data collection and data analysis procedures, timeline of the study, the institutional review board process and limitations of the study.

### **Research Questions**

1. What teacher evaluation model did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they utilized when evaluating their teachers?
2. How many hours did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they committed to the process of evaluating their teachers during an average week?
3. To what extent did select MN Secondary School Principals report the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance?
4. What was the relationship between the teacher evaluation model utilized in a school district and the hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal?
5. How did the time that select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function of their years of experience?

## **Hypothesis**

Based on the researcher's eighteen years of education administration experience in the field, the following predictions were posed related to the research questions. Research question one sought to determine the teacher evaluation model that was adopted by the respondent school district. It was predicted the Charlotte Danielson framework was the most commonly adopted framework in Minnesota and the Robert Marzano model employed as the second most commonly used model. The remaining frameworks, including the Stronge model, the state of Minnesota model and district-created models, were predicted as the least commonly chosen teacher evaluation methods. Research question two gathered information on the total number of hours principals devoted to the process of evaluating teachers during an average five day week. It was predicted the respondents would report a range of responses between four and ten hours per week.

The hypotheses for research questions three, four and five had the potential of creating more impactful findings. Research question three measured principals' perceptions of the level to which the teacher evaluation framework utilized in their school district resulted in improved teacher performance. The district's and school's implementation of the teacher evaluation model was an uncontrolled variable in the research question, though it was believed, trends could emerge specific to a particular teacher evaluation framework.

It was believed that examining the relationships between the questions could result in findings which would yield implications for principal practice and create opportunities for further study. It was predicted that a statistically significant difference would be detected when the number of hours invested by principals in the evaluation process was cross referenced with the teacher evaluation framework selected by the school district.

Regarding research question five, it was predicted there would be a relationship between the number of hours invested by respondents in the evaluation process and the number of years of experience of the principal. It was predicted a more experienced principal would report they committed more hours to the process of evaluating their teachers and other certified staff than less experienced principals. The hypothesis was based on the premise that a more experienced principal would have greater skill in the complex task of evaluating staff members and, therefore, have more strategies to share and a greater capacity for providing feedback. It was also more likely that a more experienced principal would have a greater role in the responsibilities related to the implementation of the evaluation process in their school.

### **Research Design**

The research design implemented in the study employed quantitative methodology. The study utilized a survey created by this researcher and prepared for distribution through Survey Monkey with the technical support provided by the Statistical Consulting and Research Center at St. Cloud State University. The survey may be found in Appendix A of this document.

The study asked respondent secondary school principals to report the number of hours they committed to the evaluation of teachers in their schools. Further, the study gathered data from principals on the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts. The target population for this survey was sufficiently large to conduct a quantitative survey.

A Chi-square test of independence was used to test the independence of two categorical variables. The Chi-square test was used to provide comparative data related to the selected teacher evaluation model, the level of experience of the principal, the volume of time

principals dedicated to the teacher evaluation process and the volume of time required to complete the teacher evaluation process for an individual teacher.

Respondents' survey data were compiled to examine the relationship between the volume of time principals reported they devoted to teacher evaluation and the teacher evaluation model in each school district. Respondents' survey data were also compiled to examine the relationship between the volume of time principals devoted to teacher evaluation and the years of experience of these principals.

### **Instrumentation**

With the assistance of the Center for Statistical Consulting and Research at St. Cloud State University, a survey was created using questions designed to gather information from select secondary school principals. The survey gathered data related to the research questions and was designed to specifically differentiate between the time principals reported they committed to teacher evaluation in their school districts and the teacher evaluation models in place at their schools.

The survey consisted of 13 questions: five demographic questions, three teacher evaluation model questions, four questions about time devoted to teacher evaluation and one likert scale question related to the impact of teacher evaluation practices.

This survey was piloted with select members of a cohort of doctoral students at St. Cloud State University. The pilot administration assisted the researcher in establishing the validity and reliability of the survey. There were four categories of information gathered by the survey: demographic, teacher evaluation model, time committed to teacher evaluation and the impact of teacher evaluation practices.

A Likert-type scale was used to gather perceptions related to the extent to which select Minnesota secondary school principals reported the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance. A Chi-square goodness of fit test was applied to further analyze the research questions based on the survey data.

The survey is included in Appendix A. The survey included demographic questions about the MASSP division the respondent represented, the number of years served as a principal and a question confirming the respondent was actively involved in the process of evaluating teaching staff. The MASSP division the respondent represented was considered valuable to MASSP as it provided data specific to a region of the state.

The teacher evaluation model question employed a multiple choice format to determine the teacher evaluation framework utilized by the respondent's school district. Another question employed a "yes" or "no" format regarding the use of an online tracking tool, such as iObservation, for recording or tracking teacher evaluations. It was believed the use of this type of online tracking tool may have had an impact on the amount of time principals reported they devoted to the teacher evaluation process. Another survey question was included to gather information about the components of the full teacher evaluation process used in the respondent's school district. The specific components of teacher evaluation practices in a school was believed to have an impact on the amount of time principals reported they dedicated to teacher evaluation.

Survey questions related to the amount of time principal respondents committed to teacher evaluation were multiple-choice in format and gathered data on the length of time required by principals to complete a single observation and the number of observations

principals complete over the course of a school year for each teacher, and the total observations principals completed for all of the teachers on their staffs.

Principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher evaluation practices were gathered through a Likert scale. The scale was intended to measure the extent to which principals agreed or disagreed with such statements as, "Overall, I do not spend enough time on the process of evaluating my teaching staff" and "The teacher evaluation model utilized in my school district results in improved teacher performance." These questions were posed in the negative and the affirmative to increase reliability of the responses.

### **Participants**

The study survey was distributed to Minnesota secondary school principals who were members of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP). Only lead principals of middle schools and high schools were asked to participate in the study. During the 2016 - 2017 school year, 600 principals, approximately 95% of all Minnesota secondary school principals, were members of MASSP. This organization consisted of principals from Minnesota schools with grade configurations including 5-8, 7-12 and 9-12. Although there were additional grade level configurations of secondary schools in the state, the three mentioned grade level bands represented the most common grade level configurations found in Minnesota secondary schools.

### **Human Subject Approval—Institutional Review Board**

The researcher completed all of the prerequisite training through and received approval to conduct the study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at St. Cloud State University. All participants in the study were volunteers and received permission to decline to participate in the study or to discontinue the completion of the survey at any time. Many of

the survey questions included “I prefer not to answer” as a possible response, thus, a participant could choose to not answer a specific survey question and, yet, continue to respond to the remaining questions. The survey data were collected without identification of respondents and the survey data would be destroyed at the completion of the study.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

David Adney, the executive director of MASSP, agreed to partner with the researcher in the gathering of study data. Permission was granted to elicit study data and to distribute the study survey to secondary school principals who were members of MASSP at the time of the study. The initial message was sent to the 600 lead secondary school principals on September 19, 2017 and 77 surveys were completed within one week. A reminder message was transmitted on September 27, 2017 and an additional 42 responses were received; resulting in a total of 119 responses to the survey. The total response rate for the survey was 19.8%. Survey Monkey was utilized as the repository of survey responses.

### **Data Analysis**

Data were analyzed using the analytical tools and capacity available in Survey Monkey and uploaded into the Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS). In addition, the Center for Statistical Consulting and Research of St. Cloud State University was consulted for additional support and guidance regarding the analysis of data collected in the study.

Data tables containing information from the survey respondents are included in chapter four. The data tables include the number and percentage of respondents who selected each possible answer on the survey. Responses were further analyzed using t tests and cross tabulations were presented to demonstrate the relationship between the questions posed on the survey. Results of chi-square tests are reported and analyzed in chapter four.

## **Procedures and Timeline**

Initial contact with MASSP regarding the study was made in April of 2017. This initial contact was favorable, and the proposed date to distribute the survey to Minnesota secondary principals was established for the second half of September of 2017. The date was selected based on the timing of the school year and the probability of securing a higher response rate at a time when secondary school principals were less likely to be overburdened with multiple task demands. The data was then processed and further analyzed in the fall and winter of 2017 and the study was completed in March of 2018.

## **Summary**

The purpose of the study was to gather data regarding the number of hours select secondary school principals in the state of Minnesota devoted to the evaluation of their teachers. The study gathered information regarding the teacher evaluation model utilized in the select Minnesota school districts. Data gathered were used to examine the relationship between the number of hours select Minnesota secondary school principals reported they committed to evaluating their teachers and the teacher evaluation models used by their school districts. Finally, the relationship was examined between the number of hours principals devoted to the process of evaluating their teaching staff members and the number of their years of experience as a principal.

Chapter III described the study methodology. In addition, several areas were further defined including the presentation of a hypothesis, research design, instrumentation, the IRB review process, proposed study respondents, data collection procedures and the proposed data analysis processes. Chapter IV presents the data gathered and analyzed from the survey that was distributed to select Minnesota secondary school principals.

## **Chapter IV: Results**

### **Introduction**

Data gathered for the study are presented and organized by research question. Tables of data are presented when appropriate based on the study questions and a brief description of the data precedes each table.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to gather information from select Minnesota secondary school principals related to the number of hours they committed to the evaluation of their teaching staffs during an average week, the model used for their evaluations, and their perceptions of the extent to which the teacher evaluation models in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance. The study also examined the relationship between hours spent in teacher evaluation each week and the model used by the principal, and the relationship between the principals' years of experience and the hours devoted to evaluating their teaching staffs.

### **Research Questions**

1. What teacher evaluation model did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they utilized when evaluating their teachers?
2. How many hours did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they committed to the process of evaluating their teachers during an average week?
3. To what extent did select Minnesota secondary school principals report the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance?

4. What was the relationship between the teacher evaluation model utilized in a school district and the hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal?
5. How did the time that select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function of their years of experience?

## Research Findings

**Research question 1.** *What teacher evaluation model did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they utilized when evaluating their teachers?*

Over 80% of schools reported they used either the Charlotte Danielson model or the Robert Marzano model for evaluation of their teachers. The Charlotte Danielson based model was the most widely implemented model as 72 principals or 60.5% indicated this model was used in their school districts. The Robert Marzano based model was the next most common evaluation model with 24 principals or 20.2% reporting they utilized this model in their schools. Twelve principals or 10.1% reported their school districts created their own model and 10 principals or 8.4% reported they utilized the Kim Marshall teacher evaluation model. The total n for this survey question was 119. The results are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

*The Instructional Framework That Best Describes the Teacher Evaluation Model used In Minnesota School Districts*

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Number of Respondents
Charlotte Danielson Based Model	60.5	72
Robert Marzano Based Model	20.2	24
District Created Own Model	10.1	12
Kim Marshall Teacher Evaluation Model	8.4	10
State of Minnesota Model	0.8	1
Collaborative or Consortium Model	0.0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>

**Research question 2.** *How many hours did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they committed to the process of evaluating their teachers during an average week?*

During an average 5-day week, principals were asked to report the number of hours they dedicated to the process of evaluating their teaching staffs. The most common response reported was between 2-4 hours per week as cited by 44 or 37.0% of principals. The total n for this survey question was 119. The results are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

*During an Average 5-day Week, Number of Hours Principals Spend in Total on the Process of Evaluating Teaching Staff*

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Number of Respondents
2-4 Hours	37.0	44
4-6 Hours	25.2	30
0-2 Hours	11.8	14
6-8 Hours	8.4	10
8-10 Hours	8.4	10
More than 10 Hours	8.4	10
I prefer not to answer	0.8	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>

Principals reported the number of hours they devoted to completing a full observation of an individual teacher. The most common response to the survey question from 45 respondents, or 37.8%, was 3 hours, while the next most common response was 2 hours by 34 respondents or 28.6%. Sixteen principals or 13.4% reported it required 4 hours to complete a full observation of an individual teacher while nine principals or 7.6% reported 1 hour to complete a full observation of an individual teacher; eight principals or 6.7% reported it took 5 hours and seven, 5.9%, reported it took 6 hours. The total n for this survey question was 119. The results are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

*Number of Hours to Complete a Full Observation for an Individual Teacher*

<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
3 Hours	37.8	45
2 Hours	28.7	34
4 Hours	13.4	16
1 Hour	7.6	9
5 Hours	6.7	8
6 Hours	5.9	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>

Principals reported the number of full teacher observations they completed for each teacher they evaluated during the school year. Fifty-nine principals or 50.4% reported they completed three full observations for each teacher they evaluated. Thirty-five principals or 29.9% reported they completed one full observation. Of the remaining principals, 14 respondents or 12.0% reported they completed five or more full observations; four principals or 3.4% reported they completed two full observations, three principals or 2.6% reported they complete four full observations. The total n for this survey question was 117. The results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

*Number of Full Teacher Observations Principals Complete for Each Teacher They are Evaluating during the School Year*

<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
3 Observations	50.4	59
1 Observation	29.9	35
5 or more Observations	12.0	14
2 Observations	3.4	4
4 Observations	2.6	3
I prefer not to answer	1.7	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>117</b>

Principals were asked to report the total number of teacher observations they were responsible for completing in a school year. Their responses varied widely. The most common

response from principals was “More than 40 Observations” selected by 32 principals or 27.3%. Subsequently, 17 principals or 14.5% of respondents stated they completed 16-20 observations each year and 16 respondents or 13.7% reported they totaled 26-30 observations each year. Sixteen or more observations were completed each year by 79 or 67.5% of respondents. There was a wide variation in the remaining responses reported in the corresponding table. The total n for this survey question was 117. The results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

*Number of Teacher Observations Principals Complete during the School Year*

<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
More than 40 Observations	27.3	32
16-20 Observations	14.5	17
26-30 Observations	13.7	16
31-35 Observations	12.0	14
6-10 Observations	8.5	10
21-25 Observations	8.5	10
10-15 Observations	7.7	9
35-40 Observations	7.7	9
0-5 Observations	0.0	0
I prefer not to answer	0.0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>117</b>

The components included in each school district’s full teacher observation process varied based on the teacher evaluation model employed or local decisions made regarding teacher evaluation practices and, thus, had an impact on the amount of time principals devoted to teacher evaluations. A classroom teacher observation conducted in person was a component included in a full teacher observation process by 118 or 99.2% of principals. By contrast, 27 principals or 22.7% reported they reviewed recorded classroom instruction as a component included in a full teacher evaluation. A pre-observation process was included in the full

teacher observation process for 106 principals, or 89.1%. A post-observation process was reported by 117 principals, or 98.3%, while the actual scoring of teaching staff was reported as a component of a full teacher observation process by 87 or 73.1% of principals. Ninety-eight principals or 82.3% reported walkthrough observations were included in their full teacher observation process. The total n for this survey question was 119. The results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

*Components Included in a Full Teacher Observation Process (Check all that apply)*

<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b># of Responses</b>
Conduct classroom observation in person	99.2	118
Post-observation process (may include receiving additional post-conference reflection documentation or conducting a post-observation conference)	98.3	117
Providing verbal feedback to staff regarding their score including areas of strength and areas for future growth	93.3	111
Providing written feedback to staff regarding their score including areas of strength and areas for future growth	91.1	109
Pre-observation process (may include reviewing planning documentation or conducting a pre-observation conference)	89.1	106
Walk-through observations	82.3	98
Scoring staff members based on the observation	73.1	87
Review recorded classroom instruction as an observation	22.7	27
I prefer not to answer	0.0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>

The number of assistant principals or other staff members who completed evaluative observations in the same school as the principal and worked under the supervision of the principal may have had a direct impact on the number of hours the principals were required to devote to teacher evaluation, and responses varied from 0 to 5 or more. Among respondents, 66 principals or 55.5% indicated they did not have assistant principals or other staff members who completed evaluative observations working under their supervision. The total n for this survey question was 119. The results are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

*Number of Assistant Principals or Other Staff That Complete Evaluative Observations and Work under the Principal's Supervision*

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Number of Respondents
0	55.5	66
1	23.5	28
2	14.3	17
3	2.5	3
4	2.5	3
5 or more	1.7	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>

**Research question 3.** *To what extent did select Minnesota secondary school principals report the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance?*

A Likert scale was used to gather perceptions from principals about their levels of agreement with the statement, “The teacher evaluation model utilized in my school district results in improved teacher performance.” Table data revealed that 49 principals or 42.2% agreed with the statement. There were 93 principals or 80.1% who “somewhat agree”, “agree” and “strongly agree” with the statement. The weighted average response was 4.2, nearest to

the response “Somewhat Agree”. The total n for this survey question was 116. The results are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

*Level of Agreement with the Statement, “The Teacher Evaluation Model Utilized in My School District Results in Improved Teacher Performance.”*

<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
1. Strongly Disagree	2.6	3
2. Disagree	6.9	8
3. Somewhat Disagree	9.5	11
4. Somewhat Agree	33.6	39
5. Agree	42.2	49
6. Strongly Agree	4.3	5
7. I prefer not to answer	0.9	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>116</b>
<b>Weighted Average Response</b>	<b>4.2</b>	

The final survey question gathered principals’ level of agreement with the statement, “The teacher evaluation model utilized in my school district does not result in improved teacher performance.” Table data established that 43 principals or 37.1% disagreed with the statement while 30 principals or 27.9% somewhat disagreed with the statement. Those principals who expressed any form of disagreement with the statement totaled 84 or 72.4% of all respondents. The weighted average response to this question was 2.9. The total n for this survey question was 116. The results are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

*Level of Agreement with the Statement, “The Teacher Evaluation Model Utilized in My School District does not Result in Improved Teacher Performance.”*

<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
1. Strongly Disagree	9.5	11
2. Disagree	37.1	43
3. Somewhat Disagree	25.8	30
4. Somewhat Agree	14.7	17
5. Agree	9.5	11
6. Strongly Agree	1.7	2
I prefer not to answer	1.7	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>116</b>
<b>Weighted Average Response</b>	<b>2.9</b>	

**Research question 4.** *What was the relationship between the teacher evaluation model utilized in a school district and the hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal?*

Table 10 examines a cross-tabulation of the data gathered from two survey questions to determine if there were differences found in the teacher evaluation models utilized in participating school districts and the volume of time principals reported they spent on the teacher evaluation process. These data were gathered through a cross tabulation of survey responses to question 6, “What instructional framework best describes the teacher evaluation framework that is utilized in your school?” and survey question 9, “During an average 5-day week, how many hours do you spend in total on the process of evaluating teaching staff?” These data were examined to answer the research question, “What is the relationship between the teacher evaluation framework utilized in a school district and the number of hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal.” The cross tabulation of the number of hours invested in teacher evaluation during an average 5-day week with the teacher evaluation model utilized in the school district differentiated trends based on these

two variables. There were differences in the reported time committed to teacher evaluation based on the teacher evaluation model used. Respondents who utilized the Robert Marzano based model reported spending more time on teacher evaluation than respondents employing the other teacher evaluation models. The mode response for principals using the Robert Marzano model was “6+ Hours” with nine principals or 37.5% of those using this model, while the mode for principals using the Charlotte Danielson model was “2-4 Hours” with 30 principals or 42.3% using this model.

Responses of “6-8 Hours”, “8-10 Hours” and “More than 10 Hours” were reported in the table as “More than 6 Hours.” There was only one respondent who indicated use of the State of Minnesota Model. That response was not reported in this table. The total n for this cross tabulation was 117. The results are reported in table 10.

Table 10

*Hours Spent by Principals on Teacher Evaluation during an Average 5-day Week  
Differentiated by Teacher Evaluation Model*

			Hours spent during average 5-day week				
			<b>0-2 Hours</b>	<b>2-4 Hours</b>	<b>4-6 Hours</b>	<b>6+ Hours</b>	<b>Total</b>
		Count = Number of respondents in this category	7	30	18	16	71
Teacher Evaluation Framework	<b>Charlotte Danielson</b>	Percent within subset	9.9%	42.3%	25.4%	22.5%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	6.0%	25.6%	15.4%	13.7%	60.7%
		Count	3	6	6	9	24
	<b>Robert Marzano</b>	Percent within subset	12.5%	25.0%	25.0%	37.5%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	2.6%	5.1%	5.1%	7.7%	20.5%
		Count	0	3	5	2	10
	<b>Kim Marshall</b>	Percent within subset	0.0%	30.0%	50.0%	20.0%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	0.0%	2.6%	4.3%	1.7%	8.5%
		Count	4	5	1	2	12
	<b>District Created</b>	Percent within subset	33.0%	41.7%	8.3%	16.7%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	3.4%	4.3%	0.9%	1.7%	10.3%
		Count	14	44	30	29	117
	<b>Total</b>	Percent of overall responses	12.0%	37.6%	25.6%	24.8	100%

Table 11 presents a cross tabulation of the data gathered from two survey questions to determine if there were differences between teacher evaluation models employed in school districts and the volume of time principals reported they spent completing a full observation for a teacher. This information was gathered through a cross tabulation of Question 6, “What instructional framework best describes the teacher evaluation framework that is utilized in your school?” and Question 10, “How many hours does it take to complete a full observation for an individual teacher?” These data were examined to answer the research question “What is the relationship between the teacher evaluation framework utilized in a school district and the number of hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal?” The cross-tabulation of the number of hours invested in completing a full observation of a teacher with the teacher evaluation model utilized in the school district differentiated trends based on these two variables. There were differences found based on the teacher evaluation model used. Table data reveals that four respondents or 40.0% who used the Kim Marshall based model reported spending 5-6+ hours to complete a single observation of a teacher. Principals who used other teacher evaluation models and reported spending 5-6+ hours to complete a full observation of a teacher were as follows: Charlotte Danielson 8.3% (n = 6), Robert Marzano 8.3% (n = 2) and district created 16.7% (n = 2).

Responses for completing a full observation in “1 Hour” and “2 Hours” were also combined and will be reported out together and responses of “5 Hours” and “6 or more Hours” have been combined and reported out together. There was one respondent who indicated use of the State of Minnesota Model. That response was not reported in the table. The total n for this cross tabulation was 118. The results are reported in table 11.

Table 11

*Hours Spent by Principals to Complete a Single Observation of a Teacher Differentiated by Teacher Evaluation Model*

			Hours to complete a full observation				
			<b>0-2 Hours</b>	<b>3 Hours</b>	<b>4 Hours</b>	<b>5-6+ Hours</b>	<b>Total</b>
		Count = Number of respondents in this category	24	34	8	6	72
Teacher Evaluation Framework	<b>Charlotte Danielson</b>	Percent within subset	33.3%	47.2%	11.1%	8.3%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	20.3%	28.8%	6.8%	5.1%	61%
		Count	9	8	5	2	24
	<b>Robert Marzano</b>	Percent within subset	37.5%	33.3%	20.8%	8.3%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	7.6%	6.8%	4.2%	1.7%	20.3%
		Count	4	0	2	4	10
	<b>Kim Marshall</b>	Percent within subset	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	3.4%	0.0%	1.7%	3.4%	8.5%
		Count	6	3	1	2	12
	<b>District Created</b>	Percent within subset	50.0%	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	5.1%	2.5%	0.8%	1.7%	10.2%
		Count	43	45	16	14	118
	<b>Total</b>	Percent of overall responses	12.0%	37.6%	25.6%	24.8%	100%

**Research question 5.** *How did the time select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function of their years of experience?*

The levels of experience of the survey respondents varied and were reported in the following categories: This is my first year; 2-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-15 years, and more than 15 years. Four principals or 3.4% reported this was their first year as a principal. Thirty-seven principals or 31.1% reported they have served 2-5 years as a principal. Twenty-eight principals or 23.5% reported they have been employed 6-10 years while 20 or 16.8% reported they have served 11-15 years as a principal. Thirty principals or 25.2% reported they have served as a principal for more than 15 years. The total n for this survey question was 119. The results are reported in Table 12.

Table 12

*Years of Service as a Principal*

<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
2-5 years	31.1	37
More than 15 years	25.2	30
6-10 years	23.5	28
11-15 years	16.8	20
This is my first year	3.4	4
I prefer not to answer	0.0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>119</b>

Table 13 reports a cross tabulation of data from Question 3, “How many years have you served as a principal?” and Question 9, “During an average 5-day week, how many hours do you spend in total on the process of evaluating teaching staff?” These data were examined to answer the research question, “How did the time that select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function as their years of

experience?” In general, as the years of experience of the principal respondents increased, so did the number of hours they demoted to the process of evaluating their teaching staff.

The mode response for principals in their first year of service was “0-2 hours” with 50% citing this response ( $n = 2$ ). The mode for a principals with 2-5 years of experience was “2-4 hours” with 44.4% ( $n = 16$ ) citing this response. The mode for principals with 6-10 years of experience was “More than 6 hours” with 32.1% ( $n = 9$ ) so responding. The most common response for principals with 11-15 years of experience was “2-4 hours” with 45.0% ( $n = 9$ ) so responding; while the mode for principals with more than 15 years of experience was “2-4 hours” with 40.0% ( $n = 12$ ) citing this response.

Responses of “6-8 Hours”, “8-10 Hours” and “More than 10 Hours” are reported in a collapsed category as “More than 6 Hours.” One respondent indicated “I prefer not to answer.” His/her response was not included in the table. The total  $n$  for this cross tabulation was 118. The results are reported in Table 13.

Table 13

*Cross Tabulation of Question 3, “How Many Years Have You served as a Principal?” and Question 9, “During an Average 5-day Week, How Many Hours Do You Spend in Total on the Process of Evaluating Teaching Staff?”*

			Hours spent during average 5 day week				
			0-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	4-6 Hours	More than 6 Hours	Total
		Count = Number of respondents in this category	2	1	1	0	4
Years as principal	<b>This is my first year</b>	Percent within subset	50%	25%	25%	0%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	1.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0%	3.4%
		Count	2	16	12	6	36
	<b>2-5 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	15.6%	44.4%	33.3%	16.7%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	1.7%	13.6%	10.2%	5.1%	30.5%
		Count	5	6	8	9	28
	<b>6-10 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	17.9%	21.4%	28.96%	32.1%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	4.2%	5.1%	6.8%	7.6%	23.7%
		Count	1	9	3	7	20
	<b>11-15 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	5%	45%	15%	35%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	0.8%	7.6%	2.5%	5.9%	16.9%
		Count	4	12	6	8	30
	<b>More than 15 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	13.3%	40%	20%	26.7%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	3.4%	10.2%	5.1%	6.8%	25.4%
		Count	14	44	30	30	118
	<b>Total</b>	Percent of overall responses	11.9%	37.3%	25.4%	25.4	100%

Table 14 examines the data gathered from a cross tabulation of Question 3, “How many years have you served as a principal?” and Question 10, “How many hours does it take to complete a full observation for an individual teacher?” These data were examined to further answer the research question, “How did the time that select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function as their years of experience?”. The cross tabulation of the number of hours respondents devoted to completing a teacher observation with the years of experience of the respondents differentiated trends based on these two variables. The number of hours principals reported they committed to a single teacher observation were similar across years of experience with 36.1% ( $n = 43$ ) reporting “1-2 hours” and 37.8% ( $n = 45$ ) reporting “3 hours”.

Responses of “1 Hour” and “2 Hours” were combined in reporting table data and reported out as “1-2 Hours”. Similarly, responses of “5 Hours” and “6 Hours” were combined and reported out in the table as “5-6+ Hours.” The total  $n$  for this cross tabulation was 119. The results are reported in Table 14.

Table 14

*Cross Tabulation of Question 3, “How Many Years Have You served as a Principal?” and Question 10, “How Many Hours does it take to Complete a Full Observation for an Individual Teacher?”*

			Hours to complete a full observation				
			1-2 Hours	3 Hours	4 Hours	5-6+ Hours	Total
		Count = Number of respondents in this category	2	2	0	0	4
Years as principal	<b>This is my first year</b>	Percent within subset	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	1.7%	1.7%	0%	0%	3.4%
		Count	9	16	4	8	37
	<b>2-5 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	24.3%	43.2%	10.8%	21.6%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	7.6%	13.4%	3.4%	6.7%	31.1%
		Count	13	11	3	1	28
	<b>6-10 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	46.4%	39.3%	10.7%	3.6%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	10.9%	9.2%	2.5%	0.8%	23.5%
		Count	8	5	4	3	20
	<b>11-15 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	40%	25%	20%	15%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	6.7%	4.2%	3.4%	2.5%	16.8%
		Count	11	11	5	3	30
	<b>More than 15 years as principal</b>	Percent within subset	36.7%	36.7%	16.7%	10%	100%
		Percent of overall responses	9.2%	9.2%	4.2%	2.5%	25.2%
		Count	43	45	16	15	119
	<b>Total</b>	Percent of overall responses	36.1%	37.8%	13.4%	12.6%	100%

## Summary

Chapter IV reported the results of the survey completed by 119 principals from all regions of the state of Minnesota. The tables contained in chapter 4 provided responses from 19.8% of lead Minnesota middle school and high school principals who were members of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals at the time of the study. The survey was distributed to 600 secondary school principals and 119 of those principals completed the survey.

The Charlotte Danielson based teacher evaluation model was the most prevalent model employed by the survey respondents with 60.5% reporting the model was used as the teacher evaluation framework in their schools. The Robert Marzano based teacher evaluation model was the next most prevalent system used with 20.2% of principals citing the use of this model for teacher evaluation in their schools. Principals devoted varying amounts of time to teacher evaluation during an average week, but “2-4 hours” per week was the most common survey response among responding principals using the Charlotte Danielson model, and “6+ Hours” per week was the most common response reported by principals using the Robert Marzano model. Greater than 80% of principals answered “somewhat agree”, “agree” or “strongly agree” when asked if they believed the teacher evaluation models in place in their schools resulted in improved teacher performance. Principals reported the Robert Marzano model required the most principal time to implement, and more experienced principals committed more time to teacher evaluation than less experienced principals.

In Chapter V, the results of the survey are analyzed along with a discussion of each research question, limitations of the study, recommendations for practice, and recommendations for further research.

## **Chapter V: Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to gather information from select Minnesota secondary school principals related to the number of hours they committed to the evaluation of their teaching staff during an average week, the model used for their evaluations, and their perceptions on the extent to which the teacher evaluation models in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance. The study also examined the relationship between hours spent in teacher evaluation each week and the model used by the principal and the relationship between the years of experience of principals and the hours spent evaluating their teaching staff.

There are five research questions in the study. Each of the five questions are addressed in the chapter including an overview and interpretation of the results with possible causes and implications. The chapter also includes limitations of the study, recommendations for further research and recommendations for practice in the field of education.

### **Research Questions and Conclusions**

**Research question 1.** *What teacher evaluation frameworks did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they utilized when evaluating their teachers?*

Principals in select Minnesota secondary schools identified the teacher evaluation frameworks they implemented in their teacher evaluation process. There was a lack of current data found regarding the teacher evaluation frameworks utilized by school districts across the state of Minnesota and, therefore, the data collected in this survey were not compared to any prior available data regarding the prevalence of teacher evaluation frameworks.

The Charlotte Danielson based model was the most widely implemented model as 72 principals, representing 60.5% of the respondents, indicated this framework was utilized in their schools. The Charlotte Danielson model originated in 1996 with the publication of Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. The model was revised in 2007, 2011, and 2013, although the survey question did not specify the publication date of the model principals reported using.

The Robert Marzano based model was the next most common evaluation framework with 24 principals, representing 20.2% of the respondents, reporting they used this model in their schools. The Robert Marzano model was released in 2010 and is formally referred to as the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model. In 2017, Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model was released. It emphasizes "23 essential behaviors to measure teacher effectiveness within four areas of expertise" (Carbaugh, Marzano, & Toth, 2017, p. 3). The survey question did not request information from respondents regarding the publication date of the teacher evaluation model they employed with their teaching staff members.

Learning Sciences International, with a regional office located in Sartell, Minnesota, was the parent company that promoted and sold materials and provided professional development related to the implementation of the Robert Marzano teacher evaluation framework. The proximity of this regional training facility to many school districts in Central Minnesota and the March 2017 release of an updated model, the Robert Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model, may have been precipitating factors in Minnesota school districts choosing to utilize this teacher evaluation framework.

Twelve principals reported their school districts created their own teacher evaluation model and those principals represented 10.1% of the respondents. Districts that created their

own teacher evaluation models may have incorporated parts of existing models or they may have created their own unique teacher evaluation models.

Ten principals, representing 8.4% of the respondents, reported they implemented the Kim Marshall teacher evaluation model. Kim Marshall referred to his Teacher Evaluation Rubric, most recently updated in 2011, as “open source.” He did not charge a fee for its use and encouraged schools and school districts to make modifications to the model to meet their needs.

Only one principal, representing .8% of the respondents, identified the State of Minnesota model as the teacher evaluation framework utilized in his/her school district. In the state of Minnesota, legislation was passed that required all teaching staffs to be evaluated beginning in the 2014-2015 school year. School districts were presented with the opportunity to create their own models, to adopt an existing model or to use the State Model.

**Research question 2.** *How many hours did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they committed to the process of evaluating their teachers during an average week?*

The most common response to this survey question was 2-4 hours with 44 principals or 37.0% of the respondents providing this answer.

Responses appeared to support the existing research studies. The number of hours principals reported they dedicated to the process of evaluating teaching staff members in Minnesota was comparable to the 2013 survey data from the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the 2017 Tennessee Educator Survey. During an average week, 34% of principals in Tennessee reported devoting 3 hours or less each week to conducting teacher

observations; 39% reported they spent 3 to 5 hours each week, 22% reported they committed 5 to 10 hours each week and 5% reported they spent more than 10 hours each week to conducting teacher observations.

Providing observation feedback to teaching staff members required slightly less time from school administrators with 10% reporting they spent 5 to 10 hours while 2% reported they spent more than 10 hours (Tennessee Department of Education, 2017, p. 5). In a February 2013 survey conducted by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) principals reported a substantive teacher evaluation requires 11-15 hours per teacher over the duration of the school year.

**Research question 3.** *To what extent did select Minnesota secondary school principals report the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance?*

Principals' perceptions related to the extent to which the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance revealed that a large majority of principals, 93 respondents or 80.2%, reported they "Somewhat Agree", "Agree", or "Strongly Agree" with the statement that the teacher evaluation frameworks utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance. The most common response to the question was "Agree" with 49 responses or 42.2% of the respondents. The next most common response was "Somewhat Agree" with 39 responses or 33.6% of all respondents.

When presented with the statement, "The teacher evaluation model utilized in my school district does not result in improved teacher performance", 84 principals or 72.4% of all responses indicated "Strongly Disagree", "Disagree", or "Somewhat Disagree."

**Research question 4.** *What is the relationship between the teacher evaluation framework utilized in a school district and the hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal?*

Overall, some variation existed in the number of hours principals devoted to teacher evaluation processes. The Robert Marzano Model was reported by respondents as taking 6+ hours each week (n = 9; 37.5%). The Kim Marshall Model was reported by respondents as taking from 4-6 hours each week (n = 5; 50%). The Charlotte Danielson Model was reported as taking 2-4 hours each week from (n = 30; 42.3%). Principals (n = 9; 74.7%) who used a district created model reported they spent 0-2 hours or 2-4 hours each week.

In examining a cross tabulation of the responses from principals regarding the teacher evaluation models utilized in their schools and the numbers of hours they reported it took to complete full observations for teachers, the Charlotte Danielson and Robert Marzano models were found to have similar results, and the majority of respondents indicated it took 3 hours or less to complete full observations.

**Research question 5.** *How did the time that select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function of their years of experience?*

The hours devoted by principals during an average 5-day week on the process of evaluating their teachers varied as a function of their years of experience. However, the time required to complete an individual teacher observation did not vary significantly for principals on the basis of their years of experience. Overall, principals with more years of experience spent more time on the process of evaluating their teaching staffs.

The number of principals who reported they devoted more than 6 hours each week on teacher evaluation increased with their years of experience. For first year principals, 0% reported they dedicated more than 6 hours per week on teacher evaluation; for principals with 2-5 years of experience, 16.7% reported they dedicated more than 6 hours per week on teacher evaluation; for principals with 6-10 years of experience, 32.1% reported they committed more than 6 hours per week on teacher evaluation; for principals with 11-15 years of experience, 35% reported they dedicated more than 6 hours per week on teacher evaluation; and for principals with more than 15 years of experience, 26.7% reported they allocated more than 6 hours per week on teacher evaluation.

The number of hours required to complete a full observation of a teacher also varied as a function of the principal's years of experience, but the correlation was not as strong, provided greater variation within levels of experience and did not represent a statistically significant relationship.

### **Discussion Related to Research Questions**

**Research question 1.** *What teacher evaluation frameworks did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they utilized when evaluating their teachers?*

In Minnesota, there is an emphasis on local control for school districts, including the autonomy to select their own teacher evaluation model or even create the teacher evaluation model school leaders believe best meet the needs of the staff in their school districts. This level of autonomy has lead school districts to select a range of teacher evaluation models, although the Charlotte Danielson based model was found to be in place in 60.5% of the survey respondents' school districts.

Perhaps more importantly, this level of autonomy has led school districts to vary implementation of some of the common components of teacher evaluation models, including the process of scoring their teaching staffs. Principals identified the components that are included in a full teacher evaluation observation in their school districts. Only 73.1% (n = 87) of respondents indicated they scored staff members based on the observation. The finding warrants further study, but it may indicate that respondents provided feedback to teaching staff, but stopped short of actually scoring these teaching staff members.

It is possible the future trend in Minnesota will include an increase in school districts adopting the Robert Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. Of all survey respondents, 20.2% were using the Marzano teacher evaluation model in their school districts, although it has only been in existence for a relatively short time when compared to the Charlotte Danielson based model. Learning Sciences International, the company that supports and promotes this model, has recently opened a regional training facility in Sartell, Minnesota. The location and proximity of the regional facility may be helpful to school districts that are considering making changes to the approach for evaluating their teaching staff members.

**Research question 2.** *How many hours did select Minnesota secondary school principals report they committed to the process of evaluating their teachers during an average week?*

The 2017 Tennessee Educator Survey provided the only comparative data the researcher could locate regarding the time principal's devoted to the process of observing and providing observation feedback to their teachers during an average 5-day week. During an average week, 39% of principals in Tennessee reported they committed 3-5 hours each week for conducting teacher observations; 34% reported 3 hours or less per week conducting

teacher observations, 22% reported they spent 5-10 hours and 5% reported they spent more than 10 hours each week conducting teacher observations (Tennessee Department of Education, 2017, p. 5).

According to the survey responses in the study, principals in the state of Minnesota reported they spent a comparable amount of time on the total process of evaluating teaching staff members during an average 5-day week. During an average week, 37.0% (n = 44) of principals reported they spent 2-4 hours evaluating their teaching staff; while 25.4% (n = 30) reported they spent 4-6 hours and 11.7% (n = 14) reported they committed 0-2 hours each week to the process of evaluating their teaching staffs. Of the principals who reported they spent the most time each week evaluating teaching staff, 8.4% (n = 10) reported they spent 6-8 hours and 8.4% (n = 10) each reported they spent either 8-10 hours or more than 10 hours on evaluating teaching staff.

Variations in the hours committed to the evaluation of teachers may be a function of other duties and responsibilities assigned to the principal. The need for lead secondary school principals to prioritize their responsibilities and regulate the time they spend on various functions within their building and district duties may account for some of the variation in the hours reported for evaluating teachers. The number of assistant principals and the established practices regarding the delegation of responsibilities may also contribute to variations in hours the lead principal commits to the process of evaluating teaching staff.

**Research question 3.** *To what extent did select Minnesota secondary school principals report the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance?*

The large majority of the survey respondents reported a belief that the teacher evaluation model utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance. Approximately 80% of the respondents somewhat agreed, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The teacher evaluation model utilized in my school district results in improved teacher performance”. This was a strong indication that principals were largely supportive of the teacher evaluation models in place in their school districts and believed those models resulted in improved teacher performance. “Ultimately, an effective evaluation system should help teachers teach better” (Marzano & Toth, 2013, p. 14).

Although the cell size was not sufficient to draw conclusions, all four of the first year principals who responded to the survey indicated they “strongly agreed” the teacher evaluation models utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance. Further study is recommended in this area and may provide insights into the mindset of a beginning principal.

**Research question 4.** *What is the relationship between the teacher evaluation framework utilized in a school district and the hours invested in the teacher evaluation process as reported by the principal?*

Principals who reported they were using the Marzano teacher evaluation model revealed they committed more overall time to the process of evaluating their teaching staff members during an average 5-day week. However, the same principals reported spending slightly less time each observation when compared to the other teacher evaluation frameworks. One possible explanation for this may be the provision of school-wide staff development efforts outside of the teacher evaluation process specific to an individual teacher evaluation model. This may have prompted principals to respond that the Marzano teacher

evaluation model was more time consuming to implement than other models. It is also possible the Marzano teacher evaluation framework includes an expectation of higher levels of staff development, and principals may have included this staff development time as a component of the time they devoted to their teacher evaluation framework. Limited research was found regarding the volume of time required by principals to implement different teacher evaluation models.

Based on 18 years of experience as a school principal in Minnesota, the researcher believes it is likely school districts and principals who are currently implementing the Robert Marzano teacher evaluation model have committed more time to staff development efforts specific to this model when compared to other teacher evaluation models. Compared to others, the Robert Marzano model is relatively new and would indicate a school district recently made a strategic decision to change their teacher evaluation framework. Also, the complexity of the Teaching Map and expected rigor in student learning emphasized in the Robert Marzano model represent elevated expectations when compared to other models.

**Research question 5.** *How did the time that select Minnesota secondary school principals invested in the teacher evaluation process vary as a function of their years of experience?*

Based on this study, principals with more years of experience tended to devote more time on the process of evaluating their teachers. There may be a few explanations for this result including the skill of the principal in providing feedback, the number of teachers on improvement plans and principals providing professional development to their teachers specific to the teacher evaluation model. More experienced principals have had additional opportunities to practice the process of providing feedback to teachers and may have

increased their confidence and skill in this area and, therefore, spend more time on teacher evaluation. Limited research was found on the amount of time principals invest in teacher evaluation and how that varies as a function of their years of experience as a principal.

Based on the experience of the researcher, veteran principals are perceived to be more likely to have the courage and skill necessary to place a teacher on an improvement plan. Such an action is time-consuming and requires a skilled principal to either guide the teacher to improved performance or leave the school district.

More experienced principals are believed to be more likely to be asked to lead professional development training for teaching staff related to the teacher evaluation framework and expectations for performance. This can be a time-consuming process and may also be a contributing factor to more experienced principals having reported they devoted more time to the teacher evaluation process than less experienced principals. Overall, more experienced principals committed more time to the process of evaluating their teachers though they were less confident of the correlation between their teacher evaluation model and improved teacher performance. Experienced lead secondary school principals were more likely to have been humbled by the complex and demanding work they faced in their positions and may have been less likely to strongly agree with the effectiveness of their teacher evaluation model.

All four of the first year principals that responded to the survey indicated they “strongly agreed” the teacher evaluation model utilized in their school district resulted in improved teacher performance.

### **Limitations of the Study**

Limitations of the study, including a brief description of each, are provided in a numbered format below:

1. The survey return rate from all Minnesota secondary school principals who were members of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP) was 19.8%. A higher return rate for the survey may have yielded different results.
2. The survey was one of three stakeholder surveys sent to principals through MASSP in the fall of 2017. Survey fatigue by respondents may have been a factor in the return rate.
3. Elementary school principals, assistant principals, activities directors and district office staff were not included in the survey. Although it is acknowledged these positions are also likely engaged in teacher evaluation, this study was specifically designed for, focused on and distributed to lead secondary school principals.
4. The study respondents only included four first year principals. If a greater number of respondents were first year principals, the study may have produced different results.
5. Although there were differences in the total number of hours that principals expended on the process of evaluating their teaching staffs during an average 5-day week, select principals may have included staff development time in the teacher evaluation time reported in the survey. Given the researchers background knowledge of teacher evaluation processes in Minnesota school districts, it is possible the Robert Marzano model had a greater emphasis on staff development than the other teacher evaluation models in this survey.

6. This survey was only conducted in the state of Minnesota.

### **Recommendations for Further Research**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations for further research may be helpful for the field and may result in additional recommendations for practice:

1. A study could be conducted to survey the respondents who did not believe the teacher evaluation framework utilized in their school districts resulted in improved teacher performance to determine the primary concerns related to the teacher evaluation model.
2. A study could be replicated to gather perceptions of elementary principals or assistant principals in Minnesota.
3. A study could be replicated in another state that allows school districts to select their own teacher evaluation models.
4. A study could be replicated to gather data in Minnesota to measure the number of schools that change teacher evaluation frameworks or track changes in trends related to the amount of time principals spend on the process of evaluating their teaching staffs.
5. A study could be conducted in school districts which created their own teacher evaluation models to determine which teacher evaluation models were consulted during the creation of their model.
6. The study identified respondents' use of an online scoring or tracking tool, like iObservation, to score teaching staff members during observations or tracking teacher observations. Since over 55% of respondents indicated they did not use

such a tool, a study could be conducted on the barriers principals experienced in the use of this kind of tool.

7. Since over 99% of principals indicated they conducted their teacher observations in person and only 22.7% indicated they reviewed recorded classroom instruction as an evaluative observation, a study could be conducted to determine what additional technology, staff development or philosophical shifts would be necessary to create a scenario where recording of teacher observations would be more accepted.
8. A study of Minnesota principals' years of service in comparison to principals in other states, regionally or nationally may yield meaningful results. Data gathered in the study appeared to indicate principals in Minnesota may serve longer in their positions than principals from other states.

### **Recommendations for Practice**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations for practice are offered:

1. Evaluating teaching staff members requires similar amounts of principal time and does not vary in a statistically significant manner when using different teacher evaluation models. Specific and timely staff development for principals related to teacher evaluation practices in their school districts are recommended as a method for enhancing principals' efficiency in the conduct of those evaluations and providing higher quality feedback to teachers.
2. The number of years of experience as a principal was found to have an impact on the amount of time they reported devoting to the evaluation of their teaching staff.

More experienced principals reported they committed more time to such evaluations. In that light it is recommended school districts offer specific staff development to beginning principals on the process of evaluating teaching staff, conduct inter-rater reliability training in order that evaluators learn to apply consistent standards while scoring teachers and consider pairing less experienced principals with more experienced principals to allow for enhanced mentoring opportunities.

3. School districts are encouraged to research common teacher evaluation frameworks related to the supports available to principals to ensure the implementation of the teacher evaluation framework that yields desired outcomes.
  - Principals should be guided to prioritize the time they dedicate to teacher evaluation practices that are most likely to result in positive changes in teacher practices and increased student achievement outcomes.
  - School districts are encouraged to select a teacher evaluation model that will have available supports to principals during initial and ongoing implementation. Such supports will likely result in more positive principal perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the school district's selected teacher evaluation model.

## **Summary**

Teacher evaluation practices in the United States have been a focus of many studies in recent years. The purpose of the study was to gather information about the teacher evaluation model in place in select Minnesota school districts as reported by secondary school principals. The study also gathered information on the amount of time select secondary school principals

committed to the process of evaluating their teaching staffs. There were slight variations in the amount of time principals reported in their use of different teacher evaluation models and more significant variations as the years of experience of the principal increased with more experienced principals reporting having devoted more time to the process of evaluating their teaching staffs.

### References

- Adams, K. (2013). Teacher effectiveness: The role of context. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(2), 18.
- An interview with Lamar Alexander. (2016, September). *Principal Leadership*, p. 60.
- Baker, B. D., Oluwole, J. O., & Green, P. C. (2013). The legal consequences of mandating high stakes decisions based on low quality information: teacher evaluation in the race-to-the-top era. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21(5), 1-71. <https://doi.org/http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1298>.
- Board of Testing and Assessment. (2009). *Letter report to the U.S. Department of Education on the Race to the Top Fund*. National Research Council. ISBN 978-0-309-14578-7
- Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1984). Teacher behavior and student achievement. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, pp. 328-375. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1162495>
- Bush, G. (2001). *No Child Left Behind*, 85. H.R.1—No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.
- Carbaugh, B., Marzano, R., & Toth, M. (2017). *The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model: A focused, scientific-behavioral evaluation model for standards-based classrooms*. Learning Sciences International.
- Cohen, J., & Goldhaber, D. (2016). Building a more complete understanding of teacher evaluation using classroom observations. *Educational Researcher*, 45(6), 378-387. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16659442>
- Coleman, J., & Hopkins, J. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity* (pp. 66-675). U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091096>
- Dagley, D. L., & Veir, C. A. (2002). Subverting the academic abstention doctrine in teacher evaluation: How school reform legislation defeats itself. *Brigham Young University*

- Education & Law Journal*, 123, 123-140. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/elj>.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2016, May). Creating communities of practice. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 18-23.
- Danielson, C. & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). Can value added add value to teacher evaluation? *Educational Researcher*, 44(2), 132–137. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X15575346>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171209300603>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Jaquith, A., & Hamilton, M. (2016). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 53(3), 285-328. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543053003285>
- Dodson, R. L. (2015). Richard L. Dodson, Murray State University. *Education Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 53-74.
- DuFour, R., & Marzano, R. J. (2009). High-leverage strategies for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/>

educational\_leadership/feb09/vol66/num05/High-Leverage\_Strategies\_for\_Principal\_Leadership.aspx.

Earley, P. M. (1994). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act: Implications for teacher educators.*

Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Edmonds, R. R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. *Educational Leadership*, 40(3), 4-11.

Eller, J. F., & Eller, S. A. (2015). *Score to soar: Moving teachers from evaluation to professional growth.* Solution Tree Press.

Everson, K, Feinauer, E, & Sudweeks, R. (2013). Rethinking teacher evaluation: A conversation about statistical inferences and value-added models. *Harvard Educational Review*. 83(2), 349-370.

Finkel, E. (2012). Principal as instructional LEADERS. *District Administration*, 48(6), 50-55.

Gardner, D. P., Larsen, Y. W., Campbell, A., Francis, N. C., Bartlett, A., & President, G. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.

Gilson, T. (2008). Educational leadership: Are we busy yet? *American Secondary Education*, 36(3), 84-97.

Goldrick, L. (2002). *Improving teacher evaluation to improve teaching quality.* (Issue Brief). Washington, DC: National Governors' Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction agency # ED480159).

Goldstein, D. (2014). *The teacher wars: A history of America's most embattled profession.* New York: Doubleday.

- Gruber, K., Strizek, G. A., Pittsonberger, J. L., Riordan, K. E., Lyter, D. M., & Orlofsky, G. (2006). *Characteristics of schools, districts, teachers, principals, and school libraries in the United States* (NCES 2006-313 Revised). National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006313.pdf>
- Hazi, H. M., & Rucinski, D. A. (2009). Teacher evaluation as a policy for improved student learning: A fifty-state review of statute and regulatory action since NCLB. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 17(5), 2-19.
- Heise, M. (1994). Goals 2000: Educate America Act: The federalization and legalization of educational policy. *Fordham Law Review*, 63(2), 345-381.
- Hill, H. C., & Grossman, P. (2013). Learning from teacher observations: Challenges and opportunities posed by new teacher evaluation systems. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(2), 371-385. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Hite, S. (2014). *Using the FIT teaching framework for successful teacher evaluations*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. <http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/siteASCD/publications/fit-teaching-whitepaper.pdf>
- Hunter, M. (1976). Teacher competency: Problem, theory and practice. *The Early and Middle Childhood Years of Schooling*, 15(2), 162-171.
- Hunter, M. (1979, October). *Teaching is decision making*. *Educational leadership* (pp. 62-67). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hunter, M. (1983). *Script taping: An essential supervisory tool*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervising. In *Using What We Know about Teaching*, pp. 169-192.

- Kane, T. J., Kerr, K. A., & Pianta, R. C. (2014). *Designing teacher evaluation systems: New guidance from the measures of effective teaching project*. San Francisco CA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119210856>
- Kaviat, B. (2000). The social side of schooling. *Pioneers of Advocacy. John Hopkins Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://pages.jh.edu/jhumag/0400web/18.html>.
- Klein, A. (2015). ESEA reauthorization: The Every Student Succeeds Act explained. *Education Week*, pp. 1-7.
- Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2016). *Revisiting the widget effect: Teacher evaluation reforms and the distribution of teacher effectiveness*. Brown University Working Paper. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Lavigne, H. J., & Greller, S. L. (2016). *Principals' time, tasks, and professional development: An analysis of Schools and Staffing Survey data*. Education Development Center. [https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL\\_2017201.pdf](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL_2017201.pdf)
- Lund, D. O. (2017). Priorities vs. reality: A task analysis of secondary school principals in the state of Minnesota. *Culminating Projects in Educational Administration and Leadership*, p. 22.
- Marchant, G. J., David, K. A., Rodgers, D., & German, R. L. (2015). State teacher evaluation and teacher education. *The Teacher Educator*, 50(2), 89-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2015.1011943>
- Marshall, K. (2012). Fine-tuning teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 50-54.
- Marshall, K. (2016, September 12). Marshall memo. *Marshall Memo*, 652, 1-14.

- Marzano, R., Livingston, D., & Frontier, T. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2001). A new era of school reform: Going where the research takes us. *Education*, 99(0), 111. Retrieved from <http://qualitylearning.net/community/brownsville/research/ANewEraofSchoolReform.pdf%5Cn>.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 14-19. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=83173912&site=ehost-live>.
- Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maxwell, L. (2014). Principals hard-pressed for time to be instructional leaders. *Education Week*, 33(26), 1.
- McCaffery, D. F., Lockwood, J., Koretz, D., Louis, T. A., & Hamilton, L. (2011). Considering and reconsidering value-added approaches. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(2).
- Minnesota Department of Education. (2013). *The Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation handbook*. St. Paul, MN: Author.  
<http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/dse/edev/mod/>

- Moss, J. T. (2015). *The Danielson model of teacher evaluation: Exploring teacher perceptions concerning its value in shaping and improving instructional practice*. Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses, ETDs (Paper), 2090. Retrieved from <http://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>.
- Network for Public Education. (2016). *Teachers talk back: Educators on the impact of teacher evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://networkforpubliceducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/NPETeacherEvalReport.pdf>.
- Prince, C. D., Schuermann, P. J., Guthrie, J. W., Witham, P. J., Milanowski, A. T., & Thorn, C. A. (2009). *The other 69 percent: Fairly rewarding the performance of teachers of non-tested subjects and grades* (pp. 1-38). Center for Educator Compensation Reform.
- Sanders, W. L. & Horn, S. P. (1998). Research findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Database: Implications for educational evaluation and research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12, 247.  
doi:10.1023/A:1008067210518
- Sawchuk, S. (2015, September 3). Teacher evaluation: An issue overview. *Education Week*, 35(3), 1-6.
- Sparks, S. D. (2016, November). Principals work 60-hour weeks, study finds. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/11/02/principals-work-60-hour-weeks-study-finds.html>.
- Stedman, J. B. (1993). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act overview and analysis*. Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

- Steinberg, M. P., & Kraft, M. A. (2017). The sensitivity of teacher performance ratings to the design of teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Researcher* [Internet], 46(7), 378-396.
- Stronge, J. (2012). *Stronge Teacher Effectiveness Performance Evaluation System handbook 2012-2013*. Stronge and Associates, Educational Consulting, LLC.
- Stronge, J. H. (2006). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: Improving the educational landscape. *Evaluating Teaching: A Guide to Current Thinking and Best Practice*, pp, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412990202>
- Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (1999). The politics of teacher evaluation: A case study of new system design and implementation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13(4), 339-359.
- Swanson, C. B., & Barlage, J. (2006, December). *A study of the factors shaping education policy*. Bethesda, MD: Editorial Projects in Education Research Center.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2017). *Tennessee Educator Survey*. Retrieved from <http://educatorsurvey.tn.gov/#1/all-districts/all-schools/0&participant=admin&result>.
- The New Teacher Project. (2011). Rating a teacher observation tool: Five ways to ensure classroom observations are focused and rigorous. *The New Teacher Project*, pp. 1-30. Retrieved from [http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP\\_RatingATeacherObservationTool\\_Feb2011.pdf](http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_RatingATeacherObservationTool_Feb2011.pdf).
- Veir, C. A., & Dagley, D. L. (2002). Legal issues in teacher evaluation legislation: A study of state statutory provisions. Brigham Young University. *Education & Law Journal*, 1(2), 1. <http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/elj/vol2002/iss1/2>

- Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness (p. 48). *The New Teacher Project*. Retrieved from [http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TheWidgetEffect\\_2nd\\_ed.pdf](http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TheWidgetEffect_2nd_ed.pdf).
- Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2012). “MET” made simple: Building research-based teacher evaluations. *The New Teacher Project*. Retrieved from [https://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP\\_METMadeSimple\\_2012.pdf](https://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_METMadeSimple_2012.pdf).
- Wilson, L. (2017). Madeline Hunter Lesson Plan Model. *The Second Principle*. Retrieved on April 14, 2017, from <http://thesecondprinciple.com/teaching-essentials/models-of-teaching/madeline-hunter-lesson-plan-model/>.

### Works Consulted

- Allen, J., Gregory, A., Lun, J., Hamre, B., & Pianta, R. (2013). Observations of effective teacher-student interactions. *School Psychology Review*, 42(1), 76-98.
- Alonzo, A. C. (2011). COMMENTARIES. *Learning Progressions That Support Formative Assessment Practices. Measurement*, 9, 124-129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2011.599629>
- Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2012, October 1). Take back your time. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 70-71.
- Bender, W. (1986). Effective educational practices in the mainstream setting: Recommended model for evaluation of mainstream teacher classes. *The Journal of Special Education*, 20(4), 475-487.
- Benedict, A. E., Thomas, R. a., Kimerling, J., & Leko, C. (2013, May/June). Trends in teacher evaluation. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 45(5), 60-68.
- Boffy, H. (2011, April). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards*, p. 28. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/intasc>.
- Bonavitacola, A. C. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of the impact of the MCREL teacher evaluation system on professional growth by Alexis C. Bonavitacola, Elaine Guerrazzi, PhD, Faculty Mentor and Chair Pamela Hanfelt, PhD, Committee Member Janet Moss, EdD, Committee Member A.D.
- Brandt, C., Mathers, C., Oliva, M., Brown-Sims, M., & Hess, J. (2007). Examining district guidance to schools on teacher evaluation policies in the Midwest region. *Issues & Answers. REL 2007-No. 030*. Regional Educational Laboratory Midwest. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED499235%5Cnhttp://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED499235.pdf>.

- Buzick, H., & Jones, N. (2015). Using test scores from students with disabilities in teacher evaluation. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 34(3), 28-38.
- Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework*. Retrieved from <https://www.danielsongroup.org/framework>.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Chung Wei, R., & Andree, A. (2010, August). How high-achieving countries develop great teachers. *Stanford Centre for Opportunity Policy in Education-Research Brief*, pp. 1-8.
- Delvaux, E., Vanhoof, J., Tuytens, M., Vekeman, E., Devos, G., & Van Petegem, P. (2013). How may teacher evaluation have an impact on professional development? A multilevel analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36, 1-11.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.06.011>
- Denning, P. J. (1983). A nation at risk. *Communications of the ACM*, 26.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/358150.358154>
- Derrington, M. L. (2011). Changes in teacher evaluation: Implications for the principal's work. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 77(3), 51-54. Retrieved from <http://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=59778789&scope=site%5Cnhttp://content.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ContentServer.asp?T=P&P=AN&K=59778789&S=R&D=ehh&EbscoContent=dGJyMMvl7ESep7Q4wt>.
- Doherty, K. M., & Jacobs, S. (2015, November). State of the states evaluating teaching, leading and learning. *National Council on Teacher Quality*, p. 106. Retrieved from <http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/StateofStates2015>.

- Dufour, R., & Mattos, M. (2013). How do principals really improve schools? *Educational Leadership*, 70(7), 34-40.
- Dynarski, M. (2016). *Teacher observations have been a waste of time and money*. Brookings Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/teacher-observations-have-been-a-waste-of-time-and-money/>.
- Firestone, W. A. (2014). Teacher evaluation policy and conflicting theories of motivation. *Educational Researcher*, 43(2), 100-107. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X14521864>
- Foundation, M. G. (2012). Gathering feedback for teaching. *Learning*, p. 68. Retrieved from <http://www.metproject.org>.
- Gallagher, H. A. (2004). Vaughn Elementary's Innovative Teacher Evaluation System: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(4), 79-107. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327930pje7904\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327930pje7904_5)
- Gargani, J., & Strong, M. (2015). Response to "rating teachers cheaper, faster, and better: not so fast": It's about evidence. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(4), 395-401.
- Garrett, R., & Steinberg, M. P. (2015). Examining teacher effectiveness using classroom observation scores: Evidence from the randomization of teachers to students. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(2), 224-242. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373714537551>
- Goldstein, D. (n.d.). Ending the teacher wars. *NJEA Review*, 89, 28-30.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1986). School effects. In M. S. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 570-602). New York: Macmillan.

- Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. *Educational Researcher*, 42(8), 433-444. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X13510020>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hazi, H. M. (2014). Legal challenges to teacher evaluation: Pitfalls and possibilities in the states. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 87(3), 134-139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2014.891898>
- Hazi, H. M., Martinez, D., Jackson, J., Gibb, D., & Wheaton, C. (2014). The marketing of teacher evaluation: The seductive claims of instruments. *The WERA Educational Journal*, pp. 2-9.
- Herman, R., Gates, S., Chavez-Herrerias, E. R., & Harris, M. (2016). *School leadership interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act: Volume 1: A review of the evidence base, initial findings*. New Leaders, Inc.
- Hunter, M. (1979, October). Teaching is decision making. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 62-67. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.com/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_197910\\_hunter.pdf](http://www.ascd.com/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_197910_hunter.pdf).
- Ingle, W. K., Willis, C., & Fritz, J. (2015). Collective bargaining agreement provisions in the wake of Ohio teacher evaluation system legislation. *Educational Policy*, 29(1), 18-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904814559249>
- Institute of Education Sciences. (2014). *United States Department of Education NCEE evaluation brief: State requirements for teacher evaluation policies promoted by race to the top*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2>

- Kane, T. J., Kerr, K. A., & Pianta, R. C. (2014). *Designing teacher evaluation systems: New guidance from the measures of effective teaching project*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119210856>
- Kersten, T., & Israel, M. (2005). Teacher evaluation: Principals' insights and suggestions for improvement. *Planning and Changing*, 36(1), 47-67. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=EJ737642>.
- Leonardatos, H., & Zahedi, K. (2014). Accountability and “racing to the top” in New York state: A report from the front lines. *Teachers College Record*, 116(9), 1-23. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=17561>.
- Livingston, T. (2013). *The teacher development, evaluation, and peer support model: Implementation handbook*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.
- Management, L. (2016, August). Implementing and sustaining peer-to-peer instructional rounds. *What the Research Says*, pp. 1-6.
- Markow, D. (2013). *The MetLife Survey of the American teacher: challenges for school leadership*. Metlife. Retrieved from <https://www.metlife.com/assets/cao/foundation/MetLife-Teacher-Survey-2012.pdf>.
- Marshall, K. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(10), 727-735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20441897>
- Marshall, K. (2008, May). Is supervising the heck out of teachers the answer? *Education Week*. Retrieved from [http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/05/07/36marshall\\_ep.h27.html](http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/05/07/36marshall_ep.h27.html).

- Marshall, K. (2017). *The truth about teacher evaluation*. National School Boards Association. Retrieved March 28, 2017, from <http://www.nsba.org/newsroom/american-school-board-journal/asbj-april-2017/truth-about-teacher-evaluation>.
- Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mathers, C., Olivia, M., Laine, S. (2008). *Improving instruction through effective teacher evaluation: Options for states and districts*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED520778.pdf>
- Mead, S. (2012). *Recent state action on teacher effectiveness*. Bellwether Education Partners. Retrieved from <https://bellwethereducation.org/publication/recent-state-action-teacher-effectiveness>.
- Moskal, A. C. M., Stein, S. J., & Golding, C. (2016). Can you increase teacher engagement with evaluation simply by improving the evaluation system? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(2), 286-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1007838>
- Most, T., & Football, C. S. (2013). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument*.
- Nazaryan, A. (2014, August 24). Exorcising ghosts from classrooms “the teacher wars,” Dana Goldstein’s history of education. *New York Times*.
- Paris, B. J., & Meador, N. F. (2014). *Supporting principals in implementing teacher evaluation systems, recommendations from practicing principals to improve instruction and learning*. NASSP and NAESP.
- Peterson, K. (2004). Research on teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(639).

- Pogodzinski, B., Umpstead, R., & Witt, J. (2015). Teacher evaluation reform implementation and labor relations. *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(4), 540-561.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.999827>
- Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the Institute for Research on Teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 45(8), 74-85.
- Postal, L., & Martin, A. (2016, February 11). Orange teachers angry about teacher evaluation system. *Orlando Sentinel*.
- Preston, C., Green III., Donaldson, M., & Oluwole, J. (2014). An analysis of the policy, research and legal issues surrounding the exclusion of charter schools from the teacher evaluation revolution. *Journal of Law and Education*, 43(463), 1-18.
- Quinn, A. E. (2014, Fall). Looking at the bigger picture with Dr. Robert Marzano: Teacher evaluation and development for improved student learning. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, pp. 12-18.
- Riordan, J., Lacireno-Paquet, N., Shakman, K., Bocala, C., & Chang, Q. (2015). *Redesigning teacher evaluation: Lessons from a pilot implementation*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Roberts, G. (2014). Time to demonstrate how we impact student learning. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 85(1), 27-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2013.872490>
- Rutkowski, D., & Wild, J. (2015). Stakes matter: Student motivation and the validity of student assessments for teacher evaluation. *Educational Assessment*, 20(3), 165-179.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2015.1059273>
- Sawchuck, S. (2015, September 3). Teacher evaluation: An issue overview. Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. *Education Week*. Retrieved April 14, 2017, from

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/teacher-performance-evaluation-issue-overview.html/>.

- Scott, T., Hern, R., & Alter, P. (2014). Teacher instruction as a predictor for student engagement and disruptive behaviors. Routledge. *Preventing School Failure*, 58(4), 193-200.
- Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 339-355.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487111404241>
- Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012, Fall). Can teacher evaluation improve teaching? *Education Next* (Figure 1), 78-84. Retrieved from [http://educationnext.org/files/ednext\\_20124\\_taylortyler.pdf](http://educationnext.org/files/ednext_20124_taylortyler.pdf).
- Tlhoale, M., Hofman, A., Winnips, K., & Beetsma, Y. (2014). The impact of interactive engagement methods on students' academic achievement. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(5), 1020-1034. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.890571>
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2013a). How to activate teachers through teacher evaluation? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, published online.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2013.842601>
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2013b). The problematic implementation of teacher evaluation policy: School failure or governmental pitfall? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42, 155-174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213502188>

- Ulmer, J. (2014). Re-framing teacher evaluation discourse in the media—an analysis and narrative-based proposal. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 37(1) 43-55.
- Walsh, K., Joseph, N., Lakis, K., & Lubell, S. (2017). *Running in place: How new teacher evaluations fail to live up to promises*. National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved from [http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Final\\_Evaluation\\_Paper](http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Final_Evaluation_Paper).
- Waters, J., Timothy, E. D., & Marzano, R. J. (2006, September). School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement. *MCREL*, pp. 1-25.
- Will, R. Y. (1967, June). The education of the teacher as a person. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 18, 471-475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002248716701800415>
- Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1985). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(1), 60-121. <https://doi.org/10.1086/595006>
- Wolfe, P. (1987). *The Madeline Hunter model of mastery learning*. Napa County Schools.
- Wong, W. Y., & Moni, K. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of and responses to student evaluation of teaching: Purposes and uses in clinical education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(4), 397-411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.844222>
- Wyandt, B. (2016). *Teachers' dispositions toward the Ohio teacher evaluation system*. (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>

- Zepeda, S. J. (2016). Research in educational administration & leadership principals' perspectives: Professional learning and marginal teachers on formal plans of improvement. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership, 1*(11), 25-59.
- Zirkel, P., & Gluckman, I. B. (1984). Teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 68*, 116-120.
- <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658406846824>

## Appendix A: Survey

**Dear Secondary School Principal**

You are invited to participate in a dissertation study of Minnesota Secondary Principals' perceptions of teacher evaluation. This study will gather information related to the teacher evaluation model utilized in your school district and the volume of time spent on the process of evaluating teachers. I have designed the survey to be brief and focused and I am asking for your cooperation to complete this survey. This survey is conducted in cooperation with the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP) and results of the survey can be obtained by contacting the researcher directly. Results of the survey will be made public through the St. Cloud State University dissertation repository and a link will be provided to MASSP so it can be easily accessed by its members.

The survey should take approximately five minutes to complete. Completing this survey will be considered your consent to participate in this study. The survey is anonymous and all information will remain anonymous and no personal identifying information is being requested. This survey is voluntary, there are no foreseeable risks to participants in completing the survey and you may withdraw at any time.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If you have any questions, you may contact me by phone, (651) 308 - 1892 or via e-mail at [twtetzlaff@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:twtetzlaff@stcloudstate.edu). You may also contact my advisor, Dr. John Eller at [jfeller@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:jfeller@stcloudstate.edu).

**Todd Tetzlaff**  
Principal  
North Branch Area Middle School  
MASSP Member and Doctoral Candidate  
[twtetzlaff@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:twtetzlaff@stcloudstate.edu)

\* 1. I am at least 18 years of age and consent to participate in this study.

☐ Yes

☐ No

## Demographics

\* 2. Which MASSP division do you belong to?

Reference: [MASSP Division Map](#)

- |                                 |                                 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Northeast | <input type="radio"/> Southeast |
| <input type="radio"/> Northern  | <input type="radio"/> Hennepin  |
| <input type="radio"/> Central   | <input type="radio"/> Capitol   |
| <input type="radio"/> Western   | <input type="radio"/> Unknown   |
| <input type="radio"/> Southwest |                                 |

\* 3. How many years have you served as a principal?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> This is my first year | <input type="radio"/> 11-15 years            |
| <input type="radio"/> 2-5 years             | <input type="radio"/> More than 15 years     |
| <input type="radio"/> 6-10 years            | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to answer |

\* 4. I am actively involved in the process of evaluating teaching staff in my school.

☐ Yes

☐ No

\* 5. How many assistant principals or other staff that complete evaluative observations work under your supervision?

- |                         |                                 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 0 | <input type="radio"/> 3         |
| <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 4         |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 5 or more |

\* 6. What instructional framework best describes the teacher evaluation framework that is utilized in your school?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Charlotte Danielson Based Model       | <input type="radio"/> District created own model                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Robert Marzano Based Model            | <input type="radio"/> Collaborative or Consortium utilizes own model |
| <input type="radio"/> Kim Marshall Teacher Evaluation Model | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to answer                         |
| <input type="radio"/> State of Minnesota Model              |  |

\* 7. Does your school district use an online scoring or tracking tool, like iObservation, to score teaching staff during the evaluation process or to track teacher evaluations?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

\* 8. Please check all of the components that are included in a full teacher observation process in your school district: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Pre-observation process (may include reviewing planning documentation or conducting a pre-observation conference)
- ☐ Conduct classroom observation in person
- ☐ Review recorded classroom instruction as an observation
- ☐ Post-observation process (may include receiving additional post-conference reflection documentation or conducting a post-observation conference)
- ☐ Scoring staff members based on the observation
- ☐ Providing verbal feedback to staff regarding their score including areas of strength and areas for future growth
- ☐ Providing written feedback to staff regarding their score including areas of strength and areas for future growth
- ☐ Walk-through observations
- ☐ I prefer not to answer

**Please take a moment to reflect on the total amount of time, during an average week, you spend on the process of evaluating your teachers. Include the time you spend informing staff regarding expectations related to teacher evaluation, scheduling observations, reviewing lesson planning documentation, conducting formal and informal observations, following up with staff members and documenting observations in the total amount of time.**

**\* 9. During an average 5 day week, how many hours do you spend in total on the process of evaluating teaching staff?**

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> 0 - 2 Hours | <input type="radio"/> 8 - 10 Hours           |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 - 4 Hours | <input type="radio"/> More than 10 Hours     |
| <input type="radio"/> 4 - 6 Hours | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to answer |
| <input type="radio"/> 6 - 8 Hours |  |

**\* 10. How many hours does it take to complete a full observation for an individual teacher?**

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> 1 Hour  | <input type="radio"/> 5 Hours                |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 Hours | <input type="radio"/> 6 or more Hours        |
| <input type="radio"/> 3 Hours | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to answer |
| <input type="radio"/> 4 Hours |  |

\* 11. How many full teacher observations do you complete for each teacher you are evaluating during the school year?

- |                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> 1 Observation  | <input type="radio"/> 4 Observations         |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 Observations | <input type="radio"/> 5 or more Observations |
| <input type="radio"/> 3 Observations | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to answer |

\* 12. Overall, how many teacher observations are you responsible for completing in a school year?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> 0 - 5 Observations   | <input type="radio"/> 26 - 30 Observations      |
| <input type="radio"/> 6 - 10 Observations  | <input type="radio"/> 31 - 35 Observations      |
| <input type="radio"/> 11 - 15 Observation  | <input type="radio"/> 35 - 40 Observations      |
| <input type="radio"/> 16 - 20 Observations | <input type="radio"/> More than 40 Observations |
| <input type="radio"/> 21 - 25 Observations | <input type="radio"/> I prefer not to answer    |



**STOP!!**

Thank you for taking the Teacher Evaluation survey.

## Appendix B: Correspondence to MASSP Principals



TODD TETZLAFF <ttetzlaf@isd138.org>

### MASSP - Question from a Member

1 message

MASSP Office <massp\_staff@mail.massp.org>  
 Reply-To: MASSP Office <massp\_staff@mail.massp.org>  
 To: ttetzlaf@isd138.org

Tue, Sep 19, 2017 at 12:03 PM



MASSP Principals,

The Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals has agreed to support the ongoing learning and research of its members and sends this message on behalf of Todd Tetzlaff as part of his requirement for a Doctorate in Educational Leadership. The focus of Todd's research is teacher evaluation and he is attempting to discover the teacher evaluation framework utilized in school districts across Minnesota and gather some specific information from principals related to teacher evaluation practices in their schools. When his degree is complete, Todd will make his research available to MASSP members.

This survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete and all responses will be anonymous.

[Survey Link](#)

David Adney  
 Executive Director

Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals  
 1667 Snelling Avenue N, Suite C-100  
 St. Paul, MN 55108  
 651-999-7333 phone

651-999-7331 fax

*Copyright © 2017 MASSP, All rights reserved.*  
Member of MASSP

**Our mailing address is:**  
MASSP  
1667 Snelling Ave N, Saint Paul, MN  
St. Paul, MN 55108

Add us to your address book

Want to change how you receive these emails?  
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)



TODD TETZLAFF <ttetzlaf@isd138.org>

## MASSP - Survey from a Member Reminder

1 message

MASSP Office <massp\_staff@mail.massp.org>  
 Reply-To: MASSP Office <massp\_staff@mail.massp.org>  
 To: ttetzlaf@isd138.org

Wed, Sep 27, 2017 at 10:35 AM



### MASSP Principals

The Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals has agreed to support the ongoing learning and research of its members and sends this reminder message on behalf of Todd Tetzlaff as part of his requirement for a Doctorate in Educational Leadership. The focus of Todd's research is teacher evaluation and he is attempting to discover the teacher evaluation framework utilized in school districts across Minnesota and gather some specific information from principals related to teacher evaluation practices in their schools. When his degree is complete, Todd will make his research available to MASSP members.

This is a reminder message. Thank you to those who have already completed the survey.

This survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete and all responses will be anonymous.

[Survey Link](#)

David Adney  
 Executive Director

Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals  
1667 Snelling Avenue N, Suite C-100  
St. Paul, MN 55108  
651-999-7333 phone  
651-999-7331 fax

*Copyright © 2017 MASSP, All rights reserved.*  
Member of MASSP

**Our mailing address is:**  
MASSP  
1667 Snelling Ave N, Saint Paul, MN  
St. Paul, MN 55108

Add us to your address book

Want to change how you receive these emails?  
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)