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Abstract

By Matthew Paul Coulter, Ed.D.
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Chair: Richard Sawyer

The purpose of this study was to describe the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington. In 2010, the Washington State Legislature passed SB 6696 which essentially overhauled the system of how principals evaluate teachers in the state. The bill did away with the old satisfactory or unsatisfactory evaluation and used a multi-tier model with a long list of specific criteria that teachers must now meet. The new law ultimately allowed each school district to select among three state approved evaluation models and unions were allowed to bargain with school districts about the way student performance would be used. The three evaluation models approved include the Danielson model, Marzano model, and CEL 5D+ model.

The philosophical support of teachers and principals was really not included in the re-shaping of teacher evaluation laws. This study explored whether or not this current course of action is what was best for teachers and principals. This study challenged the political support of teacher evaluation reform with the philosophical support of the teachers and principals who were the most impacted by the change.

A qualitative study based on participant interviews was completed in six school districts from the state of Washington during a two-month period. The districts were selected based on
equal representation of three evaluations instruments used in that state (Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+). A total of six school districts participated by providing a willing teacher and principal for an interview. There were a total of twelve participants interviewed.

The results of the study found the new evaluation too cumbersome and unrealistic with the current structure of time and resources allocated in the educational system. The new teacher evaluation instruments are good tools in fostering the development of teachers but lack in the ability to fairly evaluate teachers.

Implications involved lawmakers and principals. Lawmakers are advised to implement educational change cautiously. The complexity of education requires educator input on time, resources, reality, and fairness. Principals need more support.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Teacher Evaluation has been an inconsistent process. Change in teacher evaluations is a recent educational phenomenon in United States. A fair argument can be made that recent changes to teacher evaluations will impact teachers and principals. This qualitative cross-case study explores the implementation and impact of three teacher evaluation systems and links them to the perceptions held by teachers and principals alike. This study has provided a philosophical sounding board for teachers and principals on how they perceive the new standards being set before them by new evaluation models and whether or not these evaluation models are a sufficient measure of accountability.

Background

Evaluation in general is an element of everyday culture. People are judged and evaluated in most areas of society as to what there their value is to their particular institution. What is inconsistent is the method by which people are evaluated. Teachers have experienced inconsistent evaluation practices. The concept of evaluation is closely linked to accountability. Evaluation of an individual or group is completed to make sure that those being evaluated are accountable to established standards detailing what the individual ought to be doing (Thomas, Holdaway, & Ward, 2000).

Over the years, ideas have come and gone in regard to defining teacher evaluation. Teachers have been trained, hired, and rarely fired according to the outdated teaching evaluation systems which are heavily influenced by union norms. Serious administrative observations of
teachers with strong feedback have been minimal and are usually done to comply with state laws. Teachers generally have earned a satisfactory or unsatisfactory review. This is all changing. State legislatures have passed bills requiring school districts to use a multi level tier rating system instead of the old satisfactory/unsatisfactory system. Within the past four to five years, new teacher evaluation systems have included well over twenty indicators that represent successful teaching. The new models encourage more pre-conference and post-conference time between the teacher and principal. The new models also encourage more teaching goals and student measurements to coincide with the increased observation of the teacher by the principal. Changes in teacher evaluations fall in line with sweeping changes taking place in education policy throughout the United States, particularly over the past 20 years.

A key influence on education policy was a 1996 report from the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), titled *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. The commission called out teacher quality as the key to improving American education. The Commission contends that the capability of the teacher has the strongest effect on student learning and that "recruiting, preparing, and retaining" quality teachers is the most important way to improve education ("What Matters Most,” 1996). The NCTAF believed that education reformers must provide the support and conditions essential for teachers to teach effectively. The report mapped out a plan for providing every child with high quality teaching by attracting, developing, and supporting excellent teachers. The report was led by North Carolina Governor James B. Hunt (chair) and Linda Darling-Hammond (executive director), and set a goal for all students to have high quality teachers by 2006. The report specifically outlined the need for teachers who have both mastered the content of the subject they teach and developed the teaching skills necessary to interest students in learning. To further the Commission’s work, a
group of states dedicated to improving teacher quality was formed in 1996. Recognition of this report is important because it can be described as a precursor or warning of the more dramatic teacher evaluation reform that would take place a decade later.

One controversial educational policy is the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Inspired by a 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education report titled *A Nation at Risk*, it was reported that educational institutions were grossly underachieving. The report stated:

Part of what is at risk is the promise first made on this continent: All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself” (U.S. Dept. of Ed., 1983b).

The report goes on to emphasize the low skills as evidenced through test scores in American youth. Among the other findings in the report were that school content was diluted and lacked purpose, use of classroom time was ineffective, and the field of teaching was not attracting enough academically able students and that teacher preparation programs needed substantial improvement. In other words, the findings revealed that the teaching profession needed to be improved in order to make it a more respected. This led to over a decade of debate until 2001, when the George W. Bush administration (with bipartisan support from Congress) passed legislation known as the No Child Left Behind Act which placed the federal government in a more prominent role in American Education.
A goal of No Child Left Behind was to increase accountability among schools and teachers. The legislation requires schools to pass yearly standardized tests to measure progress. Schools face declined funding if requirements are not met. As far as teachers are concerned, the No Child Left Behind Act requires states to provide highly qualified teachers to all students. Each state is able to determine what counts as highly qualified.

The No Child Left Behind Act could be viewed as an attack on teachers, principals, and unions. Groups that were influential in backing No Child Left Behind were business groups and civil rights groups. Business groups believe that American schools should turn out more capable workers. Civil Rights groups continue to combat the large gap of achievement among minority students. Civil Rights groups believe low expectations and unequal opportunity as reasons for academic failure in American schools (Gerson, 2012). No Child Left Behind faced heavy resistance from within the educational community for not including enough support to match such high expectations. In the years since No Child Left Behind, federal officials, governors, legislators, school administrators, and unions have all struggled to enforce and adapt to this legislation.

This battle involving government, business leaders, Civil Rights groups, and the educational establishment has played out negatively in society. Movies such as “Waiting for Superman” and “Won’t Back Down” are examples of Hollywood fueling the fire of criticism. The movie “Won’t Back Down” is about the struggles a mother goes through with her Dyslexic daughter in a failing school. The villains of the movie are clock-punching teachers, apathetic parents, change resistant union officials, and unreachable administrators (Gerson, 2012). Government, education, and society are usually reactive instead of proactive and it is likely the
social media will continue to generate controversy and concern for education. Because of this attention, change in educational policy is likely to continue.

In more recent years, change in teacher evaluation has indeed accelerated. In 2009, the Obama administration provided financial incentives to encourage educational growth. Through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), $4.35 billion in competitive grants was invested to improve education at the state and local level. This financial “reward” focused on reform in four areas. The first focused on rigorous standards and assessments that would prepare students for college and the workforce. The second called for data systems that can effectively measure student growth and success while informing principals and teachers how they can improve instruction. The third goal was to recruit, develop, reward, and retain the best teachers and principals. And the last reform was to turn around low achieving schools. “Race to the Top” grants were awarded to states that erode tenure protections and tie teacher evaluation ratings to students’ performance on state assessments (McCann, 2011). Forty one states submitted applications. The results gave Delaware, Tennessee, the District of Columbia (which was treated as a state for its application), Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, and Rhode Island federal money to be used toward education. This meant that twenty-nine states lost in part for not having effective enough systems to evaluate teachers. Notice that the vast majority of winning states were on the East coast. This has inspired a large amount of opinion and debate on the subject of teacher evaluations from many sources throughout the West.

Washington State is an example of a state that has embraced educational reform in teacher evaluation. Washington finished near last in the competition among states for federal funding. A big reason for its low ranking was because the method of evaluating teachers and
principals was considered to be too lenient. The Washington State Legislature acted quickly to bolster teacher evaluations by passing Senate Bill 6696 in 2010. Another senate bill (5895) passed in 2012, which not only changed the design of how teachers are evaluated, but made it possible for job termination of teachers on the grounds of having a poor evaluation. The bills do away with the old satisfactory or unsatisfactory evaluation and use a multi-tier model with a long list of specific criteria that teachers must strive to meet. The new law allows each school district to select among three state approved evaluation models and allows unions to bargain with school districts about the way student performance will be used. The three evaluation models approved include the Danielson Model, Marzano Model, and CEL 5D+ Model. A thorough review of these teacher evaluation systems will be included in the literature review (Chapter Two). The 2012/2013 school year is a pilot year with the new law going into effect in 2013/2014.

Teacher Evaluation reform is clearly happening. What remains to be answered is whether or not this current course of action is what is best for teachers, principals, and students. Reports need to come in from teachers and principals to determine whether or not educators are philosophically in support of the new models of teacher evaluation.

**Research Problem Addressed by the Study**

There is plenty of political support in favor of changing how teachers are evaluated, but what really needed to be examined was the level of philosophical support. There are important flaws within most systems of observation. To prove this, multiple concepts of teacher evaluation were analyzed in this study. The literature review of this study compares different concepts of teacher evaluation throughout the history of American education up to current models being implemented this year. There is a need to further examine issues related to the implementation of
state mandated teacher evaluation instruments. Any major change in a field like education needs to be closely examined. The problem addressed by this study was the need to understand the perceptions that principals and teachers have in regard to evaluating teacher effectiveness.

**Purpose of the Study**

The point of this study is to describe the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington. This study expands the body of knowledge on teacher evaluation and the impact it has on both principals and teachers. This study also responds to the identified research problem by challenging the political support of teacher evaluation reform with the philosophical support of the teachers and principals who are the most impacted by the change.

**Professional Significance**

Teacher Evaluation has intrinsic importance to multiple groups of people. The most obvious group affected by teacher evaluation changes is teachers themselves. Teachers now need to modify their teaching style to the evaluation instrument used by their district. There is an increase in anxiety caused by changes to how they are evaluated and to the possibility that they may lose employment if they perform poorly. Principals have more pressure placed on them because the new evaluations are more complex and will take more time. In addition to the increased workloads, principals’ risk having potential relationships with teachers strained due to poor evaluations. Students are impacted by changes because teachers will likely change up teaching methods to be more aligned with the new evaluation instrument. Professionals working at the university level who are involved in teacher preparation programs are influenced by
changes to teacher evaluation because this impacts how teacher preparation programs are designed, implemented, and evaluated. The university’s education department may also be evaluated by the quality of teacher they graduate (Blankenship, 2011). The last group impacted includes employees and administrators at the district level. Superintendents, human resources managers, and curriculum directors all need to be aware of the multiple elements of new teacher evaluation models because they will ultimately be responsible for who will be using it and how it will be implemented.

Another significant reason this study was conducted, is the lack of research studies on teacher evaluation. This study covered a current reality that transforms schools and livelihoods. There are a limited number of studies that uncover teacher evaluation. This study contributes data to the field of education.

This study is significant because it examined a “real-life” setting where the implementation of teacher evaluation systems is based on relatively new theories that are widely accepted but minimally evaluated (Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005). Timing was a major strength of this study because the implementation of the new models was taking place at the same time that the study was being conducted. The newness of the educational policy change created an atmosphere of debate and discussion as to the impact of this change. The “real-life” nature of this study and the timing of it was why the qualitative method was used to gauge the acceptance of the new teacher evaluation theory.

The timing of this study was also professionally significant in that it was early enough in the implementation stage to allow the results an opportunity to reflect on the process of teacher evaluation. It was a unique opportunity to interview both principals and teachers during the first round of the process. The questions posed in this study forced teachers and principals to think
critically of what they are doing, how they are doing it, and why they are doing it in regard to
teacher evaluation. The reflection of principals and teachers increases knowledge in the field of
teacher evaluation. The early timing of this study allows for follow up studies in the future.

The results of this study provide meaning to educational practitioners because they will
be able to make connections to the findings. Perceptions of teacher evaluation are out there; this
study recognizes these perceptions and provides educators an opportunity to match their own
perceptions with that of the participants in the study. The value of literature is that the writer
produces a subject in which readers can make personal connections. Being that most educators
are involved in some way to the evaluation process, they can relate to the subject of this study
and make specific connections to the findings.

**Research Design**

Qualitative research was used in this study in order to understand the context of six
school districts and to capture the data on perceptions of teachers and principals. This qualitative
research study begins with careful analysis of the literature to determine the current realities of
teacher evaluation and how these current realities came to be. The literature review will consist
of four areas of focus:

I. The philosophical background of teacher evaluations

II. Current teacher evaluation models implemented in Washington State

III. Principal responsibilities

IV. Teacher evaluation survey results

The study was conducted in six school districts from the state of Washington during a
two-month period. The districts were selected based on equal representation of three evaluations
instruments used in that state (Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+). A total of six school districts participated providing a willing teacher and principal for an interview.

The data collection method employed was participant interviews guided by open ended questions related to teacher evaluation. Data gathered from the interviews were audio taped, transcribed, and coded. Data was studied in accordance to the accepted practices of qualitative research for education (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2007). A coding system was used to link participant responses to the following research questions:

1. What new criteria and evidence does a teacher want a principal to consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?
2. What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?
3. What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington?

Once the data was coded, it was presented in a thematic format in which the major themes are appropriately discussed.

Field notes were taken with each interview. The notes were constructed during the interview and at the conclusion to more fully document the context of the interview. Included in the field notes were observations related to participant body language, tone, and a description of the interview setting.

**Study Overview**

The goal of Chapter One is to introduce the study by providing a brief overview.

Beginning with an introduction, the chapter provided a background discussion of how teacher
evaluation reform has evolved over the past couple decades. The research problem and purpose of the study explained why this study was worthwhile. An important section of this introductory chapter included the professional significance as to who will benefit from reading this study. The final section of Chapter One included an introduction of the research design. The contents of ensuing chapters are described below.

In Chapter Two, the reader will find an overview of literature and evaluation models as it relates to the research questions and design of the study. The literature will be divided in four major components: Philosophical background of teacher evaluations, current teacher evaluation models in Washington State, principal responsibilities, and analysis of a recent teacher evaluation survey conducted by Spokane Public Schools.

Chapter Three describes the qualitative research methodology, procedures, research design, and data analysis used in this study. Incorporated into Chapter Three will be an explanation and rationale for the various methodologies employed in the study. Research ethics and limitations are also explained.

Chapter Four provides the findings for this study. Included in this chapter will be analysis and summary of the data in relationship to the purpose of this study. The findings will also be matched in relationship to the research questions and what was learned through the principal and teacher interviews.

The fifth and final chapter will provide summary of how the findings of this study relate to theoretical rationale as discussed in the literature review and through discussion of the research questions. Suggestions for further research and recommendations to current principals, teachers, district administrators, and university education program personnel will close out this study.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The research problem addressed in this study questions the philosophical support of teacher evaluation. Therefore, multiple concepts of teacher evaluation will be analyzed. The literature review of this study will compare different concepts of teacher evaluation throughout the history of American education up to current models being implemented this year. Chapter two reviews the relevant literature as it pertains to the research problem. To ensure maximum readability the literature will be divided into five sections:

I. The philosophical background of teacher evaluations
II. Current teacher evaluation models implemented in Washington State
III. Principal responsibilities
IV. Teacher evaluation survey results
V. Conclusion

At the end of every section a summary is provided concerning the importance of each concept as it relates to the research goals of this study.

The Philosophical Background of Teacher Evaluations

The purpose of this section is to identify the direction that teacher evaluation has taken through the course of American education history. By examining the literature of past studies, we can gain perspective as to where teacher evaluation in American education has been as a way to understand where it is going. The literature examined is highly empirical in that most of the authors have devoted entire careers by both directly and indirectly observing and studying the practice of evaluating teachers. By looking as far back as the 19th century, the importance of
studying the subject of teacher evaluation is confirmed. This section will examine relevant
literature from 1896 to the twenty first century.

In order to best understand the philosophical background of teacher evaluations, this
portion of the chapter will be divided up into four parts. The first part will connect teacher
evaluations to the business management approach common in education during the twentieth
century. The works of Frederick Taylor and Ellwood Cubberley will be examined as to why
education will follow the scientific management approach much like businesses and factories.
The second part will compare alternatives to the business “top down” management approach in
regard to teacher evaluation. This part will include the educational philosophy of John Dewey
and some tested practices such as Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) in which teachers play a
more prominent role in teacher evaluation. The third part of this section will address the
revolving question of what constitutes a good teacher and what specifically needs to be
evaluated. This section will go back over a hundred years with a study by H.E. Kratz as a starting
point and connect it to more modern ideas from Madeline Hunter and Charlotte Danielson. The
final part of this section will be to expose flaws within the teacher evaluation process. The
studies and experiences of Matthew Whitehead and Kim Marshall will be analyzed to offer
insight into the complexity and history of teacher evaluations. This section will conclude with
commentary that connects the literature to the research problem that questions the philosophical
support of teacher evaluations.

The Influence of the Business Model Approach in Education

An important topic to consider is the method of evaluating teachers. Principals have
modeled the business world and evaluated teachers much like corporate managers evaluate
employees. Judging employees is an obvious theme in the business world. The literature proves that business practices and ideas often influence the direction of educational institutions.

In the early part of the twentieth century, Frederick W. Taylor argued that scientific study could determine the proper method of doing every job (Spring, 2008). The key consequence of what became known as “Taylorism,” was that management directed the actions of the workers. Under Taylorism, management assumed more duties by reducing workers responsibilities and need for decision making. This concept led to the standardization of education. Standardization is a business concept with the goal of cost-effectiveness. Standardization in schools resulted in standard curriculum, standard attendance procedures, standard hiring practices, standard teacher training procedures, standard student evaluations, and of course standard teacher evaluations, yet none of these have been linked to better student understanding of teacher performance.

The standardization philosophy might have worked in a Model T factory, but would need experimentation in public schools. The factory metaphor was encouraged further by Ellwood Cubberley in his book Public School Administration (1929).

Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of twentieth century civilization and is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specifications laid down. (p. 338)

Based on the factory metaphor, Cubberly laid out a set of principles for school administrators that emphasized measurement and analysis of data to ensure that teachers and schools were productive (Marzano, 2011). This laid the foundation for teachers to receive grades such as letter grades from an A-F scale to indicate their performance for a variety of criteria. This factory style approach has been tinkered with in various ways, but remains the model of twenty-first century
education in the United States.

It is difficult to be critical of Ellwood Cubberley. As a professor at Stanford he laid the foundation for public schooling in America and became one of the leading educational administrators of the 20th century (Newman, 1992). He supported the factory model because he had very few examples of educational administrative policy to study. In the early part of Cubberley’s career there were no formal textbooks to teach educational administration and most universities lacked education departments (Newman, 1992). Cubberley supported the business factory model because of the enormous success that industry was having around the turn of the 19th to 20th century. Cubberley wrote: “From 1897 to 1907, our country experienced an unprecedented period of industrial development and national prosperity” (Cubberley, 1909).

Education in the 20th century can be viewed as an experiment as to whether or not successful business practices can duplicate as successful educational practices.

In later years, the analogy of educational process to industrial production brought criticism to Cubberley. In 1965 Lawrence Cremin wrote The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley. This publication attacked Cubberley’s historical record. The criticism ranged in scope by calling Cubberley’s educational views as anachronistic, evangelistic, sexist, and autocratic (Cremin, 1965). While it is tempting to attack Cubberley’s educational views, it is important to remember that social norms change from generation to generation. You can also find big picture philosophical motives which are sometimes positive. For educational policy to improve, Cubberley sought to free educational administration from technical ignorance and external political pressures. He advocated giving power to technically trained educators. He also urged improved teacher training (Newman, 1992).
Despite Ellwood Cubberley’s best intentions, public education institutions are not business factories. Schools are a place of extreme diversity. Students in today’s classrooms pose a wide range of diverse learning needs that teachers must be prepared to address (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). There are layers of academic and social development that take place in each and every school for students, teachers, and administrators alike.

Top down management modeled by business factories and used in education can be extremely biased and may lead to poor teacher evaluations. Managers in the world of education are called principals. Principals are the evaluators of teachers despite many not being expert teachers themselves. Many principals may have struggled with limited or sometimes unsuccessful classroom experience as a teacher themselves and this may skew their vision of ideal qualities of classroom teachers. Furthermore, principals often have a different philosophy of how to teach than a veteran teacher who has been tried and tested. Principals might even have a personal grudge toward a teacher which ultimately shows up in their evaluation of that teacher. School staffs and teacher unions across the United States have worked hard for decades to counter the top down management structure as it is implemented in public schools. Decision making models have been made to include teacher input and share major decisions with the administration. Scientific management promised to replace the unsystematic actions of workers with a planned and controlled work environment (Spring, 2008). Education is at its best when teachers and students are not systemized and are allowed to be creative and think and work outside limitations in a variety of environments.

When looking at the teacher evaluation, the concept of autocratic principal run teacher evaluations is grounded in a tradition modeled after the American business model of the 20th century and supported by educational leaders such as Frederick W. Taylor and Ellwood
Cubberley. The institution of principals evaluating teachers is ingrained in the current models of teacher evaluation. While most of the responsibility of judging the performance of classroom teachers is on the principals, there are other alternatives.

**Alternatives to the Business Model Approach**

Representing an alternative to top down management is Peer Assistance Review (PAR). This program is about teachers helping teachers. Established first in Ohio, PAR served as a model for veteran teachers to play a role in supporting new or struggling teachers. This program was created as a result of frustration regarding the caliber of new teachers. In 1999, PAR, in some form, was required by the California legislature to be implemented in each school district. A longitudinal study generated by Goldstein looked at the progress of PAR in a large urban school district (Goldstein & Noguera, 2006). The results of this study found that PAR created a better evaluation and offered better support to struggling teachers than the traditional top down method of school principals evaluating teachers.

The PAR teacher evaluation program falls in line with a mentoring program. The argument can be made that while top down principals evaluating teachers is more of a job performance rating, teachers evaluating teachers takes on more of a professional growth opportunity. Teachers and unions support PAR because of the empowerment it gives teachers to participate in their own growth and support the professional growth of their colleagues. An empowered workforce is good for our kids: empowerment is strongly correlated with teachers task motivation, higher levels of organizational commitment, meaning, self determination, and sense of efficacy (Dee, Henkin, & Duemer, 2003). When given an opportunity, the PAR program offers a good alternative to top down teacher evaluation. Due to familiarity of principal
One counter view to scientific management of teachers is from John Dewey (1859-1952). In developing a philosophy of experience, Dewey rejected scientific management in favor of democracy. Dewey’s methods emphasized student interests, student activity, group work, and cooperation methods premised on the idea that the school had to serve a new social function in a world of increasing urban life and large corporations (Spring, 2008). Clearly this philosophy is not congruent with the top down factory system of education supported by Taylor. Dewey found little satisfaction in the standard American classroom. He was opposed to daily lesson plans suited for an environment based on hierarchical control, order, and discipline. The essence of Dewey’s philosophy was freedom. Dewey uses freedom as a means to power: “Power to frame purposes, to judge wisely, to evaluate desires by the consequences which will result from acting upon them; power to select and order means to carry chosen ends into operation” (Dewey, 1938).

Teachers need to consider different educational philosophies and match their philosophy with the best method of evaluation of their job performance. Consider a teacher observation where a principal gives high praise for classroom management, yet raises the concern that students were too compliant. This is a good point to consider when examining the complexities of what constitutes good teaching. Frederick Taylor would have been pleased with one style of teaching. John Dewey, on the other hand, might have been disappointed with the same style of teaching. Many teachers might be afraid to follow Dewey’s philosophy out of fear that their freedom-filled classroom lacks management and that their principal adheres more to Taylor’s scientific approach to teaching and gives a poor teacher evaluation which ultimately might affect their job and livelihood.
Defining Good Teaching

Much of the evaluation of teaching comes down to the opinion of what constitutes good teaching. An early study conducted in 1896, by H.E. Kratz asked 2,411 students from second grade through eighth grade in Sioux City, Iowa to describe the characteristics of their best teachers (Medley, 1979). The idea behind this study is that whether consciously or sub-consciously most people have an image or an opinion of what constitutes a good teacher as opposed to a bad teacher. Kratz thought that by making desirable characteristics explicit he could establish a benchmark against which all teachers might be judged. Eighty-seven percent of the students recorded “helpfulness” as the most important teacher characteristic. This is interesting because while “helpfulness” appears to be an important trait in teaching, it can also be a barrier to effective teaching. Many educators can make the argument that a teacher being too helpful can create an environment that hinders student growth and development. The notion of teaching students to become independent thinkers and workers is now the common goal in education (Danielson, 2007). Too often the teacher becomes the enabler out of the desire to help.

Another topic worth attention from the 1896 H.E. Kratz study is that fifty-eight percent of respondents mentioned “personal appearance” as the next most influential factor after “helpfulness” (McNergney & Imig, 2003). Evaluating teacher public appearance can be subjective. Consider that the sharply dressed and neatly groomed educator represents a background that is often far different than the modest environments some students are from. This brings up a good philosophical topic about personal appearance being a factor in teacher evaluations. Some outstanding teachers do not have the best personal attire. Other teachers have great attire and are neatly groomed, yet are ineffective teachers. It is not always best to judge on
the outside looking in. Judging in general can sometimes be a flaw in human nature, yet many professional institutions view judgment and review as intrinsically linked to an understanding of individual performance. The subject of personal appearance is brought forward as evidence of something subjective that most likely happens on some level of the evaluator’s consciousness. While some might argue that evaluation of personal appearance should be included in teacher evaluation, the reality is that none of the current evaluation models of teachers include it.

A more current model that most of today’s teachers are familiar with is the Hunter Model. Toward the end of the twentieth century American education was greatly influenced by Madeline Hunter. She is most famous for her model lesson design that included the elements of anticipatory set, objective/purpose, input, modeling, checking for understanding, guided practice, and independent practice. A popular model that was used for both planning instruction and defining good teaching was Instructional Theory into Practice (ITIP). Until recently, this has been a widely used model for principals to measure the success of teachers. In her 1994 book *Enhancing teaching*, Hunter defined three categories to link to good teaching and lesson design. The first had to do with **content**. Within the context of grade level, content standards, student ability/needs, and rationale for teaching, the teacher decides what content to teach (Hunter, 1994). The second was **learner behaviors**. Teachers must decide what students will do (a) to learn and (b) to demonstrate what they have learned (Hunter, 1994). The last category that helped define good teaching and lesson design was **teacher behaviors**. Teachers must decide which “research based” teaching principles and strategies will most effectively promote learning for their students (Hunter, 1994). Notice that there is room for flexibility and creativity for teachers in these categories. Professional freedom to create quality lesson plans that best fit the
unique teaching style and unique learning styles has long been a reason to join the teaching profession.

Hunter also contributed ideas to the process of evaluating teachers such as observation and script taping. During script taping, a supervisor recorded teaching behaviors and then later categorized them into those that “promoted learning: those that used precious time and energy, yet contributed nothing to learning; and those that, unintentionally, actually interfered with learning” (Hunter, 1980). Hunter’s model provided several elements of good teaching and a framework for what principals looked for in evaluating teachers. The framework, however, is incomplete. The checklist of elements of a model lesson, observation and script taping all sound good in theory, but fall short when put into practice. In reality, the Hunter model misses several components of good lesson design including debate, student choice, role playing, and cross curriculum connections. In other words, Hunter’s model is very teacher dominant involving repetition and concepts from the scientific or business philosophy of education. As far as observation and script taping, I have yet to know a principal who script tapes teachers and many principals are only able to observe for a portion of a lesson and thus fail to see all of the different stages of a lesson plan actualized. School principals find in the real world, their time is maxed out by the overwhelming duties that range from student discipline and parent communication to district level business, and facility support.

In our current era of teacher evaluations a prominent model gaining recognition and support is the Danielson model. In 1996, Charlotte Danielson wrote about supervision and evaluation in *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Danielson’s model included four domains: Planning and Preparation, the Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. These models try to incorporate some of the concepts mentioned in
this paper from Katz, Dewey, Taylor, Cubberly, Whitehead, and Hunter. In fact the best thing the Danielson model has going for it is that it honors the complexity of teaching. Other positive elements from this model are the establishment of a common language for professional conversation and the structure for self assessment and reflection on professional practice (Marzano, 2011). In all, there are seventy-six elements that are broken into four levels of performance evaluation. Teachers will be given a grade ranging from unsatisfactory for poor performance on multiple levels to basic performance on multiple levels, to proficient performance on multiple levels, and ultimately distinguished performance on multiple levels which conveys a confident grasp of all levels. Principals will again do the evaluating. Like some of the other “scientific” teacher evaluations from over the past century there will still be margin for error in the “observation” realm of evaluating such as different perceptions of good teaching, personal bias, un-equal resources and working conditions, and unseen variables that are common within education. A more thorough review of the Danielson model will follow later in this chapter.

**Deficiencies Within the Teacher Evaluation Process**

Observation is a key component of science, yet principal observation and evaluation of teachers is flawed. In a 1952 study of teacher observation, Matthew Whitehead surveyed teachers regarding their perceptions as to the importance of each area of supervision (Marzano, 2011). The conclusion to his study pointed to the fact that observational practices failed to capitalize on its potential. Observations did not last an entire period and rarely were there follow up conferences to discuss the evaluation. This study from the 1950’s proved that administrators fall short in supporting effective teaching. Careful analysis of teacher evaluation, past and
present, proves that administrator support of teaching is inconsistent at best, yet it is administrators who hold the job security of teachers as part of their duty to observe and supervise.

Matthew Whitehead’s study provides a solid foundation for modern teacher evaluation studies. Whitehead sought to provide teachers a voice concerning how they are evaluated. The cornerstone of the study was to report teacher attitudes toward instructional improvement and to describe supervisory practices in North Carolina Negro High Schools (Whitehead, 1952). His study used questionnaires involving 115 teachers at multiple schools. The results provide important points in need of further discussion. For one, 80% of teachers looked at the classroom visitation by the principal as a method of improving instruction while 20%, stated that the purpose of the principal visits were to give ratings to the teachers and to inspect the physical features of the classroom (Whitehead, 1952). Another point addressed in this study is whether or not the principal should remain in the classroom for the entire period. In 57% of the cases in the study, the principal did not stay for the entire period (Whitehead, 1952). It was especially interesting how Whitehead broke down teacher attitudes toward classroom visitations. Of the respondents, 80% were enthusiastic, 22% indifferent, and 8% fearful (Whitehead, 1952). It will be worthwhile to compare these responses with teachers today to notice any changes to these attitudes.

Another relevant component of the 1952 Whitehead study Teachers look at supervision is the role of teachers helping teachers when it comes to evaluation. In answer to the query, “What topics would you like to have discussed at your group faculty meetings?” one hundred and one of the 115 teachers listed “improving teaching” (Whitehead, 1952). This response is relevant to today’s educators because it supports the professional learning community movement and opens
the possibility to mentoring programs or even the PAR teacher evaluation discussed earlier in this chapter. Whitehead exposes the frustration of top down autocratic management by revealing that teachers favored using the group conference as a means for improving instruction; however, it was regrettable to note that principals are still using valuable time and energy of teachers to make announcements, assign committees, and other minutiae which could be handled so easily by mimeographed newsletters, bulletins, and guide books (Whitehead, 1952). It appears certain in this study that teachers want principals to focus on improving classroom instruction and less on facility operations.

A critical section of the Whitehead study involves new teachers. Whitehead reports that helping new teachers has long been a neglected area in school administration. The teachers in this study pointed up the fact that principals in North Carolina are aware of the “coldness” which many novice teachers have received in the past (Whitehead, 1952). This coldness can certainly play a role in teacher evaluations. Being confident and feeling comfortable are traits that can be found in effective teaching. Young teachers may suffer through poor teacher evaluations because they do not feel accepted by the school faculty. While new teachers experience “coldness” from administrators in their new jobs, they are not always assigned the most difficult teaching situations. The belief that new teachers are given the hardest teaching assignments was challenged in the study with 76% of replies stating that new teachers did not inherit difficult assignments (Whitehead, 1952). The role of new teachers is important when discussing the fairness of teaching evaluations.

A final topic of interest in the Whitehead study is the relationship that lesson planning has with teacher’s attitudes toward supervision. Whitehead calls for principals to offer specific help to teachers in regard to their weaknesses and strengths. Principals should read, criticize, and
return teacher lesson plans to teachers (Whitehead, 1952). Teachers in the study wanted a clear lesson plan model and wanted instructional coaching from their principals. The lesson plan is crucial to the evaluation of the teacher. The overall consensus in the study is that better communication and cooperation between the teacher and principal is needed in the designing and modeling phase of the lesson design.

Much of Whitehead’s study is relevant to this dissertation. His study examines relevant topics in regard to teacher’s attitudes toward teacher evaluations that have stood for a great deal of time. The fact that this study is as dated as 1952 supports the fact that the research conducted in this current study is both timely and relevant. Whitehead doesn’t force his opinions on his readers. Instead he lets the teachers talk and share their attitudes and experiences of how they are supervised and evaluated by their principals. The results confirm deficiencies in the 1952 evaluation process. Sixty years later, it is worth knowing if there are still the same deficiencies. Whitehead provided opportunities for North Carolina teachers to give us data on teacher evaluations.

It is also important to learn from the experiences of principals. A principal who shed light on why teacher evaluations often miss the mark was Kim Marshall. In an article titled *It’s time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation*, Marshall argues that most processes that evaluate teachers are inefficient, ineffective, and poor use of principal’s time (Marshall, 2005). As for the reasons why? Marshall provides examples of principals observing less than 0.1% and when they do observe, the results are skewed because of an over glamorized lesson or the fact that discipline problems are reduced with an extra authoritative presence. Marshall also noticed that teachers act atypical because they are nervous while being evaluated. Another problem with evaluations is that rarely do the evaluations include student learning such as before and after
tests. Principals often have to “guess” whether or not students are learning or not by observing and writing narratives as to what they see. In Marshall’s experience, an opportunity for professional growth is wasted because of the fact that formal evaluations raise the level of anxiety making it difficult for teachers to admit errors or listen openly about areas to work at improving. The principal is also less likely to tell the whole story out of fear of facing a grievance from the union or the backlash of ill will it might create from the district office or from the collective staff in the building. Another question posed by Marshall is how well trained are the principals at using the evaluation instruments? In this era of changing evaluation systems, principals need to develop good skills at knowing the system thoroughly, how to observe using the system, how to effectively write up an evaluation within the system, and then how to have what can sometimes be “difficult conversations” with the teacher. It is also refreshing that Marshall admits that principals are often too busy to devote the time needed to evaluate teachers. The usual distractions of discipline and operational duties are what usually gobble up the time for administrators. What were most telling in Marshall’s article on teacher evaluation were the personal vignettes he tells that bring into question the validity of teacher evaluations.

The stories and experiences of teachers provide good empirical evidence on how to make teacher evaluations work. As a longtime principal, Kim Marshall offered several tips such as having a common language of what constitutes good teaching that is not too long. Marshall uses the acronym SOTEL which stands for Safety, Objectives, Teaching, Engagement, and Learning. He also recommended the multiple observations of five to fifteen minutes over the course of the year. It was interesting that he preferred principals providing prompt face to face feedback as opposed to E-mail or notes placed in teacher mailboxes. In fact, Marshall places this idea of prompt honest feedback as part of the professional learning culture of the school (Marshall,
Marshall is in agreement with most of the new teacher evaluation systems that use rubrics as a method of providing a teacher with clear feedback with respect to a standard. What I found most intriguing in Marshall’s article were the discussion of portfolios, common unit plans and assessments. If done correctly, teacher and student portfolios are the way to go because it provides real evidence of growth. Common unit plans and assessments are a great way to get teacher teams working together. Peer mentoring will always provide more meaningful teacher growth than top down principal evaluations.

The scientific/business model is guiding the direction in which American schools travel. Last year many school districts throughout the nation adopted new evaluation frameworks. The districts are moving on from the old satisfactory/unsatisfactory method of teacher evaluation to the four or five tiered model. The Washington State senate voted 46 to 3 in favor of including measured student improvement as part of the teacher’s evaluation. The bill was backed by major businesses such as Microsoft, yet teachers were not included in the negotiations. Veteran teachers will tell you that this again will be an example of government putting the cart before the horse. The fairness of teacher evaluations is worth discussion. Examining if school districts have effective mentor programs in place to help new or struggling teachers is a worthwhile endeavor. Evaluating whether or not principals really have additional time to support teacher observation and conferences needs happen. Teacher evaluation is not an exact science. Despite the varied evaluation models, with the perpetual focus on redesigning the modern educational system, there should be flexibility with the evaluation system in order to allow for truly dynamic teaching.
Philosophical Issues

A philosophical issue to consider is the role of the principal. Determining if he or she a coach who is there to guide you or if they more of an evaluating boss who may be there to dismiss you is relevant to this study. In *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*, authors Robert Marzano, Tony Frontier, and David Livingston make a strong argument that the supervisory role of a principal is to guide teachers in their role to effectively teach students. The primary purpose of supervision should be the enhancement of teachers’ pedagogical skills, with the ultimate goal of enhancing student achievement (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Philosophically this sounds great. In reality, it would be interesting to compare the amount of time principals spend helping teachers enhance their skills compared to other daily duties of principals such as discipline, communicating with parents, communicating with district administration, and tending to the organizational needs of the building.

Another philosophical issue to consider is whether student achievement should be included in a teacher’s evaluation. One viewpoint is that linking student achievement to the teacher is like linking too many cavities in one’s teeth to the effectiveness of their dentist (Taylor, 2002). A teacher only has a limited period of time to change the study habits and skills of their students. There are so many variables within the group of students that a teacher has in a given year. Variables such as abusive home environment, lack early childhood education, low income parents, cultural and language differences, and learning disabilities all play a part in student learning. Of course the counter argument to this is that teachers are just making excuses and given a fair amount of time there should be measurable growth in student achievement. If a teacher spends a full year with a group of students, and at the end of the year the bulk of the students haven’t mastered the basic material necessary to advance them to the next grade,
citizens should stop paying the taxes that support that worthless teacher’s endeavors for next year (Suprynowicz, 2009). This counter argument also supports the concept of competition. If you go to a dentist who does bad work on your teeth and then complains that it is the patients fault, you can find a better dentist who takes responsibility for whatever improvements they tell you they can accomplish (Suprynowicz, 2009). The literature backed by teacher unions opposes linking teacher evaluation to student achievement while the literature from the business community supports it. Support for using student achievement in the evaluation of teachers is gaining momentum. Student achievement and student learning is a controversial component of new teacher evaluations throughout the United States. While it is understood that student learning is the purpose of school, educators must use caution in this phase of evaluation because the use of student test scores being part of a teachers evaluation brings up the question of equity and reliability. Schools are all so very different when it comes to funding and demographics. There are so many factors involved in education and the development of students.

An interesting opinion on using standardized test scores on teacher evaluations comes from Charlotte Danielson:

I do think that it’s reasonable for teachers to demonstrate that their kids have learned. I think that does make sense. Beyond that, though, I’m not at all convinced that it can be done fairly for teachers based on what we know, particularly in a high-stakes environment (Meyer, 2012).

Perhaps using test scores on teacher effectiveness is a bit premature. In time, it makes sense if done correctly. At this time however, educators are trying to understand what good teaching practices look like and how to improve student learning. Test scores and student achievement are undeniably important topics. At this time the skill of the teacher comes first.
A final philosophical issue to consider involves how much skill from the individual teacher really factors into the learning of students. An effective teacher evaluation needs to determine this. The state of Washington has approved three models to be implemented this year. The following section of the literature is a review of these three models.
Current Evaluation Models

The Washington State Legislature passed in March of 2010, a bill (6696) that mandates a new method of evaluation be used for teachers and principals. The law calls for a four tier evaluation that measures performance against eight categories of criteria. The criteria for teachers are: High Expectations, Effective Teaching Practices, Recognizing Individual Student Learning Needs, Focus on Subject Matter, Safe Productive Learning Environment, Use of Multiple Student Data Elements to Modify Instruction, Communicating with Parents and School/Community, and Exhibiting Collegial and Collaborative Practices.

To help implement the passage of Senate Bill 6696, the Washington Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) formed in 2010. The TPEP Steering Committee included representatives from different state government agencies along with teacher, principal, and parent associations. In 2010, eight districts participated in the development of teacher evaluation systems to be piloted in the 2011-12 school year. The TPEP group has been influential in helping narrow down three evaluation options for school districts in the state of Washington to follow.

School districts are now in the process of adopting one of three state recommended models to pilot before the law goes into effect in 2013-2014. The three choices include The Charlotte Danielson Evaluation Model, The Marzano Evaluation Model, and the University of Washington CEL 5D+ Evaluation Model. The selection of the framework and evaluation model will be developed in collaboration between various groups such as district administration, teachers, principals, and education associations. Different districts were at different stages of timelines with some districts having already completed pilot programs. School districts were also in the midst of weekly and monthly meetings in an effort to make progress with the new law. Due to an increase in responsibility and training, it appears that administrators had a head start in
understanding and molding the new evaluation system. Teachers and even the general public were slower to become truly aware. While there are many similarities to the three evaluation systems there are enough differences to have a fair debate as to which system will be the most successful. The purpose of evaluation of teachers is to improve the overall quality of education for students. School districts were given the opportunity to select one of the three instruments do the best job.

Given that there are three choices, examination of the three evaluations instruments will be conducted in this section of the literature. Opinions from Washington Superintendent of Public Schools Randy Dorn will also be included since he was involved in the final decision making process on selecting these models (Salerno, 2012). The purpose of examining the three models is to examine how teacher evaluation practices that are advocated in literature compare to teacher evaluation practices actually in use. The participants of this study were selected evenly from each of the following evaluation systems used by their district. The intent of this section is to help familiarize the reader with each of the new evaluation systems implemented in the state.

The Danielson Model

The Charlotte Danielson Teacher Evaluation Model has emerged as a very popular design. Currently the Danielson Model is the most popular evaluation model in the state. At this time, eighty-three school districts in Washington State have selected the Danielson teacher evaluation model. In comparison, eighty-one districts have selected CEL 5D+ and another sixty-seven have selected Marzano. The Danielson model defines good teaching and uses a common language that educators can follow.
Charlotte Danielson is a career educator who was in the right place at the right time in regard to providing much needed input in how best to evaluate teachers. Having taught all levels from kindergarten to college, Danielson has spent years as an educational consultant. She is currently based out of New Jersey and holds degrees from Cornell, Oxford, and Rutgers. In the educational community she is highly respected for her work in curriculum planning, performance assessment, professional development, and teacher growth. Teachers and administrators find her to be a reliable source. Grounded in research, Danielson published *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* in 1996. This book was popular and widely used in the late 1990’s and 2000’s before legislative action in states began an overhaul of teacher evaluations. The book was updated in 2007, which was perfect timing with the “Race to the Top” competition under the Obama administration. The Danielson Model was viewed as a tried and tested framework that was readily available for school districts to evaluate teachers.

A key reason for having a multi-tier evaluation system is what Danielson (2007) calls a question of fairness. Under past evaluation systems all teachers who went about their jobs without causing any major problems would be lumped into the “satisfactory” category. This meant that an incredibly large group of teachers were consistently rated as the same when clearly there are some that are better at teaching than others. There would also be a very small number of teachers that were rated as “un-satisfactory” when it would be clear that there were many more teachers who needed help but had not done anything extreme enough to get the “un-satisfactory” grade.

Danielson makes a good case for why we have systems for teacher evaluation. Her first point of emphasis is to provide a clear definition of the “what” of teaching and then have instruments and procedures that provide evidence of the “how” of teaching (Danielson, 2007).
Using this definition will help evaluators to make accurate judgments based on the evidence of teaching. In turn, this will help guide professional development for teachers to understand and execute the methods being evaluated in good teaching practices.

Danielson communicates why it is important to assess teacher effectiveness. First and foremost teaching is a fulfillment of public trust (Danielson, 2007). Parents trust that teachers will provide safety and learning for their children. Public money provides for the salary of teachers as compensation for this public trust. Another reason for assessing teacher effectiveness is to comply with state law. Even before states passed legislation calling for more stringent teacher evaluation, laws were in place providing for quality teachers in each state. Observations have almost always been a part of American Education. State law requires effective teachers. Since teaching can be complex and challenging Danielson also understands that professional development is essential and a more specific way to measure effectiveness can assist in identifying areas of needed improvement.

The Danielson (2011) Model of teacher evaluation is divided into four domains. Under each domain, the teacher is then evaluated on a four tier evaluation scale of Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished. This four tier grade effectively does away with the old method of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. See the chart below for an example of how a teacher might be scored on Quality of Questioning Techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Questions</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions are virtually all of poor quality, with low cognitive challenge, single correct responses, and asked in rapid</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions are a combination of low and high quality, posed in rapid succession. Only some invite a thoughtful</td>
<td>Most of teacher’s questions are of high quality. Adequate time is provided for students to respond.</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions are of uniformly high quality, with adequate time for students to respond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The domains are consistent with most state requirements. Washington State for example lists eight criterions for teacher expectations and all of the domains and sub categories underneath each domain fall under each criterion. These domains attempt to define what effective teaching is. On one hand you have what teachers do (the work of teaching) and on the other hand you have results or what the teachers accomplishes by how well the students learn. The four domains define what teachers do. Domain 1 is Planning and Preparation. Domain 2 is The Classroom Environment. Domain 3 is Instruction. Domain 4 is Professional Responsibilities. Out of these domains are more specific descriptions as to what teachers are to do. The chart below provides examples of the different elements that make up each domain of evaluation.

Figure 1. Danielson rubric for questioning techniques (Danielson, 2007).
### Professional Teaching Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1 – Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Domain 2 – Classroom Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td><strong>2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of content</td>
<td>Teacher interaction with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of prerequisite relationships</td>
<td>Student interactions with other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of content related pedagogy</td>
<td><strong>2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</strong></td>
<td>Importance of the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of characteristics of age group</td>
<td>Expectations for learning and achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of students' varied approaches to learning</td>
<td>Student pride in work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of students' skills and knowledge</td>
<td><strong>2c: Managing Classroom Procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage</td>
<td>Management of instructional groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Management of transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, sequence, and alignment</td>
<td>Management of materials and supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Performance of noninstructional duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability for diverse learners</td>
<td><strong>2d: Managing Student Behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</strong></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for classroom use</td>
<td>Monitoring of student behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources to extend content knowledge and pedagogy</td>
<td>Response to student misbehavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for students</td>
<td><strong>2e: Organizing Physical Space</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1e: Designing Coherent Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Safety and accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning activities</td>
<td>Arrangement of furniture and use of physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials and resources</td>
<td><strong>Domain 4 – Professional Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional groups</td>
<td><strong>3a: Reflecting on Teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson and unit structure</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1f: Designing Student Assessments</strong></td>
<td>Use in future teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence with instructional outcomes</td>
<td><strong>4a: Maintaining Accurate Records</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria and standards</td>
<td>Student completion of assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of formative assessments</td>
<td>Student progress in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use for planning</td>
<td>Non-instructional records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 3 - Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3a: Communicating with Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of oral and written language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3c: Engaging Students in Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure and pacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Figure 2.** Danielson professional teaching standards.
The first Domain under the Charlotte Danielson (2011) Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument is Planning and Preparation. Many teachers will tell you that the key to successful teaching is the work you put in behind the scenes. Being prepared is an integral part of professionalism. Under this domain are subcategories such as Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (1a), which means you have thorough knowledge of the subject that you teach and you have prepared ideas in which to effectively pass this knowledge on to students. This includes questions and answers, making significant connections to the curriculum, and the development of skills related to the subject matter which would be useful to the growth and development of students. For a teacher to earn an unsatisfactory under this domain they would display little understanding of the subject matter or approaches suitable to students learning the content. For a teacher to earn a distinguished mark, they would have displayed extensive understanding of the topic and provided a wide range of pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.

Domain 2 under the Danielson (2011) Framework is The Classroom Environment. Interacting positively with students and creating comfortable environment is a huge part of effective teaching. Classroom management is an important part of teaching evaluations. The Danielson model does a good job of capturing this critical component within the evaluation model. The first category under Danielson’s (2011) Domain 2 calls for Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a). An unsatisfactory evaluation of this category would involve any disrespect taking place in the classroom such as negative body language, rolling of eyes, and not calling students by first names. A distinguished evaluation would involve politeness, being friendly, displaying caring interactions, and always allowing students to maintain a sense of
dignity. Rapport with students makes the difference on whether or not a student will be motivated to learn and whether or not they will want to break any classroom rules or procedures.

The focus of Danielson (2011) Domain 3 is Instruction. Under this domain the first category is Communicating with Students (3a). Keeping students on task and on pace to achieve their learning goals require clear guidance through effective communication. Conveying what is being taught and what needs to be accomplished is an important element in teacher evaluation. Clear communication on the board, on handouts, and reinforced by students and teachers explaining the plan help teachers stay in the proficient and distinguished categories of evaluation. Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) is a category under Instruction (Danielson, 2011). An example of how a teacher might earn unsatisfactory in this category would involve only calling on students raising their hands and ask only recitation questions. Proficient and distinguished teachers ask a variety of critical thinking questions and inspire other students to ask their fellow students questions with the ability to include follow up questions in a debate like manner.

The final section of Charlotte Danielson’s (2011) Teaching Evaluation Instrument is Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities. An argument can be made that the professionalism of teachers has been brought into question prompting the need to evaluate. The first category for this domain is Reflecting on Teaching (4a). This entails constant analysis on both the lesson and planning phases of teaching. For those who call teaching an art, this is all about perfecting your art or craft. The distinguished teacher will always look for new ideas or strategies to improve a lesson. An example of a category of Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities is Maintaining Accurate Records (Danielson, 2011). Teachers have a legal responsibility to maintain accurate attendance and provide evidence of student growth through a grading system. There is a trust
involved that teachers will be consistent, fair, and accurate. Disorganized teachers who lose
student assignments or make mistakes with attendance will be given unsatisfactory scores in this
category. Another good category of Danielson’s (2011) Domain 4 is communication with
families (4c). Teachers need to be proactive in communicating with parents. Creating family
friendly assignments, E-mails, phone calls, web pages, and newsletters are all examples of ways
in which teacher can communicate. At the very least, teachers are expected to inform parents of
any academic or behavior concerns.

Domain 4 makes a point to evaluate the teacher beyond the classroom. For example,
Danielson’s (2011) fourth category is Participating in a Professional Community (4d). This
category has been heavily stressed in school districts over the past five years. A professional
learning community is a support network intended to support teachers and improve their practice.
Having good relationships with colleagues helps maintain a positive school climate, provides an
opportunity to align grading practices, find consistency in procedures, and allows teachers to
synchronize units. Danielson (2011) calls the teacher who only works regular contract time
without reaching out in other capacities as a teacher who might be rated as unsatisfactory. A
distinguished teacher hosts book study groups and might lead a “mentor” group (Danielson,
2011).

Growing and Developing Professionally (4e) is another category under Danielson’s
(2011) Domain 4 that extends beyond the classroom. Teaching experience is often a good thing
but sometimes the experienced teacher can grow stale and be out of touch with educational
trends and ideas. The purpose of this category is to always pursue professional growth through
workshops, institutes, and advanced degrees. The state of Washington requires this in order to
renew a teaching certificate.
Many educators have endorsed the Danielson Evaluation Model. In addition to the large number of school districts in the state of Washington, her teacher evaluation model is being used in multiple states (Hess, 2011). Some states such as Idaho, have decided to use only the Danielson model. Some reasons for its popularity are that philosophically it is a system that educators can identify with and agree with in terms of what constitutes good teaching. Politically, teacher unions are in support of the Danielson model and can endorse it. Danielson has a proven track record of being tried and tested. In 2009, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation embarked on a large research project “Measures of Effective Teaching” and used Danielson’s *Framework for teaching evaluation instrument* (Danielson, 2011). This study helped enhance the Danielson model and gave it a great deal of political credibility. Another positive attribute of the Danielson model is that it comes from the voice and experiences of a former teacher and includes the experience and voices of thousands of successful teachers. The ultimate evaluators of the model will most likely be a combination of principals and teachers who use this model on a daily basis. An additional evaluator of this model will come from student achievement scores. Evidence of student growth will ultimately play a role in deciding whether or not this teacher evaluation model is making a difference. Principals are in the midst of training to use this system. Time will be the best gauge to fully evaluate whether it works or not.

Danielson urges patience in the process of changing teacher evaluations. In an interview given by Theodoric Meyer, Danielson answered a question about what she has learned in the current work going on in states and school districts. She noted that you have to give it enough time, start on a small scale and learn from that (Meyer, 2012). Danielson noted that Arkansas has taken over an 18 month period to implement the new system and had a limited amount of backlash. The same could not be said for other states. Danielson uses Michigan as an example:
Michigan passed a law last July mandating that every district in the state implement a new evaluation system by that September. Well, the ink wasn’t even dry. I don’t think anybody thought that was a good idea, except maybe the legislators who passed the law. Many of them don’t understand the complexity of it. I mean, they’re not doing it because they’re bad people. They just don’t know. They don’t have a clue what’s really involved (Meyer, 2012).

In a different interview, Danielson expands on the potential for her evaluation system to go badly. One potential problem is the enormous need for people who can do the evaluations well. It is well acknowledged that administrators carry most of the burden of carrying out well done teacher evaluations but Danielson contends that through improved training department chairs and supervisors can help with teacher evaluations (Hess, 2011). Another idea is for teachers in good standing, they don’t have to do a comprehensive, formal evaluation every-year—they do it every other year, or every three years, and the other teachers engage in rigorous, self-directed inquiry (Hess, 2011). Regardless, Charlotte Danielson acknowledges that her role is not to police how school districts implement her model of teacher evaluation. She simply provided educators with a design to assess teachers. As an evaluation architect, Danielson believes that while teaching might be hard, assessing it shouldn’t be (Meyer, 2012).

**The Marzano Model**

A well known teacher evaluation system is The Marzano Model. Robert Marzano is a well-known and influential writer, speaker, trainer, and researcher in education. Marzano has authored over thirty books and a hundred and fifty articles on topics related to education. In the midst of teacher evaluation reform, The Marzano Research Laboratory released *The Marzano*
teacher evaluation scales in 2011 as an option available for school districts to use for
evaluations. Marzano has ties to the state of Washington (his masters degree is from Seattle
University and his doctorate is from the University of Washington). Because of his background
and work, the state of Washington included the Marzano Model as an option for school districts.

The primary purpose of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is to enhance the
pedagogical skills of teachers (Marzano 2011). The model itself is designed to link student
achievement, teacher pedagogical skill, and evaluation together. Like the Danielson model, there
are four domains in the Marzano model. The domains are strikingly similar yet in different order.
Domain 1 is Classroom Strategies and Behaviors. Domain 2 is Planning and Preparing. Domain
3 is Reflecting on Teaching. Domain 4 is Collegiality and Professionalism. For each domain,
Marzano (2011) has books such as The Art and Science of Teaching that further supports each
category. A summary of the four Marzano domains is provided below.
Figure 3. Marzano domains (Marzano, 2012).
A key difference in the Marzano Model was the use of a five part scale to rate teachers instead of the four part scale used in the Danielson model. The categories are labeled Innovating (4), Applying (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), and Not Using (0). At first glance, educators might prefer this scale over the Danielson scale because it provides one extra category and the wording is more positive than terms such as basic or unsatisfactory as found in the Danielson model. Within each category of each domain, the Marzano scale provides examples detailing what it takes to earn that marking. For example a category under Domain 1 is Classroom Strategies and Behaviors. Under the Innovating (4) category, the teacher describes, adapts, and creates new strategies for unique student needs and situations. A Developing (2) teacher provides a clearly stated learning goal accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance. This is where educators might be critical of the scale. A teacher who earns a “two” really is not that far off of a teacher who earns a “four” yet the terms innovating and developing seem far apart from one another. As a principal, this scale might present challenges in determining an accurate marking for a teacher. There is not enough separation between the scores on the evaluation system.

Another key difference between the Marzano Evaluation Model and the Danielson Model is the amount of evaluation categories within each domain. While the Danielson Model spreads categories within each domain with equal proportion and emphasis, Marzano’s model is top heavy with the Domain 1 (Classroom Strategies and Behaviors) having way more evaluation rubrics to it than the other domains. Classroom Strategies and Behaviors includes a checklist of thirty-nine rubrics for a principal to evaluate a teacher on while the domains of Preparing and Planning has eight categories, Reflecting on Teaching has five, and Collegiality and Professionalism has six. This proves that the Marzano Teacher Evaluation System places more
emphasis on observable behaviors in students. Danielson’s Domain #3 of Instruction has only five categories of evaluation compared to the thirty nine of Marzano in his Classroom strategies Domain. It is worth considering that with the high demand on the time of principals, it would be more realistic for principals to evaluate fewer categories.

One component of the Marzano (2011) Teacher Evaluation Model is well designed rubrics. The rubric is clear and functional. For example, when a principal is evaluating a teacher, there is a checklist for teacher evidence and a checklist for student evidence. There is a section for observation notes and a summary of what it takes to get a certain score.

A good question in regard to teacher evaluation is whether or not veteran teachers should be evaluated in the same fashion as beginning teachers. Marzano addresses this question by including stages of development guideline as part of the evaluation system. Teachers are divided into stages of Initial Status, Professional, Mentor, and Master. Each stage includes benchmarks as to which score a teacher should earn for each domain. It is common for beginning teachers to be given the most challenging teaching assignments at the lowest performing schools with very little support. This should be taken into consideration or the new evaluation systems will cause districts to lose teachers with great potential.

Washington State can look at the implementation of the Marzano Model in other states. A good state to compare is Florida. In 2011-12, the Marzano Evaluation Model was included within a controversial teacher merit pay law that used test score information to help judge teacher quality and determine pay. Florida used part of the $4.7 million federal reward (Race to the top) money on the evaluation model developed by Marzano (Postal, 2012). Over the past year, harsh criticisms from teachers have been the result. An example of this is from a nationally honored math and science teacher who was given a “beginning” teacher rating under the
Marzano Model because he had erased the “learning goal” on the white board to make a demonstration while teaching a chemistry lesson (Postal, 2012). Mary Louise Wells was one of five finalists for state teacher of the year in 2002, and described the evaluation system: “It’s been humiliating for a lot of extremely accomplished people” (Postal, 2012). Overall, there appear to be more negative rumblings of this nature toward the Marzano Model than toward the Danielson Model. This example leads me to believe that feedback from teachers might be contrary to the feedback from legislative decision makers.

The CEL 5D+ Model

The third teacher evaluation option for Washington State school districts is the CEL 5D+ Model. The Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) is a service arm of the University of Washington College of Education. Established in 2001, UWCEL began with a mission to create research-based programs focused on improving the quality of learning and leadership in our nation’s schools (Fink, 2012). In 2007, CEL created a teacher evaluation system called the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D). This evaluation model was the result of research conducted by the UW CEL faculty.

At the core of the CEL 5D+ Evaluation Model are five dimensions called Purpose, Student Engagement, Curriculum & Pedagogy, Assessment for Student Learning, and Classroom Environment & Culture. Underneath each dimension are the thirteen sub dimensions of Standards, Teaching Point, Intellectual Work, Engagement Strategies, Talk, Curriculum, Teaching Approaches and/or strategies, Scaffolds for Learning, Assessment, Adjustment, Use of Physical Environment, Classroom Routines and Rituals, and Classroom Culture. From these dimensions and sub-dimensions is a rubric that captures a teacher’s level: A novice instructional
leader (1), An emerging instructional leader (2), A developing instructional leader (3), and an expert instructional leader (4). Like the Marzano and Danielson models, the CEL 5D+ Model matches the eight criteria of requirements for teachers in the state of Washington. The concepts are the same. It is mostly the language and the rubrics that differ.

A key objective of the CEL 5D+ evaluation tool is to differentiate between novice and expert teachers. Novice teachers for example are not as advanced in the content of what they teach and sometimes might teach inaccurate information. Expert teachers know the content extremely well and are able to articulate thought provoking questions to generate student interest and understanding. Novice teachers sometimes lack patience and make rash evaluative judgments while expert teachers use a wide array of evidence to pose questions that will help form strategies and actions. Expert teachers are more aligned in leadership action and tend to be more metacognitive in decision making.

The CEL 5D+ Model highlights the evaluative process as a whole. This model was a leader in creating a user friendly online tool that could be administered anywhere. The Marzano and Danielson models have since caught up, but the CEL 5D+ Model was technology friendly from early on. The evaluative process involved using a website to watch a twenty-minute lesson and write a response using three provided questions. After submission of the response it would be sent to the University of Washington where two UWCEL staff would independently rate the responses using the four point rubric. University of Washington claims to have a 92% inter-rater reliability (Fink, 2012). Most of the early returns reveal that the average evaluation has teachers falling in an emerging instructional leader category or level 2. It appears that this system has high standards which are the reason for developing the teacher evaluation in the first place.
While the CEL 5D+ Model has high standards and may really frustrate teachers, there is much to like about it. For one, the evaluation models itself is always going through extensive evaluation of itself. The UWCEL faculty is in constant research and evaluation mode. Supported by a renowned research university (University of Washington) it has the public trust of both academia and the general public. The Center of Educational Leadership looks at many variables of educational research and teacher evaluation. For example, there is comparison between teacher evaluations from district to district that take into account large, small, urban, and rural districts. Another comparison matches a teacher’s years of experience with their teacher evaluation. The UWCEL research suggests that years of experience don’t make a big difference in instructional expertise (Fink, 2012).

A key component in regard to the new teacher evaluation instruments is the evaluator. Under the CEL 5D+ Model, it took faculty four hours practicing with the evaluation tool to gain a consistent, shared evaluation of the teacher’s performance (Fink, 2012). All three of the evaluation systems approved to be used in Washington State (CEL 5D+, Danielson, and Marzano) require the building principal to evaluate the teacher. Philosophically, this might not be ideal if you consider the potential of peer evaluations, student input, or parent input. Having an evaluation fall under the eye of the building principal is evidence of politically based top down management. Many principals have limited classroom experience and their strengths often lay in others important elements of school life such as safety, discipline, maintenance, and facilitation of meetings. A well rounded and thorough teacher evaluation is expected to take up precious time if done correctly. Knowing how spread out administrators are with their job requirements I wonder will they find this time that is so necessary for conducting legitimate evaluations. The number of administrative evaluators compared to teachers to be evaluated in
each school is staggering. It makes one wonder if policy makers take this into consideration. Possibly, this extra strain on time will steer away good principals from the profession.

**Summary of Three Teacher Evaluation Models**

The biggest theme linking the Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+ models together is that they all genuinely support and encourage teacher development. All three systems will face the challenge of supporting principals who evaluate teachers. All three of them identify what constitutes great teaching from mediocre teaching. All three of them provide motivation for teachers to think more critically about their own craft.

**State Superintendent on Teacher Evaluations**

The Superintendent of Public Schools in the state of Washington is Randy Dorn. As the Superintendent, Dorn has perhaps the greatest influence over principals and teachers. This research study is a qualitative review of teacher and principal perceptions of the new teacher evaluations in the state of Washington. Being that six principals and six teachers will be interviewed in this study, it is appropriate to include an interview of Superintendent Dorn. This portion of the literature review highlights Dorn’s comments from an April 25th, 2012 interview by Christina Salorno. Dorn’s interview will be divided into two categories. The first category will include topics that that are generally supported and the second category will include topics that are more controversial and up for contention.

School districts in the state of Washington are moving forward at a steady pace on new teacher evaluations. Superintendent Randy Dorn used the tortoise and hare analogy when describing how the state is doing in the process of implementing the new teacher evolution systems.
We’ve seen other states do it from the top-down level and it has become a very tough time in those states. We may be a little tortoise and hare nationally, but the tortoise wins.

So I’m going to bet on the tortoise. We’re going to get it right (Salerno, 2012).

Beginning with nine statewide pilot programs, Dorn helped select three (Danielson, Marzano, & UWCEL 5D) frameworks to unify the state when it comes to evaluating teachers. The evaluations basically give us definitions and understanding of what good teaching is (Salerno, 2012). In the spirit of giving local school districts some control and say over the process, each district is able to select from one of the three models approved. Dorn call this a positive step.

“School district leaders and teachers will choose which one fits them best, and which one works for their teachers and students. You get a more robust exchange of ideas” (Salerno, 2012).

Over the past couple years; school districts have taken advantage of this opportunity to exert a bit of local control over deciding which model would serve its district the best. This phase in the process has taken more time, but the time has been well spent because by discussing the three models, principals and teachers within school districts have developed better understandings of the new evaluation systems.

In the interview with Christina Salerno, Superintendent Dorn addressed several topics related to teacher evaluations that are controversial. Dorn addressed the overall purpose of the evaluations, the issue of trust, and general concerns when he was asked about the reaction by teachers and principals.

The big concern by teachers is trusting that this is really about improving the profession, rather than just getting rid of bad teachers. A lot of principals are concerned about this shift of their workload. Over the past three years, many vice principals and deans of
students have gone away. So they have less personnel to do the evaluations today compared to four years ago (Salerno, 2012).

Another controversial topic discussed in the interview is the use of student test scores on teacher evaluations. When asked what role student test scores would play in teacher evaluations, Dorn’s answer was vague at best.

School districts can use the data as a substantial part of evaluations-but what does substantial mean? To me, if you had money invested in the stock market and got a 5% return, that’s not substantial. But 15-20 percent, that’s substantial. So that’s going to be decided at the local level. Some are saying the data and growth of a student should be a third, and others think it will be 50 percent. You have to trust that principals and school districts will use it as a factor, but also use other factors (Salerno, 2012).

Interpretation of this quote would mean that Dorn definitely supports the use of student test scores on the evaluation of teachers but he understands the controversy of it and is passing the issue on to districts and teacher unions to sort out. As far as using other factors, it would have been nice if Dorn was more specific in stating the other factors or if Salerno would have had a follow up question asking Dorn to break down the different components of teacher evaluations even further.

One final issue that Superintendent Dorn discussed is how he would like to see teacher evaluations go further by denying tenure to teachers who get unsatisfactory evaluations. Salerno questioned Dorn further on this:

What I mean by that is when someone gets “1” that means they are not doing a good job at all. They should be put on a plan of improvement and if they get a “1” again, the the
district should have the opportunity to let them go. We believe it takes too long to go through the process of removing the teacher. I’m hoping in the future we work on that process and can make it shorter. It can take 2½ years to remove a teacher and the whole thing gets in the courts and is expensive. I would rather use the resources in the classroom. We need to shorten the process and make it more effective (Salerno, 2012).

This topic is a difficult one because it involves the livelihoods of a great many teachers and if Dorn had it his way, teachers would not have a very long opportunity to improve their teaching and they would be doing so with a great deal of pressure. Earlier in the interview Dorn stated: “The evaluations give us definitions and an understanding of what good teaching is” (Selerno, 2012). The question that should follow is the question that many principals have to confront. Is the primary objective of the new teacher evaluations to improve teacher performance or to weed out poor teacher?

By including portions of the question and answer between Christina Salerno and Randy Dorn in the literature review, readers gain a better understanding of the different perceptions of teacher evaluations. Thanks to Salerno’s article and interview, state government was given a voice through Superintendent Dorn. There is clearly division between state government, principals, and teachers on educational philosophy as it relates to teacher evaluations. A central theme of this research study is to let the different participants involved in the phenomenon of changing teacher evaluations have their voices heard. State government, teachers, and principals are all working at creating improved classroom instruction for students in the state of Washington and through the United States. A common theme involves the role of principals as being pulled by state laws and classroom realities within their schools. To better understand this,
the next section of the literature review will examine the role of the principal in relation to teacher evaluations.

**Principal Responsibilities**

Before Marzano entered into the realm of teacher evaluation, he was already well known as a guiding influence in principal evaluations. The fact remains that principals will play a major role in the evaluation of teachers. It is worth examining the responsibilities of an effective principal to understand the relationship principals and teachers have when it comes to teacher evaluations. Marzano offers the best literature to examine on this topic.

This section will examine selected principal responsibilities from Marzano, Waters, and McNulty’s (2005) work entitled *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Marzano outlines twenty-one specific principal responsibilities that effective principals must satisfy to ensure high levels of student achievement. The twenty-one responsibilities included *Affirmation, Change agent, Contingent awards, Communication, Culture, Discipline, Flexibility, Focus, Ideals/beliefs, Input, Intellectual stimulation, Involvement in curriculum/instruction/assessment, Monitoring/evaluating, Optimizer, Order, Outreach, Relationships, Resources, Situational awareness, and Visibility.*

The twenty-one responsibilities categorized by Marzano et al. (2005) were the result of a meta-analysis of sixty-nine studies examining the relationship between principal effectiveness and student achievement. The studies involved 2,802 schools, roughly 1.4 million students and 14,000 teachers. The outcome of these studies noted that taken individually all responsibilities, when successfully satisfied by effective principal do posses a positive effect on student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005).
In the interest of staying on the topic teacher evaluations, ten of Marzano’s et al. (2005) twenty-one principal responsibilities will be analyzed here in this literature review. The ten principal roles examined in this study will include Affirmation, Change agent, Contingent awards, Communication, Intellectual stimulation, Involvement in curriculum/instruction/assessment, Knowledge of curriculum/instruction/assessment, Monitoring/evaluating/relationships, and Resources. These ten responsibilities are important to the discussion of the role of principals when it comes to the evaluation of teachers. It is the intent of this portion of the literature to link the responsibilities of teachers with the responsibilities of principals in an effort to understand the working relationship that both groups need in order to achieve desired success in their respected profession. The principal responsibilities will be discussed in alphabetical order in an effort to not place greater importance of one trait over another.

The first principal responsibility is Affirmation. Marzano et al. (2005) defines the first principle responsibility, Affirmation, as “…the extent to which the leader recognizes and celebrates accomplishments – and acknowledge failures”. In this way the leader engages in honest communication regarding the realities under which the school is operating. On the one hand, the genuine successes of students and teachers are celebrated, while the shortcomings of the school are openly identified. By exercising the responsibility of affirmation the principal is providing an honest view of what is happening within the school (Marzano et al., 2005). Affirmation can also be open to perception which is a theme in this study.

Affirmation provides motivation for teachers. A principal looks for as many incentives as possible to motivate teachers to facilitate high levels of student learning. An example of the impact of affirmation comes from Whitaker (2003) when he states:
When we acknowledge the efforts of others, especially our highest achievers, they redouble their efforts. They feel more connected to us and to the school. When we show our respect for them, they gain more respect for us. Reinforcing our teachers—especially the ones we value most—makes everyone’s job easier and more satisfying (Whitaker, 2003).

Affirmation works in two ways. For one, it celebrates good teachers (Marzano et al. 2005). Affirmation also requires an honest acknowledgment of failures within the school (Conca, 2009). Honesty is important because it allows a school to identify areas of weakness in the hopes of finding improvement. Honesty also allows for healthy and productive dialogue giving hope that there can be better cooperation between the principal and teacher which in turn will improve student performance.

Marzano et al. (2005) identifies the second principal responsibility as that of Change Agent. According to Marzano et al. (2005) the responsibility of Change Agents refers to the leader’s disposition to challenge the status quo and temporarily upset the school’s equilibrium. Inspiring changes for the better is a common goal among principals. As potential leaders of teachers, principals have a great deal of influence over impacting the way teachers perform their duties. Motivational staff meetings, classroom visits, e-mails, inspirational stories, and sharing of relevant literature are just a few examples of how a principal might inspire change.

Disrupting the status quo can sometimes improve learning institutions for the better. Changes to teacher evaluations is an example of the federal government challenging state governments (Race to the top), state legislatures challenging school districts (SB 6696), school districts challenging principals, principals challenging teachers, and teachers challenging students. Perhaps the biggest challenge in this process will be how well principals will challenge
changes in teaching. To further emphasize this point, Ricken (2007) stresses the importance of embracing change and challenging the status quo when he states:

We must realize that principals have to constantly challenge the status quo and become activists for meaningful change…. Being a principal is not a spectator sport. We must always challenge present situations and conditions. Our purpose should be to elevate our current standards and increase both our expectations and those of our staff. Rocking the boat frees the creativity of the staff and is the means to move alone and continuum of school improvement (Ricken, 2007).

While justified change is important, an effective principal will not engage in modifications simply for the sake of change (Conca, 2009). The effective principal recognizes that the implementation of new teacher evaluations is an opportunity to make meaningful change in the working relationship between teachers and principals. When principals appropriately explore and embrace change, while simultaneously urging their faculty to do the same, schools marked by enhanced teaching and high levels of student achievement usually result (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004).

According to Marzano et al. (2005) the third principal responsibility, Contingent rewards, refers to the extent to which the leader recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments. Recognition of individual accomplishment is crucial because it provides the principal with an opportunity to reinforce behaviors and accomplishments he/she deems important to the overall success of the school (Marzano et al., 2005). Under the old teacher evaluation era, recognition of outstanding teachers was non-existent. The best a teacher could earn was a rating of satisfactory. Under the new Marzano (2011) Teacher Evaluation Model a teacher can earn a rating of innovating. Under the Danielson (2011) Model, a teacher can earn a rating of distinguished. The
CEL 5D+ Model has a top rating label *expert instructional leader*. The new ratings clearly encourage teachers to earn the principal’s recognition by earning a high rating. In time the teacher evaluation ranking might carry over into monetary recognition or merit pay.

*Contingent rewards* can sometimes serve as a great motivator. While there are different forms of awards from school to school, every teacher is evaluated and has the opportunity to earn a special distinction. The purpose is to create positive teaching behaviors while paying attention to positive teaching behaviors.

The principals understand that celebration both identifies what desirable behaviors and actions are those in the school and reinforces these behaviors and actions when they occur. They understand that when students and staff feel good about how they are doing and how their school community is doing they move toward doing better. They create positive behavior by paying attention to positive behavior. (O’Hanlon & Clifton, 2004)

This trait, stresses importance of rewarding teachers for behaviors and actions that facilitate the attainment of school goals. The end result is likely to produce more people exhibiting the rewarded behaviors. If the principal is rewarding behaviors that lead to effective teaching and student learning, the school and principal will likely increase their success in educating the students (Waters et al., 2004).

*Communication* is the fourth principal responsibility. A fair argument could be made that good communication is vital to the success of most organizations. Teachers appreciate principals who have excellent communication skills. *Communication* refers to the extent to which the school leader establishes strong lines of communication with and between teachers and students. Good communication is a critical feature of any endeavor in which people work in close proximity for a common purpose (Marzano et al., 2005).
There are several factors that link Communication to the evaluation of teachers. For one, principals are given the challenge of communicating how the evaluation process works in their school. From there, principals need to communicate to teachers before, during, and after the evaluation process. The topics usually range from about learning targets of the school and department, classroom management procedures, and particular strengths and weaknesses of the teacher. The pre-conference communication is about developing trust and understanding the process of evaluation. The communication that takes place during the evaluation or observation is specific note taking detailing the specific strengths and weaknesses of the teachers ability to teach. The post conference requires clear and honest dialogue on how the rating of the teacher will be given and areas in which the teacher can improve. At this time the principal will most likely communicate positive strengths the teacher can build upon. Good principal communication is necessary in the process of teacher evaluations.

The next responsibility of principals is to provide Intellectual stimulation. This desired trait requires the principal to remain current and knowledgeable of the latest trends and innovations within education. Once the principal is up to date on current educational practices, he or she must then ensure that all appropriate educational innovations are communicated to the faculty. Marzano et al. (2005) refers to intellectual stimulations as: The extent to which the school leader ensures that the faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices regarding effective schooling and makes discussions of those theories and practices a regular aspect of the school’s culture.

Principals may use a variety of professional development strategies to intellectually stimulate a staff within a school. To be effective, professional development must be relevant to teacher needs (Conca, 2009). Currently, knowledge of the new teacher evaluation instruments
offers a perfect example of a relevant teacher need. There are specific teacher behaviors in the new evaluations that need to be expressed to the teachers by the principals. The new teacher evaluation models are designed to incorporate the most current trends in good teaching. Professional development workshops, staff meetings, journal articles, guest speakers and professional learning communities are all places where the principal can intellectually stimulate the teachers for whom they may ultimately evaluate. The literature stresses the importance of personalized professional development.

Individual needs must be considered as much—if not more—than institutional needs.

Teachers and support staff differ in their years of experience, gender, stage of career and life, and expertise in certain areas. Teachers can and will support development when they can choose the type of learning that is best for them. Seldom, if ever, should… a principal or assistant principal enforce professional development programs on others. If it is not voluntary, then little learning will take place. (Matthews & Crow, 2003)

In this way the principal supports the teacher to become an active participant in their learning while providing the structure and encouragement. Together, principals and teachers work to develop a common purpose themed to the improvement of teaching and learning. Together, principals and teachers work to build a learning and inquiring community (Sergiovanni, 2006).

The most effective professional development often is marked by principal participation. It is something the principal and teachers do together, so that both parties benefit. Many advise that professional development should not be something done to the staff, as this often breeds resentment and a lack of motivation. Rather it should be approached in a collective fashion with both administrators and teachers engaged in the initiative (Marzano et al., 2005).
In order to gain credibility among teachers, principals need to welcome the next responsibility of *Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment*. This responsibility describes the principal as an “Instructional Leader.” *Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment* addresses the extent to which the principal is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment activities at the classroom level (Marzano et al., 2005). Effective principals make an effort to involve themselves in various classroom learning activities. Bolstering support for this responsibility, Sergiovanni (2006) maintains that “In high-achieving schools, principals exerted strong leadership, participated directly and frequently in instructional matters, had high expectations for success, and were oriented toward academic goals. Matthews & Crow (2003) emphasizes that principals take on an instructional leadership role, in which principals are expected to focus on teaching and learning and facilitate the learning community of the school.

The point of including this principal responsibility is that the effective principal is given the responsibility of being routinely involved in curriculum, instruction and assessment such that the school and its teachers are delivering sound educational practices that will enhance student learning. (Marzano et al., 2005). If principals can deliver on this responsibility, teacher evaluations will have more of peer to peer evaluation as opposed to the traditional top down manager to employee evaluation. To be appropriately involved in the planning and design of curriculum, instruction and assessment, the principal must have a foundational knowledge of these disciplines. Accordingly, the next responsibility, knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment speaks to this foundation.

*Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment* is another principal responsibility that is important to the evaluation of teachers. This responsibility infers that the principal will
have a deep and rich understanding of curriculum, instruction and assessment. Marzano et al. (2005) states that “Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment addresses the extent to which the leader is aware of best practices in these domains. The Focus here is on acquisition and cultivation of knowledge. The importance of this responsibility cannot be overstated since the principal is not normally involved with curriculum and instruction on a day to day basis. The principal has to go out of their way a bit to familiarize themselves on what is being taught and how it is being taught by every teacher in every subject within their school. Matthews & Crow (2003) validate this assertion when they talk about the importance of being a continual learner, especially in light of the constant innovation currently permeating our society. Accordingly, Matthews & Crow state, “As a principal in society where knowledge forms the basis of the economy, [the principal] must be a learner and must facilitate learning in others.” Furthermore Marzano et al. (2005) goes on to state that: Specific behaviors and characteristics associated with this responsibility are the following:

- Possessing extensive knowledge about effective instructional practices
- Possessing extensive knowledge about curricular practices
- Possessing extensive knowledge about effective assessment practices
- Providing conceptual guidance regarding effective classroom practices.

By adhering to the responsibility of Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, the principal will be improving his or her knowledge of best teaching practices and will be in a more deserving role of teacher evaluator. This knowledge can then be communicated to the teaching faculty, when it comes time to discuss best teaching practices and assessment as it relates to staff development and teacher evaluation. The principal can help ensure that both
he/she and the teaching faculty are providing sound instructional activities for the students within the school (Conca, 2009).

To determine if the teaching faculty is proving sound educational activities, the principal must both monitor and evaluate what is taking place within a given school. The responsibility to monitor and evaluate represents another responsibility of an effective principal. Monitoring/Evaluation are obvious principal responsibilities especially when it comes to the topic of teacher evaluations. According to Marzano et al. (2005), the responsibility of Monitoring/Evaluating refers to the extent to which the leader monitors the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement. The principal will ultimately supervise and evaluate the teaching staff to ensure teaching practices are as appropriate as possible given the needs of the students. This is such an obvious responsibility of principals that there is an abundance of literature pertaining to the Monitoring/Evaluation responsibility of principals. Sergiovanni (2006) is very direct in discussing the need for supervision within a school setting. He argues that:

Principals can no longer get away with just talking about the importance of teacher quality to advancing teaching and learning and the importance of building up the collective intelligence of their schools. They must take the lead by visibly and directly assuming their supervisory responsibilities.

In his earlier work, Sergiovanni & Starratt (2002) again stresses the importance of principal supervision and the realization of the Monitoring/Evaluating responsibility when he states:

Principal Supervisors are obliged to concentrate on what students are learning in relationships to what curriculum standards and state tests indicate they are supposed to be learning. Rather than looking for teaching strategies that the school systems consider
effective… supervisors have to look for observable evidence that’s students are learning as a result of the various stimuli presented by all their teachers. Supervisors are challenged to sit down, not simply with individual teacher after teacher to discuss specific teaching skills, but more so with groups of teachers to discuss which students are learning at the required levels and which are not…. The job of the supervisor is to help teachers pinpoint the source of the developing difficulty… and to monitor the gradual improvement in the students’ learning.

While this responsibility of the principal might be obvious, what can be gained by reviewing this important role is the difficulty and complexity of both monitoring teachers and evaluating teachers.

The ultimate responsibility of a principal is the welfare of the students. Parents put a great deal of trust in schools to not only keep their children safe, but to educate in such a way that their children will have the foundation to experience a lifetime of happiness and success. Teachers have an undeniable influence on shaping such a foundation. The principal is responsible to ensure teachers are doing a good job. At the heart of this responsibility is the principal’s capacity to gain information about the effectiveness of teaching and subsequent student learning within the school. The effective principal must then apply this information such that the best possible educational opportunities are available to all students (Marzano et al., 2005; Sergvioanni & Starratt, 2002).

In satisfying the Monitoring/Evaluating responsibility, the principal will likely encounter teachers that are not utilizing the most effective instructional means. While these teachers may be difficult to deal with, the principal who utilizes an optimistic approach will most likely inspire others to make the necessary instructional changes (Conca, 2009). To foster instructional growth,
principals will need to utilize a variety of skills to successfully monitor and evaluate teachers. One skill that can help in this process is the ability to foster relationships.

Building and cultivating *Relationships* is a principal responsibility that can help in the teacher evaluation process. Relationships can make a tremendous difference in most workplaces. A person’s vocation is just one part of who they are. It is hard to turn on and off the personal life of an educator with their professional life. Support systems of one another can make differences in teacher effectiveness. In discussing the importance of relationships to the success of a principal, Marzano et al. (2005) state that:

A case can be made that effective professional relationships are central to the effective execution of many of the other responsibilities. In the context of our meta-analysis, the responsibility of *Relationships* refers to the extent to which the school leader demonstrates an awareness of the personal lives of teachers and staff.

Relationships exist everywhere and a school is no different. In a school setting it is the principal’s responsibility to ensure that relationships are recognized and carry a level of dignity and respect.

Trust is the benefit that comes from recognizing *Relationships*. Successful leaders know the importance of building trusting relationships. They know that relationships grow and strengthen over time. Good relationships encourage honesty and availability. The major benefit to establishing trusting relationships is the influence afforded to the principal as a result of such relationships (Matthews & Crow, 2003). It is the influence that will help the principal build support for changes within the school such as the method of evaluation for teachers.

Without positive relationships and the influence those relationships carry, the principal will have a very difficult time acquiring the resources needed to further the educational mission.
of the school. Acquiring and attending to these resources represents another principal responsibility identified by Marzano et al. (2005).

The final principal responsibility from the Marzano et al. (2005) work entitled *School leadership that works: From research to results* is Resources. When describing this principal responsibility, Marzano et al. (2005) states that the responsibility of resources refers to the extent to which the leader provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their duties. The principal serves as a provider for the teachers, ensuring that they have access to the materials necessary for fostering high achievement levels among students. In regard to teacher evaluation, resources basically are the tools given to teachers to get the job done. Resources could include technology, teaching space, education assistants, books, and supplies.

The resources allocated to the teachers can also take the form of professional development opportunities. Such professional development opportunities must be structured to foster refinement of teacher’s instructional practice, thereby improving the educational experience for all students. As Sergiovanni (2006) points out:

Professional development approaches emphasize providing teachers with a rich environment loaded with teaching materials, media, books and devices. With encouragement and support, teachers interact with this environment and with each other exploration and discover. When a principal offers this type of professional support, teachers that embrace the professional development opportunities are more likely to see a strengthening of their instructional skills. It is this strengthening that leads to enhanced instructional activities for students (Matthews & Crow, 2003).
This section of the literature review has described just ten of the twenty one principal responsibilities. They are enough to help one understand the overwhelming expectations of school principals. As we usher into this new era of new teacher evaluations, we should be mindful that these new instruments are more in depth and dependant of more time. There is perhaps more pressure now on the principal than any other player in our educational system.

**Teacher Evaluation Survey Results**

This study addresses the need to understand the perceptions of principals and teachers in regard to evaluating teacher effectiveness. A goal of this study is to expand the body of knowledge on teacher evaluation and the impact it has on both principals and teachers. The intent is to provide insight regarding the impact of three state mandated teacher evaluation instruments on the livelihoods of teachers and principals alike. The specific purpose of this study is to describe the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington. With all of this stated, it is clear we need to hear from teachers and principals.

An excellent teacher evaluation survey was conducted by Spokane Public Schools in 2011. Different school districts have offered a variety of surveys in regard to teacher evaluation. The Spokane Public Schools teacher evaluation survey was the best one found in reviewing the literature. Spokane is one of the largest school districts in the state of Washington and in May of 2011, 896 out of 2,030 teachers (44%) and 56 out of 95 administrators (59%) completed a teacher evaluation survey (Purdue, 2011). The purpose of the survey was to help the Teacher Evaluation Committee understand the level of understanding and support of the new teacher evaluation instruments. The survey was intended to find the major themes of where principals
and teachers stand philosophically in their support of teacher evaluation changes. It should be noted here that Spokane Public Schools adopted the Marzano teacher evaluation model.

An important goal of this literature review is to examine what is already known when it comes to teacher evaluations. There is a great deal of professional significance related to this proposed study. Many teachers are currently now becoming aware of this need to be supported. This survey backs up many of the claims connected to the perceptions of teachers and principals on the subject of teacher evaluations.

There are few actual research studies on teacher evaluations. The inclusion of this Spokane Public Schools survey is paramount to the literature review because it helps solidify what we know about the current state of teacher evaluation reform. This study covers a current reality that is transforming schools and livelihoods. Viewpoints and perceptions from teachers and principals must be evaluated. This dissertation seeks to build off of previous studies and contribute new forms of data to the field of education.

The survey method used by school districts can only take teacher and principal perceptions so far. The qualified method in this study furthers the data and knowledge on the subject of teacher evaluations. The timing of the qualitative interviews is ideal because it took place more than a year after the Spokane Public Schools survey. One year later, districts are now much further ahead. The new teacher evaluations are relatively new but minimally evaluated. The “real-life” nature of this study and the timing of it is why the qualitative method will truly test the acceptance of the new teacher evaluation theory.

The reason Spokane and other districts in the state of Washington have conducted teacher evaluation surveys is because the results might provide meaning to educational practitioners. This portion of the literature will look at each question of the survey in the effort to help
educators understand relevant questions and answers about teacher evaluations. Another reason for the inclusion of this survey is it provides quantitative numbers to compare and support the qualitative research study which is the topic in this study.

The results of the teacher evaluation survey was packed and presented in Power Point form by Brent Perdue (2011), who is the Director of Evaluation and Certificated Staff for Spokane Public Schools. Perdue worked with a district level teacher evaluation committee which was composed of twenty-two different teachers and principals from multiple grade levels and subjects. There were twelve questions that provided responses that included na/don’t know, strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. There were three open ended questions included at the end of the survey. Most questions of this survey were analyzed along with the responses from the participants in an effort to support and compare the questions of this qualitative study.

Spokane Public Schools Teacher Evaluation Survey Questions (Perdue, 2011):

-What best describes your role with Spokane Public Schools?

-I understand the provisions of the law regarding changes to teacher evaluation (stemming from House Bill 6696).

-The current summative evaluation process (observations, observation summary documents, observation conferences, end-of-year evaluation document, etc.) helps me grow professionally.

-The current professional growth plan (PGP) process (planning form, growth log, verification form, etc.) helps me grow professionally.

-The current teacher evaluation system identifies exemplary performance.
The current teacher evaluation process provides specific feedback to help me improve my instructional performance.

The current teacher evaluation process promotes student achievement.

My current evaluator adequately understands my work and can assess my level of performance.

Conferences with my evaluator (pre-observation, post-observation, evaluation, etc.) help me grow professionally.

I should receive feedback to help improve my practice following observations.

I should receive on-going specific feedback to improve my practice.

I should receive evaluations that recognize my strengths and identify areas for growth and development.

What role should student data play in your evaluation?

Do you have any concerns or fears about changes in the evaluation process?

Do you have any questions, suggestions or concerns about the evaluation committee’s work?

The survey item that supports this study and is an integral part of this review of literature was: I understand the provisions of the law regarding changes to teacher evaluation stemming from House Bill 6696 (Perdue, 2011). While eighty-three percent of administrators agree or strongly agree with new teacher evaluation law, only forty-four percent of teachers were in agreement (Perdue, 2011). This supports the perception that teachers are just now truly becoming aware of the law that will ultimately influence their career.

Another important theme found in the survey revealed the potential for resistance to the new teacher evaluation law. When surveyed whether “the current summative evaluation process
(observations, observation summary documents, observation conferences, end-of-year evaluation document, etc.) helps me grow professionally”, sixty-three percent of teachers responded with neutral or agree (Perdue, 2011). That response means that close two-thirds of teachers were satisfied with the old evaluation system. Keep in mind that under the old evaluation system, only 459 of 59,481 teachers in the state of Washington were rated unsatisfactory (Shaw, 2011).

The survey identifies topics that would offer support of the new teacher evaluations. In response to the question the current teacher evaluation system identifies exemplary performance, ninety-five percent of administrators and sixty-one percent disagreed (Perdue, 2011). What this means is that the old evaluation system did not differentiate average teaching from exceptional teaching. In 2009-2010, 59,022 were all rated satisfactory (Shaw, 2011). Obviously some teachers perform better than others and the new teacher evaluations will indicate this.

The survey question that creates the least amount of agreement among teachers was the current teacher evaluation process provides specific feedback to help me improve my instructional performance (Perdue, 2011). Six percent strongly agree, thirty-three percent agree, twenty-four percent were neutral, twenty-four percent disagree, and thirteen percent strongly disagree. The results to this question show there is no clarity. One of the primary points to the new teacher evaluations is to provide meaningful feedback to teachers (Danielson, 2007). According to this question, close to half of the teachers surveyed felt that the old evaluation already did this while the other half did not feel the evaluation provided specific feedback to improve their instructional performance (Perdue, 2011). Leaders in education most likely would like more consensuses on whether the teacher evaluation process improves their instructional performance. This result supports the need for teacher evaluation change.
Further supporting the need for teacher evaluation change is the response to the question *the current teacher evaluation process promotes student achievement*. Fifty-six percent of principals disagreed with the idea that the current evaluation model promoted student achievement while thirty-six percent of teachers also disagreed (Perdue, 2011). In fact, a theme found in most of these questions is that administrators were much more critical of the old evaluation system than the teachers were. Sixty-two percent of teachers did respond either neutral or in agreement that they did think the current evaluation process promoted student achievement (Perdue, 2011). This continues the theme that teachers were not all in agreement on the effectiveness of the old system of teacher evaluation.

An important issue in this proposed study was uncovered in the survey question *my current evaluator adequately understands my work and can assess my level of performance*. Twenty-four percent of teacher responded that they disagreed with another twelve percent responding neutral (Perdue, 2011). This is concerning because it means close to 1/3 of teachers in one of the largest school districts in the state of Washington question that their principal can fairly assess their teaching performance. This is the philosophical question at the heart of this study. Should principals be trusted to fairly evaluate the teachers?

Other responses to questions on the survey were mostly predictable. For example teachers and administrators were in agreement about *receiving feedback following observations, receiving on-going specific feedback to improve practice, and receiving evaluations that recognize strengths and identify areas for growth and development* (Perdue, 2011). In fact, the predictable nature of many of the survey questions along with the similar responses from teachers and administrators supports the need to have a more in depth qualitative study on teacher and principal perceptions of state mandated teacher evaluation instruments.
The most relevant portion of the Spokane Public Schools survey was the inclusion of three open ended questions. Unfortunately, the teacher evaluation committee did not believe survey respondents had an expectation that individual responses would be published and therefore offered only to employees the opportunity to make an appointment to view responses (Perdue, 2011). Instead, the committee took the 1,902 total responses by teachers and coded the different themes that emerged.

The first open ended question from the Spokane Public Schools teacher evaluation survey asked *what role should student data play in your [teachers] evaluation?* The committee reported three main themes from the results (Perdue, 2011). First, data should play no role at all in a teacher’s evaluation. Second, data should be used to inform only. Third, data should be just one of multiple measures used to evaluate teachers. These themes represent a resistance from teachers to the concept of student data such as test scores being used in evaluation of their teaching. The question here that needs to be further examined is to what extent does elimination of student data in teacher evaluations go? For example, should student data be included in professional growth goals of teachers and excluded in the evaluation process? Or, if student data is included in a teacher’s evaluation, how much does it factor in compared to observations, portfolios, self assessments, or other indicators of performance? This open ended question would benefit from a qualitative interview with follow up questions.

The second open-ended question asked teachers if *they have any concerns or fears about changes in the evaluation process.* There were three main concerns that emerged from the results (Perdue, 2011). The first concern reiterated what was previously mentioned in that teachers were concerned about using student data in a teacher’s evaluation. The second concern/fear teachers expressed was that they would be held accountable for areas out of their control. This theme
represents another good topic that should be followed up on. It would be nice to have examples stated here. Perhaps lack of resources, low socioeconomics, or lack of administrative support. Without reading the specific responses or having the opportunity to follow up the questions, we can only speculate. The third concern/fear that teachers have about changes in the evaluation process is that the evaluator lacks expertise in areas of instruction out of his/her area of specialty/background. This again questions the legitimacy and fairness of the administrator who usually serves as the evaluator. This survey and overall review of literature is certainly calling into question the qualifications of the principal when it comes to evaluating the effectiveness of the teacher.

The final open ended question of the survey asked teachers if they have any questions, suggestions or concerns about the evaluation committee’s work. After reviewing the responses, the committee reported that no primary themes emerged but there were a few minor themes (Perdue, 2011). These themes were for the most part obvious suggestions. The first suggestion was about being careful not to overwhelm teachers/administrators with the new process. The second suggestion encouraged the use of more and better feedback. The third theme reiterated again, to be careful with the use of student data. The fourth minor theme was encouraging a focus on strengths and giving praise when warranted. This last theme is another topic that a research study can examine more. Emphasizing positive teaching traits within the evaluation process can go a long way in creating a successful transition of moving from the old system of teacher evaluations to the new system.

Conclusion of Literature Review
The review of literature has presented a case of where research has been in regard to teacher evaluations and where further research is needed. Theoretically, the literature review reveals that public education has tested the business model approach of top down evaluation of teachers despite multiple alternatives such as peer evaluation. The literature has proven that there are multiple definitions as to what good teaching is and that the meaning of what constitutes good teaching has evolved over the past century. The literature has shown that there are deficiencies within the teacher evaluation process that provide multiple philosophical questions in regard to the teacher evaluation process. The literature has provided current examples of new teacher evaluation systems (Danielson, Marzano, & CEL5D+) currently being implemented in the state of Washington. The literature has provided viewpoints from an elected representative of state government in the form of State Superintendent of Public Schools Randy Dorn. The literature has reviewed the responsibilities of principals (Marzano et. al., 2005) as their jobs relate to teacher evaluations. The literature has also provided teacher responses from a large school district survey on teacher evaluations. This literature has provided a large amount of data on what we know about the process, methods, and instruments used in teacher evaluations. The literature has also made it clear that now is great time to study the teacher and principal perceptions of the state-mandated teacher evaluation instruments in a qualitative study.
CHAPTER THREE
DESIGN OF STUDY

This qualitative doctoral research study examined teacher and principal perceptions of teacher evaluations. Because many school districts are in the process of changing teacher evaluation systems, this topic was both relevant and intriguing. There are stakeholders such as teachers, principals, and students who are affected by how a teacher is evaluated. My intention was to promote dialogue on the subject of teacher evaluation and describe the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the components of the research design and methodology applied to exploring the implementation of new teacher evaluations in Washington State. An explanation of the framework is provided including a summary of the research questions, a description of the research methodology, data collection procedures, interview questions, data analysis, and limitations.

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF WASHINGTON STATE TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS: DANIELSON, MARZANO, AND CEL 5D+

The following are the research questions:

1. What new criteria and evidence does a teacher want a principal to consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?

2. What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?
3. What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington?

These questions guided the study and made clear the concepts which were being investigated. The above questions were intended to be somewhat open ended and general to stay within the realm of qualitative research (Creswell, 2008).

The first research question asked: *What new criteria and evidence does a teacher want a principal to consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?* This question provided the teacher a voice in regard to how they are evaluated. Having someone watch you and judge you can be a nerve racking experience. There is always an interesting dynamic being played out when a principal walks into a classroom to observe and evaluate a teacher. As researcher, I was observing if both the teacher and principal were in agreement as to what was being evaluated. Teachers have strong opinions on what constitutes good teaching. Teachers are more aware of the realities in the classroom than anyone else. This question got to the truth of what constitutes a fair evaluation. Teachers had an opportunity with this research question to make their case about using student data, effective classroom management, what level of content knowledge is appropriate, and how do you evaluate professionalism. This research question also gave teachers an opportunity to share whether or not they understood the new evaluation instruments and if they agreed with them.

The second research question asked: *What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?* This question provided a platform to philosophically discuss the components of teacher evaluations. Much of the controversy surrounding new teacher evaluations involved the criteria being evaluated. It was interesting to listen to teachers and principals discuss student achievement and standardized test scores as a
topic of teacher evaluation. This question provided an opportunity for teachers or principals to discuss student input or parent input as potential evidence. The researcher encouraged discussion on how long and how often a principal observation of a teacher should last. This question also provided an opportunity to examine the use of portfolios. During the course of the interviews, the participants were provided an opportunity to share other examples of criteria and evidence that is not included in the mainstream literature on teacher evaluations. This question provided an opportunity to see how well aligned teachers and principals were with their current evaluation system. This question provided room for different answers from the different participants. The question gave into the fact that most evaluation systems are principal driven. By asking both the teacher and the principal what the principal should consider acknowledged this. Originally, I thought of being more open with this question by asking what the school district, state, or evaluator should consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness. I settled on the principal, because that was the current reality and it helped the study to look for information that we don’t already know. What was best about this question was that it opened up dialogue on the philosophical debate of measuring good teaching.

The third research question asked: *What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington?* This question took the study to the heart of the philosophical debate of teacher evaluations. Much of the controversy surrounding new teacher evaluations is the notion that big government is regulating education without enough input from the educators themselves. This question addressed the purpose of the study. New teacher evaluations represent a major change in education and deserved input from those who are most affected by that change. By allowing
teachers and principals an opportunity to describe how they felt about the teacher evaluation changes, new evidence was added as to the impact this educational change is making.

Comparing the perceptions of teachers and principals was a goal of this study. The researcher tried to determine differences in how the principal and teacher view the evaluation process. Differences such as the perception that the evaluation is a tool to help the teacher improve their craft compared to an audition to keep employment. The research questions aimed to also examine what the principal pays attention to during an observation compared to what the teacher thinks the principal is paying attention to. The principal most likely has a form, rubric, laptop computer, or notepad with them. It was necessary to learn if the teacher is aware of what the rubric might look like and what is being tallied or written. A teacher’s career is at stake, it is important to learn what was going through their mind through the evaluation process. A principal doesn’t know the student personalities as well as the teacher and the classroom is not as familiar. This all changes the dynamics. It is possible for the principal and teacher to disagree on philosophical concepts of teaching. The principal might view a structured and disciplined class working on an assignment independently as a model of distinguished teaching. A teacher might view an energetic, engaged, and a slightly argumentative class as distinguished. A principal might view students using their cell phones in class as a disruption to the learning environment. A teacher might view the use of cell phones as a reality that can be harnessed for more positive than negative (calculator, picture, surveys, Google, etc.).

Perception is an interesting concept. Asking what a principal and what a teacher perceives placed a great deal of value of gaining knowledge through senses. We use our senses all the time as a computer like data base taking in all kinds of information. For example, a teacher listens and watches how a principal treats his or her staff. A teacher has probably had
multiple interactions with the principal and from those experiences, has created a positive, negative, or neutral feeling from those interactions. On the other side, a principal has probably heard or observed things about the teacher that has built a pre-conceived opinion of the teacher. The years the teacher and principal have known each other make a big difference what level of rapport they have. If they haven’t known each other very long, than both of their senses will be working overtime to get a feeling about the other. If the principal and teacher have known each other for a long time, than there might be a bias because past perceptions might interfere with current reality. Perception is a very human way in which we try to comprehend a complex world with complex people.

It is important that teachers and principals know how the other perceive teacher evaluations. Teacher evaluations make an undeniable mark on a teaching record. It is probably not the most talked about subject between administration and staff because there is a layer of sensitivity and even awkwardness to it. It might sometimes be the case that principals are friends with the teachers that they evaluate. The teacher evaluation process might impact that friendship. The dynamics between principals and teachers change during the teacher evaluation process. This research question and this study provided a platform to formally discuss different perceptions and whether or not those perceptions are in tune with reality.

**Research Methodology**

Qualitative research methodology was used in this study because it was consistent with the nature of the research problem and purpose of this study (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Qualitative research was used in this study because of the educational setting in which the researcher attempted to gain a better understanding of human perceptions and experience. This
qualitative study describes the interactions of people in their natural settings, ordinary routines, and their perceptions of these routines. As a researcher, I was able to determine the meaning of events according to the participants. The qualitative nature of this study allowed me to incorporate the simultaneous process of analyzing while I collected the data (Creswell, 2008).

This study was an effort to understand the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington, according to those who participate in it. As a qualitative researcher, I was concerned with making sure I captured the perspective of the participants accurately (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2007).

The research used qualitative methods to compare three different teacher evaluation systems used in six different school districts. This study offered an opportunity to examine a real life situation that presents a dilemma or unsure outcome. The qualitative questions and answers have enough relevancies to help a significant portion of society. The idea of qualitative methodology is that it is a method of learning based on active participation by members of a group such as principals and teachers. A key goal of this research was to find meaning. It is consistent with qualitative research to be interested in how different people make sense of their lives (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2007). The study will increase knowledge which in turn might improve skills and attitudes. It was my intent to contribute to the pool of knowledge the perceptions of teachers and principals in regard to teacher evaluation. In other words, this study provided a voice to individuals who are directly involved in a major change in educational policy and philosophy.

There are many different types of qualitative methodologies. In the traditional sense, this was an illustrative case study describing a real world example of how teachers view teacher evaluations compared to principals (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). An illustrative study also
reinforced the argument that more stringent teacher evaluation systems are worthwhile. Another realm of the study is implementation. This would involve study on a management change of practice within the workplace. Focus would be on the different changes of the process. Teacher Evaluation reform in public schools qualified as a topic that could work as either an illustrative or implementation study.

Within the realm of Qualitative research, the constant comparative method was used. By using multiple participants to gather data, formal analysis began early in the study and was nearly completed by the end of the study (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2007). Clear categories emerged throughout the course of the qualitative interviews allowing for comparison. As researcher, I had an eye toward seeing the diversity of the dimensions under the categories (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2007). This allowed for the grouping of relationships and themes found within the data.

Qualitative methodology identified the current perceptions of the public school teachers and principals from six school districts within a Washington State. This method was selected because it is a means to describe a sample of a population of educators who are most affected by an existing change in educational philosophy (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The philosophy is that teachers are a major factor in student learning. Teacher demands are increasing due to this philosophy (Darling-Hammond, 2005). The role of evaluating teachers belongs to the building principal, therefore adding to the demands of principals. This research will help find the distinguishing perceptions from teachers and principals on the subject of teacher evaluation.

Qualitative research is a good fit for an education study. The reason it fits well is that it investigates patterns of interaction when evaluating teachers. This type of research often takes a “what is” approach (McNabb, 2012). All three of the research questions for this study are “what”
questions:  *What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington? What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness? What new criteria and evidence does a teacher want a principal to consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?*

An advantage to using qualitative research is that it doesn’t have to account for every variable in education (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen, 2007). Alternative studies such as quantitative are sometimes hindered by complex variables such as race, language, cultural background, and socio economic status. Qualitative research will include variables in a way that best suits the study. Qualitative research was also good in that it is able to capture observations of life’s experiences (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In this study on perceptions of teacher evaluations, the experiences of teachers and principals help build the case of whether or not the instruments used are worthwhile or not. A final reason qualitative research was a good fit for this study is because it included data that was spread over multiple participants over a large geographic area.

**Data Collection**

Data collection for this research study involved personal face to face interviews from principals and teachers. The reason for this method was to get more in depth responses and gain additional data by reading the body language and visual cues of the participants. The disadvantage to personal interviews is that it required more travel time and money and that it took more of the participant’s time. The impact of using qualitative case study research was that it provided a platform to promote ideas that lead to positive changes in the design of teacher evaluation systems. In the very least, qualitative research provided others a more complete understanding of the impact that new evaluations were having on teachers and principals.
Research leads to prescriptions that instructional designers and educators can heed as they consider future direction (McNabb, 2012). The data collection through personal interviews was all about the means of getting to an end.

Interviews were conducted to generate data. In order to best describe the perceptions of teacher evaluations this method was selected. Participants answered questions through interview questions. As the researcher, I describe the responses given. To ensure reliability, carefully crafted questions were created. Many of the questions were open ended questions with the goal of getting closer to the truth about how teachers and principals felt about the new methods of teacher evaluations. There were many different methods to choose from, but this study selected open ended interview questions because:

Open-ended questions allow for a greater variety of responses from participants but are difficult to analyze statistically because the data must be coded or reduced in some manner. Closed-ended questions are easy to analyze statistically, but they seriously limit the responses that participants can give. (Jackson, 2009)

As the researcher, I did not want limited responses for the sake of easier analysis. Surveys are too limiting. Interviews had more potential. In answering the question of effectiveness of teacher evaluation systems, a Likert type survey questionnaire might have been too impersonal or closed minded to allow deeper responses from the participants. It is these deeper responses that this study looked for to generate more accurate answers to the research questions.

To accomplish meaningful dialogue on teacher evaluation, six teachers and six principals within Washington State were selected for interviews. The twelve participants were intentionally selected based on experience, gender, and characteristics of the schools they are from. For example, participants were from urban, suburban, and rural schools alike. It was the intent of this
study to have a sample of participants that fairly represented characteristics of most teachers and principals.

Purposeful qualitative sampling was used in this study. Selected principals and teachers throughout the state were used to best explain the phenomenon of validity of teacher evaluations. The intent of selecting this purposeful sample was to develop a further understanding of teacher evaluations. This sample was expected to provide useful information which might help educators understand the multiple facets of teacher evaluations. The interviews of the selected participants provided a voice to teachers and principals who might of otherwise been silent on this subject.

The process of data collection began shortly after successful defense of the proposal. From there, I started the selection process of teacher and administrator participants. Potential participants were first screened to fulfill certain characteristics that I was looking for in the population sample of this study. In addition to screening the potential candidates, there was a screening of potentials school districts. Each potential school district was studied to review not only the demographics, but to see if there were any significant changes to the teacher evaluation process of their school district. An effort was made to select school districts that use all three of the state mandated teacher evaluation systems. In other words, two districts using the Marzano teacher evaluation system were selected, two districts using the Danielson system were selected, and two districts using the CEL 5D+ evaluation system were selected. The use of websites, phone calls, and recommendations from trusted colleagues were all used in this process.

After an initial screening (school websites, word of mouth, phone calls), I selected two lists of potential teacher and principal candidates. The first list was my first choice of interview participants. The second list was used in the case any of the participants declined to participate in the interview. A letter summarizing the study and asking for their participation in the study was
e-mailed to each of the selected participants. Respondents were assured that neither their personal identity nor the identity of their school would be released during the dissertation. A return address, e-mail, and phone number was provided for the selected participants to respond back with either a yes, no, or to have any questions answered. Selected participants, who did not respond within one week, received a follow-up telephone call and e-mail from the researcher. If a selected participant declined, then the researcher will looked for participants from group two, with similar characteristics from the person who declined from group one.

Once a group of participants was selected, interviews with the twelve teachers and principals were scheduled. Anticipated interview time was close to one hour. Since the participants were spread out geographically, the interview process took several weeks.
Interview Questions

The interview included a list of open-ended questions that was audio taped and transcribed. The purpose of conducting the interview was to provide the participants an opportunity to voice their experiences and opinions about teacher evaluation unconstrained by any perspectives of the researcher or past research findings (Creswell, 2008). These interviews were one on one.

The interview questions aligned with the research questions. Questions one through six supported the first research question. Questions seven through eleven supported the second and third research question. A teacher from a local school participated in the piloting of the interview questions. Interview questions are listed below.

1. What is your current position and explain how teachers were evaluated when you first started? How did you feel about the old evaluation system?
2. Do you agree with the 2010 decision by the State Legislature to change the way teachers are evaluated? Do you agree with the plan to give school district three different options?
3. Your district has adopted the (Danielson, Marzano, CEL 5D+) teacher evaluation system. How has it been implemented and how would you describe it?
4. Do you have any concerns about changes in the teacher evaluation process?
5. Do you view the teacher evaluation process more as a means of helping the teacher or rating the teacher?
6. What are some strengths and weaknesses of the new teacher evaluation system?
7. Describe how your school district’s method of evaluating teachers has changed?
8. Describe what you would consider excellent teaching. How can excellent teaching be proven for the purpose of evaluation?

9. What components of teaching should be included in the evaluation of teachers?

10. What role should student data play in a teacher’s evaluation?

11. Describe what an ideal teacher evaluation model would include. How many observations and conferences? Are there other criteria that would help administrators evaluate teachers?

12. Do you have any final comments as we conclude this interview?

Data Analysis

Upon completion of the interviews, the process of analyzing the data surrounding teacher and principal perceptions of teacher evaluation began. Most of the data came from the interviews. A small portion of the data will be in the form of school district and state documents describing the teacher evaluation process as well as general descriptions of the school district that each participant is from. The first phase of the data analysis was the transcription a re-listening of the audio recorded interviews.

Step two was the initial reading of the transcripts and interview notes. During this reading, a different color pencil was used to underline portions of the interview that related to each research question. For example:

1. What new criteria and evidence does a teacher want a principal to consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness? (Red)

2. What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington. (Green)

3. What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness? (Blue)
These colors were used to visually separate what was transcribed and provide a link to the research questions.

The third step was to use index cards to record the most common themes that come from the interviews. When a theme is repeated, a tally mark was used on the index card to record the most common themes. The index cards were transformed into posters with sub themes included underneath each main theme. Ultimately a matrix was designed to offer a visual representation of the main themes that emerged from the study.

The fourth step in the data analysis was to create a scale using the interview questions to compare the perceptions of principals and teachers. The first comparison was comparing the principal and teacher that are in the same building followed by an overall comparison of all teachers with all principals in the study. A four part scale was designed which compared the perceptions of teachers with principals. The scale will include: All in agreement, mostly in agreement, mostly in disagreement, and all in disagreement.

The final step included cross checking the findings and writing a summary of the findings. Included in the summary was analysis of which findings were supported by the literature and which were not. This section also cross checked the main themes I found in this study. To help achieve this, I asked another researcher to study the transcripts and verify if the same themes and conclusions were found.

**Limitations of the Study**

Four limitations can be identified in the design and implementation of this study. The first limitation of this study is the limited sample size. One state, six school districts, and twelve
participants were selected for the study. While the aim of this study was to provide a voice for
teachers and principals in regard to the new evaluation systems being used in their state, the
study sacrifices quantity in return for quality. The intention of this study is to open the door of
discussion about teacher evaluation, not to quantify it.

The second limitation of the study is the issue of confidentiality and rapport. While an
effort was made to build trust and assurances were given to provide confidentiality, there was the
possibility of some level of apprehension and even skepticism from the participants. I had a
limited relationship with these participants which may have caused some apprehension on their
part. Having good rapport between a researcher and subject can have its benefits. While this is a
limitation, it was not major enough to alter the study.

A third liability is that each of the districts involved in the study were at a different stages
of the implementation process. Six school districts used in this study were using three different
teacher evaluation systems. Where they were at in the implementation process may have altered
the perceptions of the teacher and principal participants. For example some districts had been
trained more extensively than other districts. This may affect the generalizability of the study. It
is important to provide attention to this within the study to correlate the findings from the
interviews to the evaluation system that is being used in their district and identify where each
district is at in the process.

The fourth limitation is the bias of the researcher. Qualitative researchers, whether in the
tradition of sociology or anthropology, have wrestled over the years with charges that it is too
easy for the prejudices and attitudes of the researcher to bias the data (Bogdan & Knopp Biklen,
2007). There is the potential for bias when the researcher interprets the responses from the
interviews. The researcher guides the study and it is always a possibility that despite the intent to
stay neutral, that personal bias might influence the direction of any study. Recognition of this potential limitation helped me to focus on being as neutral as possible during the course of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The results of this study are focused on the perceptions that Washington State teachers and principals have toward the new teacher evaluation instruments of Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+. These evaluation instruments have been mandated by the Washington State Legislature to be in full use by the 2013-14 school year. This study was conducted in February and March of 2013. The purpose of the study was to describe the level of support teachers and principals have for the new mandated teacher evaluation instrument. The study was conducted while the instruments were in the process of being implemented in school districts throughout the state. The study was focused on satisfying research questions. The guiding research questions were:

1. What new criteria and evidence does a teacher want a principal to consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?

2. What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?

3. What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington?

To satisfactorily speak to the research questions, interviews were conducted with six principals and six teachers in six different school districts throughout the state of Washington. The districts were selected based on how well they represented the state and how far along their district was in the implementation of the teacher evaluation instrument. In fairness to the three teacher evaluation models approved by the state, two of the districts used in the study are implementing the Danielson model, two districts are implementing the Marzano model, and two districts are implementing the CEL 5D+ model.
As stated in Chapter One of this dissertation, it is necessary to examine the level of philosophical support teachers have toward the new politically mandated teacher evaluation system in Washington State. In order to accomplish this, this chapter presents the data generated from twelve interviews with principals and teachers across the state. To begin with, the participants from the six school districts will be introduced. Next, a review of the key findings as they relate to the three research questions will be reported. From the research questions, the major themes from the study will be presented. This chapter will compare different components from the study such as teacher perceptions versus principal perceptions. Ultimately, this chapter will summarize the key findings. Several charts will be included to help represent the data and findings of this study.

Participants

Twelve teachers and principals were interviewed for this study. These participants were interviewed in either their office or classroom. The interviews were conducted one-on-one in schools throughout the state of Washington. Most of the participants were veterans in their field with many years of experience. All of the participants had good knowledge about the new teacher evaluation instruments adapted by their districts. Most were involved in pilot committees that either selected the instruments or were piloting them. Of the twelve participants, six were male and six were female. Two were non-Caucasian. Pseudonyms were provided to each participant to conceal their identity. Subsequently, the individuals who participated in this study were Mr. Stewart, Mrs. Connors, Mrs. Kennedy, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Brinkerhoff, Mrs. Terry, Mr. Miller, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Patrick, Miss Tong, Mr. Tresner, and Mrs. Mason. Pseudonyms were also used for the school district and school by which each of them was
employed, respectively. The school districts used in this study include Timberland, Fort Taylor, Meadows, White Falls, Bayview, and Midland. A brief description of the districts, schools, and participants will follow to provide context to the study. In order to help describe the school districts, statistics will be used from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) school report card website. For the purpose of comparison, they will be grouped in the new evaluation system recently adopted by their school district (Danielson, Marzano, & CEL 5D+).

**Danielson Districts**

The first representative school district using the Danielson teacher evaluation model was the Timberland School District. Of the six districts in this study, Timberland had a graduation rate of 86% and a free and reduced lunch rate 36%. It is a district that is predominately white and has suburban middle class make up. Timberland has around 6,000 students and is considered a medium sized school district. The district selected the Danielson model for teacher evaluations in the 2011-12 school year and has made 2012-13 a pilot year using a small sample of teachers to implement the new model.

Mr. Stewart is one of the principals in the Timberland school district. He is a former Spanish teacher who went into administration around fifteen years ago. Mr. Stewart had worked in one other district before becoming principal at Timberland.

Mrs. Connors is an English teacher at the high school in the Timberland School District. She has taught and coached for close to fifteen years. Mrs. Connors was a former student at Timberland and returned to teach at her former school around six years ago. She is part of pilot group of teachers testing out the Danielson model this year.
Fort Taylor was the second school district in this study that uses the Danielson model. Located near one of the state’s multiple military bases, the Fort Taylor School District is a very diverse district (55% white) that maintains an 82% graduation rate. The percentage of students on free/reduced lunch is at 40%. With over 14,000 students, Fort Taylor is over twice the size of the Timberland district. The district was one of the original districts to pilot the new evaluation system allowing for an extra year to prepare teachers and principals for the change.

Mrs. Kennedy is the principal at one of the Fort Taylor’s high schools. She has been a principal for several years and also serves as an instructional specialist for the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Mrs. Kennedy has been a leader in not only training her own district staff on good teaching and evaluation practices but she helps other districts throughout the state.

Mr. Thompson is a veteran Social Studies teacher who has taught high school for twenty years in the Fort Taylor School District. In addition to teaching, Mr. Thompson has coached numerous sports at the high school level. Before teaching at Fort Taylor, Mr. Thompson taught college level History. Mr. Thomson was invited to help pilot the Danielson model in his district during the 2012-13 school year.

Marzano Districts

Meadows School District is currently implementing the Marzano Teacher Evaluation system. With close to 5,000 students, The Meadow’s school boundaries encompass a Native American reservation, a military base, an agricultural area, and a bedroom community for a nearby urban center. Forty percent of the students qualify for free/reduced lunch and the graduation rate is around 75%. A challenge the district faced with regard to the new teacher
evaluations was the turnover of key leadership positions at the district office. The district had originally been preparing to implement the Danielson Model until this past summer when a new superintendent and director of learning were hired and they chose to implement the Marzano model instead.

Mr. Brinkerhoff is the principal of the high school at Meadows. Mr. Brinkerhoff sought to become an administrator in part to positively impact teaching and learning through teacher evaluations. Mr. Brinkerhoff has been a principal at Meadows for two years and previously worked as a principal and district administrator at a neighboring district for over fifteen years.

Mrs. Terry represented a teacher for this study from the Meadows School District. As a teacher of Middle School English/Language Arts, Mrs. Terry taught in the Meadows School District for around five years and taught in other districts for many years prior to that. While many of the participants have taught multiple levels in the K-12 system, Mrs. Terry helped by providing her perspective as a middle school/primary level teacher.

The other school district that uses the Marzano teacher evaluation model was the White Fall School District. White Falls is one of the largest districts in the state with over 29,000 students. The district has a student population with free/reduced lunch for 56% of the students. The district was involved early on in the Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) piloting of the new evaluation. Along with other schools in the same geographic consortium, White Falls involved staff within the first year of Senate Bill 6696 by forming committees, providing training, and conducting surveys to gauge the understanding and support of its staff. White Falls is already using the new evaluation model in many of its schools.

White Falls has over forty five schools and five high schools in its district. The two participants from this study representing this school district (Mr. Miller and Ms. Johnson) work
at the same high school in the district. The high school has a high 70% free/reduced lunch rate and a graduation rate of 63%. This fact is pointed out to show that this study represents principals and teachers who work with students from many different social and economic backgrounds.

Mr. Miller is the principal representing the White Falls School District. His current position is Vice Principal and he has worked in the district in numerous roles in his lengthy career as an educator. Mr. Miller was selected to participate in this study because he has served the past two years as an administrative representative on the district’s TPEP committee. Like most of the other participants, Mr. Miller was both knowledgeable and helpful in regard to the new teacher evaluations, particularly the Marzano instrument.

Ms. Johnson is a teacher at the same high school as Mr. Miller in the White Falls School District. She teachers the Advanced Placement History classes and is considered one of the top teachers in her district. Ms. Johnson is a nationally certified teacher with a great deal of knowledge and experience in education. She too was a member of the TPEP committee for White Falls.

**CEL 5D+ Districts**

Bayview School District is a district with over 29,000 students and is currently implementing the CEL 5D+ model. While district leaders were training staff for the CEL 5D+ evaluation instrument at the time of this study, it was still not official that the district had adopted that instrument. Due to local bargaining with the union, the Bayview School District was still waiting for confirmation of what exactly the evaluation will entail. Most districts such as Bayview were still in some type of negotiations with union groups during the study, causing
slight differences in how the evaluation model is used from district to district. Bayview is an ethnically diverse urban district (41% White, 21% Black, and 19% Hispanic). The free/reduced lunch rate was 64% and the graduation rate was 61%.

The participants selected for this study (Mr. Patrick and Miss Tong) both work at the district’s alternative high school. The alternative high school had a 79% free/reduced rate and 11% graduation rate.

Mr. Patrick is the principal at the alternative high school in the Bayview School District. Mr. Patrick has been a principal for over ten years at different high schools in the Bayview district. Before working at the alternative school, Mr. Patrick served several years at one of the largest high schools in the district. Mr. Patrick has a doctorate degree and superintendent credentials. Mr. Patrick has a strong reputation in his district for being firm, hardworking, intelligent, and honest.

Miss Tong was the teacher participant from Bayview used in this study. Miss Tong is the Family Consumer Science teacher at the alternative school. She has taught for close to five years and is currently working on her credentials to become a principal.

The other CEL 5D+ district examined in this study was the Midland School District. Midland was a district with around 3,000 students. Midland represented a school district that had a percentage of English language learners and Hispanic students of around 27%. The free/reduced lunch percentage is 66% and Midland graduates around 63% of its students.

Midland had previously been using a form of the Danielson model four years before Senate Bill 6696 required a massive change in teacher evaluation practices. In some ways, Midland was ahead of the learning process. Despite using forms of the Danielson model in the past, district leaders recently selected the CEL 5D+ model as the best teacher evaluation fit for their district.
The principal at Midland High School is Mr. Tresner. He provided a tremendous level of experience and wisdom to this study. Mr. Tresner was longtime teacher, coach, and principal in two states.

Mrs. Mason was the teacher participant from Midland. Mrs. Mason is a veteran Special Education teacher who has been involved in much of the TPEP activity in her district. Special Education is a unique and challenging subject. It was important to include Mrs. Mason because Special Education teachers have significantly more data collecting, documenting, and general paperwork than general education teachers. The new teacher evaluation system has potential to impact even further the job expectations of Special Education teachers.

**Findings**

The findings of the qualitative study on teacher and principal perceptions of the new teacher evaluation instruments used in the state of Washington will be presented in the order of the research questions they are related to. Questions one and two are more specific, and presentation of those questions first will help support the findings to question three. The common themes emerging from the twelve interviews will be used to further support the findings. Specific answers from the participants will be included to further support the key findings found in this study. Comparisons between the participants will be made as the findings are shared. To help study and compare the different perceptions of teachers and principals with regard to the new teacher evaluations, charts have been provided that detail the general perceptions related to each research question.
Research Question #1: What New Criteria and Evidence Does a Teacher Want a Principal to Consider When Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness?

This study presented an opportunity for six teachers to share their perceptions of what should be included in teacher evaluations. The two goals of this research question are to provide an opportunity for teachers to voice their views in a study about evaluations of their own profession and to compare the results of their perceptions with the results of principals from the same state and school district. The presentation of the results pertaining to this question will be similar to the results from research question #2. The primary difference between the results of these two questions is that there will be more comparisons between principal perceptions and teacher perceptions about what constitutes an effective teacher evaluation. To begin with, Figure 4 represents a diagram of what teachers and principals consider good teaching.

![Diagram of Effective Teaching]

Figure 4. Effective teaching.
Teachers and principals were both in agreement on several components of effective teaching. Good student engagement, well designed lesson plans, developing good relationships and rapport with students, creating a safe and student-centered learning environment, collaborating with peers, well designed assessments to measure student growth, and having good communication skills with both students and parents were all common responses from both principals and teachers in this study.

Teacher Perceptions of Effective Teaching

In addition to the common answers with regard to what makes up effective teaching, teachers added several more components. These components included classroom management, good delivery of instruction, knowledge of subject matter, flexibility with students, enthusiasm, and using portfolios.

Classroom management was reported by teachers as an element of effective teaching. Mrs. Connors recognized multiple skills that go into good classroom management. These factors include “tone in room, being direct, instinct of kids, taking an interest in your students, preventive planning, being approachable, picking up on details, and having good relationships” as the keys to effective management. Mr. Thompson admitted that while all components of teaching are important, classroom management goes back to the relationships you have with students. Mr. Thompson felt that “if you know your content, have good rapport with students, have a sense of humor, and are flexible, you will most likely have good classroom management.” For the purpose of the new teacher evaluation, however, Mr. Thompson dryly admitted that “it still only depends on those two hours of observation.”
Good instruction and delivery was another component of effective teaching. Miss Tong provided examples of good instruction. She felt that “using high level question strategies mixed with differentiated instruction” was essential to good teaching.

Four of the six teachers expressed during the interview that knowledge of subject matter is an important component to being an effective teacher. Some teachers admitted that this might be difficult for some principals to evaluate depending on the subject matter. Mrs. Terry listed knowledge as number one on her list of excellent teaching. She shared that “it is important to know the what, why, and how of a subject.” Miss Tong referenced Bloom’s taxonomy and the need for teachers to raise the level of learning.

The ability to be flexible was another common response from teachers. Ms. Johnson felt it is “extremely necessary to adapt to the needs of students.” Many students in the state of Washington come from low income homes and are dealing with a variety of economic and emotional issues. Ms. Johnson believed that “knowing your clientele” and understanding their situation goes a long way in being an effective teacher and helping them. Mr. Thompson felt that “teachers get too caught up in rules, deadlines, and consequences.” Flexibility will be the ultimate reward for students and teachers.

Having enthusiasm was another trait that teachers consider important to effective teaching. Ms. Johnson connected enthusiasm with “selling what you teach.” Mrs. Terry mentioned that “kids need to know you care and that by having enthusiasm, kids are engaged more with the lesson.” Mrs. Mason thought it is important for students to be interested in the lesson and enthusiasm from the teacher will help this cause.

The final component of effective teaching that two teachers mentioned as important was the ability to collect relevant data in a portfolio. Collecting data is a key element of the new
evaluations. Mrs. Mason cited her years as a Special Education teacher as a reason to support tracking items such as student growth and parent communication. Ms. Johnson supported the part of the Marzano model that encourages teachers to compile data. A favorite portfolio item that Ms. Johnson encouraged teachers to keep is student work samples.

**Criterion and Evidence Teachers Want Principals to Use**

In order to receive a fair evaluation, teachers perceived certain methods used to gather evidence as better than others. Teachers were in agreement that principal walkthroughs were acceptable. Teachers were in agreement that student data should not be used in teacher evaluations. Teachers were in agreement that portfolios were important in their evaluations. Teachers were also in agreement that student input should not be included in their evaluation. Teachers were in disagreement of how often a principal should formally observe a teacher. Teachers disagreed on the use of peer input within a teacher evaluation. Teachers were also in disagreement on the use of parent input within their evaluation. The one area that teachers and principals were in disagreement on was the role of student input in the evaluation of teachers.

Figure 5 provides a breakdown on the perceptions of each teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>Principal observations</th>
<th>Principal walkthroughs</th>
<th>Student data</th>
<th>Peer input</th>
<th>Student input</th>
<th>Parent input</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thompson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Connors</td>
<td>One a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Terry</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, feedback only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnson</td>
<td>Two a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes &amp; teacher evaluate principal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers disagreed with one another when it came to principal observations. While all of the teachers agreed with having informal principal walkthroughs as a method of gathering data, there was division with the traditional formal evaluations. Ms. Johnson and Mrs. Mason agreed with the traditional two observations a year. Mrs. Connors believed one formal observation is enough. Miss Tong believed “multiple” observations are necessary. Mr. Thompson and Mrs. Terry are opposed to the traditional format of scheduled formal principal observations. Mr. Thompson believed a teacher can “fake their way through an observation.” Mrs. Terry described the formal observation as “the two times a teacher would wear pantyhose to school.” It was clear from the interviews that unannounced principal walkthroughs were the most authentic and preferred measure of evaluating teacher effectiveness.

In regard to including input from individuals other than the school principal, teachers were in disagreement. Many teachers supported peer input, a couple teachers supported parent input, and none of the teachers was supportive of including student input. As for the peer input, Mrs. Mason was one of the two teachers who opposed it because she favored it used for professional growth only instead of teacher evaluation. Mrs. Terry had a similar response in that it depended on the teacher and situation so “that it’s not weird.” Mr. Thompson supported peer input but emphasized the need for trust because “teaching is very personal.” It was interesting that two teachers were supportive of parent input in teacher evaluations. Mrs. Connors felt that input from sources such as parents should be weighted less. Miss Tong defended her opinion of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miss Tong</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mason</td>
<td>Two a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, only for professional growth</td>
<td>No, informal only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Criterion and evidence of what teachers want.**
including parent input as a parent’s right to have a say in the progress of their child’s education including positive or negative feedback about the teacher.

The final areas where teachers were mostly in agreement were student data, student input, and portfolios. Every teacher in this study was opposed to the use of student data on a teacher’s evaluation. In addition, every teacher opposed student input on teacher evaluations. The most common reason given was the given variables of student diversity. In other words, it was clearly a fairness issue. One method of teacher effectiveness data that was supported by teachers in this study was portfolios. Only one teacher opposed portfolios as a part of teacher evaluations. His reason, as stated earlier in the results, was that it was all part of the new teacher evaluations becoming “too cumbersome.”

**Research Question #2: What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?**

In an effort to specifically identify how principals perceive the teacher evaluation process, principals were asked a series of questions about effective teaching and what a principal looks for when evaluating teacher effectiveness. The findings of this question will be divided into two categories. The first will look at what principals perceived as good teaching. The second will look at criteria and evidence that principals consider when they evaluate teachers. This research question is centered on the perceptions of principals. The third research question will focus on teacher perceptions. Comparisons will be made between the two. Common themes from the data will be reported throughout.
Principal Perceptions of Effective Teaching

Six principals were asked how they would describe effective teaching. Different models use different words to describe good teaching such as distinguished, proficient, and excellent. The word effective will be used in this study because it simply means to produce the intended result (Thompson, 1993). Principals depend on teachers to produce intended results in many different ways. Ten themes that described what principals perceived as effective teaching were repeated multiple times by principals in this study. Figure 6 represents these common themes.

![Figure 6. Principal perceptions of effective teaching.](image)

According to multiple principals interviewed in this study, they were looking for ten criteria when they evaluate teachers. All of these criteria are included in the three state approved evaluation models. Some of these areas happen outside the classroom lesson which would not be
as obvious in a formal lesson observation. In order to break down these elements of effective teaching, the criteria of what happens outside the classroom will be followed by the criteria involved within a class lesson.

Much of what principals perceive as an effective teacher happens outside of classroom. The first quality is professionalism. Mrs. Kennedy believed that all the other criteria should actually fall under professionalism. Mr. Stewart looked at professionalism as all the extra duties that are not seen in a classroom observation. Examples of this include participation at staff meetings, supervision in the hallways and assemblies, and attending professional growth opportunities. Closely related to this is collaboration. Mr. Brinkerhoff felt that effective teaching is “built around collaboration and professional development.” Improved collaboration has been a goal in many school districts. The Timberland School District sets aside an hour and a half of the regular school day once a week for teachers to collaborate professionally with one another. Rapport with students can be seen as out of class and in class. Most of a student’s life is centered on life outside of a teacher’s classroom. The ability of that teacher to learn and recognize what their students’ lives are like outside the classroom makes a difference as to how things go in the classroom. Mr. Patrick felt that “the ability of the teacher to relate and connect with the student should absolutely be included in the evaluation of teachers.” Another example of effective teaching done out of the classroom is careful lesson planning. According to several principals, lesson design is critical to effective teaching. Much of what is asked in the teacher evaluation frameworks can only come to fruition with careful lesson design.

What the principal typically observes in the classroom is a measure of teacher performance. One major criterion for effective teaching is student engagement. Mr. Stewart said engagement is when you enter a room and you “feel it in the room.” Mr. Miller described this as
“a teacher connecting with kids using multiple engagement strategies and there is a level of passion.” Along the lines of engagement is classroom environment. Mr. Tresner was a big believer in active learning strategies and creating an atmosphere of student interaction and involvement. Another element of effective teaching is communication. There are multiple levels of good teacher communication. One is clear and respectful instructional communication to students. The other is following up communication through websites and e-mails that may involve communication with parents. The other criteria that principals in this study looked for in effective teaching are clear learning targets, higher level concepts (with necessary modifications), and the ability to assess the learning.

**Criterion and Evidence Principals Use to Evaluate Teachers**

Teacher evaluations consist of official evidence and un-official evidence. Official evidence generally consists of what the principal observed during a planned observation. Un-official evidence would include data that ranged from student grades to what students would tell a principal at lunch in the cafeteria. Depending on a teacher’s point of view, this can be viewed positively or negatively. Realistically however, a teacher evaluation uses all forms of evidence even if they don’t fall within the realms of an evaluation rubric, score, or official observation. The new teacher evaluations are now more complex in that there are more types of evidence which is permissible for a principal to now use. This section examines what principals prefer to use as a means to gather evidence in evaluating teachers. Figure 7 provides a break down on the methods individual principals in this study prefer to use when they gather evidence for a teacher evaluation.
**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PRINCIPALS</strong></th>
<th>Principal observations</th>
<th>Principal walkthroughs</th>
<th>Student data</th>
<th>Peer input</th>
<th>Student input</th>
<th>Parent input</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Kennedy</td>
<td>Two a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, not at this time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stewart</td>
<td>Two a year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Local data: yes state data: no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brinkerhoff</td>
<td>Several 10-15 min. observations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (only for teacher growth)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Miller</td>
<td>Two a year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No (only for teacher growth)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick</td>
<td>Not formal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tresner</td>
<td>Not formal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (only for teacher growth)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7. Criterion and evidence principals use to evaluate teachers.**

Principals were mostly in agreement with methods used to gather evidence of effective teaching. The methods in which principals were mostly in agreement upon included walkthroughs, student data, peer input, and portfolios. All but one principal supported evidence being collected from principal walkthroughs. A walkthrough is when a principal walks into a classroom at any point during a lesson and observes things like student engagement, learning
targets, classroom management, etc. The principal might stay two minutes or they might stay eight minutes, but rarely will they stay for the majority of a class period. Principals liked this because it is more authentically represents what happens on a daily basis instead of what Mr. Tresner calls “the dog and pony show.” Teachers don’t rehearse their best lesson. The one principal who disagreed was Mr. Brinkerhoff, who advocated having several ten to fifteen minute observations based on the philosophy of former principal and educational writer Kim Marshall (his philosophy is included in Chapter Two of this dissertation).

Using student data on teacher evaluations was something principals were against. Mr. Brinkerhoff, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Tresner supported using student data for teacher growth and improvement but not for teacher evaluation. Mr. Stewart was the one exception. He felt that local student data can be used for teacher evaluations, but nothing beyond that from the state level or federal level. He said:

Local student data should play a big role. If a [teacher] gives a test and 50% of his students fail it, it’s not his students fault. There is something that happened instructionally there that was missed. So, that data should inform some changes to the teacher, who is going to go back and do something differently…. Is it fair to use state data? I don’t think so. Until the state quits moving the target it’s not fair especially at the secondary. If you are a math teacher, you are going to be judged on what kids have learned K-8 on their 9th grade Algebra score. I don’t think that is a fair statement.

A component of teacher evaluations that principals supported was the inclusion of peer input. Teacher evaluation models such as the PAR model mentioned in Chapter Two are often supported, yet rarely implemented. Due to the emphasis on teacher growth and the burden of time required for principals to evaluate teachers, peer input makes sense. Mr. Miller believed a
staff should “be progressive by utilizing teacher to teacher conversations and collaboration time.” He goes on to share that teacher evaluation should not be static and that “we have to evolve.” Peer input in teacher evaluations appears to be a component that principals favor.

The final teacher evaluation component favored by principals is the use of portfolios. In many ways the new teacher evaluation instrument is portfolio friendly because the instruments encourage teachers to keep track of evidence. Portfolios save and document components that prove a teacher is doing an effective job. Some examples of documents that can be included in a portfolio are parent communication, pre and post tests that track student growth, evidence of professional growth attendance, and evidence of modified instruction. None of the principals in the study objected to portfolios as part of a teacher’s evaluation.

There was disagreement among principals on some of the criterion and evidence used in teacher evaluations. One minor disagreement involved the traditional two observations a year. Under the old teacher evaluation, a principal observed a teacher twice a year. Three of the principals in this study still support that method. Mr. Brinkerhoff, as previously mentioned, supported the Marshall philosophy of multiple 10-15 minute chunks of observation. Mr. Patrick and Mr. Tresner opposed the formal observation and supported the use of walkthroughs instead.

Another area of disagreement was the role students play in the evaluation of a teacher. Three of the principals supported student feedback as part of a teacher’s evaluation. This would include written or verbal student input that a principal can factor into the overall evaluation of a teacher. Mr. Stewart shared how students love to talk about what is going on in the classroom and what kind of job their teacher is doing. The other three principals opposed using student input. Mr. Patrick questioned the credibility of student evaluation of students:
If all students are going to evaluate teachers and its going to be completely credible meaning that everyone does it instead of just the kids that like you doing it, how do you streamline that and its equitable? If they could do that I would be very surprised. How would you quantify it so that it is credible?

Mr. Tresner felt that student input is good for teacher growth, but not for evaluation. He felt it opens the door for students to take “pot shots” at the teacher and may only open up a “can of worms.”

Principals were also divided on using parent input on teacher evaluations. Mr. Brinkerhoff thought that using parent input is “too hard to validate.” Mrs. Kennedy liked the parent component in Danielson in which teachers can collect parent input as part of proof that they are teaching effectively. Mr. Patrick was opposed to parent input because it is not consistent or equitable. Mr. Tresner believed that there is already enough feedback and parent input is not needed.

Research Question #3: What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington?

The first part of the interviews with teachers and principals consisted of questions related to the level at which teachers support the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington. Six main findings emerged that helped answer the above research question. The first was that teachers and principals are mostly in agreement that the state of Washington needs to improve or change the system of evaluating teachers. The second finding was that there is disagreement over the decision to allow school districts to select from three possible evaluation models (Danielson, Marzano, or CEL 5D+). Third, most districts are doing a pretty
good job of implementing teacher evaluation instruments into their districts considering the circumstances. Fourth, all of the principals and teachers have concerns over the changes to teacher evaluation to some degree or another. The fifth finding is that almost all of the teacher and principal participants feel the new teacher evaluation models are tools to help teachers grow professionally rather than instruments to rate them. The last finding is that there is disagreement among educators that the strengths outweigh the weaknesses of the new teacher evaluations.

Three figures are provided below to represent the various themes related to the level of support the teachers and principals have for the new teacher evaluation instruments. Figure 8 provides a web representation of how the six themes emerged from the interviews. Figure 9 provides a breakdown of where each principal in the study stood in regard to the six themes. Figure 10 provides the same breakdown of how the teacher participants perceived the new teacher evaluation instruments. Following the three figures, more specific evidence will be presented in the form of individual responses from the participants.
Figure 8. Themes that describe the level of support of teachers and principals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>The state needed a new teacher evaluation.</th>
<th>Supportive of the state providing 3 models for districts to choose from.</th>
<th>Current school district has done a good job implementing the new teacher evaluation system.</th>
<th>Have strong concerns about the new teacher evaluation.</th>
<th>The new teacher evaluation is designed to help teachers grow more than it is about rating teachers.</th>
<th>There are more strengths to the new evaluation system than there are weaknesses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Kennedy (Danielson)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stewart (Danielson)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brinkerhoff (Marzano)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Miller (Marzano)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick (CEL 5D+)</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tresner (CEL 5D+)</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Individual principal perceptions.
The state needed a new teacher evaluation. Supportive of the state providing 3 models for districts to choose from. Current school district has done a good job implementing the new teacher evaluation system. Have strong concerns about the new teacher evaluation. The new teacher evaluation is designed to help teachers grow more than it is about rating teachers. There are more strengths to the new evaluation system than there are weaknesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>The state needed a new teacher evaluation.</th>
<th>Supportive of the state providing 3 models for districts to choose from.</th>
<th>Current school district has done a good job implementing the new teacher evaluation system.</th>
<th>Have strong concerns about the new teacher evaluation.</th>
<th>The new teacher evaluation is designed to help teachers grow more than it is about rating teachers.</th>
<th>There are more strengths to the new evaluation system than there are weaknesses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thompson (Danielson)</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Connors (Danielson)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Terry (Marzano)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnson (Marzano)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Tong (CEL 5D+)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mason (CEL 5D+)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Individual teacher perceptions.

Agreement

Participants in this study had solid consensus in half of the main themes that described the level of support teachers and principals had toward the new evaluation instruments. Ten of the twelve participants agreed that the state of Washington needed a new system to evaluate teachers. Mr. Patrick was in slight disagreement because he felt there was room in the old system to provide enough detail and comments to provide a fair evaluation. Mr. Thompson was in slight disagreement because he felt the old system was at least realistic in matching the
amount of time available for principals to evaluate teachers. The other ten participants strongly agreed that it was time for the old system to go.

Participants all had genuine concerns about the new evaluation instruments. The level of concern varied. The specific concerns will be shared later in the reporting of themes.

The final area in which participants were in general agreement was the perception that the new teacher evaluations were designed more to help teachers grow as opposed to rating teachers. Ten of the twelve participants agreed. Ms. Johnson and Miss Tong were the two that were in slight disagreement. All six principals and four of the six teachers perceived the new evaluation models as a way to help teachers grow professionally.

Disagreement

In an effort to provide another level of analysis, the disagreements among the participants will be broken down into groups. The first group will be teachers and principals. The second comparison will be based on the evaluation instrument used by school district of each participant. Following this comparison, a more specific breakdown of each theme will be presented.

Teachers: Danielson Model

Mr. Thompson and Mrs. Connors were in disagreement over the state’s decision to allow school districts the option selecting from three evaluation instruments. Both teachers are in districts that selected Danielson. During the course of the interviews, Mr. Thompson was more critical in general of the evaluative process and he was asked by his principal to be on the pilot team. Mrs. Connors was more optimistic and had volunteered in her district to be on the pilot
team. Both teachers also had a very different overall perception of the new evaluation system. Mrs. Connors viewed the Danielson model of having more strengths than weaknesses while Mr. Thompson felt the complexity of the model gave it more weaknesses than strengths. A final area in which both teachers disagreed was the perception that their current school district was doing a good job with the implementation of the Danielson model. Mrs. Connors was happy with the job Timberland School District was doing while Mr. Thompson felt that Fort Taylor could do better. These results represent the school district’s implementation process and the willingness of the teacher to participate as key factors determining the overall teacher perception of the new evaluation instrument.

Teachers: Marzano Model

Mrs. Terry and Ms. Johnson represent the two teachers whose district is implementing the Marzano Model. They were in disagreement on the three options for teacher evaluation models. Mrs. Terry mostly agreed with the state’s decision while Ms. Johnson disagreed with it. They were more in agreement on the perception of how well their district was implementing the new instruments, and they were also aligned in that they both disagreed on some level that the new evaluation instrument had more strengths than weaknesses. Ms. Johnson and Mrs. Terry were teachers at very similar stages of their careers and their answers matched up closely most of the time.

Teachers: CEL 5D+ Model

Miss Tong and Mrs. Mason were teachers whose district was implementing the CEL 5D+ Model. While both teachers supported the option of districts choosing one of three evaluation
model options, they were in disagreement with how well the implementation process was going in their district. Miss Tong mostly agreed with how Bayview School District was implementing the CEL 5D+ model while Mrs. Mason mostly disagreed with how Midland School District was implementing the new model. This result is most likely due to the fact that for several years, Midland had been using Danielson as a teacher growth model before switching to the CEL 5D+ Model recently. Both teachers were in agreement that the CEL 5D+ had more strengths than weaknesses which perhaps gives the CEL 5D+ model a perceived advantage in that it was the only model where both teachers felt it had more strengths.

**Principals: Danielson Model**

Mrs. Kennedy and Mr. Stewart were both principals in this study using the Danielson model. While they both disagreed with districts having three options to choose from, they were both happy with how their school districts were implementing the change. This could be due to the fact that Fort Taylor School District was one of the early TPEP pilot districts and Timberland School District cautiously followed Fort Taylor’s lead. Timberland is a neighboring school district to Fort Taylor. Where these two principals disagreed was the balance of strengths and weaknesses in the Danielson model. Mr. Stewart slightly disagreed with the perception of there being more strengths than weaknesses in the Danielson model. Mrs. Kennedy, on the other hand, was in agreement that the Danielson model had more strength.

**Principals: Marzano Model**

There was significant disagreement between the two principals whose districts are implementing the Marzano model. Mr. Brinkerhoff (Meadows School District) and Mr. Miller
(White Falls School District) had very different perceptions of the new teacher evaluation. Mr. Miller liked that his district had the opportunity to select the Marzano model from the three choices. Mr. Brinkerhoff didn’t believe the models were different enough to warrant having the selection. According to Mr. Brinkerhoff, evaluating with one model exclusively would have been a more efficient means of evaluation. The two principals had different perceptions of how well their districts were implementing the Marzano model. Mr. Miller mostly agreed that the White Falls School District was implementing the model well, while Mr. Brinkerhoff mostly disagreed with how Meadows School District was implementing the new model. Meadows school district had changed models due to a change in district administration, and this might have influenced the perceptions of Mr. Brinkerhoff. Finally, Mr. Miller viewed the Marzano Model as having more strengths than weaknesses while Mr. Brinkerhoff disagreed. Both principals were at similar stages in their career, so what might account for their different perceptions is the leadership of the school district administration in the implementation of the new model.

**Principals: CEL 5D+ Models**

Mr. Patrick and Mr. Tresner represented two principals from two different districts implementing the CEL 5D+ model. These two principals had only slight differences in their perceptions. They both disagreed with the state’s choice to allow one of three evaluation models to be selected per district. They also both felt that the CEL 5D+ model had more weaknesses than strengths which merits attention because they were the only pair to both feel that way. This might suggest that the model itself is why they feel it has more weaknesses than strengths. What Mr. Patrick and Mr. Tresner were in disagreement about was how the CEL 5D+ model was being implemented in their district. Mr. Patrick mostly agreed that the Bayview School District was
doing a good job implementing the new model while Mr. Tresner mostly disagreed with the job the Midland School district was doing. The perceptions of Mr. Tresner might again have to do with late changes made by the Midland School District administration with regard to implementing the evaluation model.

The review of participants based on their model was done to report any distinguishing differences that stem from the models themselves. The results have too many other factors, such as years of experience of the participant or the implementation stage of the school district, that take away the ability to perceive the effectiveness of the models. Perhaps more study of the models or interviewing the participants later in the implementation of the instrument will provide results that are clearer. What did emerge from the participants were clear themes based on the level teachers and principals support their evaluation model.

**Theme #1: A New Evaluation System**

There was clear consensus that teachers and principals recognized a need for a new system to evaluate teachers in the state of Washington. With only two exceptions (Mr. Thompson & Mr. Patrick) all of the participants supported the goal of Senate Bill 6696, which essentially got rid of the old teacher evaluation system to replace it with a new model. Mr. Stewart described the old system as “archaic, out-dated, and irrelevant with no value in terms of professional growth.” Mr. Stewart had used this old system for fifteen years as an administrator at Timberland High School and had this used on him even longer when he was a teacher. His sentiment was echoed by other participants. Mr. Brinkerhoff shared that he became principal in part of the old system when he noticed his principal had simply made carbon copies from one year to the next without even observing him as a teacher. He went and shared,
I don’t like the old system. I think it devalues teachers by saying you are either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. I think that when I look back at how many minutes or hours that I actually spend in the classroom per teacher it makes it hard to meet that goal of being a professional growth issue. I never liked that on the old system that the only valuable information was what I wrote down when I observed. I want a lot more of teacher input. I think that teachers can grow together a lot more than just two thirty minute observations.

Mr. Thompson goes even further by calling the old system “silly.” He degraded the old twice-a-year principal lesson observations by admitting that teachers and students can fake a good lesson observation twice a year:

The students, if they like you, will pretend that they are engaged for that one period. If they like you and they like the principal they will be angels for forty-five minutes and be engaged and stare at the screen and ask you questions and answer the questions… kids that have never raised their hand will because they like you and don’t want you to get in trouble with your boss. That’s just the reality of the whole thing. And then the [students] didn’t see the [principal] again. If you were a good teacher you did a good job every day, and if you were not as good a teacher and you wanted to slack you could. The one day evaluation said nothing about what you did on a daily basis. [Principals] know what you do on a day to day basis because kids will tell them. Principals know who does their job and who doesn’t.

When pressed further and asked about the new system, Mr. Thompson didn’t feel as though the state really changed it. He felt that they simply made it more “cumbersome.”
Most of the participants looked at the new teacher evaluation models as a marked improvement over the old system. Mr. Miller shared that “any effort to improve the [the old teacher evaluation system] was welcome.” Ms. Johnson agreed with the legislature’s decision because something needed to change and there needed to be a growth option in the new model. Miss Tong liked it because it gave teachers more of a guide and helped teachers be on the same page with their colleagues. Mrs. Mason agreed with the state because it put student growth first. Mrs. Kennedy liked it because the new evaluation system created a common understanding of what good teaching is. Mr. Tresner liked some of it, but not all of it. The parts he was opposed to were that there wasn’t much input from educators and that it will probably change again. Overall, it was clear from the interviews that changing the old evaluation system was a good move for education in the state of Washington.

**Theme #2 Evaluation Model Options**

Most of the participants in the study disagreed with the decision by the State Legislature to require school districts in the state of Washington to choose one of three instructional teacher evaluation frameworks (Danielson, Marzano, or CEL 5D+). In the aftermath of Senate Bill 6696, the legislature passed Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5895 as a new law, asking OSPI to select three teacher evaluation frameworks. The law went into effect on June 7th, 2012. School districts assembled committees and did their best to educate themselves on the three frameworks available. At the time of this study, just about every district had selected a framework. The overall theme found in this study was that there was disagreement with this decision. Seven of the twelve participants disagreed with the option for districts to select one of three models. Acknowledging that five participants agreed with this decision opens up an opportunity for good
discussion on the subject. It is necessary to note most of the participants who disagreed were principals. To prove evidence of this disagreement, this theme will start with why the seven participants disagreed with the three option law and finish with perceptions of the four teachers and one principal who supported the decision.

Out of twelve participants, five principals and two teachers disagreed with the state of Washington giving school districts three teacher evaluation models to choose from. The most consistent reason given is that one option would have provided more uniformity in schools throughout the state. Mr. Tresner followed this up when he added:

I think the three options are a little contrived. It is a division of resources. If they had good information and just made a decision on one of them, I think it would have been better. I think there would have been more uniformity around the state because right now, as I would imagine, as people try to move between districts, let’s say principals try to move between districts, I think that will be an issue if I apply at a district that is using Marzano, now [the district] needs to incur some training costs for me in which they may not want if there is another candidate that’s got whatever evaluation tool they are using, so there’s going to be all sorts of unintended consequences that we cannot even foresee.

Mr. Brinkerhoff would have rather started with one when he mentioned that “there will be dysfunction between all three models and state criteria and that having three models will be problematic.” Mrs. Kennedy called the three model choice “curious and concerning.” She brought up a good question as to how to align a score in each model. The language will not be the same in the three models. Mr. Patrick went into further depth:

The different frameworks, if I am going to sit here and be honest with you, it is just money. So the [frameworks] are making money with the different frameworks. You can
pick one framework, you can pick five, but they all have to fit into categories and that is basically what you found. People are lining their frameworks so they can fit these categories that have been stamped by legislature. So it’s just a matter of having some consistency with whatever you’re doing so they can fall into categories…. You have these categories, how are you going to measure efficiency in the categories? This opens the door to bigger battles and lots of bargaining.

With that said, Mr. Patrick reminded us that going through a teacher evaluation overhaul is an expensive endeavor and that there are different groups and individuals with ties to the three systems that stand to profit from this change.

Mr. Stewart brought up other good points in challenging why three options were given. Mr. Stewart reminded us of the learning curve involved with learning a new model and that it is common for teachers and principals to change districts. Another group to consider is teachers coming out of higher education into the teaching profession. Mr. Stewart asked:

Are they now going to have to be masters of three domains and know all the language and lingo around those three? So as they’re popping out [of higher education], they need to know the speech of Marzano. Or if they happen to be interviewing in a 5D district, do [they] have to know all of the 5D stuff? You know that’s going to be an implication at the higher [education] level.

Mr. Thompson reiterated that the only thing that giving three options does is add to how cumbersome teacher evaluations already are. Ms. Johnson expressed concern about the excess of options and raised the point that the frameworks should be the same. Clearly, these opinions bring up valid points that lawmakers and educators should consider.
The four teachers and one principal who supported this decision liked the flexibility of picking from three models. Miss Tong, a family consumer science teacher, liked the idea of giving school districts different options because:

No school district [is the same] and even schools are different and have different needs and so it’s good that the legislature gave us three different options so that districts could pick what they felt would meet the needs of the population that each school district serves.

Mr. Miller felt that by giving districts a chance to blend a framework into what they already do actually causes less of a disruption in their evaluation processes. Mr. Miller brought up a good reminder that some districts were already improving their own teacher growth and evaluation model before the State Legislature mandated the change. Mrs. Mason expressed support for having three options:

It is a good idea to give districts three different choices because with the different options, it actually [helps] what our district focuses on. I believe that different choices focus on different things. We were actually between Danielson and 5D, because they were both focused on the same stuff we were with collaboration and student engagement and it seemed like those two really focused on that the most.

Mrs. Mason, who is a Special Education teacher, later brought up another good point that she was happy her district selected the same model as a neighboring district so that they could collaborate professionally by using the same concepts encouraged in the evaluation model. This argument, however, also might reinforce the need for one system. Mrs. Connors liked that Timberland School District selected the Danielson model, which enforces the concept that if given a choice, you probably will have more buy in or commitment to that choice.
One teacher who really saw both sides this discussion was Mrs. Terry. She recognized that the decision to provide three options is just another “top down, administrative decision.” She didn’t mind the concept of having three different options. She simply didn’t like that teachers play such a small role in deciding what those options are going to be and what will be in each option. Mrs. Terry also reminded us that the complexity of teaching isn’t sufficiently covered by one model or another. She backed this up by sharing:

There are some kids where it doesn’t matter what I do and there are some kids where it does matter. There are some kids where I [ask], that kid’s test score is my fault? Really, how about the legislature gets to try and teach that kid. How about they make the parent conference? And phone calls that [are] never [answered]. Sometimes I feel they forget that we are inherent people.

What is clear from these responses is that there are pros and cons to having three options and that evaluating and defining good teaching is a complex process.

**Theme #3: District Implementation**

Eight out of the twelve participants were supportive of how their districts were handling the implementation process of the new evaluations. The role the district plays in the process is a key variable in whether or not principals or teachers will support the new teacher evaluations. While there was sufficient evidence of support toward how their district was implementing the changes, it was not overwhelming support. Many of the participants seemed cautious when describing how their district was adapting to the change.

It was clear that each district was at a somewhat different stage in the process of changing teacher evaluations. White Falls was way ahead in the process because they had been an early
pilot district and a recipient of grant money to help in the development of staff. Fort Taylor was in a similar situation in that had been a pilot district. Timberland was progressing at a cautious, yet steady pace. Meadows was behind because they had experienced a change in district leadership and had changed their model. Midland was going through somewhat of a “wasted year” according to Mr. Tresner because:

We had been using Danielson as an instructional framework, decided to switch to CEL 5D last year, and then hit bump in the road when the union said we weren’t involved in this decision. We should be implementing this year, but had to take another year off for the union to negotiate it and the district/union ended up sticking with the 5D anyway. It’s been kind of a rocky transition; we have been in a holding pattern for a year now after a full year of training and learning walks, collaboration, and all of that stuff. Really we have done next to nothing this year, which to me seems kind of like a wasted year. But, next year we are going to implement. We are going to have a couple trainings with staff.

Bayview was also experiencing some implementation challenges due to union negotiations. Mr. Patrick admitted that there is still a chance that the Bayview School District might have to change from the CEL 5D+ due to difficult ongoing negotiations with the union. If that were to happen, it would have certainly wasted countless hours of time and money.

Theme #4: Concerns

A critical theme in this study is that all of the participants have concerns about the new teacher evaluation instruments being implemented in Washington State. These were solid concerns that deserve recognition. The most repeated themes (mentioned by at least five of the participants) were time, lack of trust in the state government, the inability of the system or
principals to be fair, and the reactions of teachers when they earn a lower score than they deserve. Figure 11 represents these concerns.

Figure 11. Principal and teacher concerns.

The time involved is undoubtedly the biggest concern, especially for principals. Throughout the normal school day, principals are pulled many different directions outside of evaluating teachers. In review of Chapter Two, Marzano identified some of the responsibilities of principals. The twenty-one responsibilities and roles included Affirmation, Change agent, Contingent awards, Communication, Culture, Discipline, Flexibility, Focus, Ideals/beliefs, Input, Intellectual stimulation, Involvement in curriculum/instruction/assessment, Monitoring/evaluating, Optimizer, Order, Outreach, Relationships, Resources, Situational
awareness, and Visibility (Marzano et al., 2005). A perfect example of what a principal has to deal with is described by Mr. Thompson.

The principals don’t have time. They know it and they have told their bosses. Their bosses come over and watch, and ask where your principal was today? Well, he was supposed to be in [Mr. Thompson’s] third period and [Mr. Collier’s] fourth period but there was a fight in the commons, and some parents called to sue about playing time on the basketball team, and the cheerleaders don’t like their coach, and the [staff] toilet is plugged up, and some kids flushed Styrofoam popcorn down the toilet in the end bathroom, and the copier doesn’t work, and there is an all day meeting at the district office about safety issues.

While this may sound humorous, principals can identify with what Mr. Thompson is talking about. Mr. Tresner calculated the extra hours required per staff member under a principal’s supervision and came up with an extra six weeks of time to properly carry out the evaluation. “Unrealistic” is how Mr. Stewart described the issue. Obviously, something will have to give.

Time will be a problem for teachers as well. Ms. Johnson is an A.P. teacher who is required to teach thousands of years of human history to high school students hoping to earn college credit by scoring high on an exam in mid May. The time it takes to document items required for her evaluation and go to trainings takes away from her teaching duties. This new evaluation system will be a time burden for principals and teachers alike.

The next major concern involved a lack of trust in the State Legislature. Mr. Tresner called that state a “wild card” or a “moving target.” Veteran educators know that new programs, standards, goals, and systems come and go from year to year and decade to decade in education. There was a sense from the participants that the new teacher evaluation instruments are just the
latest fad to come from the top down. Multiple principals recognized the concern each year of an eleventh hour change in education laws by the state government that will dramatically alter the livelihood of educators making it increasingly more difficult to carry out the duties of their job on a year to year basis.

The third main concern questioned the fairness of the new system. What was being called into question here was the scoring system. There was concern about differentiating between one score and another. Danielson and CEL 5D+ have a four tier rating system and Marzano has a five tier rating system. Under the old system it was only a two tier rating system. The concern here is how a principal will tell the difference between a score of 2 or 3 or even a score of 3 or 4. Mr. Miller would preferred to have it broken down even more so that you could rate a teacher with fractions of points, for example, a 2.3 or a 2.8. Mr. Patrick would have preferred having only a three tier system. Mrs. Mason believed there will certainly be discrepancies with how principals rate their teachers. Unfortunately for teachers, they felt as though they are at the mercy of the principal’s judgment.

The last major concern was the worry that teachers will act negatively over their scores and ultimately challenge the legitimacy of the new teacher evaluation system. By pure numbers (over 62,000), teachers represent a major force in the state of Washington. Teachers have an impact on what goes on with the learning on a daily basis. Teachers also have strong union ties, and the unification of teachers on any idea can be powerful. It remains to be seen how teachers will react when scores are tabulated. Miss Tong had noticed resistance already with a veteran staff at the school where she is doing her principal internship.

Some of the teachers are still resistant to like posting a simple learning target on the board, which is part of the purpose and the principal continues to hound this why you
need to do this and during walk thru and not seeing it and that’s going to end up impacting their evaluation. [We are] still getting that resistance. It is in the staff meetings and the professional developments. The principal can only do so much until it goes back to the teachers and says I’m giving you the support you’re choosing not to do this.

There were other concerns that warrant inclusion to the topic of teacher and principal perceptions of the new teacher evaluation instruments. Three participants felt that there isn’t enough money and training to successfully prepare and support such a complex system of evaluating teachers. Mrs. Mason was concerned that one principal might score more strictly than another principal on the same administration team. Mr. Stewart and Mrs. Connors from Timberland were concerned that teachers are not told their scores during the process, leaving little flexibility to adjust in the areas in which teachers need to improve. Mr. Thompson admitted that his concern is that the new system still won’t get rid of bad teachers. Mr. Patrick and Mr. Brinkerhoff were concerned with teacher unions and that much of the new evaluation’s strength will be bargained down. Miss Tong is concerned about the new system being too linked to standards based grading and student data. Ms. Johnson is worried about the mistrust between new principals and veteran teachers. Mrs. Terry is concerned that the new system is too contrived and rushed. Miss Tong and Mrs. Mason had concerns that veteran teachers would resist and have difficulty adapting to the new evaluation instruments.

Theme #5: Professional Growth

Ten out of twelve of the participants in this study agreed that the new teacher evaluation instruments were created to help a teacher grow professionally more than to rate their job performance. Clearly the new models do both, but the perception of what it is most intended for
is important to this study. An evaluation tool that is intended to score teachers and group
teachers into unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished groups is likely to create more
negative teacher perceptions. If the evaluation is intended to be a means to fire bad teachers,
than there will be increased anxiety over the new evaluation instruments. Using the instruments
as a professional growth framework provides more positive perceptions because it allows
educators to improve without the concern of probation or dismissal. All six of the principals
agreed that the new teacher evaluations focus more on professional growth. Four of the teachers
agreed that the models are more about teacher growth. Two teachers viewed it as both, but
definitely recognize that it was a rating of teachers. Ms. Johnson reminds us that “it is a score.”
This theme gives educators hope that the challenges that come with this new evaluation of
teachers will improve teacher performance and be worth the time and effort.

The original intent of the three teacher evaluation instruments, Danielson, Marzano, and
CEL 5D+, is to be a professional growth model for teachers. Mr. Miller reminded us that the
Danielson and Marzano models are not evaluation systems. The rating scales had to be added in
later to qualify as a teacher evaluation instrument. Mr. Miller felt strongly that the models are to
be used for teacher growth instead of punishment and the legislature has attempted to morph
them into more effective ways to remove bad teachers.

The principals Mr. Stewart, Mr. Brinkerhoff, and Mr. Tresner all appreciated how the
models emphasize a continual process of improvement. Mr. Stewart liked the collaborative
process of setting professional goals and tracking the data. Mr. Brinkerhoff thought the new
evaluation instruments will be great for young teachers learning what quality instruction is meant
to look like. Mr. Brinkerhoff likes the concept of teachers setting goals:
I think it is a great process for young teachers because I can help them grow from 1’s to 2’s and 2’s to 3’s, and if they want to go further than that, it is really about their own professional development and their own drive to do that. I wish more teachers across the state would look at it that way and say if I want to be a 3 or 4, I can be. It’s going to be hard. It is not easy. I won’t start out as a 4, but it is all about what I do as a teacher. It is our job as administrators to help [teachers] find the evidence and set the appropriate goals. It is a goal setting process.

Mr. Tresner viewed the evaluation tool as a means to help a teacher be in a constant state of improvement. He did admit, however, that it will depend somewhat on the relationship that the principal and teacher have in regard to utilizing the intended process of teacher improvement in the evaluation instrument.

**Theme #6: Strengths and Weaknesses**

The final theme related to understanding the level of support that teachers and principals have toward the new teacher evaluation instruments is that there is disagreement about the new teacher evaluation system having more strengths than it does weaknesses. In describing the perceptions of teachers and principals, it has been evident to this point that participants have both positive and negative feelings for the new instruments to evaluate teachers. During the course of the interviews, participants had an opportunity to discuss the strengths versus the weaknesses. In coding the data, participants were counted as naming forty-four strengths and thirty-six weaknesses. Three participants listed more weaknesses. Five participants listed more strengths. Four participants listed an equal number of strengths and weaknesses. For the sake of clear data reporting, I will present the findings by strengths first followed by the weaknesses.
There were many perceived strengths to the new teacher evaluation instruments. A common response was that it was more intentional toward promoting teacher growth. Participants also favored the clear terminology and vocabulary that helped describe the good teaching. Mr. Miller felt that it was not only a legitimate framework of teaching, but it “added credibility to teaching by recognizing the complexity of the teaching process.” Mrs. Connors shared that the new teacher evaluation instruments “made teaching more relevant by having a thorough process examining what you have done as a teacher.” Miss Tong felt that a strength of the new system was that it provided teachers with a purpose, such as being aware of the classroom environment and how classroom environment promotes student learning. Mrs. Mason liked how the new evaluation requires teachers to keep track of student learning. She thought this was a good idea because Special Education teachers have to do this anyway. For the most part, teachers and principals in this study liked what was in the criteria and domains of the evaluation. It was interesting when coding this data that some of the reasons why participants liked the new evaluations were also reasons they didn’t like the new model.

Teachers and principals identified many weaknesses in the teacher evaluation instruments. The biggest weakness was the extra burden placed upon educators. While having a more in depth system was considered a strength, principals such as Mr. Brinkerhoff warned that it “might die under its own weight.” Mr. Taylor referred to it as being “cumbersome” and “hoop jumping.” Many of the previously listed concerns were again repeated as weaknesses, such as the amount of time that will be needed to carry out the new teacher evaluations. Mr. Stewart explains:

The weakness in this new system is we are continuing to try and deliver the same model with new expectations. What I mean by that is… I am asking [the teacher] to step up
[their] game professionally while at the same time they are still teaching five periods, has 150 kids on [their] caseload, and has a family outside of school. So if [teachers] are getting scored on their professionalism, what time does [the teacher] have to grow professionally or collaboratively with their peers if we are not embedding any time within the system? We have raised the bar, but we haven’t provided professional development time. We haven’t provided a re-structuring of time within the system. Realistically, we haven’t provided the professional support.

Mrs. Terry explained some things are hard to evaluate despite the complexity of the system. For example, she mentioned some teachers just have that “with-it-ness” and are good at what they do. Mrs. Terry also believed that a weakness of the evaluation is that there are other programs out there that she feels are better for improving teaching. An example she provided was the Kagen Learning Program. Mr. Patrick felt that the new evaluation was not consistent in that it shifted terms around in its rubric. Other weakness included concerns that the system will get bogged down by union issues and has unclear areas such as the role of student data in the evaluation.

In closing, there are a number of points to consider from the results of this study. It should be noted that many of the results of this study overlap with one another. Education in general is often interconnected. It should also be noted that the responses given often reflected the general stage that each participant was at in his or her career. I couldn’t help but notice that the more veteran the participant, the more open they were in their responses and even more critical at times. This may explain why some responses were more frank and direct compared to others. This study certainly provided more data to analyze than I could have ever hoped it would.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This chapter summarizes the study about teacher and principal perceptions on new state teacher evaluations and examines conclusions from the data presented in Chapter Four. A summary of the study will be provided, followed by a discussion of the major findings. A key component of this chapter is a discussion of relationships to their findings to the literature. Unexpected findings in this study are highlighted followed by conclusions. As part of the conclusions, implications for action and recommendations for further research are presented. The chapter closes with a review of the key findings from this study that pertain to the greater body of educational research.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington. This study also compares the elements of what teachers and principals consider good teaching with the new teacher evaluation frameworks. In 2010 and 2012, the Washington State Legislature passed SB 6696 and ESSB 5895 which essentially overhauled the system of how principals evaluate teachers in the state. The bill did away with the old satisfactory or unsatisfactory
evaluation and used a multi-tier model with a long list of specific criteria that teachers must now meet. The new law ultimately allowed each school district to choose between three state-approved evaluation models, and unions were allowed to bargain with school districts about the way student performance would be used. The three approved evaluation models include the Danielson model, Marzano model, and CEL 5D+ model. The 2012-13 school year is a pilot year with the new law going into effect in the 2013-14 school year.

There were several reasons for this study. The philosophical support of teachers and principals was really not included in the reshaping of teacher evaluation laws. This study explored whether or not teachers and principals perceived the current course of action as being in the best intent of themselves and students. The body of knowledge on teacher evaluation and the impact it has on both principals and teachers has expanded as a result of this study. Finally, this study responded to the identified research problem by challenging the political support of teacher evaluation reform with the philosophical support of the teachers and principals who were the most impacted by the change.

In an effort to put the subject of teacher evaluation into context, a review of literature was conducted. The literature review consisted of a history of the multiple concepts of teacher evaluation. The literature review compared different concepts of teacher evaluation throughout the history of American education up to current models currently being implemented. The literature review started by examining the philosophical background of teacher evaluations. This section went back over a hundred years and reviewed writers and researchers such as Frederick Taylor, Ellwood Cubberly, John Dewey, H. E. Kratz, Madeline Hunter, Charlotte Danielson, Matthew Whitehead, and Kim Marshall. The second section of the literature review examined the current teacher evaluation models implemented in Washington State. This section described
and compared the Danielson model, Marzano model, and CEL 5D+ model. The third section examined selected principal responsibilities from the Marzano et al. (2005) work entitled *School leadership that works: From research to results*. The final section of the literature review examined a survey conducted by Spokane Public Schools in 2011 on the subject of the new teacher evaluations.

To generate data that described the levels of support teachers and principals have for the new teacher evaluations, a qualitative study based on participant interviews was completed. The study was conducted in six school districts from the state of Washington during a two month period. The districts were selected based on equal representation of three evaluation instruments used in that state (Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+). A total of six school districts participated by providing a willing teacher and principal for an interview. There were a total of twelve participants interviewed. Research questions provided the direction of the interview questions. The following are the research and interview questions that guided the study, followed by a summary of the results derived from these questions:

1. What new criteria and evidence does a teacher want a principal to consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?

   - Describe how your school district’s method of evaluating teachers has changed?
   - Describe what you would consider excellent teaching.
   - How can excellent teaching be proven for the purpose of evaluation?
   - What components of teaching should be included in the evaluation of teachers?
   - What role should student data play in a teacher’s evaluation?
   - Describe what an ideal teacher evaluation model would include.
   - How many observations and conferences?
   - Are there other criteria that would help administrators evaluate teachers?
2. What new criteria and evidence does a principal consider when evaluating teacher effectiveness?

- Describe how your school district’s method of evaluating teachers has changed?

- Describe what you would consider excellent teaching.

- How can excellent teaching be proven for the purpose of evaluation?

- What components of teaching should be included in the evaluation of teachers?

- What role should student data play in a teacher’s evaluation?

- Describe what an ideal teacher evaluation model would include.

- How many observations and conferences?

- Are there other criteria that would help administrators evaluate teachers?

The results taken from research questions one and two were more specific to the evaluation itself. There was solid consensus from both principals and teachers that effective teaching should include student engagement, well designed lesson plans, great rapport between teacher and student, safe and inspiring learning environments, collaboration with peers, assessments that measure student growth, and good communication skills from the teacher. Teachers and principals support multiple unannounced principal walkthroughs as a fair and effective way to evaluate teachers. Teachers and principals also support peer input and portfolio input within an evaluation. An important result from this study is that teachers and principals agree that student data should not count toward the evaluation of a teacher. An area where teachers clearly answered differently than principals was the role of student input in the evaluation of teachers. A result of this study is that teachers are opposed to student input while some principals were in support of it.
3. What is the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington?

- Explain how teachers were evaluated when you first started. How did you feel about the old evaluation system?

- Do you agree with the 2010 decision by the state legislature to change the way teachers are evaluated?

- Do you agree with the plan to give school district three different options?

- Your district has adopted the (Danielson, Marzano, CEL 5D+) teacher evaluation system. How has it been implemented and how would you describe it?

- Do you have any concerns about changes in the teacher evaluation process?

- Do you view the teacher evaluation process more as a means of helping the teacher or rating the teacher?

- What are some strengths and weaknesses of the new teacher evaluation system?

The results of the this question showed that while teachers and principals mostly agree that the state of Washington needed to improve or change the system of evaluating teachers, there were major concerns with how it was being accomplished. One concern was the state’s decision to give three different options. Another concern was the new evaluation is too cumbersome and unrealistic with the current structure of time and resources allocated in the educational system. Teachers and principals supported how the evaluation models encouraged the growth and development of teachers. The result of the study provided evidence that new teacher evaluation instruments in Washington State are good tools in fostering the development of teacher but lack in their ability to fairly evaluate teachers.

**Discussion**
The three research questions work together in that questions one and two provide specific examples from teacher evaluation instruments that support how teachers and principals feel about the new evaluation models. Question one and two divided the teachers from the principals in an effort to let the findings stand alone per group. The findings are then merged together to form the major themes that result from question three. In general, the big idea to come from question three is that teachers and principals were supportive of a new teacher evaluation model, yet the three new models are less than ideal. The new teacher evaluation instruments of Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+ do not provide enough clarity or support. While the old system did not provide enough depth to foster improved teaching, the new teacher evaluations are too in depth. They jeopardize how realistic it will be for them to reach their full potential. Perhaps that is the point. The new evaluations are about high standards with the belief that teachers and principals have the potential to meet those standards. What remains to be seen, is whether or not the concerns that teachers and principals have are legitimate warnings of what will happen or simply normal worries that usually are associated with any major change in procedure or routine.

Something worth discussing is whether or not the teacher’s and principal’s evaluation of the new model is consistent with their general belief of how teachers should be evaluated. For the most part, the participant’s general belief of teacher evaluations is consistent with their perception of the new model. Seven of the twelve participants believed that the new teacher evaluations had less strength than weaknesses. This is consistent with their general belief of how teachers should be evaluated. For example, under the new state law (ESSB 5895, 2012) the new evaluation models require two formal teacher observations by the principal for at least thirty minutes at a time per year. The observation time increases for new teachers or teachers in the
third year of provincial status. Only half of the participants agreed with this setup while all of the participants preferred more frequent unannounced walkthroughs as an improved method of evaluating teacher performance. State law also states that student growth data must be a factor in the evaluation process (ESSB 5895, 2012). All twelve of the participants disagreed with this requirement. The new teacher evaluation instruments (backed by ESSB 5895) allow for student input. Nine of twelve of the participants were opposed to student input being included in the evaluation of teachers. All six of the teachers were against student input. Portfolios are in the new evaluation instruments and were one area that teachers and principals were generally in support of.

It was evident from the results that the teachers in this study support the three models more than the principals. It can be interpreted from the individual responses that the reason for this is that most of the behind the scenes work of the new evaluation model is the principal’s responsibility. Principals hope that eventually teachers will do more in terms of data collecting and providing evidence of good teaching. In the short term however, principals will have to train the teachers on the new evaluation rubrics, schedule more pre conferences, observations, do more in terms of writing up a evaluation summary/score, more post conferences, and do more with student data and student input. All of this requires time and energy. There is more stress on principals because they have to formulate high stake scores for each teacher and be able to back it up with clear evidence. Meanwhile teachers will simply need to make more of an effort to document proof of good teaching with items such as student work, attendance at professional conferences, communication with parents, and lesson plans that promote student engagement. Teachers from this study were well aware that the new teacher evaluation models will promote their development as teachers. They were not as concerned with the evaluative part of the model.
The findings suggest that the state of Washington is half way there in regard to improving teacher evaluations. If the goal is to improve the quality of education in the state, than it appears that the state legislature has taken its resources from one area (principals) to improve in another (teachers). While this might be common in government, this study recognizes potential problems that will result from it. In an effort to promote improved teaching and learning, the state of Washington passed two major education bills that reformed teacher evaluations. The result provided three researched evaluation frameworks in the form of Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+. The three models successfully identified and described what good teaching is. They struggled however with identifying how to efficiently run the model given the current resources found in most schools. At the very least, a new principal or instructional coach/evaluator needs to be hired. Due to financial constraints that is unlikely to happen. What has not been considered is the impact the new evaluation will have on school principals. It is clear from this study that principals were more concerned with the logistics of the new models than teachers were. The state has continued with the tradition of top down management by keeping the burden of evaluation on the shoulders of principals while at the same time increasing their load of responsibilities. This study recognizes that something has to ultimately give.

Findings Related to the Literature

There were many connections found between the findings of this study with those found from previous studies. This section will compare my findings from this qualitative study with what was reviewed in the literature (Chapter Two). In addition to comparing the research, the findings of my study will be examined to consider whether or not they fit in with previous findings from past studies. I will also look to clarify any contradictions in the literature. This
section will conclude by examining if new ground has been broken in the study of principals, teachers, and teacher evaluation.

While the study of teaching and learning is common in educational research, the study of teacher evaluation is not. For many years, teacher evaluation was only brought to the forefront under extreme cases of neglect, abuse, or obvious lack of skill. Global competition and political pressure has changed all of this. Teachers now are under the microscope. Principals are now under pressure to lead schools to higher performance. Data is becoming the new driving force to differentiate low performing schools from high performing schools. Teachers and principals are caught in the crossfire of this educational phenomenon. I selected the topic of teacher evaluations to research because it is currently relevant and there is very little research on it in comparison to other topics in education. The qualitative method was chosen because philosophically, I believe you can get more sincere and in-depth data from one on one interviews. I was satisfied with the amount of data this study generated. Other studies on teacher evaluations were mostly quantitative or outdated in light of the teacher evaluation reforms that are sweeping the United States in reaction to President Obama’s Race to the Top educational reform.

There were two studies that were most relevant to this study on teacher evaluations. The most inspiring study I found was the 1952 Matthew Whitehead study Teachers look at supervision. His study provides a solid foundation for modern teacher evaluation studies. Whitehead sought to provide teachers a voice concerning how they are evaluated. Sixty years later, my study brought up many of the same issues such as fairness of principal evaluations, importance of collaboration, lesson plan design, and the challenges facing new teachers. This study was inspiring and foundational. A study I found timely was the Spokane Public Schools
Survey completed in 2011. This study provided qualitative numbers to the same topic as mine and was completed in a large district of the same state that my 2013 qualitative study was conducted.

I was able to find several similarities between the results of my study and the results of previous studies. One finding that I found to be similar was from the research based on a work by Marzano, et al. (2005) entitled *School leadership that works: From research to results*. This book, when viewed in conjunction with the results of this study, conclude that a principal’s time is too maxed out to properly follow through with the expectations that the new teacher evaluations put on him or her. The book, outlines twenty-one specific principal responsibilities that effective principals must satisfy to ensure high levels of student achievement. The twenty-one responsibilities and roles included Affirmation, Change agent, Contingent awards, Communication, Culture, Discipline, Flexibility, Focus, Ideals/beliefs, Input, Intellectual stimulation, Involvement in curriculum/instruction/assessment, Monitoring/evaluating, Optimizer, Order, Outreach, Relationships, Resources, Situational awareness, and Visibility.

The result of my study confirmed many of these responsibilities and leaves one wondering where principals will find the time to conduct evaluations. For example, one principal participant (Mr. Tresner) estimated that under the new prescribed evaluation process, he will need to find an additional 240 hours to pre-conference, observe, post-conference, and write up reports for teachers under the new evaluation system. This adds up to an additional six weeks of work in a 180 day school year. Principals already put in 60 hour weeks, and this doesn’t even include the additional responsibility of principals to evaluate their vice principals. The reality was described in my study by Mr. Thompson:
The principals don’t have time. They know it and they have told their bosses. Their bosses come over and watch, and ask where your principal was today? Well he was supposed to be in [Mr. Thompson’s] third period and [Mr. Collier’s] fourth period but there was a fight in the commons, and some parents called to sue about playing time on the basketball team, and the cheerleaders don’t like their coach, and the [staff] toilet is plugged up, and some kids flushed Styrofoam popcorn down the toilet in the end bathroom, and the copier doesn’t work, and there is an all day meeting at the district office about safety issues.

Another similarity I found between my study’s results and previous research results was on what constitutes good teaching. The best example came from Madeline Hunter. In her 1994 book *Enhancing teaching*, Hunter defined categories to link to good teaching and lesson design. Two examples included Learner Behaviors and Teacher Behaviors. Under these categories, Hunter emphasized student engagement, good assessments, and teachers employing researched instructional strategies as part of good lesson design. The findings from my study of participants echoed many of the same arguments of what effective teaching looks like. Specific examples of the similarity between my findings and her arguments included differentiated instruction, good use of classroom time, and the ability for students to articulate what they have learned.

One finding that was different in my study was the perception of the old teacher evaluation system. In this qualitative research study, ten of the twelve participants discussed in depth why they agreed it was time to change from the old teacher evaluation system. In the Spokane Public Schools survey in 2011, 63% of the respondents reported (neutral or agree) that the old system *helped them grow professionally*. That response could be interpreted that close to two-thirds of teachers were satisfied with the old evaluation system. Most likely, that response
had to do with timing. In 2011, teachers were less aware of the reasons why the state of Washington was changing its evaluations and less aware of the strengths of the new systems. Another reason for this discrepancy between the two studies is that in my qualitative study, I had fewer participants and the participants that I did include were mostly members of TPEP committee groups that were heavily involved in understanding and implementing the new evaluations. It is likely their involvement made them less resistant to the change because they understood it better.

While this study can be compared to other educational research on teacher evaluations, I ultimately feel that it is unique. It is unique mostly because of the timing of it. I would like to characterize this time in education as a sort of calm before the storm. The new law goes into effect in the 2013-2014 school year. The timing of this study comes at a time when educators are piloting, bargaining, studying, and discussing the new teacher evaluations. The stage is truly set for follow up interviews with the participants two years from now. Their perceptions might change. Education in America does not appear to be very stable at this time in history. Along with sweeping changes in the teacher evaluation process, states are soon to be implementing new federal Common Core learning standards by the year 2014. American education is in the growing pains of redefining itself. This study is unique because it has been conducted in a time of major educational reforms.

Charlotte Danielson (2011) urges patience in the process of reforming teacher evaluations and this study confirms her warning. Danielson believes you have to give the new evaluation enough time and start on a small scale. She feels that legislators don’t understand the complexity of it and that is why it has not gone smoothly in other states. Participants in my study supported the same perceptions as Danielson. Mrs. Kennedy described the process like “building the plane
in the air” and worried that educators will become discouraged before it ever takes off. Mr. Patrick warned that this new evaluation system will take some time to learn and that “there will be confusion.” Mr. Brinkerhoff reminded us that “it takes many years to be good.” Will educators and lawmakers have the patience? Mr. Miller is afraid that the new teacher evaluation “has the potential to open all kinds of Pandora boxes.”

One area of contradiction found in the literature was the role of student data in the evaluation of teachers. For example, Washington State Superintendent Randy Dorn is supportive of student testing and data. When asked what role student test scores would play in teacher evaluations, Dorn responded:

School districts can use the data as a substantial part of evaluations—but what does substantial mean? To me, if you had money invested in the stock market and got a 5% return, that’s not substantial. But 15-20 percent, that’s substantial. Some are saying the data and growth of a student should be a third, and others think it will be 50 percent. You have to trust that principals and school districts will use it as a factor, but also use other factors. (Salerno, 2012)

Charlotte Danielson was more direct on the subject of using standardized test scores on teacher evaluations:

I do think that it’s reasonable for teachers to demonstrate that their kids have learned. I think that does make sense. Beyond that, though, I’m not at all convinced that it can be done fairly for teachers based on what we know, particularly in a high-stakes environment. (Meyer, 2012)

The findings from this study helped clarify principals and teachers are strongly opposed to using student data on teacher evaluations. The exceptions of this include local data from within an
individual teacher’s grading and assessment. The overall theme from my study is that state level
tests are unreliable and unfair. Local data, however, can help encourage professional growth
among individual teachers.

New ground that should be broken on the subject of teacher evaluations is the role of a
principal in teacher evaluations. From the early writings of Elwood Cubberly (1929) to more
current writings from Kim Marshall (2005) and John Marzano (2010), the principal still plays the
dominant role in evaluating teachers. This plays into the top down business model trap in which
education is caught. This study touches on the need to rethink the role of the principal, but
further study is recommended. Developing instructional coaches whose number one priority is
to thoroughly know and communicate all factors of the evaluation system is a great starting
point. Principals are currently stuck in a position of not having enough time, or being labeled as
unfair because of their lack of teaching experience, especially in certain content areas.

The literature review in this study connected well with the results of the study. Education
is such a complex process with so many different ideas, philosophies, experiences, and variables
that it creates a challenge to appropriately describe it. Education is so valuable to a society that
educational leaders do their best to describe it and offer solutions. This leads to an atmosphere
of important discussion and debate as to what best practices lead to success. This is a difficult
endeavor. In connecting the literature to the results of this study, I found that education, as with
many things, is evolving, slowly at times and rapidly at times. Teacher evaluation has long been
slow to evolve. That is not the case anymore.

**Surprises and Unexpected Findings**
An unanticipated finding of this study was the complexity of teacher evaluations and the impact teacher evaluations have on principals. Going into this study, the perceptions of teacher evaluations was that it was a straightforward process that determines how good a teacher is at teaching. This study sheds light on many educational issues. For instance, there is a real disconnect between state policymakers and educators. There needs to be more of a partnership and such a partnership does not exist. Principals and teachers feel helpless when the State Legislature is in session and new laws are passed around that sound good in theory, but in reality will sabotage much of the good work already happening in classrooms throughout the state. These laws will impact the livelihoods of thousands of educators.

It was somewhat surprising how many of the teachers had similar perceptions about evaluating teachers as did the principals. In most of the educational categories, such as walkthroughs, portfolios, student data, peer input, engagement, communication, and lesson design, teachers and principals were generally in agreement. It was these categories and others that reminded me that teacher evaluation is complex and the Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+ models are overwhelming because they try to quantify the complexity of teaching.

Finally, I was surprised at the level of sincerity from the principals in this study. It was clear in my visits to the schools that these principals have an unfair amount of responsibility on them. The principals gave more in-depth responses, were more critical, and were more passionate on the subject of teacher evaluation. I sensed an increased level of stress among principals caused by the new teacher evaluations.

**Implications for Action**
Multiple groups can benefit from the findings of this research study. These groups include teachers, principals, lawmakers, district level administrators, university level education professors, and teacher and principal candidates who are working through their certification program. This study described the perceived realities of life as a principal or teacher.

Teachers need to involve themselves more in their own evaluation. The new evaluation instruments encourage teacher involvement from the collection of the evidence of their work to the setting of professional goals. Just as it is required in student teaching, I would like to see a videotaped segment where the teacher uses a rubric and videotape to rate themselves as a part of the evaluation. Along with self-evaluation, a teacher could also include a portfolio to make sure that they are a part of their own evaluation process. The voice of the teacher is sorely needed in teacher evaluations. When I study the evaluation models, I see clear evidence of the policy maker, researcher, and administrator perspective. In order to gain more credibility, voices and perspectives from teachers are needed.

The job requirements of principals need to be reduced if they are going to be the chief evaluators of teachers. Principals have more pressure placed on them because the new evaluations are more complex and will take more time. In addition to the increased workloads, principals risk having their relationships with teachers strained due to poor evaluations. Another potential course of action is for school districts to hire professional coaches whose main job is to evaluate teachers, freeing up principals for their other leadership responsibilities in a school.

Lawmakers can benefit from the findings of this study. It would be beneficial for lawmakers to read studies such as this before making new laws or changing education policy. The interviews from the six teachers and six principals would have had more meaning if their responses were heard by state level lawmakers who hold positions of great importance and
influence. Perhaps selected participants such as the ones used in this study can meet with legislative education committees before they go in session.

District level administrators can certainly influence the success of teacher evaluations in their districts. Time and resources are major concerns when it comes to successfully implementing the new teacher evaluations. District level decision makers from superintendents, to curriculum directors, to school board members all can benefit from understanding the concerns voiced by teachers and principals. Human Resource directors need to consider whether teacher or principal applicants are capable to carry out the duties required in the new teacher evaluation instruments.

Professionals working at the university level who are involved in teacher preparation programs can benefit from this study. By reading this study, faculty at the higher levels of education will understand how the expectations of teachers and principals have changed. This change impacts how teacher preparation programs are designed, implemented, and evaluated. The university’s education department is ultimately evaluated by the quality of teacher they graduate.

The last implication of this study is that it provides a source to study for educational researchers and students. A reason this study was conducted was the lack of research studies on teacher evaluation. This study covers a current reality that transforms schools and livelihoods. This study contributes data to the field of education.

This study provides meaningful results to educational practitioners because they will be able to make connections to the findings. Perceptions of teacher evaluations are out there. This study recognizes these perceptions and provides educators an opportunity to match their own perceptions with that of the participants in the study. The value of the literature is that it
concerns a subject in which readers can make personal connections. Being that most educators are involved in some way in the evaluation process, they can relate to the subject of this study and make specific connections to the findings.
Recommendations for Further Research

Teacher evaluations are not going way. It can be expected that teacher evaluations will continue to change in format, method, and instruments. There are several possibilities for further research. The three possibilities that have the most potential would be a state-to-state comparison of teacher evaluations, a descriptive study about that describes the perceptions of principals and teachers toward the state mandated teacher evaluation instruments, and a study about the unrealistic job demands on principals and their reaction toward unrealistic job expectations.

A state-by-state comparison has great potential for research on teacher evaluations. In the course of this study, I came across a plethora of articles detailing the growing pains of different states across the nation. Recently, Montana’s state government has modified and added more requirements to state teacher evaluations. Arizona has dramatically overhauled its expectations of teachers and how teachers are evaluated. Arkansas, Michigan, Florida, Idaho the list goes on and on with states that are going through teacher evaluation reform. Like Washington, every state is somewhat unique in how they are carrying out the process. It would be interesting to do a multi-state comparison of successes and failures of the evaluation systems and their implementation. A state can save itself considerable time and money by studying the success and failures of other states. With Common Core Standards an imminent reality in 48 states, American education is increasingly becoming more centralized federally at a loss of local, decentralized control. A cross-state comparison of teacher evaluation expectations would be timely and relevant.

To provide a complete picture of teacher evaluation changes in Washington State, a follow up study looking to describe the level of support teachers and principals have toward the
new mandated teacher evaluation instruments is recommended. The reason a follow up study would be worthwhile is to learn if perceptions change over time as the new instruments move beyond the piloting stages and are fully implemented. By next school year (fall of 2013), the new teacher evaluation instruments will be required under state law to be used by principals. There is the possibility that with experience, attitudes will change. A comparative study that looks at the before and after perceptions of principals would provide a more complete narrative of the impact teacher evaluation is making in the lives of teachers and principals in Washington State.

Another recommended study is one more specific to the role principals play in teacher’s evaluation. At first thought, one might think teacher evaluation is a topic that has a tremendous influence on teachers themselves. Through the course of this study, however, it has been evident that the principal is impacted just as much and possibly more than the teacher is. In what might become an ironic twist, instead of the new teacher evaluations being a method of removing bad teachers from the profession, they might instead remove good principals from the profession. The amount of time and resources given to principals is a serious dilemma that needs to be addressed soon. Given that principals are in jeopardy of being overburdened, a study of their daily routine and duties would be helpful in understanding at the bigger picture of teacher evaluations. A theme that came out of this study was an undercurrent of concern that principals cannot be fair in how they evaluate one teacher to the next. Principals are not knowledgeable in every content area. Many principals have limited teaching experience and that experience might have been unsuccessful experience that caused them to go into administration in the first place. Principals are leaders who can influence positive changes in teachers, students, and communities. Their job is too important to neglect. A current study on principals would be worthwhile.
Concluding Remarks

Qualitative research is a way to understand the lives and experiences of people. It is a daily challenge for people in all walks of life to make sense of their life and find meaning and purpose in the world in which we live. What tends to happen is human beings go about the daily work of their lives with blinders on. In a field like education, leaving the blinders on can be problematic. The results of this study urge educators and lawmakers to take off the blinders. Instead of looking straight ahead, look around, observe, and take notice of what you see. A qualitative study inspires this keen awareness.

At the conclusion of this study this is what we see. Principals and teachers are telling lawmakers to slow down educational reform. Let’s do things right. That means slowly, methodically, and only with adequate support from state and district funding. As for teacher evaluations, the message is clear that common sense needs to come into play. Be realistic about a principal’s time. Replace the two hour long formal observations with unannounced walkthroughs that fit better with a principal’s time and provide a more realistic picture of what is really happening in the classroom on a daily basis. Support the new evaluation instruments by training others to do the evaluating. You can start with hiring instructional coaches and move to department coordinators and eventually have a rotating schedule of peer evaluation. The new teacher evaluations can be successful without incorporating the traditional, top-down, power arrangement with the principal as the boss and the teacher as the employee. It is time for education to move past that. And finally, it is time to put to rest the emphasis on state and federal standardized testing to measure teacher performance for now. Using testing and other student data at the local level is good for helping teachers set professional goals and grow in their practice but is unfair to use in job evaluation. This qualitative study takes the blinders off in
order to provide a clearer presentation of educational issues. In regard to teacher evaluations, this means better awareness of critical factors that lead to a more successful transition toward teacher evaluation reform.

The beginning of the 21st century is an era of major changes in education as a result of federal programs such as No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top. In a review of the subject of teacher evaluation, it is clear there are many gaps. More literature needs to offer the perspective of teachers and principals who are most affected by these changes. There has not been nearly enough follow through with major educational initiatives. If education indeed intends to go the scientific route, then observation, evaluation, diagnosis, and follow through need to be integral parts of educational initiatives. More studies are needed to evaluate educational decision makers who offer prescriptions to educational woes without a thorough understanding of the ills and without proper follow through of the treatment. Research needs to continue to go inside the many doors of American schools and classrooms and talk to the teachers and principals who are most impacted.


APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What is your current position and explain how teachers were evaluated when you first started? How did you feel about the old evaluation system?

2. Do you agree with the 2010 decision by the State Legislature to change the way teachers are evaluated? Do you agree with the plan to give school district three different options?

3. Your district has adopted the (Danielson, Marzano, CEL 5D+) teacher evaluation system. How has it been implemented and how would you describe it?

4. Do you have any concerns about changes in the teacher evaluation process?

5. Do you view the teacher evaluation process more as a means of helping the teacher or rating the teacher?

6. What are some strengths and weaknesses of the new teacher evaluation system?

7. Describe how your school district’s method of evaluating teachers has changed?

8. Describe what you would consider excellent teaching. How can excellent teaching be proven for the purpose of evaluation?

9. What components of teaching should be included in the evaluation of teachers?

10. What role should student data play in a teacher’s evaluation?

11. Describe what an ideal teacher evaluation model would include. How many observations and conferences? Are there other criteria that would help administrators evaluate teachers?

12. Do you have any final comments as we conclude this interview?
APPENDIX B

CONSENT LETTER

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Teaching and Learning/College of Education

Research Study Consent Form

Study Title: A Qualitative Study of Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Washington State Teacher Evaluation Instruments: Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+

Researcher: Matthew Coulter

Participant: High School Principal/Teacher

I would like to ask your permission to participate in a research study carried out by myself, Matthew Coulter. This study is in fulfillment of the dissertation requirement for the Doctorate of Education requirement in Teacher Leadership. This form explains the research study and your part in it if you agree to participate. Please read the form carefully, taking as much time as you need. If you have any questions about anything, please contact me or my dissertation committee chair at Washington State University. Our telephone and email is listed at the end of this form.

If you agree to participate in this study, you can change your mind later and withdraw at anytime. You taking part in this study is completely voluntary.

The purpose of this study is to describe the level of support teachers and principals have toward the new mandated teacher evaluation instruments in the state of Washington. Teacher evaluations represent a major change in education and warrants examination. This study hopes to provide a philosophical sounding board for principals and teachers. The study is not directly examining the teacher or principal, but rather the perceptions that teachers or principals have in regard to the new teacher evaluation instruments being implemented in the state of Washington.

This study has been approved for human subject participation by the Washington State University Institutional Review Board.

If you agree, I will ask you to take part in one open ended interview. The interview consists of twelve questions and should last no longer than 45 minutes. The interview questions will be provided to you in advance and will focus primarily on the topic of teacher evaluation. You have the option to decline answer to any of the twelve questions.
The results of this study are to help fulfill the requirements of a doctoral dissertation. I also intend to publish the results of the study. Your identity and that of all participants and study locations will be kept anonymous. No actual names of individuals, schools, or school districts will be used.

There is no direct benefit to you being in this study. However, if you take part in this study you may help others understand the impact that new teacher evaluations have on educators.

There are no outstanding risks for either taking part or not taking part in the study. If in the unlikely event you find discomfort or stress arising from specific interview questions, you may choose not to answer them.

The data for this study will be kept confidential. All data in this study will be kept in a locked cabinet in my office. With the exception of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and my committee chair, I will be the only one with access to the data. Furthermore, all data from this study will be destroyed approximately three years after its completion. No information you share will be communicated to other participants in the study. There are no additional sponsors, researchers, or agencies involved in this study.

The results of this study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but the identities of all research participants will remain anonymous.

There is no cost to you for taking part in this study. You will not receive money for taking part in this study.

If you have questions about this study or the information in this form, please contact me, Mr. Matthew Coulter at matt.coulter@tumwater.k12.wa.us and/or (360) 709-7682.

You may also contact my committee chair, Dr. Richard Sawyer at rsawyer@vancouver.wsu.edu and/or (360) 546-9658.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, or would like to report a concern or complaint about this study, please contact the Washington State University Institutional Review Board at (509) 335-3668, or e-mail irb@wsu.edu, or regular mail at: Albrook 205, PO Box 643005, Pullman, WA 99164-3005.
Your signature on this form means that:

- You understand the information given to you in this form.
- You have been able to ask the researcher questions and state any concerns.
- The researcher has responded to your questions and concerns.
- You believe you understand the research study and the potential benefits and risks that are involved.

Statement of Consent

I give my voluntary consent to take part in this study. I will be given a copy of this consent document for my records.

____________________________________                   _____________________
Signature of Participant                                     Date

_____________________________________
Printed Name of Participant

Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in this study what he or she can expect.

I certify that when this person signs this form, to the best of my knowledge, he or she understands the purpose, procedures, potential benefits, and potential risks of participation.

I also certify that he or she:

- Speaks the language used to explain this research.
- Reads well enough to understand this form.
- Does not have any problems that could make it hard to understand what it means to take part in this research.

____________________________________                   _____________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent                          Date

Matthew Coulter_________________________________________  Researcher/PI________