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WHAT SUPPORTS DO ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS NEED IN ORDER TO IMPLEMENT TEACHER EVALUATION?

ABSTRACT

By John Lawrence Mancinelli, Ed.D.
Washington State University
August, 2014

Chair: Michele Acker-Hocevar
Co-Chair: Chad Lochmiller

Both nationally and at the state level, educational reform is focusing on the improvement of classroom instruction. Recently, Washington State enacted the Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP) to define evaluation criteria intended to measure effective professional practices, including classroom instruction. This exploratory survey study sought to describe the perceptions of Washington State elementary principals regarding their professional development needs for implementation of the new evaluation criteria. The survey consisted of 5 parts totaling 25 questions and was disseminated to 1,897 elementary principals with a return rate of 354. While the state effectively disseminated initial information about the evaluation criteria through local Educational Service Districts (ESDs), some policy inconsistency appears to have developed between the school district and building level in terms of implementation support for principal leadership activities, learning behaviors, and preferred learning topics. Responses indicated that principals rarely engage in social learning activities that would prepare them as a group to consistently and reliably interpret the criteria on the evaluation. Also, few principals identified a strong desire to learn about collaborative structures within their school, which increases concerns about the
sustainability of the TPEP policy, because of the need to develop shared understandings of the language and the expectations. Fostering such an understanding may comprise the next phase of development.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, education reform has focused on improving classroom instruction (Borman & Kimball, 2005; Cuban, 1988). This follows research suggesting that instructional practice is the most significant predictor of student achievement (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005). Barber, Mourshed, McKinsey, and Company (2007) studied highly successful school systems around the world and found that they made a concerted effort to develop their teachers into effective instructors, providing systematic supports to develop high quality instruction for every student. In many school systems, principals represent the key to improving teacher practice. This focus is consistent with the new Washington State evaluation criteria for classroom teachers, which expect principals to be able to recognize effective instruction, provide feedback to the teacher to support instructional improvement, and create conditions in schools that enable teachers to continuously improve their practice (OSPI, 2013b; Stien & Nelson, 2003). Historically, the principal has engaged in evaluation as a form of instructional leadership (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983). The new evaluation criteria adopted by Washington State shift the purpose of evaluation from emphasizing summative results to emphasizing long-term growth (Burke, 2011). This shift involves new terrain for many principals, who will need support in order to effect these changes in their evaluation practices. The purpose of this study is to examine what kinds of professional development support elementary school principals suggest they need to effectively improve classroom instruction through the implementation of the new Washington evaluation criteria.

Background
Over the past three decades, scholars have debated whether principals are to act as educational managers or instructional leaders (Dwyer, 1984; Greenfield, 1985; Hallinger & Heck, 1996). Reilly (1984) placed the responsibility of instructional leadership on teachers and defined principals as program planners, implementers, and evaluators of classroom environments. Horng, Klasik, and Loeb (2010) suggested that principals’ engagement in administration and organizational management tasks contributed to a school’s well-being, while their engagement in day-to-day instructional tasks might actually lower student learning outcomes. Other scholars have offered alternate views suggesting the importance of the principal emphasizing instructional leadership over managerial responsibilities in order to improve student learning (Edmonds, 1979). Dwyer (1985) discussed these two competing ideas of the principal’s role and found some pragmatic behaviors demonstrated by all successful principals, regardless of managerial or instructional leadership emphases: they act with purpose, hold multi-faceted images of schools, use routine behaviors to move incrementally toward goals, and tailor the principal’s role to suit the school’s context and purpose. In short, Dwyer (1985) suggested that the principalship is dynamic, contextual, and pragmatic.

While the empirical debate continues regarding the most effective role of the principal, Washington State’s new teacher evaluation criteria codify the principal’s role as an instructional leader (Stewart, 2011). Burke (2011) identified four shifts resulting from the new teacher evaluation system in Washington State. First, principals will be expected to evaluate the effectiveness of classroom teachers. Second, principals will be expected to interpret data to inform their decisions about teacher effectiveness. Third, principals will be expected to provide formative evaluation feedback that supports and sustains professional
growth. Fourth, principals will be expected to evaluate both individual and collaborative teaching progress. Each of these shifts requires principals to be knowledgeable and skilled in the areas of effective instructional practices, data usage to improve instruction, formative assessment, and collaborative teaching practices.

Preparing principals to move from managerial to learning-focused leadership roles requires a shift from learning skills and knowledge in isolation to learning how to apply them to specific contexts. In contrast to the managerial role, the learning-focused leader’s role is team-oriented and collaborative (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). The principal must develop other leaders within their organization to influence classroom instruction and teacher learning (Portin, Alejano, Knapp, & Marzolf, 2006). In many instances, the principal will also need to acquire strategies enabling them to cultivate other leaders while simultaneously tending to their own learning about instruction, pedagogy, and content (Gallucci, Van Lare, Yoon, & Boatright, 2010). Finally, the principal will need to understand how to develop an overarching culture in which expertise is shared and used collectively to accomplish building goals (Acker-Hocevar, Cruz-Janzen, & Wilson, 2012; Carmeli & Gittell, 2009; Copland, 2003; Hord; Scribner, Sawyer, Watson, & Myers, 2007; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009).

The application of these new skills and knowledge to improve classroom instruction becomes complicated because each principal operates in a unique context (Copland, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1996, 2010). Their success or failure in responding to these new evaluation criteria depends on many factors, including their current expertise (Portin, 2004), instructional experience (Stien & Nelson, 2003), career phase (Crow, 2010), leadership style (Goldring, Huff, May, & Camburn, 2008), and the specific needs of their school (Hallinger &
Heck, 2010). In light of these complexities, professional development must be modified as well in order to support principals in acquiring new knowledge and skills, improving existing knowledge and skills, and responding to teacher needs.

**Statement of Problem**

In Washington State, the advent of new teacher and principal evaluation criteria is changing the role of the principal. Depending upon their knowledge, skills, and context, principals need differentiated professional development that provides them with the new skills and knowledge required to help them improve classroom instruction (Crow, 2010; Goldring et al., 2008; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Stien & Nelson, 2003). While teacher evaluation has comprised part of the principal’s role in the past, the significantly more complex and sophisticated evaluation criteria raise the bar on this process substantially. Therefore, commensurate adjustments to professional development are needed to equip principals to meet this challenge.

**Purpose of Study and Goals**

Specifically, the purpose of this study is to understand the support that elementary school principals suggest they need to effectively improve classroom instruction under the new teacher evaluation criteria in Washington State. The study presumes that supports (i.e., forms of professional development) are required to assist principals in their personal learning as they strive to implement the new criteria. Understanding the supports needed by elementary principals in Washington State is important to central office administration and legislators alike. For this reason my study will seek to (a) determine what principals perceive they need in support of implementing the new teacher evaluation criteria; (b) describe types (or categories) of supports elementary principals need; and (c) relate years of principals’
experience with perceptions of needed supports.

**Research Question**

The study will address the following research question: “What professional development supports do Washington elementary principals perceive they need to implement the new teacher evaluation criteria in their schools?”

**Importance of Study**

This research is timely and significant to practicing principals to better understand their resources for applying the new teacher evaluation criteria in their contexts. Additionally, central office leadership, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and legislators can use the information gleaned from this study to develop supports for principals. This research will provide empirical information on current principal perceptions in the state of Washington as well as further research recommendations to improve school leadership preparation and suggestions for differentiated professional development.

**Definitions of Terms**

*Supports* pertains to the *knowledge, skills, and resources* required by principals to successfully apply the teacher evaluation criteria. *Knowledge* refers to the understanding of adult learning, instructional pedagogy, curriculum content, team development, data acquisition, evaluation criteria and processes, and leadership styles. *Skills* includes strategies to address problems of practice, such as delivering professional development to teachers, formative evaluation of teachers, data usage, teacher collaborative practices, communication, and time management. *Resources* includes staffing, district support, reference materials, available time, and abilities to adjust job responsibilities within the school building. Each of these components provides the principal tools with which to contextualize their school’s
situation and apply appropriate leadership strategies that result in high quality classroom instruction.

Instructional Leadership is defined by two concepts: “Learning-focused Leadership” (Knapp, Copland, Honig, Plecki, & Portin, 2010) and “Leadership for Learning” (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Learning-focused leadership entails a shift of building principal responsibilities towards activities that (a) set direction by articulating a vision, fostering acceptance of group goals, and creating high performance expectations; (b) develop people by offering intellectual stimulation, providing individualized support, and setting examples for others to follow; and (c) redesign the organization by strengthening school cultures, modifying organizational structures, and building collaborative processes (Knapp et al., 2010, p. 28).

“Leadership for Learning,” a term referenced by Hallinger and Heck (2010), complicates this definition of instructional leadership by suggesting that the actions of the principal need to be differentiated depending upon the school’s level of development. Combining the two concepts renders instructional leadership contextual in that such leadership addresses specific school developmental needs and builds academic capacity within that organization to be responsive to teacher and student needs, focusing consistently on improved student learning. Both concepts agree that sharing leadership responsibilities across people and roles increases the level of organizational responsiveness, which has been found to be a mediating variable in improving student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters, including an introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, and discussion and recommendations. This introductory chapter has
summarized the transformation of the principal’s role brought about by the Washington State TPEP policy. The literature review in chapter 2 will synthesize the extant research by defining instructional leadership, exploring what actions instructional leaders use most effectively to improve student learning and how teacher evaluation can be leveraged to effectively encourage these high-value actions. Chapter 3, methodology, discusses the Fast Response Descriptive Survey instrument and how it will be used to explore my questions and collect and analyze my data. Chapter 4, which presents findings, covers trends observed in survey results. And lastly, chapter 5 offers a discussion and recommendations based on these findings, regarding the supports principals need in order to implement teacher evaluation.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Need for Research

In the fall of the 2013-2014 school year, Washington State law required the full implementation of the Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP). The TPEP provides new evaluation criteria and formative evaluation processes that shift from measuring teacher and principal qualities to assessing their efficacy in the classroom and school (Borman & Kimball, 2005). This shift in evaluation philosophy, in turn, realigns the principal’s responsibilities to focus less on management tasks and more on instructional leadership. The principal’s role now emphasizes the development of others, fostering collaborative processes, using data for the improvement of student learning, and creating an environment for learning (OSPI, 2013b). These shifts require principals to develop a fundamentally new set of skills, knowledge, and foci to improve classroom instruction.

The context in which principals find themselves has a significant impact on their ability to improve classroom instruction (Jenkins, 2009). Depending upon their current management expertise (Portin, 2004), instructional experience (T. Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2005; Brundage, 1996; Crow, 2010; Fouts, Brown, & Thieman, 2002; Gallucci et al., 2010; Honig, 2006), content knowledge (Stien & Nelson, 2003), career phase (Crow, 2010), leadership style (Goldring et al., 2008), and school needs (Hallinger & Heck, 2010), the principal may need to master managerial skills before learning more complex applications of multiple skillsets (Crow, 2010). For this reason, the professional development needs of novice principals may differ from those of more experienced principals and require more contextual and complex supports tailored to address their experience and competency.
As principal supports may vary, district offices across Washington have identified obstacles to developing differentiated professional development including (a) underfunding of professional development by the state; (b) the need for new school board teacher evaluation policies; (c) the rapid pace at which implementation of new criteria is advancing; and (d) the need for in-depth leadership training for evaluators that establishes clear expectations and definitions for applying teacher-rating systems. Consequently, in their attempts to meet the changing requirements, principals may find themselves ill-prepared and under-supported. These concerns raise the level of urgency for completing research on principal professional development ("Kennewick School District: Case Study Final Report: A teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP) Case Study Prepared for the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.,” 2012; OSPI, 2013a, 2013b; “Wenatchee School District: Case Study Final Report: A Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP) Case study Prepared for the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.,” 2012).

Organization of Literature Review

This literature review synthesizes the research surrounding principals’ professional development needs for effectively applying teacher evaluation criteria. First, this review summarizes the historical transition of the principal’s role from educational manager to instructional leader. Next, it explores the definition of instructional leadership as it relates to the new Washington State evaluation criteria. Discussed next is current knowledge of principal professional development as it relates to evaluation of classroom teachers. Finally, the review concludes with a discussion of themes that emerge from the literature, outlining both barriers and supports for principals to be less or more successful.

Literature Search Process
The process by which literature was selected from peer reviewed sources featured a combination of the Washington State University (WSU) Library “cross-search” function within the “Education” and “Psychology” databases: EBSCO, ERIC, SAGE, Web of Science, and WorldCat. Additionally, Google-Scholar provided research articles, resources and websites for current information about the TPEP. Beginning with the general terms of “teacher evaluation,” “Instructional Leadership,” and, “School Improvement,” research articles were identified. Key words emerged and were generalized into categories allowing for a conceptual understanding of how these three concepts related. In order to synthesize the literature, a concept map was developed. Common topics across the literature were identified as they related to principal roles, tools for school improvement, and complexities of evaluation criteria application.

Within the topic of “Instructional Leadership,” emerged five key themes: The Principal Role; School Effectiveness; Educational Reform; Sustainability; and Adult Learning. The Principal’s Role was associated in the literature with: “student learning outcomes,” “instructional standards,” “organizational learning,” “organizational adaptation,” “distributed leadership,” “leadership for learning,” “leadership of learning,” “educational teams,” “role socialization,” “professional learning communities,” “educational teams,” “high quality teams,” “boundary spanning,” and “boundary practices.” The category of “School Effectiveness” contained subtopics centered on four main themes of literature: evaluation criteria, measurements, best practices, and the principal’s role. These themes were associated in the literature with the following key words: “student learning outcomes,” “achievement,” “continuous improvement,” “addressing failure,” “sustainability,” “educational accountability,” “leadership effectiveness,” “teacher preparation,” “teacher
certification,” and “classroom equity.” Teacher evaluation literature included the following key words: “student achievement,” “teacher accountability,” “collaborative leadership,” “teacher leadership,” “adult learning,” “educational accountability,” “effective teaching,” “school improvement,” “learning improvement,” “organizational learning,” “individual learning,” “high quality educational teams,” “instruction,” “instructional coaching,” and “peer coaching.”

From this body of literature, seminal articles were identified and used for synthesis of major ideas. Articles were annotated and compiled into EndNote®, a research database. Themes and concepts were identified and placed on a matrix so that cross-themes could be identified.

**The Shifting Role of the Principal (Educational Manager to Instructional Leader)**

The literature identifies three general phases to educational reform auguring the change of the principal’s role. The first phase, preceding the 1980s, framed the principal as a manager of resources, time, and organizational structures. The second phase, spanning roughly from the 1980s to the 1990s, expanded the focus of the principal’s role from management to include limited teaching and learning inputs such as curriculum alignment and development. The third and current role furthers this shift to encompass not merely teaching and learning inputs but learning-focused leadership that develops academic capacity in order to leverage high quality classroom practice. The relatively rapid transformation of the principal’s role through these three phases has resulted in a muddling of responsibilities. In order to better understand the supports needed by today’s principals to improve classroom instruction, we need first to examine this transformation of the principal’s role over the past 30 years, precipitating the lack of clarity around responsibilities today.
Phase 1: The Manager. Prior to the 1980s, the principal’s role emulated industry’s vision of a business manager focused on the optimization of time, resources, and finances (Cawelti, 1984; Dwyer, 1984). Educational management of the late 1970s focused on the administrative “inputs” for classrooms, such as defining the mission, managing instructional programs, and promoting school climate. During this era, management of instructional programs included the supervision and evaluation of instruction, coordination of curriculum, and monitoring of student progress (Reilly, 1984). While supervision of classroom practices was mentioned in the literature during this era, the focus was minimal: “There is little evidence that close supervision of instruction results in greater student achievement” (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985, p. 222). The principal focused more on protecting instructional time, promoting and delivering professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, enforcing academic standards, and providing incentives for students. Instructional leadership activities involving teacher practice were generally discussed as secondary to managerial responsibilities (Cuban, 1988; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Reilly, 1984).

While much of the literature during this time emphasized the principal role as manager, some research did foreshadow a shift toward instructional leadership due to the ineffectiveness of efforts to improve student learning during this time. R. F. Elmore and McLaughlin (1988) identified three levels of educational reform: evaluation criteria, administration, and practice. They asserted that each level failed to influence how teachers would act within the classroom, resulting in a lack of integration across these efforts. For these reasons, Elmore and McLaughlin emphasized the need for principals to focus on (a) how teachers learn to teach; (b) how school organization affects practice; and (c) how these
factors affect student performance.

As educational reform and research increased its focus on effective school practices, a connection became evident linking principals’ effective leadership behaviors with effective schools (Dwyer, 1985; Edmonds, 1979; Heck, 1992). Some principals began to grapple with the competing demands of management duties and instructional leadership by creating new organizational structures and processes (R. F. Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988). This was in part due to the increased expectations brought on by expanding the focus of improving minority student learning to all student learning (Education, 1983). The academic standards calling for higher-order thinking skills created a ripple effect in teaching that necessitated an increase in expertise among principals to support teachers in both pedagogy and content areas. Principals began to lead instruction by directly monitoring and evaluating teacher instructional practices as they were enacted in the classroom. As a result, “instructional leadership” became codified in the principal role as a primary function (Edmonds, 1979; R. F. Elmore, 2004; Fouts et al., 2002).

**Phase 2: The Instructional Leader.** During this phase, the “Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965” (ESEA) was replaced by the “Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994” (IASA). The nation’s eye shifted to placing political pressure on educators in order to improve schools. Schools were identified as “failing” in local newspapers and media. In turn, the responsibility for closing the learning gap for all students became high stakes for the principal and required a new set of priorities, skills, and knowledge (Dwyer, 1985; Heck, 1992; Louis & Kruse, 1995).

Creating a school culture that shaped teacher perceptions and attitudes about students now became an important goal for principals. Edmonds (1978) identified schools effective in
closing the gap for low socioeconomic and ethnically diverse students. This research challenged educators’ indifferent attitudes towards disadvantaged students of varying cultural backgrounds. The principal, in this context, focused on breaking down barriers of preconceived notions about students to create a school climate of social justice. Doing so required principals to educate staff and the implement practices that would help close the learning gap for subgroups of student populations (Cuban, 1988). Additionally, the report, “A Nation at Risk,” called for the American education system to create school cultures that set high standards for all students and improved teaching regardless of student demographics or socio-economic status. “A Nation At Risk” specifically recommended that school boards retrain principals from their role as manager to a role that emphasized “…leadership skills involving persuasion, setting goals and developing community consensus” (p. 27). This emphasis initiated the transition of the principal role toward activities that indirectly influenced classroom practices. Such activities included orchestration of curriculum alignment, lesson to standards alignment, and the supervision of teaching (R. F. Elmore, 1990). This approach to classroom reform began to redefine “instructional leadership” and focused the principal’s role on the structures and resources surrounding the classroom as a way to raise expectations for student learning (K. D. Peterson, 1986).

The “Goals 2000: Educate America Act” of 1994 broadened educational reform from addressing only children “at risk” to all children in order to help ensure economic competitiveness (Heise, 1994; Jorgensen & Hoffmann, 2003). These increased student learning standards required teachers to be more knowledgeable and skilled within their discipline. Federal education requirements specified that teachers must be “highly qualified” in their subject area in order to teach. Universities modified programs for teacher
certification; moreover, to meet these higher standards, the current teacher workforce required on-the-job training. The principal’s responsibilities included professional development for teachers in workshops, clinics, and staff meetings, as well as summatively evaluating teacher qualities (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

Teacher quality comprised the focus of principal work during this time period. Borman and Kimball (2005) found that principals exerted significant influence on teacher quality through the evaluation process and demonstrated that teacher evaluation scores could offer a strong leading indicator for improved student learning. Viewed as a new and valuable skillset for principals, instructional leadership demonstrated a significant yet indirect effect on student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). This connection of student learning to teacher instruction would furnish the impetus behind the next educational reform phase.

**Phase 3: The Learning-focused Leader.** Since the early 2000s, public pressure for increased accountability through evaluation criteria and has caused schools to become more responsive to the needs of their students. With this transformation, in turn, comes a new level of complexity for administrators (R. Elmore, 2000). Portin (2004) identified seven common forms of leadership from principals: instructional, cultural, managerial, human resources, strategic, external development, and micro-political leadership. This research reveals the accretion of responsibilities upon the principal’s role over time. Managerial and instructional leadership elements continue to compete for principals’ time and priority. With so many hats to wear, the principal occupies a multifaceted role that has continued to demand changes in structures and processes in addition to skill sets and knowledge. The principal must determine which of his or her many functions is of highest value to leverage improved student learning at any point in time. This situational decision-making requires principals to
become effective at applying multiple skillsets within their school context (Knapp, 2008).

The depth and breadth of knowledge and skill required of one person to fulfill all the learning demands of a school is significant – significant enough to compel principals to rethink how they leverage structures, policies, and people to improve student learning. Research casts an image of the “new” principal as someone who builds capacity within the school in order to sustain continuous improvement. Hallinger and Heck (2010) identified “Leadership for Learning” as a model for capacity building. Based upon collegial leadership, leadership for learning seeks to develop people and devise processes that coordinate decisions to foreground a shared vision of the work at hand.

While the concept of “collegial leadership” is referred to by several different names within the literature, including “shared” or “distributed” leadership, it generally denotes a redistribution of roles traditionally held by the principal across multiple people in various positions within the school. Hallinger and Heck (2010) attribute a responsive learning environment for teachers to collegial leadership because it builds academic capacity and, in turn, makes classrooms more responsive to student needs. In this model of leadership, the principal and the teachers share responsibilities for making instructional decisions. In real terms, the principal’s role changes from making all decisions independently to guiding the decision-making process and coaching those around him/her to cultivate leadership.

Collegial leadership appears more sophisticated and complex than traditional instructional leadership concepts from the 1980s for several reasons. First, the level of communication must be high and frequent in order to establish a clear and cohesive vision for the school’s work. This requires that the principal create face-to-face time with teachers, parents, students, and the central office in order to ensure unity of the organization’s purpose.
and goals (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Hord, 1997; Portin, 2004). Second, the principal must understand how to establish and develop organizational structures that support teacher learning and problem-solving. The abstract knowledge and skills needed by principals to develop structures require an understanding of adult and organizational learning (Bransford, Pellegrino, & Donovan, 1999; Brundage, 1996; Gallucci et al., 2010; Jenkins, 2009; Scribner, 2003). Third, the principal must possess a breadth of instructional knowledge and deeper understanding of content knowledge in order to provide frequent and high-value feedback to teachers (Danielson, 1996; Hallinger & Murphy, 2013; Hattie, 1999; Stien & Nelson). To be able to shift from educational management to this type of collegial leadership, principals require the enrichment of specific, deep, and contextual professional development.

In such a demanding environment, principals will need to utilize multiple leadership styles for sustainable improvements based upon their school’s needs. One such leadership style is the contextual balance between educational management and instructional leadership (Grissom & Loeb, 2011). The balance between these two roles has been previously discussed as an either/or choice; however, a number researchers maintain that both instructional leadership and organizational management should be considered simultaneously and applied synergistically (Cuban, 1988; Dwyer, 1984; Edmonds, 1979; R. F. Elmore, Peterson, & McCarthey, 1996; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Reilly, 1984). Knowing how and when to use various leadership styles equips a principal to potentially leverage sustainable improvement (Copland, 2003; Drago-Severson, 2012; Gallucci et al., 2010; Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Knapp et al., 2010). Thus, principal professional development may need to consider contextual leadership as a key focus.
Knapp (2010) researched contextual leadership and recommended a shift toward “Learning-focused Leadership” because of its ability to build academic capacity. Learning-focused leadership shifts principal responsibilities towards activities that achieve the following: (a) set direction by articulating a vision for the school, fostering the acceptance of group goals, and creating high performance expectations; (b) develop people by offering intellectual stimulation, providing individualized support, and setting examples for others to follow; and (c) redesign the organization by strengthening school cultures, modifying organizational structures, and building collaborative processes.

Learning-focused leadership activities accomplish multiple functions, allowing the principal to become more efficient. For example, a principal that engages in regular conversations with staff about instructional goals and expectations affects two aspects of their organization: individual and group work. Individually, a teacher might adjust their lesson plan to incorporate high level questioning in order to support the overarching goal of increased student learning, while at a group level this same conversation might motivate teachers to work together in order to learn about questioning strategies (Cawelti, 1984; Murphy, 2002; Portin, 2004). Additionally, developing collaborative structures, such as a decision-making protocol for PLCs, distributes the school’s capacity for making informed and timely decisions (Copland, 2003; Hord, 1997).

Structures such as PLCs provide supports and accountability for teachers (Hord, 1997), allowing staff to work together and learn about instructional or logistical issues in a manner that creates an environment of collaboration. As a result, staff member better understand and support the reasoning behind decisions (Bolam et al., 2005; Carmeli & Gittell, 2009; Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006; Scribner et al., 2007). In turn, academic capacity of
the school is increased, allowing the principal to serve as an architect rather than gate-keeper of knowledge or decision-making authority (Drago-Severson, 2012).

A foundational element of learning-focused leadership is the ability of the principal to build such academic capacity. Unification of a school’s vision occurs as the principal articulates high expectations in regard to teachers’ daily work. Portin (2004) compared the role of a principal to that of a jazz band leader who “…lays down the basic melody line and encourages individual ‘band members’ to improvise around the theme” (p. 16). This equates to individual teachers making decisions about their instruction in light of their grasp of the vision set by the principal. Teachers can then contextualize variations of the vision for high expectations in order to design activities within their classrooms. Teams of people can refer back to the vision and become unified in their work for improved student learning. In effect, a school increases its capacity to respond to the needs of students without the principal being directly involved in every decision.

Part of building academic capacity in schools relies on the establishment of culture, structures, and collaborative processes. Heck (1992) identified school cultures fostering a belief in the idea that “all students can learn” as the most significant difference between high and low performing schools. In order for principals to sustain this type of culture, they must create structures that foster a team approach to addressing student needs (Hollins, McIntyre, DeBose, Hollins, & Towner, 2004; Hord, 1997). The PLC is an example of a structure that brings teams of people together for the purpose of improving student learning (Bolam et al., 2005; Hord, 1997; Huggins, Scheurich, & Morgan, 2011). Within such structures, the principal must create processes that reinforce accountability relative to the cultural stance that “all students can learn” (Copland, 2003). The sharing of student performance data
among teachers is one activity that holds each member accountable to the culture of “all students can improve.” By combining culture, structures, and processes, the principal can potentially create an environment that encourages teachers to continually improve their practice (Carmeli & Gittell, 2009; Rock & Wilson, 2005).

Finally, Knapp (2003) connects teacher evaluation to learning-focused leadership as a vehicle that promotes vision-setting, the development of others, and the creation of structures and processes supporting a collaborative culture. By leveraging the evaluation criteria and processes, principals can help compel teachers to align their classroom practices with the overarching student learning goals of the building. This, in turn, can help improve cohesive instructional practices to result in improved student learning. Additionally, evaluation often creates a framework for professional development, whereby teachers can be encouraged to access learning resources to support their growth in specific areas. Finally, an effective evaluation process potentially offers intellectual stimulation, individualized support, and examples for teachers to follow. Teacher learning facilitated through an evaluation process potentially offers job-embedded, continuous follow-up and sustained supports over the course of a school year (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Wei et al., 2009). For these reasons, principal professional development may need to focus on application strategies and processes for teacher evaluation.

**Defining Instructional Leadership in the Evaluation of People**

Today, instructional leadership is being defined by the need to build academic capacity. As described in this literature review, the complexity of the principal’s role stems from the multifaceted obligation to maintain managerial responsibilities, address the needs of an increasing number of academically under-prepared students, continually develop content
and instructional expertise required to support high quality classroom practice, answer to high-stakes public accountability, and fulfill the requirements of the new Washington State evaluation criteria. Responding to all these demands as an individual is not possible and requires the principal to develop capacity through collaboration and the orchestration of an academic staff team that quickly responds to the needs of students (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Developing a collaborative school requires that the principal exercise the following skills: (a) communicate effectively; (b) develop people to make decisions and provide expertise; (c) create a culture in which professional collaboration and risk-taking can safely occur; and (e) establish structures that support all of these activities simultaneously (Knapp et al., 2010). In light of this research, the new Washington State evaluation criteria have the potential to facilitate academic capacity, communicate vision, and create a positive professional environment.

**Teacher and Principal Evaluation Criteria Support Instructional Leadership**

As part of today’s instructional leadership role, the use of tools that leverage multiple functions and address several school improvement challenges simultaneously becomes essential for principals. One such tool could be the Washington State evaluation criteria. From the principal’s perspective, two converging spheres affect his/her professional development needs: (1) the evaluation criteria of the teacher; and, (2) the evaluation criteria of the principal. The teacher evaluation criteria, in combination with a professional framework, require the principal to be knowledgeable and skilled in order to mentor teachers. The principal evaluation criteria, designed by the Association of Washington School Principals, require that the principal demonstrate knowledge and skills to close school achievement gaps regardless of their context. As these two evaluation criteria converge, the
complexity of skills, knowledge, and contextual leadership expected of principals significantly increases.

The Washington State criteria require the principal evaluate teachers in the following areas: (1) centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement; (2) demonstrating effective teaching practices; (3) recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs; (4) providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum; (5) fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment; (6) using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning; (7) communicating and collaborating with parents and the school community; and (8) exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practices and student learning (OSPI, 2013b).

The Washington Principal Evaluation Criteria contain eight areas in which the principal must demonstrate competency: (1) creating a school culture that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and teaching for students and staff; (2) demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap; (3) providing for school safety; (4) leading the development, implementation and evaluation of data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements; (5) assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local district learning goals; (6) monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices; (7) managing both staff and fiscal resources to support student achievement and legal responsibilities; and (8) partnering with the school community to promote student learning (OSPI, 2013b). Similar to the teacher evaluation criteria, all eight criteria align with Knapp et al. (2010)’s definition of learning-focused leadership.
Both teacher and principal evaluations are accompanied by a professional framework that explicitly describes tasks and behaviors as “Unsatisfactory,” “Basic,” “Proficient,” or “Distinguished.” In the state of Washington, school districts are allowed to select from one of three teacher professional frameworks: (a) Charlotte Danielson; (b) Robert Marzano; or (c) the University of Washington’s Center for Educational Leadership 5 Dimensions (CEL5D). The Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) developed the principal professional framework. Each of these frameworks categorizes domains of professional practice with subdomains that define explicit behaviors, tasks, or actions of teachers and principals. Each of the subdomains aligns with the Washington State evaluation criteria. Because each framework was designed independently from the state evaluation criteria, cross-over documents align the frameworks to each of the eight criteria. This has created a high demand on principals to develop new knowledge in order to explain, teach, and use these tools with building staff skill.

**Categories of Evaluation Criteria that Support Learning-Focused Leadership.**

Viewing the teacher and principal criteria through the lens of Knapp et al. (2010), it becomes evident that the TPEP evaluation criteria have the potential for leveraging all three functions of learning-focused leadership as shown in Table 1. The first function of learning-focused leadership involves setting direction. Teacher criteria “(1) centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement,” and “(4) providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum” comprise leveraging areas for the principal to work with teachers to develop a vision for deep instructional content and high student learning expectations. Teacher criterion 7 expects teachers to communicate the school’s vision to parents and the community. This criterion could be used by the principal to build academic
capacity within the community and ties directly to collegial leadership in communicating vision. The principal criteria “(2) demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap,” and “(4) leading the development, implementation and evaluation of data-driven plan for increasing student achievement…” both expect that the principal communicate a vision of high standards for student performance and be accountable to ensure that staff understand the vision for excellence. Finally, principal criterion 8 expects the principal to communicate the vision and building goals to the community. The principal and teacher evaluation criteria complement each other, holding both parties mutually responsible for communicating a vision of excellence to the community at large.

The second function of learning-focused leadership involves developing people. Teacher criteria “(2) demonstrating effective teaching practices,” “(3) recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs,” and “(6) using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning” all provide expectations of teachers to develop their craft of instruction. The principal has both direct and indirect responsibility for supporting teacher development in these areas. Accompanying these expectations of continuous instructional improvement is the use of an instructional framework which can be used by the principal to communicate specific areas of improvement and helps to generate rich and deep intellectual conversation about teaching and learning. Additionally, the instructional framework helps to provide examples for teachers and principals to follow in their own practice. The principal criterion “(5) assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local district learning goals” explicitly defines how principals can develop staff. Principal criteria “(6) monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment
practices” directs the principal to support struggling teachers and provide professional
development for staff as a whole (Burke, 2011; Danielson, 1996).

The third function of learning-focused leadership involves redesigning organizational
structures and processes to support collaboration for the purpose of improving student
learning. Both the principal and teacher evaluation criteria expect the principal to develop
structures that support a climate maintaining high expectations. Teacher criterion “(1)
centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement,” “(2) demonstrating
effective teaching practices,” “(3) recognizing individual student learning needs and
developing strategies to address those needs” and “(4) providing clear and intentional focus
on subject matter content and curriculum” all lend themselves to such structures as
professional learning community (PLC). Within a PLC structure, the principal not only
provides an opportunity for collaboration but can create processes that promote continuous
reflection on instructional practice. Criteria “(6) using multiple student data elements to
modify instruction and improve student learning” and “(8) exhibiting collaborative and
collegial practices focused on improving instructional practices and student learning” both
contribute to a culture of collaboration through reflective processes.

The principal evaluation criteria expect principals to develop a school culture that
promotes ongoing improvement of teaching and learning for both staff and students.
Because principals cannot be in all places at all times, they must create structures and
processes that help to facilitate this culture. Criterion 2 expects principals to develop
intellectual safety for staff to take risks in their learning, while criterion 3 expects principals
to lead development and evaluation of a school improvement plan that creates a roadmap for
all to follow. Criterion 4 expects principals to create processes that allow instructional staff
to align their content and instruction to district, state, and national student learning standards. These criteria compel the principal to create organizational structures and processes that foster collaboration focused on continuous student learning improvement.

After comparing learning-focused leadership to the new Washington State evaluation criteria, it becomes clear that new skills and knowledge are required of principals. In essence, the teacher evaluation criteria explicitly define the knowledge and skills needed by principals in order to develop teachers in their pursuit of improved classroom instruction. The principal criteria, on the other hand, define new responsibilities for principals requiring the ability to contextualize their school’s needs, reprioritize their work, and develop structures and processes that promote collaboration for continuous student learning improvement.

Table 1
Alignment of learning-focused leadership functions to Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot Criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning-Focused Leadership Functions</th>
<th>Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Set direction** by articulating a vision for the school, fostering the acceptance of group goals, and creating high performance expectations. | **Teacher Criteria:**
1) Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement.
4) Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum.
7) Communicating and collaborating with parents and the school community.

**Principal Criteria:**
2) Demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap.
4) Leading the development, |
implementation and evaluation of data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements.
8) Partnering with the school community to promote student learning.

2. **Develop people** by offering intellectual stimulation, providing individualized support, and setting examples for others to follow.

**Teacher Criteria:**
2) Demonstrating effective teaching practices.
3) Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs.
6) Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning.

**Principal Criteria:**
5) Assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local district learning goals.
6) Monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices.

3. **Redesign the organization** by strengthening school cultures, modifying organizational structures, and building collaborative processes.

**Teacher Criteria:**
5) Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment.
8) Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practices and student learning.

**Principal Criteria:**
1) Creating a school culture that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and
teaching for students and staff.
3) Providing for school safety.
6) Monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices.

The Shift from Managerial to Learning-focused Leadership. The teacher and principal evaluation criteria both emphasize leadership activities over managerial tasks. Of the eight principal criteria, two are arguably managerial in nature: criterion “(3) providing for school safety,” and criterion “(7) managing both staff and fiscal resources to support student achievement and legal responsibilities.” The teacher evaluation criteria all focus on instruction, with the exception of criterion “(5) fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment pertaining to management of students and classroom environment.” Even in this case, classroom environment contributes directly to learning within the classroom. The six remaining principal evaluation and seven remaining teacher criterion all pertain to activities that create and communicate vision and goals focused on improved student learning, develop staff’s content knowledge and instructional skills, and create structures that support an environment of continuous learning and improvement. With nearly 87% of the evaluation criteria emphasizing leadership activities for the principal, it becomes clear that principals will need to shift the priority of their daily work to learning-focused leadership.

Principal Professional Development Supporting the Shift to Learning-Focused Leadership.

The professional development literature encompasses principal preparation, recruitment, induction, and continuing education. This study focuses on continuing
education as professional development required by those who have already entered the principalship. It makes sense to determine what influences the development needs of currently employed principals and what can be done to support them in the shift toward learning-focused leadership. Additionally, the literature suggests that most principals enter the profession inadequately prepared for its complexity and demands, thereby underscoring the need for job-embedded continuous learning (Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, 2010; Crow, 2010; Portin, 2004).

While there are several factors that impact principal professional development, the shift toward learning-focused leadership is most significant (Knapp et al., 2010). This shift requires principals to develop human capital capacities to improve classroom instruction and distribute leadership and decision-making tasks traditionally held by them as managers (Copland; Hulpia & Devoes, 2010; Knapp, Copland, & Talbert; Portin, 2004). Officially codifying this role shift are the new principal/teacher evaluation criteria (AWSP Leadership Framework; Representative Marcie Maxwell & Senator Andy Hill). Both historical work demands and the new evaluation criteria have helped to define six mechanisms shaping today’s principal professional development needs: (a) competing educational demands; (b) instructional leadership activities required by the new evaluation criteria; (c) principal context; (d) principal socialization; (e) school context; and, (f) structures that support principal development.

**New criteria for leadership, old competing interests.** The first mechanism shaping principal professional development needs concerns the competing demands of educational management and instructional leadership activities. Portin (2004) pointed out that instructional leadership is only one of seven common functions in which principals engage.
To operate effectively at leading a school, the principal requires adequate time, knowledge, skill, and effort for all these functions. Several articles in the literature suggest that educational management tasks may actually carry more importance than activities associated with instruction (R. F. Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; Horng et al., 2010). With the implementation of the new Washington State evaluation criteria, principals will be faced with decisions on how to prioritize their time and energy in order to be effective at teacher evaluation while maintaining their managerial responsibilities. For this reason, policy makers may need to reconsider the principals’ scope of responsibilities. Additionally, organizational structures need to be retooled to support principals in their work of continuously learning and engaging in learning-focused leadership (T. Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2005; Knapp et al., 2010; Portin et al., 2006 2010). Using history as a predictor, the principal’s role will feature a continuous balancing of educational management and instructional leadership. For this reason, principal learning opportunities should include both sets of topics, skills, and knowledge.

**Principal context calls for professional development differentiation.** People come to the principalship with varying backgrounds and expertise and are employed in different school situations – conditions which make up the context of their position. Specifically, the literature defines principal context as composed of the following: content knowledge, experience, school context, formal education, and technical expertise (Browne-Ferrigno, 2010; Crow, 2010; Drago-Severson, 2012; Fink & Resnick 2012; Grissom & Harrington, 2010). Because so many variables influence a principal’s context, the changing demands of providing resources and serving as instructional leaders for teacher means that learning has become a continual and essential part of the position (Jenkins, 2009). Understanding what
principals need to learn and how they best learn it comprise significant elements of designing principal professional development (Goldring et al., 2008; Grissom & Harrington, 2010; Horng et al., 2010; Stien & Nelson, 2003).

Principal learning often follows a series of phases, beginning with an enhanced understanding of what the school needs (Portin, 2004). School context contributes to principal learning needs based upon the kinds of issues that require attention. Factors including socio-economic status, ethnicity, primary language, teacher experience, parental involvement, special education population, programs, district resources, and community resources all bring unique challenges to the task of improving student learning. Each of these school issues influences the context of concerns that the principal needs to resolve (Bolam et al., 2005; Borman & Kimball, 2005; Goldring et al., 2008). After identifying and understanding their school’s context, the principal then needs to determine what knowledge and skills are requisite in order to address its problems (Portin, 2004).

The second phase of principal learning is to determine what deficiencies of knowledge and skill a particular principal may have in relationship to each specific problem. Principal background – including such elements as previous work experience, formal education, induction circumstances, and organizational socialization – provides a filter by which to gauge learning deficiencies (Crow, 2010). For example, a principal’s previous role as a teacher or counselor contributes to the principal’s content knowledge and instructional skill in providing teacher feedback through the evaluation process (Stien & Nelson, 2003). It also contributes to an understanding of academic content, standards, and pedagogic strategies (Danielson, 1996). In the event that a principal candidate does not come from a teaching role, a significant amount of learning through formal education may be needed in several
areas relevant to the Washington evaluation criteria. Formal education includes certification programs that hold varying philosophies about what knowledge and skills are appropriate for principal candidates (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983). Often formal education does a good job of instilling theoretical concepts and forges a common understanding that unifies the administrative culture as a whole (Greenfield, 1985). Depending upon the strengths and weaknesses of the formal program, continuously updated instructional and content knowledge, and increasingly rigorous student learning standards, a principal may need to continually engage in formal programs (Hattie, 1999).

Principal induction contributes several elements to a principal’s role perception. Greenfield (1985) describes these elements as anticipatory role learning, formal internship, informal internship, and role taking. Even though these various activities are generally accepted practice, each is limited by the significant variation of deep experiences that provide a true understanding of what the principalship entails and enable principal candidates to take on transferrable principal behaviors rather than contextually developing skills for a specific role. Crow (2010) groups internships, both informal and role taking, into two types of socialization: professional and organizational. Professional socialization pertains to university programs that provide formal training, while organizational socialization pertains to both formal and informal exposure to the principal’s role as facilitated by a school district. Both sets of research reinforce the fact that principals enact their roles based upon both formal and informal perceptions they take from their experiences. A “right of passage” is achieved once the principal candidate takes on the role as defined by their mentor. However, depending upon the mentoring principal’s experience, knowledge, skills, and level of trust with the candidate, wildly varying induction experience can occur.
Organizational socialization occurs in a unique climate surrounding the principal within a specific district. A district’s expectations, level of collaboration, quality of supports, central office philosophy, and structures all influence principal learning. For instance, a significant factor to principal learning is the manner in which the district climate facilitates questions by principals. If the district climate looks down upon questions as undermining authority or labeling the principal as “weak,” principals will refrain from this form of authentic engagement in learning. Fundamentally, principals need to feel safe in exposing their deficiencies to superiors in order to access district resources (Edmondson, 1999). To promote principal learning, Honig (2006) emphasizes a need for the central office to engage in collaborative learning at the building level. A central office that engages in boundary spanning among schools emphasizes a sense of acceptance of learning. As principals and district administration learn together, the risk of exposing weaknesses is lowered for the principal. A secondary benefit is that district office becomes able to make more informed decisions, create better structures, and allocate suitable resources to support buildings.

The third phase of principal learning pertains to the structures and resources available to accomplish new learning. Often, due to limitations of time and money, the first place a principal might look for learning resources is among experts within the building or school district. Teacher-leaders in content or instruction can provide timely information and direction on where to learn more. This information, however, can be inconsistent or biased by the teacher-leader’s opinions and perceptions about a specific topic (Stien & Nelson, 2003; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). The next level at which to look for resources is the network of professionals and published information. This network could include professionals from across a district, personal associations, district resources, community
resources, and state or national organizational resources (T. Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2005; Grissom & Harrington, 2010). As many structures and resources are available, the principal must select from among them based upon personal learning needs.

The fourth phase of principal learning is the actual participation in and acquisition of new knowledge or skills. The complexity of the principal’s role often necessitates the contextualizing of knowledge and skills relative to his/her school’s situation (Crow, 2010; Drago-Severson, 2012; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008). This could imply a two-tiered learning process in which technical knowledge and skills are initially acquired and practiced in isolation, to be followed by a second stage that contextualizes the technical knowledge into practice. Parts of the literature suggest that technical knowledge or skills should be obtained prior to being considered for the principalship and as a condition of promotion (Barber et al., 2007; Crow, 2010; Fink & Resnick, 2012; Grissom & Loeb, 2011). While following this recommendation could contribute to foundational principal learning, technical learning has been demonstrated to be continuously emerging as new research clarifies best practices and establishes enhanced standards for student learning (Hattie, 1999; Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011).

Grissom and Harrington (2010) focused their research on the second tier of contextual principal learning and defined it as “…formal opportunities for continuing education that principals undertake in conjunction with their job responsibilities…” (p. 585). Their recommendations pointed to the creation of dynamic and interpersonal learning formats such as mentoring, coaching, and networking.

The final phase of principal learning is the application of knowledge and skills to the school context in order to solve student learning problems. Two factors of the application
phase significantly increase the complexity of skill sets needed by principals. Putting solutions into operation within a given context requires specific and explicit dialogue with others who have previously solved similar problems. Second, the fact that principal learning does not occur in isolation from implementing solutions contributes to its sophistication. In many cases, learning must occur in the midst of implementing solutions. The phenomenon of teaching while learning introduces the concept of nested learning, which poses a new skill set for principals and districts to consider in the design of professional development (T. Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2005; Crow, 2010; Fink & Resnick, 2012; Gallucci et al., 2010).

Keeping the phases of principal learning in mind, the literature provides some recommendations for improving principal content knowledge, experience, school context, formal education, and technical expertise.

**Induction shifts from role taking to role making.** The literature repeatedly emphasizes the need for new principal support groups and induction resources due to the complexity of the job (K. D. Peterson, 1986). In Washington State, traditional induction takes place during the formal training and internship phase. In this phase the principal candidate is paired with a practicing principal charged with the responsibility of mentoring. Since the mentoring principal controls the candidate’s experience, depending upon his/her abilities and willingness to involve the candidate at a deep level, the candidate’s experience may vary tremendously, from profoundly transformative to frustratingly rote. This suggests that a principal’s induction through mentorship may influence their ability to succeed in their future role.

Many times no explanation of the principal’s role is provided other than tradition,
district leadership culture, and past perceptions held by the new principal (T. Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2005; Crow, 1992). In many cases, this results in the principal engaging in role-taking verses role-making activities that inhibit instructional leadership. Specifically, learning-focused leadership requires that the principal communicate vision in a situational frame of reference, develop others, and build structures depending upon the context of the school (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Knapp et al., 2010). This definition of instructional leadership supports the act of principals engaging in role-making activities (Crow, 2010).

Fink and Resnick (2012) provide recommendations for principal mentorship and suggest a shift toward role-making rather than taking. They describe the need by new principals to engage in rich discussions and problem solving with experienced principals in order to contextualize skills and knowledge relative to their current situation. These discussions help to subvert helplessness and hopelessness of new principals overwhelmed with the complexity of their work. Topics often include techniques for coaching teachers, how to run professional development for teachers, and other problems of practice. In short, a role-making mentorship process for new principals allows them to contextualize their learning and transition from theory into practice (Barber et al., 2007; Grissom & Harrington, 2010; K. D. Peterson, 1986).

**Continuously emerging content knowledge.** Subject-centered content knowledge coupled with teaching experience is essential for principals so that they can support formative development of teachers, develop teacher learning, and shape curricular decisions across the building (Stien & Nelson, 2003). Commonly, principals come to their role with experience in teaching a single subject but may lack explicit content knowledge in other areas they are to supervise or evaluate. While some pedagogical strategies may be
transferrable among subjects, more in-depth training may be needed as an essential part of principal professional development. Additionally, content knowledge and standards are continuously emerging, requiring that the principal update their knowledge on a regular basis.

**Formal education.** A principal’s formal education helps to unify leadership concepts that provide frameworks for applying skills and knowledge to practice.

High performing schools from around the globe all credit rigorous principal professional development for the principal’s ability to address problems of practice and motivate teachers and staff to be more responsive to the needs of their school (Barber et al., 2007). Responsiveness to school needs and the ability to anticipate problems is part of the learning required by today’s principals. Being a diagnostician of school issues incorporates the principal’s ability to use contextual information to modify solutions learned in other situations. In turn, principal professional development needs to be differentiated in order to enable principals to contextualize solutions (T. Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2005; Crow, 2010).

**Principal experience.** Principals of differing experience may require different professional development. Fink and Resnick (2012) describe the distinctions between new and experienced principals, saying that new principals generally come to their jobs, “…not yet expert in the many aspects of instructional leadership…” (p. 4) while experienced principals need reflective and collegial supports to further develop. Regardless of experience, principals are affected by the demands of program implementation and teacher development and thus require professional development. Experienced principals may need less time spent learning about district implementation processes, while new principals may
need explicit and direct instruction. Because of this difference, new principals could benefit from support groups and more problem-centered professional development, whereas experienced principals often seek to learn more about how to apply and adapt their skills to obtain the results they seek (Fink & Resnick, 2012). In order to meet the needs of principals with such varying experience and maximize their capacities, differentiated professional development is essential.

**Technical knowledge and skills.** Fundamental to the new Washington State evaluation criteria are the principal’s technical skills. Data manipulation and interpretation can no longer be learned on the job if principals are expected to do their jobs effectively. In order to minimize the amount of managerial time and maximize the amount of instructional leadership time, principals must have confidence in their technical skills and use them with automaticity. Again, principals’ needs can vary greatly depending upon their background and experience.

**Inter-rater reliability.** Darling-Hammond et al. (1983) argued that inter-rater reliability between principals would be essential to the correction of teacher deficiencies through evaluation. Foundational to the reliability of the principal’s observations is the uniformity of the framework and structure of the teacher evaluation tool. The Washington TPEP provides criteria for evaluation coupled with an instructional framework that provides a uniform structure from which to develop expertise. To assist principals in calibrating their application of the instructional framework, Milanowski (2011) recommends multiple observations and multiple observers who confer periodically and come to consensus on the use of the evaluation tool. It is cautioned, however, that too much prescriptiveness with extensive documentation may yield negative effects such as increased anxiety in teachers,
thereby interfering with the principal’s effectiveness (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983).

Borman and Kimball (2005) found that perceptions of the students and teacher being observed affected the evaluators’ scoring. One means of reducing this bias is supported through clear and explicit rubrics for evaluation, frameworks for teaching and learning, and ongoing calibration with other evaluators. The Washington TPEP has provided the structures of rubrics and frameworks. The ongoing calibration of principals in the evaluation process will be a significant and necessary support.

**Teacher measurements.** A primary component of the Washington TPEP is the measurements of effective teaching. Milanowski (2011) argued that outcome measures of improved student learning weren’t sufficient to gauge and improve teacher performance. Similarly, measurement of instructional practices alone doesn’t link to improved student learning results. For these reasons, the research recommends a three-pronged approach to teacher measurement: (1) observations of classroom practice for use in periodic formal teacher evaluation; (2) teaching “work samples” or performance assessments for such decisions as granting tenure or movement on a career ladder; and (3) classroom walk-throughs that provide information for everyday performance. The Washington TPEP utilizes these measurements in determining a teacher’s evaluation rating. It will be essential for the principal to understand the components of measurement as well as how to use them in order to create inter-rater reliability among the different artifacts. Prior to the TPEP, teacher evaluation in Washington State encouraged a wide variance of interpretation due to the scoring scale, as a given teacher received a rating of either “unsatisfactory” or “meets standard.” In the new evaluation system, strong emphasis is placed on consistent rating using “Unsatisfactory,” “Basic,” “Proficient,” and “Distinguished.” Descriptors for these scales are
defined by the Instructional Framework selected by the district. In order to determine where a teacher falls on each descriptor’s continuum, principals must use teacher evaluation measurements to collect evidence (Burke, 2011).

Classroom observations for the TPEP consist of a minimum of 60 minutes total over the course of a school year by the evaluating principal. During the observation(s) the principal follows a protocol to collect information about teacher and student activities, while objective statements, also outlined in the protocol, limit subjective assumptions by the principal. This will allow for a more uniform application of the evaluation tool across classrooms, buildings, and districts. The associated instructional framework provides a rubric with concrete examples that help to guide the principal’s rating based on evidence. In turn, when teachers receive the principal’s observation feedback, they are able to refer to the instructional framework to determine where on the rating scale they fall. From that point, a discussion can occur between the principal and the teacher about the teacher’s practices and how he/she might achieve the next level of instruction, also defined by the instructional framework. Principals will need practice conducting these observations of teaching and learning and holding conversations with teachers to clarify the meaning of their feedback. Honing these skills in collaboration with other principals will improve the inter-rater reliability as common understanding will contribute to common practice.

The collection of artifacts such as lesson plans, student work, and assessments provides a basis for evaluating teacher effectiveness in curriculum alignment, planning, and organization (Milanowski, 2011). Principal training on high-value artifacts and how to collect them appropriately will be important for a successful evaluation process. For example, a proper balance and limitation of artifact collection should be established so that
the teacher doesn’t feel compelled to develop a full portfolio. Consulting content area specialists will help principals to provide further objective feedback and input to the rubric scoring as well. Professional development on teacher measurements will be key for the successful implementation of the TPEP.

**Instructional frameworks.** Frameworks create flexibility and efficiency within the educational system by defining focus and purpose for daily decision-making. An instructional framework defines the nature of quality instructional practices and creates a common language through which teachers and supervisors can discuss them (Danielson, 1996). Because the meaning of quality instructional practices is defined, conversations are more efficient and time saved in providing explicit feedback (Milanowski, 2011). Washington State TPEP allows districts to select from one of three research-based frameworks: Charlotte Danielson, Dr. Robert Marzano, or the University of Washington’s CEL5D+. Regardless of the selection, principals will need to possess a strong understanding of their respective framework in order to leverage improved classroom practices (Borman & Kimball, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Milanowski, 2011).

Knowledge of the framework involves an understanding of the terms and what they represent in teacher practice. Employing a common definition for professional practices across an entire school district will create the foundation for changes within the classroom and align the way teachers work together (Marzano, Schooling, & Toth, 2010). While each framework contains variations, all define professional educator practice as (a) acting on the most current knowledge; (b) client-centered service; (c) results-oriented; and (d) upholding standards through peer review (Wiggins & McTighe, 2006). Principals will need a deep understanding of frameworks and how to use them in order to successfully deploy the
evaluation criteria (Burke, 2011; OSPI, 2013b)

**Professional Development Structures.** Reiterating that the focus of this study is on professional development for principals currently in practice, the literature speaks to several formats for principal learning in support of learning-focused leadership. Each of these formats provides opportunities for technical and contextual learning which, in turn, allows principals to apply their learning to practice with greater efficacy.

**Conferences and workshops.** While conferences and workshops can be expensive and time-consuming, principals – especially experienced veterans – value the intellectual simulation generated by presenting topics to peers as well as discussing them with others. Conferences and workshops provide a safe environment in which principals can focus on topics of interest, find additional resources, and test out ideas acquired from others (Drago-Severson, 2012). At an organizational level, conferences and workshops help to build a larger community that acts as the “glue” for system-wide improvement (Fink & Resnick, 2012).

**Independent reading.** Regardless of school type or resource level, principals value the ability to read independently. Reading educational literature allows the principal to reflect on their own practice and spawn new ideas to apply to their work. It was also suggested that the experience of independent reading offers a sense of renewal for the principal amid the hectic realities of their job (Drago-Severson, 2012).

**Networking.** Crow (2010) recommends networking by principals as a means of securing continuous support. Networking allows principals to refine and clarify work over time, offering support for continuous improvement while helping to prevent burnout. Learning in a complex situation, such as the principalship, requires openness to change and
re-prioritization of tasks. Networking supports reflective practices by principals to adapt and apply changes to their practices (Drago-Severson, 2012).

**Mentorship.** Crow (2010) identified mentorship as a common practice in many school districts. Partially because information and experience can be imparted within the workplace, exchanges of contextual meaning between experienced and new principals occur continually (T. Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2005). Mentorship provides learning on both sides of the relationship, with a sense that one can learn more about one’s self through the act of teaching (Drago-Severson, 2012). Allowing the oversight of a new principal by a principal with greater experience brings some complications as well as benefits. Many times, experiences are limited by the mentor or translated to the new principal as verbatim prescriptions; however, in the post-industrial climate of today’s education, the principal’s role is less fixed. It is suggested by Crow (2010) that mentorship be accomplished with several experienced principals to allow for the new principal to fully contextualize their role.

**Coaching.** Crow (2010) differentiates the needs of experienced principals from those of novices. While mentoring is generally geared toward benefiting new principals, coaching can benefit all principals based upon their needs (Grissom & Harrington, 2010). For longstanding principals, coaching from a peer with experience at or beyond their level fosters increased content knowledge, collegiality, and problem-based learning, as well as stimulating the scholarship of teaching and learning (Huston & Weaver, 2007). Because of the current educational climate, job-embedded learning through the coaching model allows the principal to receive focused professional development while applying into practice (Gallucci et al., 2010).

**Formal Programs.** Formal programs such as university degrees, certification, and
fellowships can exert a heavy toll on the principal’s time and finances; however, principals have found formal programs to be a great source of collaborative connections and focused personal improvement (Drago-Severson, 2012). Formal programs also allow for system-wide improvement by creating a common source of intellectual development (Fink & Resnick, 2012).

**Themes Across the Literature**

Some of the pressures converging on the principal’s role include (a) pressures from the public; (b) accountability to district, state and federal policies; (c) needs of the students; (d) needs of the teachers; and (e) needs of principal for learning and skill development. Each of these factors can be individually challenging; however, in the real-world work of a principal, all must be addressed simultaneously, making the job highly complex. Beyond simply multi-tasking, a principal must possess the skills to create a system that is responsive to multiple demands (Knapp et al., 2010). The following topics consolidate overarching themes found in the literature.

**A balance between instructional management and instructional leadership.**

Throughout the “effective schools” literature, there has been a debate about what behaviors principals must engage in on a daily basis in order to achieve sustained student learning improvement. Much of the literature argues that instructional leadership must take priority over managerial leadership in order for classroom instruction to improve, therefore improving student learning (Cuban, 1988; R. F. Elmore, 1990; Greenfield, 1985; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). In contrast, other research also recognizes the impracticality of ignoring managerial duties and argues that a balance must be struck in order for educational reform to be sustained (Grissom & Loeb, 2011; MacDonald, 2009; Reilly, 1984). The daily battle to
balance time for both instructional and managerial leadership is complex, requiring that principals possess strong skills and knowledge in order to economize their activities and develop school structures to support instructional leadership across their organization. Drago-Severson (2012) supported the concept of balanced leadership by stating, “…principals must adapt from having largely managerial roles to being architects of collaborative learning organizations and adult developers…” (p. 4).

**Priority placed on evaluating teaching and learning.** The research discussed in this literature review clearly emphasizes the importance and value of focusing principal roles on classroom instruction. The new Washington evaluation criteria provide the impetus and tools for defining priorities for principals and teachers, based on the belief that “Learning is driven by what teachers and pupils do in the classrooms” (Black, 1998). Darling-Hammond et al. (1983) defined two reasons for the principal to shift evaluation to classroom instruction: (a) individual teacher improvement; and (b) organizational improvement. At the individual teacher level, improvement is realized by formative feedback in the evaluation process while overall performance accountability is achieved through summative evaluation. At the organizational level, individual teacher evaluation leverages school improvement, resulting in increased organizational academic capacity. The Washington evaluation criteria seek to place priority on the evaluation of classroom instruction in order to leverage systematic improvements to student learning (OSPI, 2013b).

**Shifts from educational manager to learning-focused leadership.** In order for principals to meet the demands of their role, they will need to communicate vision, develop others, and create structures with processes that promote collaboration and improved classroom instruction (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Knapp et al., 2010; K. D. Peterson, 1986).
These complex skills require a strong understanding of how each element ultimately affects teacher behaviors as it pertains to classroom instruction. (Knapp et al. (2010) described the shifts principals must take in order to build academic capacity.

Articulating and communicating a vision for their building requires from principals a deep understanding of teaching and learning in addition to the time to interact with staff, parents, community, and central office (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Knapp et al., 2010). In order for principals to contextualize these elements into a vision, they must communicate frequently and in depth with staff, be reflective, and learn continuously (Drago-Severson, 2012; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 2002). By shifting to learning-focused leadership, principals may renew their abilities to address complex problems, increase their enthusiasm for the work, and in turn make their role more responsive to the needs of their school (Drago-Severson, 2012).

Developing others has transitioned from single workshop episodes to ongoing, job-embedded, content-specific training requiring that the principal become an architect of human development (Drago-Severson, 2012). This entails the development of teachers, teacher leaders, para-educators, and secretaries in order to support improved classroom instruction. Additional partnerships with district resources are also required to deliver high quality learning opportunities for staff within their buildings (Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, 2010; Gallucci et al., 2010; Portin et al., 2006). In turn, principals will need professional development in the processes and skills of selecting appropriate and meaningful learning opportunities for their staff. To consider the diverse and complex learning demands of staff will require that principals, in turn, shift their work toward planning, resource procurement, and the development of meaningful learning.
Finally, principals will need to create organizational structures that support a collaborative school climate, a vision for excellence, and improved student learning. An example is professional learning communities (PLCs). PLCs offer support for teachers, foster a climate of professional learning, help support high quality instructional practices, and provide organizational accountability. In order to bring such a structure about, the principal must have a strong understanding of adult learning (Brandsford et al., 1999), team development (Copland, 2003; Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006), climate development (Carmeli & Gittell, 2009), and data interpretation (Bolam et al., 2005). While there are other structures at the principal’s purview, the PLC exemplifies the array of specialized skills and knowledge required by today’s principals (Bolam et al., 2005). Professional development for principals in such structures will improve efficacy and support high quality classroom instruction (Huggins et al., 2011).

**Developing skills for complex leadership.** Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) identified one of the most significant factors of a principal’s efficacy as their ability to acquire new skills. Whether one’s belief in his/her self-efficacy is weak or strong and exerts a significant influence on the school climate. A weak belief in one’s self-efficacy dissipates confidence quickly when the going gets difficult. In a climate of significant change such as the implementation of a new evaluation system, it will be essential to know what skills are required of principals in order to improve their efficacy and indirectly improving classroom instruction and school climate.

Portin et al. (2006) framed the new set of leadership skills in terms of principal responsibility for “…engaging the broad participation of stakeholders and faculty[, which] ensures that the school can learn and change in response to the adaptive challenges it faces”
In other words, a school’s response to student learning needs and teacher needs is dependent upon the principal’s ability to find and organize resources, coordinate the learning of staff, and facilitate organizational learning. Portin et al. (2006) found that the principal’s task of distributing and redesigning leadership roles within a school helped to build organizational capacity. This work included the development of teacher-leaders, informal leadership roles, and collective leadership such as PLCS. The activity of the principal to foster a culture in which all members are learners is significant and requires highly developed personal communication skills (Bolam et al., 2005; Copland, 2003; Donaldson & Scribner, 2003; R. Elmore, 2000; Gallucci et al., 2010; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hord, 1997).

**Situational leadership.** Principals will need to understand their personal leadership tendencies and the context in which they work in order to meet the demands of the new TPEP. Goldring et al. (2008) identified three general groups into which principals can be categorized based upon how they allocated their time: (a) Eclectic leadership; (b) Instructional Leaders; and (c) Student Leaders. The Eclectic leader distributes activities evenly across managerial, instructional, political and student domains. The Instructional Leader focuses most on activities reinforcing instructional practices within the classroom and spends considerable time on community/parent relations and student affairs, as relationships with students and community/parents are often leveraged to influence the instructional organization of their school. Student-Centered Leaders focus on specific student needs and issues which all other functions support.

Goldring et al. (2008) recognized that a principal’s context highly influences his/her leadership practices. Specifically, they found that eclectic leaders are often found in high performing schools where student learning is high, staff is highly qualified, and logistics are
running well. Student-Centered Leaders are often found in low performing schools where an emphasis on improved instruction and student behaviors needs to be addressed. Since the TPEP emphasizes instructional leadership, the principal will need to determine the context of his/her school and apply the TPEP evaluation criteria, looking for ways that allocation of principal evaluative activities can overlap with their other duties. This task will become complicated, especially if the principal’s school context does not align with the instructional leadership group identified by Goldring et al. (2008).

**Developing structures such as professional learning communities.** Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) hold the potential for sustained applied practice changes in leadership (Bolam et al., 2005; Hord, 1997; Huggins et al., 2011). The benefits of using the PLC format are multi-layered and include the following: (a) individual learning; (b) organizational learning; (c) individual and group reflection; (d) personal renewal; (e) mentorship; (f) accountability to each other; and (g) modeling. Principals participating in a PLC are able to dialogue in a safe environment periodically throughout the school year in order to share experiences and discuss possible solutions to complex problems (Drago-Severson, 2012). Principals are also able to lead through example by modeling a culture of learning and interdependence with others (Fink & Resnick, 2012). The socialization of new principals is fostered through the sharing of experiences by more mature principals in an environment that also allows the new principal to contextualize their learning.

**The increasing complexity of principal tasks.** The role of the principal has significantly increased in its complexity over the past 30 years. Today’s principal must have higher student learning standards, deeper content knowledge, and greater expectations that all students improve, while recognizing more diversity in student and staff needs that necessitate
sophisticated structures to lead. Simply drawing upon individual knowledge and skill sets no
longer meets the needs of today’s schools. Principals must become versed in applying skills
and accessing knowledge in a contextual manner to foster improved student learning (Tricia
Browne-Ferrigno; Crow; Drago-Severson; Hallinger & Heck; Knapp et al.; Portin et al.).

**Sustainability of principal practice.** Copland (2003) referred to “extraordinary
leadership” as unsustainable and therefore prone to limited school improvement over time.
This statement is echoed throughout the literature as a cautionary note in considering
principal evaluation (Acker-Hocevar et al., 2012; Bolam et al., 2005; R. Elmore, 2000;
Gallucci et al., 2010; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hallinger & Murphy, 2013; Huggins et al.,
2011; Knapp et al., 2010; MacDonald, 2009; Portin et al., 2006; Wei et al., 2009). Along
with the caution are recommendations for practitioners, evaluation criteria-makers, and
districts to consider in reducing barriers to instructional leadership.

**Barriers to exercising instructional leadership.** Hallinger and Murphy (2013)
identify three barriers to principals exercising instructional leadership: the lack of (a)
expertise to lead learning; (b) time to lead; and (c) an encouraging normative environment.
These three leadership barriers are taken into account by the principal with their intent to take
action. Overcoming them may appear simple, but for many principals the job is
overwhelming and best intentions are repeatedly put on hold to deal with the next crisis.
Tony Ciaglia, a middle school principal from New York, sums up the sentiments of many
principals: “When I come to these workshops, I often leave with feelings of guilt and shame.
Why is it that when I return to my school, I can’t seem to keep a focus on what I am told are
my most important responsibilities? Is there something wrong with me? (p. 5)” Hallinger
and Murphy (2013) argued that instructional leadership can only fully realize its potential if
the principal’s intentions to lead are supported by expertise, time, and expectations.

Principal expertise to lead learning requires a combination of knowledge, learning, and communicating. With the depth and breadth of knowledge expected in every subject, a person could spend several lifetimes trying to master content alone. Thus, the question arises: what should a principal know in each subject area? Better yet, who is the principal’s resource for this particular subject area? This is one reason leadership in the post-industrial era must lean on distributed responsibility in order to close the gaps one person cannot possibly cover (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Simultaneously, learning by the principal must be continuous and focused on the primary subject area tenants and pedagogy (Cawelti, 1984; Dwyer, 1985; Reilly, 1984).

Developing others to act relies on the structures, culture, vision, and language that the principal establishes. Providing a shared vision of learning with common school goals and targets allows decision-making to be carried out by multiple people without the direct supervision of the principal (Copland, 2003; Edmondson, 1999; Hord, 1997). Frameworks that include descriptions of instruction, assessment, and curriculum help the school to adopt a common language of teaching and learning, saving time, energy and resources in negotiating the meaning of good practice (Borman & Kimball, 2005; Burke, 2011; MacGregor, 2007; Marzano et al., 2010). Team leadership structures clarify where and how decisions are addressed and who is available to clarify questions about specific topics, which relieves the principal of fielding all questions (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Hord, 1997; Portin et al., 2006). Finally, the support of professional development and learning by staff members through coaching empowers and renews academic capacity to address challenges.

Lacking the time to lead is is often the greatest barrier to successful instructional
leadership, due to the demanding and hectic work environment imposed on principals (Horng et al., 2010). The difficulty of allocating adequate time to serve as instructional leaders has been part of the principal’s leadership dilemma for decades, with no easy solutions (Cuban, 1988; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). This is part due to the imperative responsibility to efficiently manage the school building rather than activities within the classrooms, a conflict contributing to the normative environment of the principal. Several scholars argue that the education system must adjust the management responsibilities and expectations of principals in order to see sustained, continuous improvement of both schools and the principals leading them (Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, 2010; Drago-Severson, 2012; Horng et al., 2010; Jenkins, 2009; MacGregor, 2007; Portin et al., 2006).

Supporting teachers based upon student needs. Throughout the 1990s, American student demographics were changing and required a different way of teaching in order for students to access curriculum and develop high level skills and thinking (Darling-Hammond, 2000). In Washington State, student demographics demonstrated a shift in classroom instructional needs between 1997 and 2012. Based upon the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) “Report Card” statistics, in 1997 the state was comprised of 77.5% “White,” 22.5% “non-white,” and was at 31.2% free and reduced lunch status. In 2012, the student population shifted to 60.2% “White,” 39.8% “non-white,” and was at 45.5% free and reduced lunch status. The increase of minority and low-income students in Washington schools meant that content needed to minimize cultural bias; it also meant that students came to the classroom with more varied academic knowledge and backgrounds. English Language Learners and low socio-economic students brought challenges of meeting grade-level standards in reading but also academic cultural deficits, such as school preparedness, access
to technology, and social experiences outside of their local community. Traditional classroom instruction was no longer meeting the needs of these new students, so changes had to be made.

Funded by the Gates Foundation, Fouts et al. (2002) studied 669 classroom lessons across Washington State and found that classroom instruction was failing to meet the needs of the diverse population. They recommended an instructional change to increase constructivist learning strategies that would build context and opportunities to experience concepts, engage in dialogue, and negotiate understanding. Scribner’s (1998a) research supported instructional changes as well, requiring a richer learning environment for teachers to meet student needs because of variation in language and cultural backgrounds. As teachers strived to develop these instructional skills, it became clear that the problem of educational reform lay not the structures surrounding the classroom, but in teacher learning (P. L. Peterson, McCarthey, & Elmore, 1996). Thus, it is essential that the principal understand (a) the context of teacher learning; (b) teacher motivations to learn; and (c) teacher use of professional knowledge. Additionally, the principal must create ways to foster teacher learning and share the responsibility of professional development, perhaps via the coordination of teams with the focus on instructional improvement (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Scribner, 1998b)

Accountability as a motivator for improvement. The status quo methods of leading education are no longer feasible; the high-stakes environment creates a sense of urgency for principals to become more effective at achieving improved student learning (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010; Portin et al., 2006). Over the last 30 years, federal and state policies have placed public pressure on schools to improve, causing the principal’s
role to become more results oriented. Heck (1992) documented several instances in which educational governing bodies directly reassigned or terminated principals based on school performance.

Part of school effectiveness is measured through high-stakes testing and graduation requirements. While pressure from published test scores has mounted pressure on teachers to close the achievement gap, it was also a catalyst that integrated teacher practices toward instructional improvement (Copland, 2003). The Washington evaluation criteria add another layer of accountability that applies pressure on the educational system to become more innovative at improving student learning (Burke, 2011; “Kennewick School District: Case Study Final Report: A teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP) Case Study Prepared for the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.,” 2012; OSPI, 2013b).

**Changing Role of the Principal and Implications for Principal Professional Development**

As their role shifts from educational management to instructional leadership, principals will need professional development that instills not only new knowledge and skills but training on how to apply this learning to their school’s needs. This implies two levels of technical and contextual learning by principals. The literature suggests that collegial leadership, such as learning-focused leadership, provides leverage for principals to address the high demands of learning and leading in their role via the following methods: (a) communicating vision; (b) developing staff; and (c) creating collegial structures (Knapp et al., 2010). Finally, the literature recommends principals apply leadership for learning activities based upon their school’s needs (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Combining the literature recommendations with the impetus of the new Washington State TPEP evaluation
criteria renders evident the vital necessity of understanding principal professional development needs. For these reasons, this descriptive survey seeks to learn what elementary principals perceive as needed professional development changes in order to effectively implement the new evaluation criteria.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand the supports that elementary school principals suggest they need to effectively improve classroom instruction under the new teacher evaluation criteria in Washington State. This study presumed that supports (i.e., in the form of professional development) are required to assist principals in their personal learning as they strive to implement the new criteria. Understanding the supports needed by elementary principals in Washington State is of high importance to ensuring improved classroom instruction and effective implementation of the new teacher/principal evaluation criteria. For this reason my study sought to: a) determine what supports principals perceive they need in order to implement the new teacher and principal evaluation criteria; b) describe types (or categories) of supports elementary principals need; and c) compare preferences and responses between principal contexts. (Elfers, Plecki, Knapp, Boatright, & Loeb, 2004; Knapp, Elfers, & Plecki, 2004; Plecki et al., 2003).

Specifically, the literature identified principal context as an important factor in meeting demands within a school. Principal characteristics include: gender, career experience, and content background. Hallinger and Heck (2010) then identified school context as a significant factor principals learning. School context includes: school size, staffing support, student ethnicity, student socio-economic status, and reading performance.

This study addressed the following three questions, given that principals are expected to enact a new teacher and principal evaluation criteria: a) what do principals perceive they need in support of implementing the new teacher evaluation criteria; b) what types (or
categories) of supports do elementary principals need; and c) How do perceptions of principals in different contexts differ about needed supports?

Survey Design

This study solicited principals’ perceptions of their current leadership practices, current professional learning activities, and professional learning preferences in light of the new teacher/principal evaluation criteria using an online survey. The survey was administered to the members of the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP). The association granted access to a statewide listserv of more than 1,800 elementary school administrators. The survey was administered between March 18th, 2014 and April 4th, 2014.

The study was purely descriptive. Many educational problems are studied by using descriptive research methods and typically assess attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions and procedures only to measure what exists. Creswell (2008) defines descriptive research as a way to describe the current state of affairs at the time of the study.

Instrumentation.

The survey used in this study included 25 questions. The survey items were developed after an extensive review of the existing literature related to instructional leadership, principal supervision of instruction, principal acquisition of new evaluation methodologies, as well as research regarding effective forms of principal professional development. The completed survey instrument included six sections: a) principal context; b) school context; c) work conditions; d) learning focused leadership practices that the principal currently engages in; e) principal learning needs; and f) recommendations from field. There were no reliability tests conducted. The focus was on content validity and instrument approval by AWSP for endorsement.
Each of these sections is described in greater detail below:

- **Principal Characteristics (questions 2-6).** Principals were asked to categorize their content background experience and gender. Additional demographic information was solicited about their experience: a) years as administrator at current school; b) years as administrator total; and c) years in education total. Principals reported a numerical value for their number of years served in each category. Fractional responses were rounded down to the nearest whole number.

- **School Context (questions 7-12).** Principals were asked to identify the Educational Service District that they were associated. Also, principals were asked to categorize their schools: a) free/reduced lunch percentage; b) ethnic/racial diversity percentage; c) school size; and d) reading performance percentage. Each school category provided a list of options for the respondent to choose.

- **Working Conditions (questions 13-16).** Principals were asked to rank their school’s improvement priorities and identify if their school currently had an assistant principal, dean, secretary or administrative assistant. Finally, principals were asked if they had access to technology as it pertains to data-collection for teacher evaluation.

- **Current Leadership Practices (question 17).** Principals were asked to rate the frequency in which they currently engage in leadership activities. They scored each activity on a Likert scale from “Daily” (1), “Weekly” (2), “Monthly” (3), “Less than once a month” (4) to “Not-at-all” (5).
Principal Learning Needs (questions 18-22). Principals were asked to rate the frequency of their professional learning activities. They scored each activity on a Likert scale from “Daily” (1), “Weekly” (2), “Monthly” (3), “Less than once a month” (4) to “Not-at-all” (5). In order to describe the current professional learning, principals were asked to identify all or any of the formats that they had received information about the teacher/principal evaluation criteria. Next, principals were asked to rate their level of interest in professional learning topics from the teacher and principal evaluation criteria. A Likert scale was used for both criteria in which principals rated topics as: “Very Interested” (1), “Somewhat Interested” (2), “Slightly Interested” (3), and “Not Interested” (4). Finally, principals were asked to rate how well various learning formats supported their learning using a Likert scale: “Very well” (1), “Somewhat” (2), “Not well” (3), “Not at all” (4).

Barriers to teacher evaluation (questions 23-25). Principals were asked to prioritize the most significant barrier to evaluating teachers. This question provided nine options with the ability to add others. Next, principals were asked to describe how they have attempted to address the most significant barrier listed in the first question of this section. Finally, principals were asked to provide further recommendations about the kinds of support that they viewed helpful in the implementation of the teacher/principal evaluation criteria.

Survey development and piloting

The survey was developed using Dillman’s (2007) Tailor Design Methodology
(TDM). This approach focuses on the clarity of the survey and ease of completion as the primary driver of improved survey participation rates. The design process includes: a) aspects of the survey process that could affect either quality or quantity of the responses; and b) efforts to organize the survey effort to support completion of the survey instrument. More specifically, this study used the TDM to consider potential barriers to successful survey completion including survey readability, ease of access, trust, and length. Readability was improved through the piloting process. A web-based survey tool was used for the purpose of easy access. Trust was established through the partnership of AWSP and the researchers’ positioning as a practicing principal. The length of the survey was limited through a prioritization and item elimination consensus process.

**Validity and Reliability**

The survey instrument was piloted with students in the educational leadership program at Washington State University in order to improve instrument validity and face reliability. The students were provided with links to take the survey. The pilot participants were not practicing principals; however, all had completed a significant portion of a principal preparation program. The survey instrument was piloted electronically. The pilot included 25 participants. After taking the survey, the pilot participants were to rate the clarity of the questions as well as to make recommendations for improving the survey instrument. Participants recommended several changes to the pilot questions:

1. The ranking tool on the survey website provided drop-down menus for respondents to select the ranking score. Some web-browsers, however, required that the respondent drag and drop the answers in the desired order. Pilot participants recommended a technical prompt to assist with this
complication. The following was added to the item, “(1=High Priority to 7 = Low Priority) [Note: some browsers require drag and drop in order rather than drop down fields]”

2. The following question was clarified, “How and in what ways are you responding to the barrier you selected in the previous question?” Thirty percent of pilot participants rate this with low clarity. The question was modified to read, “How have you responded or attempted to respond to the barrier you selected in the previous question?”

3. Participants were asked, “What support would you most like to receive from your school district to support your efforts to evaluate classroom teachers?” Participants suggested rephrasing the question to determine a wide understanding of other needed supports. For this reason the question was changed to read, “Do you have any further recommendations about the kinds of support that would be helpful for you as the state continues to implement new teacher evaluation criteria?”

4. Pilot participants were asked, “What important questions were not asked?” Several questions were suggested: a) “What do other administrators (not in a building) need to know and be able to do when evaluating staff”; b) “How does this [teacher evaluation] relate to the work we are doing in the district”; c) “How can we tie what we are doing so we do not have so many seemingly different initiatives”; and d) “Something regarding the complexity of the scope of work in the principalship?” Input was considered and determined to
be outside the scope of this descriptive research and therefore not included.

However, the author has included recommendations for future possible
qualitative research.

Survey Participants

There are 1,897 public elementary school principals in the state of Washington that
serve pre-school through sixth grade. Approximately 96 percent of elementary school
principals are current members of the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)
("Association of Washington School Principals Website," 2014). Of the 1,897 elementary
school principals represented by the association, 354 principals representing 18.6 percent of
the association’s elementary school membership responded to the invitation to participate in
the survey. Out of the 354 responses received, 308 responses were deemed complete and thus
included in the analysis. Forty-six responses were partially completed and thus excluded
from the survey.

As Table 1 demonstrates, principal characteristics contained gender, experience level,
and content background. Principal experience was defined by years of administration
experience.

Principal experience was divided into three categories “Novice,” “Emerging,” and,
"Established." These categories were defined by the number of years served as an
administrator. “Novice” principals were defined as having no administrative experience and
up to two years of experience. “Emerging” principals served three to four years as an
administrator while “Established” principals had five or greater years of experience. The
majority of responding principals (n=227, 74.2%) were considered “Established” with 17%
(n=52) considered “Emerging” and 8.8% (n=27) considered “Novice.”
Overall, respondents had a total experience in the education field with 23.6 average years of experience with a standard deviation of 6.9 years. The average years of experience in administration was 11 years with a standard deviation of 6.9 years. The average experience at the current school was 5.4 years with a standard deviation of 4.4 years.

Within the “Novice” category the total average education career was 16.3 years with a standard deviation of .6 years. “Novice” principals also had an average administrative experience of 1.2 years with a standard deviation of .6 years. The average administrative experience in their current school was 1.1 years with a standard deviation of .5.

The “Emerging” category averaged 17.8 total career years with .5 years standard deviation. “Emerging” principles had an average administrative experience of 3.4 years with .5 standard deviation. The average years of experience “Emerging” principles had in the current school was 2.7 years with a standard deviation of one year.

The principals categorized as “Established” had an average career in education of 24.9 years with 6.2 years standard deviation. “Established” principles averaged 12.7 years of administration experience with 6.2 years standard deviation. The average “Established” principal has 6.1 years administrative experience in the current school with 4.4 standard deviation.

Content background was defined by the area of expertise an administrator had when they taught. The “Content” category contained the following certification areas: Elementary General, Literacy/Reading, Math, Science, and Special Education. Art, Music, Theater, Physical Education, Counseling, Technology, and Library Arts were all categorized as “Specialist.” Any principal without certification from any previously listed was categorized as “Non Content.”
School contexts contained: the percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced lunch; the percentage of ethnically/racially diverse students; the school size; and, the percentage of students meeting state reading standards. School with 0 to 500 students were categorized as a “Small School” while schools with 500 or greater students were categorized as a “Large School.”

Table 2

General Principal Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Category</th>
<th>Total % (N)</th>
<th>Male % (n)</th>
<th>Female % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>8.9 (27)</td>
<td>2.0 (6)</td>
<td>6.9 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>7.9 (24)</td>
<td>1.7 (5)</td>
<td>6.3 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>83.2 (252)</td>
<td>34.3 (104)</td>
<td>48.8 (148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Content Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>92.1 (279)</td>
<td>34.3 (104)</td>
<td>57.8 (175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>7.6 (23)</td>
<td>3.6 (11)</td>
<td>4.0 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Content</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 ()</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>21.8 (66)</td>
<td>8.9 (27)</td>
<td>12.9 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>31.0 (94)</td>
<td>13.2 (40)</td>
<td>17.8 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>21.8 (66)</td>
<td>8.3 (25)</td>
<td>13.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-90%</td>
<td>19.8 (60)</td>
<td>6.3 (19)</td>
<td>13.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100%</td>
<td>5.6 (17)</td>
<td>1.3 (4)</td>
<td>4.3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Ethnic/Racial Student Population Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9%</td>
<td>11.2 (34)</td>
<td>4.6 (14)</td>
<td>6.6 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-29%</td>
<td>34.0 (103)</td>
<td>13.9 (42)</td>
<td>20.1 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49%</td>
<td>25.1 (76)</td>
<td>8.6 (26)</td>
<td>16.5 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69%</td>
<td>16.5 (50)</td>
<td>7.9 (24)</td>
<td>8.6 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-100%</td>
<td>13.2 (40)</td>
<td>3.0 (9)</td>
<td>10.2 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small School</td>
<td>54.5 (165)</td>
<td>23.1 (70)</td>
<td>31.4 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large School</td>
<td>45.5 (138)</td>
<td>14.9 (45)</td>
<td>30.7 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Reading Met Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>2.0 (6)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>1.7 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>10.9 (33)</td>
<td>2.6 (8)</td>
<td>8.3 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>33.0 (100)</td>
<td>13.5 (41)</td>
<td>19.5 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-90%</td>
<td>46.2 (140)</td>
<td>18.5 (56)</td>
<td>27.7 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100%</td>
<td>5.0 (15)</td>
<td>2.6 (8)</td>
<td>2.3 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 compares the ratio of surveyed principals to the overall state ratio population. The most recent statistics on the state-wide principal population were used as comparison of representation. Fewer male principals (38%) responded than in the general population (42.5%) while more female principals (62%) responded than in the general population.
(57.5%). A larger ratio of “Novice” and “Emerging” principals (16.8%) were represented in the survey population than found in the general population (3.6%). “Established” principals (84.2%) were a smaller proportion of the surveyed population than found in the general population (99.6%).

Table 3

Surveyed to Population Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>2013-14 Surveyed % (n)</th>
<th>2012-13 Population % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.0 (115)</td>
<td>42.5 (473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.0 (188)</td>
<td>57.5 (639)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice/Emerging</td>
<td>16.8 (51)</td>
<td>3.6 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>84.2 (255)</td>
<td>99.6 (1108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed</td>
<td>100.0 (303)</td>
<td>100.0 (1112)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant Recruitment. Recruitment for the survey was accomplished with the assistance of the Association of Washington School Principals. The association distributed information about the survey using the statewide listserv. Information regarding the survey appeared in the AWSP Newsletter (Appendix B); an email invitation sent to all association members (Appendix C); as well as email announcements sent in cooperation with the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) and Educational Service Districts (ESD). A reminder notice was sent weekly by AWSP to participants who had not responded to previous survey invitations (Appendix C). The final week of the survey, follow-up phone calls were made to nine ESDs to request reminders be sent to districts within their boundaries.

Data Analysis.

Descriptive statistics were used as the primary analytic strategy. Before analysis began, responses were analyzed for completion. Frequencies and ranges were calculated for
each survey item using Microsoft Excel to identify incomplete responses as well as responses that were outside the anticipated response range. Pairwise deletion was used for any incomplete or out of range responses. The resulting dataset included 308 school principals.

Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were calculated for each survey item. Cross-tabulations including variables such as gender, years of experience, and school poverty level were also calculated and used to disaggregate survey responses. The cross-tabulations allowed for each survey item to be compared and for analytic questions (i.e., how do principal professional development needs differ by school context?).

Limitations

The study faced three significant limitations. First, the study was primarily descriptive and designed to provide baseline information about principal’s current professional development needs and leadership practices given the implementation of the state’s new teacher evaluation criteria. While descriptive studies provide important information for practitioners and scholars, the absence of inferential statistics makes developing statistical arguments about the effect of the principal’s leadership context on their responses impossible.

Second, given the descriptive nature of the study as well as the nature of the sample, generalizations beyond the state in which the survey was conducted cannot be made. As such, the results should be viewed as a descriptive study of Washington state elementary school principals, which may not be representative of other types of principals in the state (i.e., middle or high school principals) as well as principals in other state settings.

Third, the sample used to complete this analysis represents members of the state’s principals’ association. Many of the association’s members have been active in shaping the
implementation of the teacher evaluation policy as well as advocating for additional resources that support the successful implementation of the new evaluation criteria. Thus, the sample is hardly unbiased and their responses regarding additional resources as well as additional supports should be viewed within the context of their role as association members and advocates for principals. While this limitation should not temper the findings of this study related to the need for additional support, it is worth noting that principals who are members of the association have routinely heard that additional resources are needed to effectively implement the evaluation criteria.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to describe Washington elementary principal perceptions about the supports needed to implement the teacher evaluation criteria. For the purpose of this study, supports refer to professional development format and content. There are three research questions the study sought to address:

a) What do principals perceive they need in support of implementing the new teacher evaluation criteria?

b) What types (or categories) of supports do elementary principals need?

c) How do perceptions of principals in different contexts differ about needed supports?

To answer these questions, an online survey instrument was developed (see appendix E), based on principal professional development and role theory literature. The survey tool consisted of 25 questions that asked principals to provide information about their (a) background characteristics; (b) school context; (c) work environment; (d) leadership behaviors; (e) professional learning needs; (f) recently encountered barriers associated with evaluating classroom teachers. Principals were also asked to provide their recommendations for future professional development and improved support. Given the descriptive nature of the study, frequencies and percentages were calculated. A difference of five percent on any survey item was considered a significant difference.

Long-term Professional Development Plan Needed

With 74% of the Washington elementary principal population averaging nearly 25 years of experience, continual professional development may be needed in order to ensure a complete organizational transition to the new evaluation processes. This will help replace
“old” habits with current practice expectations. Also, many existing principals may retire in the next five to ten years. Principal certification programs will need to adapt their curriculum to incorporate the new evaluation criteria quickly in order to meet the market demands for prepared principals. With a potential for a large population of “novice” principals joining the workforce in the next five to ten years, districts, professional organizations, and universities should begin preparing professional learning supports now. Because all principals currently employed are learning the evaluation criteria together, responses suggest that many learning needs are similar regardless of principal characteristics or school context. As time progresses, this will not be the case for new principals joining the workforce who may need explicit skill training, while experienced principals may need training at a more complex level for leveraging school improvement.

Because “established” principals hold no greater knowledge, skill, or experience regarding teacher evaluation, “novice” and “emerging” principals may not encounter the support they have had in the past. Specifically, many districts have relied on “established” principals to instruct the less experienced principals (via mentoring) and thus may find the need for a new instruction format. This survey demonstrates a low rate of mentorship and coaching being enacted. When mentoring is occurring, younger principals expressed frustration with their mentors’ incomplete understanding of the new paradigm of instructional leadership. Districts will need to account for this and consciously plan for a variety of professional development formats that include technical skills and knowledge aligned with the teacher and principal evaluation criteria. In addition, principals will need learning formats that allow them to contextualize and strategize how to best serve their specific school’s needs. The conscious efforts by districts, professional organizations, and university programs to
provide a multi-layered approach to learning will help successfully transition new principals into the workforce for years to come.

**School Improvement Initiatives Suggest Low Leverage Priorities**

School improvement strategies are often a catalyst for improved student learning and are commonly found across Washington schools. Principals were asked to rank initiative priorities from 1 to 7. Responses scored as 1 or 2 were categorized as “high priority” while those scored at 3, 4 or 5 were categorized as “moderate priority.” Initiatives scored at a 6 or 7 were categorized as “low priority.”

Survey responses strongly identified literacy improvement as a top priority, with 64.8% principals ranking it in the top two (see Table 4). Math improvement was ranked “high priority” by 59.5% of principals. Principals placed all other improvement initiatives at a significantly lower priority level. The third ranked initiative, improving data use and data-driven decision-making, was ranked a “high priority” by 28.9% of principals. Improving assessment practices was ranked as a “moderate priority” by 63% of principals. Improving school climate had 40.8% principals rank it as “moderate priority” and 47% rank it as “low priority.” The lowest ranked initiative, by 63.2% of principals, was improving parent and community involvement. Improving school climate, assessment practices, and community involvement were all identified by Hallinger & Murphy (1985) as essential to building sustained and consistent improvements over time. Responses by principals in this survey may suggest that leveraging long-term improvement is not a priority.
### 2013-2014 School Improvement Priorities

Please rank the following improvement priorities for your school for the current school year?
(1 = High Priority to 7 = Low Priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>High % (n)</th>
<th>Moderate % (n)</th>
<th>Low % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving literacy instruction (ELA, Reading, writing)</td>
<td>64.8 (197)</td>
<td>30.9 (94)</td>
<td>4.3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving math instruction</td>
<td>59.5 (181)</td>
<td>33.6 (102)</td>
<td>6.9 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving data use and data-driven decision-making</td>
<td>28.9 (88)</td>
<td>52.6 (160)</td>
<td>18.4 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving processes and structures (Response to Intervention, PLC, etc.)</td>
<td>16.8 (51)</td>
<td>47.4 (144)</td>
<td>35.9 (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving assessment practices</td>
<td>12.9 (39)</td>
<td>63.0 (191)</td>
<td>24.1 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving school climate (i.e., student behaviors or teacher working conditions)</td>
<td>12.2 (37)</td>
<td>40.8 (124)</td>
<td>47.0 (143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving parent and community involvement</td>
<td>4.9 (15)</td>
<td>31.9 (97)</td>
<td>63.2 (192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this study, ethnic or racial diversity was defined as any category other than Caucasian/White. Differences were noted between principals of schools with varied percentages of ethnically/racially diverse populations. For example, more principals (12.2%) from high ethnically/racially diverse (70-100%) schools prioritized parent and community involvement with “high priority” than principals from schools with lower percentages of ethnically/racially diverse populations. Inversely, more principals from schools with low ethnically/racially diverse populations ranked math and literacy improvements “high priority.” More principals from high ethnically/racially diverse (70-100%) schools ranked improving school climate higher than other schools with low ethnically/racially diverse populations. As Table 5 demonstrates, these survey results could suggest that school context affects improvement priorities.
### Table 5

**School Improvement Priority Comparison by School Ethnic/Racial Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>0-9% Diversity % (n)</th>
<th>10-29% Diversity % (n)</th>
<th>30-49% Diversity % (n)</th>
<th>50-69% Diversity % (n)</th>
<th>70-100% Diversity % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving literacy instruction (ELA, Reading, writing)</td>
<td>76.5 (26)</td>
<td>62.5 (65)</td>
<td>61.0 (47)</td>
<td>68.0 (34)</td>
<td>61.0 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving math instruction</td>
<td>64.7 (22)</td>
<td>62.5 (65)</td>
<td>55.8 (43)</td>
<td>58.0 (29)</td>
<td>56.1 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving data use and data-driven decision-making</td>
<td>20.6 (7)</td>
<td>27.9 (29)</td>
<td>31.2 (24)</td>
<td>36.0 (18)</td>
<td>24.39 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving processes and structures (Response to Intervention, PLC, etc.)</td>
<td>17.7 (6)</td>
<td>14.4 (15)</td>
<td>20.8 (16)</td>
<td>18.0 (9)</td>
<td>12.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving school climate (i.e., student behaviors or teacher working conditions)</td>
<td>8.8 (3)</td>
<td>9.6 (10)</td>
<td>15.6 (12)</td>
<td>8.0 (4)</td>
<td>19.5 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving assessment practices</td>
<td>5.9 (2)</td>
<td>19.2 (20)</td>
<td>11.7 (9)</td>
<td>6.0 (3)</td>
<td>14.6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving parent and community involvement</td>
<td>5.9 (2)</td>
<td>3.9 (4)</td>
<td>3.9 (3)</td>
<td>2.0 (1)</td>
<td>12.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improving Instruction is the Primary Focus of Principals

Principals were asked to rate the frequency with which they had engaged in leadership activities over the past three months. An overwhelming majority of elementary principals (97%) reported that they had observed classroom instruction on a daily/weekly basis. Further, 95% of principals indicated that they had also spent considerable time informally talking with classroom teachers about their instruction on a daily/weekly basis. Principals also appeared to invest considerable energy providing feedback to classroom teachers about their instruction. Ninety percent of surveyed respondents indicated that they provided formal feedback on a daily/weekly basis.

Principals indicated spending less time on non-instructional activities and engaging in them less frequently. For example, 68% of principals reported that they engaged in curriculum development monthly or not at all. Principals were also prioritizing classroom instruction over team development. Nearly a third (32.4%) of principals were working with...
teams to develop consensus on a monthly basis and 69.6% of principals were addressing team expectations on a monthly basis or not at all. Nearly half of principals (50.9%) were advocating for school initiatives with the public on a daily, weekly or monthly basis. Clearly, as Figure 1 demonstrates, principals have prioritized classroom instruction.

With a significant amount of time being committed to the evaluation of classroom instruction, principal responses to this question suggest other valuable leadership activities may be minimized or even abandoned. For example, one principal stated in an open ended response, “I believe in the new evaluation system and how it can benefit my teachers; however, I find that I do not do as good a job as I can when time is at a minimum to get the job done.” This provides insight into the fact that classroom evaluation is taking up a large quantity of time yet not facilitating a quality experience from which teachers gain insight. While activities like classroom observation and teacher dialogue develop teacher capacity, other activities like curriculum development help to set high standards systems that sustain...
improvement. If such activities go ignored, the sustainability and the quality of improvement efforts may be diminished.

**Instructional Leadership by School Achievement Levels**

The survey data suggests that fewer principals leading low-performing schools are consistently engaged in instructional leadership activities. Only 16.7% of principals leading low-performing schools engaged in advocacy for their building on a daily/weekly basis, while principals leading higher-performing schools were more engaged. Similarly, fewer principals from low-performing schools reported engaging in advocacy for their building to the district office (16.7%), serving on district committees (33.3%), and aligning curriculum (16.7%). Figure 2 illustrates the percentage of principals who had engaged in leadership activities over the previous three months on a daily/weekly basis. Principals are categorized by the percentage of students meeting state reading standards. These findings suggest that principal context impacts their decisions to engage in certain leadership activities. In turn, the long-term support for improvement efforts may be adversely affected.
Compliance Rather Than Growth

Principals expressed a high level of effort to comply with the evaluation process rather than facilitating authentic teacher growth. For many principals, the new evaluation criteria felt more like a “hoop” to jump through rather than a process that genuinely supported teachers’ professional development. Based upon survey responses, principal instructional leadership behaviors demonstrated high compliance through the reallocation of their time. As one principal stated in an open ended survey response:
Comprehensive evaluations are packed with too much stuff to get through during a normal observation cycle. There just isn’t enough time in the day to have the discussions we need to fully engage with staff on comprehensive evaluation and still have a good conversation about teacher practice. We are currently so focused on getting all the rubrics highlighted and criteria coded that we end up not talking much about the lesson itself.

When principals were asked to identify the most significant barrier to the evaluation of teachers, they responded with “too much time required for each evaluation,” “too many steps in the process,” and “too many teachers to evaluate.” These barriers, in turn, impede the intent of the new evaluation criteria to create a growth model encouraging authentic discussion around professional expectations to correct poor practice. As seen in Table 6, the most significant barrier identified by 47.6% principals was the amount of time required to conduct evaluations. Understanding that the quantity of teachers and the number of steps to the process also increase the time needed to complete teacher evaluation, the sum of these barriers indicates that 86.2% of all responding principals find the time required to conduct the new evaluation criteria to be the most significant barrier to teacher evaluation.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Barriers to Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>% (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much time required to conduct evaluations</td>
<td>47.6 (138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many teachers to evaluate</td>
<td>26.9 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many steps in the evaluation process</td>
<td>11.7 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from assistant or vice principal</td>
<td>8.3 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited technology to support data collection</td>
<td>3.1 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about evaluation practices</td>
<td>1.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from the central office or district (e.g., Human Resources)</td>
<td>0.7 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited understanding of the evaluation models (e.g., Danielson, Marzano, CEL5D+)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from secretary or administrative assistant</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking deeper into the problem of limited time, several themes emerged. One principal stated:

The current system is so complex that giving teachers specific, focused feedback is often lost. It takes so much time that principals are unable to give brief feedback; too much time is taken by writing [rather than dialogue with the teacher].

Besides the complexity of the process, principals also commented on the complexity of implementing the instructional framework to fit their context. One principal stated:

I think there needs to be work around teachers that are in unique classrooms. I am spending a lot of time trying to make sense of the 5D framework in terms of my teacher that is in a self-contained classroom where the students are non-verbal and are working on functional life skills.

There also appear to be inconsistent supports in place depending upon the instructional framework selected by the district. Many reported frustration with the web observation tool eVAL: “I have spent hours trying to figure it out and I am still struggling.” Others stated a need for examples and modeling of the process using their specific framework. Some principals voiced concern over district-specific forms: “I don’t believe that our school district has adopted the right forms to support teacher growth in a meaningful way.” One principal did express gratitude for the resources afforded him:

Having electronic tools has been very helpful (observation from Marzano). Having professionally trained Marzano personnel train us. Having quality Marzano resources. Having our admin evaluation match Marzano has made alignment nice.
Having multiple instructional frameworks within the state has also caused a barrier for principal networking and dialogue. One principal stated:

It would have been nice to have one evaluation [instructional framework] to use instead of three different ones. It’s hard to discuss TPEP with other districts that aren’t using the one we are using.

At the district level of implementation, there appears to be situation in which negotiated processes also impede the effectiveness of the evaluation criteria. One principal stated:

The vagueness, which is left on purpose by the legislators in the interpretation of the language, is making individual districts walk a fine line with their unions. With it [TPEP] being a growth model, it will be very difficult to get ineffective teachers out of the profession.

As seen in the previous statements, evidence from this survey suggests that the complexity, inconsistent supports, and vague negotiated processes contribute to the struggle principals are experiencing in order to comply with the new evaluation criteria. One principal asked, “How can we make TPEP evaluation system work…for continual growth of all certificated staff…when we are bogged down with data collection and documentation?” Principals continually voice their understanding of the purpose of the new evaluation system but remain caught up in efforts to comply rather than facilitate growth.

**Socialization, a significant factor in current TPEP learning.**

Principals were asked to select all professional development formats in which they received training for the TPEP. As Table 7 illustrates, the majority of responding principals (83%) received training through an Educational Service District (ESD) or school district
workshop. This response was not unexpected, given the fact that state support for principal professional development related to the new evaluation criteria has largely been directed toward the ESDs and not other forms. Further, it is particularly striking that most principals participated in professional development that has not been shown to improve administrator efficacy. Most of the professional development has involved “sit and get” workshops and other modalities that have been shown to provide limited impact on administrator learning (Joyce & Showers, 1985). Indeed, other forms of professional development that have been shown to be more beneficial (i.e., mentoring or coaching) appear to be the least used form of professional development (Grissom & Harrington, 2010). As one principal explained, “The training is okay, but even the ESD personnel are not fully aware of new developments or [apprised of] clarifications to provide us.” As this statement demonstrates, the workshop format may have been efficient but not effective.

Networking (talking with other principals who have solved a similar issue) was the second most used format for TPEP training, employed by 58.8% of principals. Networking occurred at the district, regional, and state levels. One principal stated, “We had weekly meetings [at the district office] where we could talk with other principals about evaluation.” In rural communities, networking occurred between districts as mentioned by one principal: “I calibrated with another principal in a neighboring district.” Other principals mentioned that they contacted colleagues after participating in a conference that allowed them to network with other principal colleagues.

Independent reading and web resources were closely ranked, with 45.8% and 42.5% of principals using these formats. In both cases, the “novice” principals used these formats least and the “emerging” principal used them the most. As an example of web resource use, a
principal stated that she had completed 30 hours of Teachscape. Independent reading was mentioned in conjunction with district work. “We completed a Danielson book study last year as a district team and continued it in our buildings this year.” While independent reading and web resources were easily accessible by principals, the low number of principals engaging in these formats may suggest that working in isolation was not desired.

Fewer principals engaged in the remaining formats. As an example, Professional Learning Communities were ranked fifth, with 37.3% of principals engaging in this format. Mentoring was ranked sixth, with 30.4% of principals engaging. One “novice” principal who had engaged in mentoring cautioned, “Old school manager-principals do not understand instructional framework basics.” This implies that “established” principals are being put into roles in which they may not be as effective. Two principals did not respond to this question.

While the formal structure for TPEP training is clearly the regional workshop format, over half (58.8%) of principals sought out networking opportunities. One “established” principal stated, “I like attending sessions where administrators that have lived TPEP and have a good understanding can simply talk with me. I am better able to process ideas into my own situation.”
Table 7

2013-2014 Received Professional Development

In what form has the majority of professional development related to the state's new teacher and principal evaluation criteria been presented to you? (Select any that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop provided by ESD or School District</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with other principals</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Reading</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Resources</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring (learning from a supervisor or other district administrator)</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference or Seminar</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach (learning from a person outside of district)</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Program</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 306

Preferred Learning Formats

The survey asked principals to identify their preferred professional development format. Not surprisingly, the survey reveals that principals were not satisfied with the support that they were currently receiving and thus felt other supports would be more beneficial. As an example, more than half of principals (54.3%) indicated that they preferred workshops, while 63% of principals ranked informal networking as the best professional development strategy. Professional learning communities were the second highest preferred learning format, with 61.4% of principals scoring them as high preference (see Table 8). Other types of professional development were viewed with considerably less favor. For example, principals tended not to view professional development conferences (40.4%), university seminars (18.7%), and web resources (14.6%) as their preferred professional development strategy. Independent reading was ranked even lower, with less than one eighth (11.8%) of principals indicating preference.
Table 8

**Preferred Learning Formats**

How well would the following types of professional development support your growth as a leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Very well % (n)</th>
<th>Somewhat % (n)</th>
<th>Not well % (n)</th>
<th>Not at all % (n)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal networking with other principals that may have solved the same issue.</td>
<td>63 (191)</td>
<td>31.4 (95)</td>
<td>5.6 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
<td>61.4 (188)</td>
<td>30.7 (94)</td>
<td>7.5 (23)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop (District/ESD/Private)</td>
<td>54.3 (165)</td>
<td>41.1 (125)</td>
<td>4.3 (13)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association conference or meeting</td>
<td>40.4 (124)</td>
<td>46.6 (143)</td>
<td>11.1 (34)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University seminar or conference</td>
<td>18.7 (56)</td>
<td>47.7 (143)</td>
<td>27.7 (83)</td>
<td>6 (18)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web resources (e.g., blogs, websites, webinars, etc.)</td>
<td>14.6 (44)</td>
<td>56 (169)</td>
<td>25.2 (76)</td>
<td>4.3 (13)</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reading</td>
<td>13.8 (42)</td>
<td>56.1 (171)</td>
<td>25.6 (78)</td>
<td>4.6 (14)</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Development Preferences by Career Phase**

Understanding that the teacher and principal evaluation criteria are creating a new baseline of knowledge and skill, principals at different phases of their career responded similarly about their preferred learning formats (see Figure 2). Small differences were noted; however, these findings reinforced the unified desire of principals to learn socially and within the context of their school. What cannot be generalized is the reasoning behind their selections. For example one “novice” principal stated, “I struggle with student growth goals. I’ve had limited training on this expectation and if it’s not clear to me I can’t make it clear to others.” This “novice” principal was looking for explicit training on teacher evaluation, whereas one “established” principal stated, “We need time to talk amongst ourselves so that evaluation looks similar.” Other “established” principals echoed similar sentiments of the desire to engage in interactive dialogue to problem solve their specific issues.
Overall, less than half of responding elementary principals engaged in daily/weekly professional learning activities (see Table 9). When they did engage, 43% of principals participated in informal discussions with peers about instruction. Mentoring other principals was second, with 22% of principals engaging on a daily/weekly basis. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) were the third most engaged-in learning activity, used by 19% of principals. The remaining learning activities were infrequently engaged. The least engaged learning activity was receiving coaching (3%) from a non-evaluative person outside of the district.
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily/Weekly Learning Activities</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal talk with peers</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Others</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Workshop</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Mentorship</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observation with another administrator</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Coaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences were observed when comparing principals of various experience. Figure 3 displays the difference in professional learning by principal experience. More “novice” principals (51.9%) engaged with informal talk about instruction than either “emerging” (44.2%) or “established” (41.9%) principals. More “novice” principals (25.9%) engaged in daily/weekly PLCs than either “emerging” (11.5%) or “established” (19.4%) principals. More “established” principals (24.2%) mentored others than either “emerging” (21.2%) or “novice” (7.4%) principals. Inversely, 29.6% of “novice”, 13.5% of “emerging,” and 5.7% of “established” principals received mentorship on a daily or weekly basis.

With survey data showing few principals engaging in learning activities, the literature would suggest that our principals might be at risk of isolation and the development of inconsistent practices. Specifically, observing instruction with a peer is significantly absent from current learning practice. Developing a common understanding of quality instruction and how it translates to the teacher evaluation criteria is an essential part of implementing the new evaluation criteria. Without a common understanding, there is a high risk of inconsistent teacher ratings between principals or low inter-rater reliability.
Preferred Evaluation Focus Topics

Teacher Evaluation Focus Topics

Given the pressure placed on principals by the new teacher evaluation criteria to improve classroom instruction, nearly two-thirds (65.8%) of principals indicated that they were very interested in learning about instructional strategies to increase student engagement and independence. Similarly, principals also expressed interest in learning how to write student growth goals with teachers – the second ranked topic of interest with 60.6% of principals responding “very interested” (see Table 10). A majority of principals (52.8%) had high interest in conferencing strategies with teachers. Other topics showed lower interest. For example, 49% showed high interest in the topic of development of assessments for student learning. High interest in pedagogy of student math development was shown by
42.2%, followed by 36.4% in pedagogy of student literacy development. Approximately a third of principals showed high interest in strategies for creating classrooms of equity (36.1%), and writing lesson goals, targets and objectives (32.6%). The lowest ranked topic, at 18.4%, was collaboration with parents and community.

Table 10

**Teacher Evaluation Priority Topics**

Given the new teacher evaluation criteria, how much do the following professional development topics interest you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Very Interested % (n)</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested % (n)</th>
<th>Slightly Interested % (n)</th>
<th>Not Interested % (n)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies to increase student engagement and independence.</td>
<td>65.8 (202)</td>
<td>26.4 (81)</td>
<td>6.5 (20)</td>
<td>1.3 (4)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing student growth goals with teachers.</td>
<td>60.6 (186)</td>
<td>29 (89)</td>
<td>9.4 (29)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing strategies with teachers.</td>
<td>52.8 (162)</td>
<td>31.6 (97)</td>
<td>13.4 (41)</td>
<td>2.3 (7)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of assessments for student learning.</td>
<td>49 (150)</td>
<td>36.6 (112)</td>
<td>11.1 (34)</td>
<td>3.3 (10)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of student math development.</td>
<td>42.2 (130)</td>
<td>43.2 (133)</td>
<td>11.4 (35)</td>
<td>3.2 (10)</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of student literacy development.</td>
<td>36.4 (112)</td>
<td>44.8 (138)</td>
<td>14.3 (44)</td>
<td>4.5 (14)</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for creating classrooms of equity.</td>
<td>36.1 (110)</td>
<td>39 (119)</td>
<td>21.6 (66)</td>
<td>3.3 (10)</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing lesson goals, targets and objectives.</td>
<td>32.6 (99)</td>
<td>38.5 (117)</td>
<td>22.7 (69)</td>
<td>6.3 (19)</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with parents and Community.</td>
<td>18.4 (56)</td>
<td>37.8 (115)</td>
<td>35.9 (109)</td>
<td>7.9 (24)</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferred Principal Evaluation Focus Topics**

When asked about preferred learning topics as they pertain to principal evaluation, over three-fourths (78.4%) of principals demonstrated high interest in the topic of improving instruction (see Table 11). The second highest rated topic was strategies for closing the achievement gap, with 70.8% of principals rating it “very” interesting. The remaining topics were scored with considerably less interest. For example, the third ranked topic, curriculum development or alignment to Common Core State Standards, received 61.4% “very interested” scores; planning with data had a 60.3% rate of high interest; and developing a collaborative
school culture was rated high interest by 42.5% of principals. The fewest principals (18.6%) rated community involvement as a high interest topic. These data may suggest that principals are prioritizing learning topics that will, by their perception, achieve immediate improved student learning, rather than efforts to sustain improvement over the long term.

Table 11

Principal Evaluation Priority Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given the new principal evaluation criteria, how much do the following professional development topics interest you?</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Slightly Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving instruction.</td>
<td>78.4 (239)</td>
<td>19.3 (59)</td>
<td>1.6 (5)</td>
<td>0.7 (2)</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for closing the achievement gap</td>
<td>70.8 (218)</td>
<td>23.7 (73)</td>
<td>5.2 (16)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development or alignment to Common Core State Standards</td>
<td>61.4 (188)</td>
<td>30.7 (94)</td>
<td>5.9 (18)</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning with Data</td>
<td>60.3 (185)</td>
<td>30 (92)</td>
<td>8.5 (26)</td>
<td>1.3 (4)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a collaborative school culture</td>
<td>42.5 (131)</td>
<td>38 (117)</td>
<td>16.2 (50)</td>
<td>3.2 (10)</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management to support improved student learning</td>
<td>34.2 (105)</td>
<td>42 (129)</td>
<td>21.2 (65)</td>
<td>2.6 (8)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of teams</td>
<td>28.8 (88)</td>
<td>43.1 (132)</td>
<td>25.5 (78)</td>
<td>2.6 (8)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a safe learning environment</td>
<td>26.5 (81)</td>
<td>45.1 (138)</td>
<td>23.2 (71)</td>
<td>5.2 (16)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>18.6 (57)</td>
<td>46.4 (142)</td>
<td>30.4 (93)</td>
<td>4.6 (14)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived Barriers to Teacher Evaluation

Principals were asked to identify the “most significant barrier faced when attempting to evaluate classroom teachers” (see Figure 12). Totals for each barrier receiving a vote were calculated and placed in rank order to compare the perceived significance. The “evaluation process” was overwhelmingly listed as the most significant barrier to teacher evaluation by 86.2% of principals. Approximately one-half (47.4%) of all respondents identified the most significant barrier to be, “too much time required to conduct evaluations.” The second highest barrier was “too many teachers to evaluate” with 78 (27%) principals categorizing it as the most significant barrier. One principal described the impact of the evaluation process:
The time commitment to thoughtfully and intentionally engage with teachers throughout the entire process including: two formal observations, data collection, evaluation of student growth goals, and the final evaluation process is a huge challenge. This in consideration of the number of teachers on board and the fact we still evaluate other staff – both certificated and classified who are not on TPEP…not to mention the fact we, ourselves, must engage with our own supervisors for our own evaluation!

“Logistical Support” was the second most popular barrier, rated by 12.4% of principals. Twenty-four (8.3%) principals identified “no support from assistant or vice principal” as the most significant barrier. Nine (3.1%) principals identified “limited technology to support data collection” as the most significant barrier, while “no support from secretary or administrative assistant” received one vote and “no support from the central office or district…” received two. One principal shared their perception of barriers stemming from district office:

I believe that the district office has no real knowledge of the time it takes to roll out this new [evaluation] process, and what it is going to like for principals in order to sustain it. When 100% of teachers in the building are on TPEP, it will be simply overwhelming.

Another principal expressed the need for districts to clarify the process and provide technological support:

The new process is not clearly outlined/uniform in our district and the use of the eVAL computer program has so many steps that it’s confusing and cumbersome for staff and administration to use.
“Principal Learning” only accounted for 1.3% of votes as the most significant barrier. Three principals identified “lack of information about evaluation practices” and one principal voted for “limited understanding of the evaluation models.” Representation of this category may be small, but one principal illuminated the significance: “Training has been ‘just in time,’ with not enough information to plan ahead.” While there are individual principals needing more training, the low ranking of principal learning could imply that only basic knowledge about the new teacher/principal evaluation criteria has been imparted to most principals.

**Structural Supports**

Principals were asked to identify any additional barriers that may have impeded their ability to effectively evaluate teachers. The majority of respondents to this question were “established” (90%) principals, with only 6.7% “novice” and 3.3% “emerging” principals. Technology integration was named by 1.1% of respondents. One principal stated, “This is so different from what we have done in the past and requires so much more time, technical skill, and evidence….” As referenced here, technology is now used in the evidence collecting and feedback process. One cannot happen without the other. Another principal referenced principal evaluation (1.1%) as another barrier. “It’s tough to think about putting my own evidence together at the same time I am trying to get teacher evaluations completed.” Other principals commented about the lack of tools (2.2%), such as data collection forms or exemplar evaluation collection strategies. A few described the limited time to build relationships (2.2%) with teachers because of the evaluation process as a barrier. One principal shared:
New teachers are the least prepared for this new process. They have to survive their first year, and on top of that they have to navigate this new process. It can be overwhelming for them…. [The administrator] has to spend even more time with them because they’re still figuring things out.

Learning (3.3%) was discussed at the principal and the teacher level. One principal stated, “Principals need training on the whole feedback cycle, and teachers need training on what data to use and how to import data into their evaluation for principals to consider.” Technology function (4.4%) generally referred to a poor experience with the eVAL user interface and mobility. Some respondents shared how the depth of work (4.4%) impacted the time required for evaluation. “There’s a real need of quality time for instructional leadership while not abandoning the needs of kids, families, and school safety/culture.” Bargaining issues (7.8%) generally referred to negotiated processes that were too vague. Attempts by some principals to ensure a quality evaluation experience (8.9%) impacted the amount of time needed to talk with the teacher. Clarity of district process (10%) was mentioned by a principal: “I would like clarity on how to assess student growth. Words like ‘most’ or ‘nearly all’ make ‘adequate’ growth are hard to quantify, and that leads to stress for teachers.” Finally, several principals mentioned the competition between management and instructional leadership (12.2%). One principal stated:

If the legislature really wants us to spend the time to do this right, we really do need more support in the form of additional personnel to handle the day-to-day tasks that we were already doing.

A majority of these responses suggest structural supports that principals need from districts in order to implement teacher evaluation. For example, districts define expectations
for principal priorities and responsibilities. These expectations have been broad and encompassed every aspect of building management and instructional leadership. While instructional leadership has traditionally been strongly encouraged, many managerial tasks are prioritized by the simple fact that a principal can be dismissed if he/she does not manage fiscal responsibilities, safety, school climate, daily operations, or evaluations effectively.

Traditionally, instructional leadership fell to the “nice if you can get to it” category. Now that the quality of teacher evaluation and principal leadership are being emphasized by the new evaluation criteria, principals do not have the ability to remove tasks in order to accomplish instructional leadership responsibilities. For these reasons, it is important that districts work with principals to clarify negotiated processes and depth of work, streamline evaluation forms (tools), and work to integrate technology so that principals can better use their time. Structural supports from districts will help to ensure that the work is manageable.

Table 12

**Barriers to Teacher Evaluation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much time required to conduct evaluations</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many teachers to evaluate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many steps in the evaluation process</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logistic Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from assistant or vice principal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited technology to support data collection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from secretary or administrative assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from the central office or district (e.g., Human Resources)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about evaluation practices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited understanding of the evaluation models (e.g., Danielson, Marzano, CEL5D+)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact of New Evaluation Criteria on Principal Leadership**
Principals were asked how the new evaluation criteria had impacted their leadership. These responses were categorized and the total responses were summarized into 15 individual themes. As Table 13 illustrates, 84 of responding principals (23.4%) stated that they have made efforts to better schedule and manage their time. Fifty-seven (15.9%) stated that they have extended their working hours beyond the normal contract day. Fifty-four (15%) stated that they have streamlined the evaluation process in one shape or form. Thirty-one (8.6%) principals have self-advocated to central office for additional help and/or support. Twenty-six (7.2%) stated that they have prioritized their daily work for teacher evaluation. Twenty-one (5.8%) stated that they have delegated duties to other people within their school. Eighteen (5%) stated that staff were added so that they could focus on teacher evaluation. Eighteen (5%) principals stated that they used technology in order to accomplish teacher evaluation. Sixteen (4.5%) stated that they have developed tools to assist in the evaluation of teachers. Fourteen (3.9%) stated that they have sought out professional learning for themselves. Seven (1.9%) stated that they have developed other staff members to better understand the teacher evaluation process. Five (1.4%) stated that they have engaged in learning activities within a PLC. Five (1.4%) stated that they have networked with other administrators. Finally, two (.6%) principals stated they have received mentoring, while one (.3%) principal stated that they have received coaching.
Table 13

*Responses to the “Most Significant” Barrier of Teacher Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Hours</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline Process</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Advocate Needs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate Managerial Responsibilities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Technology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Staffing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Tools</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Learning</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking w/ others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Coaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voices from the Field**

Open-ended responses from principals provide further testimony of the difficulties encountered in implementing the new evaluation criteria. Repeatedly, principals comment about the extensive efforts they are making to meet the expectations of the new evaluation process. As a consequence, some principals are reporting that authentic growth and development of teachers is being neglected in order to accomplish the steps within the official process. One principal stated, “The conversations are great, the process is ridiculous and not meaningful. To the teacher, this is just a hoop, and it is very evident.” A key problem principals identify in establishing a growth model evaluation system is the ability to provide authentic and meaningful feedback to teachers with adequate time to dialogue and process the feedback. Because the evaluation process is so complex, the ability of principals to offer dialogue about improving practice is limited. One principal stated:
The current system is so complex that giving teachers specific, focused feedback is often lost. It takes so much time that principals are unable to spend time with individual teachers to provide brief feedback.

Because principals perceive they are not able to achieve adequate conversations about improving instruction, many experience a strong sense of futility:

Quite honestly, I don’t see this new system making any difference in student learning. Because of its size and the unrealistic expectations placed on teachers and administrators, I believe the system will simply collapse due to its own weight.

Please know that I am working hard to meet the expectations of this system; I simply find it too cumbersome.

Overwhelmingly, principals are prioritizing their daily jobs in order to comply with the teacher evaluation process rather than improving teachers’ ability to provide high quality instruction through meaningful feedback. As illustrated in this survey, principals are shifting their current leadership practices and priorities in order to comply with the TPEP process; however, their abilities to realize improved teacher practice are blocked by the complexity and requirements of the process.

Another factor principals are communicating through this survey pertains to the simultaneous convergence of both teacher and principal evaluations onto the principal. Principals expressed a concern about meeting their own evaluation criteria due to competing timelines, depth of work, and collection of evidence for both the teacher and principal evaluations. With both evaluation deadlines occurring at the same time, the ability to reflect is minimal. One administrator requests, “Change the date administrator evaluations are due. It’s tough to think about putting my own evidence together at the same time I am trying to
get teacher evaluations completed.” Several principals implied a lack of understanding by central office administrators as to the impact that the TPEP has made on them (principals):

No one from the central office has an idea of what adjustments need to be made because none of them have actually done a complete cycle with the new evaluation criteria.

In turn, expectations on principals from central office compound the time spent complying with their own evaluation process rather than focusing on school improvement. Based upon this study, principals are focusing their time and efforts on classroom evaluation with limited time to fulfill the other seven principal evaluation criteria.

Repeatedly, principals find themselves caught between unions and district expectations because of vaguely negotiated processes and forms. One principal stated, “The vagueness left (on purpose) by the legislators in the interpretation of the [evaluation] language is making individual districts walk a fine line with their unions. With it being a growth model, it will be very difficult to get inadequate teachers out of the profession!”

Responses from principals, like this one, suggest that locally negotiated processes have increased the amount of steps for at-risk teachers to improve rather than bolstering the effectiveness of teacher evaluation. These concerns suggest that locally negotiated processes contribute to the lack of systematic support for principals and may potentially lower the effectiveness of teacher evaluation rather than improve it. One principal expressed concern:

I am concerned for the retention of principals. I see a great deal of stress on principals, potential health concerns, and negative effects on one’s family due to the pressure of work. Without some viable infrastructure support, the work may lead to an increasing turnover rate for principals.
Throughout this survey, the evidence shows the new teacher and principal evaluation criteria have significantly affected principal time allocation regarding priority activities such as classroom instruction and the evaluation of teacher practice. The urgency for this mandate has been emphasized by the high stakes student growth component of the TPEP. Student safety, climate, and community involvement are important for a healthy learning environment but do not directly result in improved student learning. Naturally, teachers and principals prioritize their time towards efforts that they perceive to directly improve student learning. Principals find themselves faced with either abandoning or minimizing low priority or managerial activities.

This survey demonstrates that principals are attempting to redefine their roles within existing restrictions and boundaries. The efforts are short-term in nature. Some examples include the hiring of substitute teachers to provide space and time for evaluator feedback or the hiring of retired administrators to manage the building so that the principal has time to conduct classroom observations and the evaluation processes. These supports are provided on a consistent basis neither throughout the year nor within or among school districts. It is unknown whether these supports are effective or financially sustainable by districts. In order for the role of principal to shift from a building manager to an instructional leader, sustainable and systematic financial support needs to be provided. Otherwise, individual best efforts to implement the TPEP will ultimately fail. As one principal states:

I don’t see how this system of evaluation can sustain itself for long. It will overwhelm us in a very short period of time by the magnitude of time and effort required. None of my other duties were taken away. Indeed, I do more now than I did just five years ago, and certainly ten and twenty years ago. I can’t keep this up.
Another principal reiterates the competition between manager and instructional leader:

There needs to be some balance between management and instructional leadership duties. The heavy weight lifting these days is how much time we spend on T-PEP and other initiatives. I'm not able to get everything done. The majority of my time during the student day is working with kids and families. The pendulum has swung to the instructional leadership side – BIG TIME. I spend at least 4 - 6 hours every weekend completing T-PEP stuff. I'm going to need much more time when I do summative evaluations. This year I have seven teachers on T-PEP comprehensive. The next two years are going to be much tougher. I foresee an additional dozen TPEP comprehensive evaluations each of those two years. Principals need support.

This kind of a role change in a statewide system cannot be made by those within the role alone. A systematic process by which to alleviate managerial duties from the instructional leadership role will need to be addressed at the state level in order to sustain the new teacher/principal evaluation criteria.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Washington State education system finds itself in a critical time of transformation. The implementation of the new teacher/principal evaluation pilot (TPEP) has created a shift in educational reform toward the improvement of classroom instruction. This, in turn, has shifted the primary role of principals toward instructional leadership. Knapp et al. (2010) have suggested that this shift requires a new instructional leadership paradigm: learning-focused leadership. Learning-focused leadership requires that principals develop human capital capacities to improve classroom instruction and distribute leadership tasks and decision-making.

This study reveals the current status of principals and their shift toward learning-focused leadership. In order to develop capacity to improve instruction, the principal must identify teacher needs, then engage in several activities that build teacher knowledge, improve skill, and foster the ability for continuous growth. Principal leadership behaviors, school improvement priorities, and learning interests all offer insight into principals’ progress toward being instructional leaders.

The first aspect of learning-focused leadership pertains to high expectations. The new evaluation criteria assist principals in this matter through the explicit definition of instructional and professional practices. Currently, principals are frequently and consistently engaged in classroom observations and conversations with teachers about their instruction in relationship to their instructional framework. These conversations contribute to teachers’ better understanding of expectations.

Secondly, the feedback from principals contributes to the development of teacher
knowledge and skills to improve instruction. Development of others is a significant component of learning-focused leadership that allows a school’s shared capacity to respond to student needs. Highly skilled and knowledgeable teachers enable sound decision-making that doesn’t need to be directly managed by the principal – thereby increasing the school’s academic capacity. Repeatedly throughout this survey, principals expressed a high level of frustration due to the inability to sufficiently process feedback with teachers. In fact, surveyed principals reported that they were focusing on classroom instruction to the detriment of other leadership activities that contribute to authentic teacher growth and the development of collaborative structures.

Lastly, learning-focused leadership relies on the principal’s ability to create collaborative structures. This appears to be a significant area in which transition toward instructional leadership is lagging, which raises concerns of policy sustainability. Principal leadership activities show that principals infrequently engage in the development of teams, group norms, or curriculum alignment activities. Without strong collaborative structures, teachers are limited in terms of where they can seek assistance or problem-solve student learning challenges. In turn, the support for teachers may diminish over time.

This evidence points to a partial transition by Washington elementary principals towards learning-focused leadership. The incomplete nature of the transition is significant to the success or failure of the new evaluation criteria. In this survey, principals clearly articulated barriers to successful teacher evaluation implementation originating in the conflict between educational management and instructional leadership tasks. Policy makers need to consider the toll of this conflict. Without redefining the principal role or adjusting the new evaluation criteria, there is high risk of policy failure due to principal burn out.
This survey demonstrated that principals clearly understand the new evaluation criteria and have changed their daily/weekly behaviors to focus on classroom instruction. It should be noted that Washington State has done an exceptional job at imparting teacher evaluation knowledge to principals. Very few principals rated lack of knowledge as a reason for poor implementation. The challenge has been in the depth, complexity, and contextual application of the evaluation process.

In order to work through the challenges, principals are attempting to independently redefine their role by delegating responsibilities to other staff, developing evaluation tools, streamlining evaluation processes, reallocating their time to evaluation, and using resources to support the evaluation of teachers. Some are receiving supports from their districts; however, there is no information to imply that these efforts are sustainable. If policy-makers wish to ensure successful implementation, systematic supports for the change in the principal role should be put in place.

The information in this study provides an initial look at principals’ perceptions about their professional learning, preferred learning formats, preferred learning topics, and responses to the implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation criteria in the state of Washington. Trends affirm that Washington elementary principals are individually engaged in redefining their role as instructional leaders. Many principals are accomplishing this through the delegation of responsibilities to classified and non-evaluating personnel. Additionally, several principals stated that they are hiring temporary support, such as substitute teachers and administrators, to allow for evaluation to occur. Uncertain of this support continuing, many principals voice concern about the next phase of teachers transitioning to the TPEP and being unable to meet the demands. Principals are self-
advocating with some responses from district; however, in most cases there are no resources for a long-term solution on the table.

The low frequency of professional learning by principals is concerning. Less than half of Washington elementary principals engage in professional learning, such as observing and discussing classroom instruction with a peer administrator, on a daily or weekly basis. Activities like this allows principals to compare how their observations could be measured on the evaluation criteria and collaborate on coaching strategies, enabling principals to calibrate their language and observation skills and increase inter-rater reliability. A lack of such activities fosters, low inter-rater reliability, high frustration, and a sense of isolation among principals.

Responses were compared between various principal characteristics and school contexts. While minor differences surfaced, the bulk of the evidence demonstrated that all Washington elementary principals had similar learning needs and preferences for professional development. This may be primarily due to the newness of the TPEP criteria and the fact that all principals are beginning from the same place. As time progresses, however, new principals with different learning needs will be joining the profession.

Principals clearly expressed a desire to conduct teacher evaluation with integrity and quality, though most inhibited by the complexity of the evaluation process. One principal stated, “There is a difference between doing it and doing it right…[There is] not nearly enough time to complete all steps in the process well.” She and others expressed the strong desire to support teachers fairly and to implement a sound growth model, but as stated above, found themselves frustrated by the inability to do so. An overwhelming percentage of principals (86.5%) identified inadequate time to evaluate the volume of teachers to the depth
required as the most significant barrier. In order to ensure teacher evaluation requirements are met, 84% of principals are managing their time more strictly by prioritizing teacher evaluation. Fifty-seven percent of principals are extending their work hours into evenings and weekends in order to complete the evaluation process. Some principals (21%) are delegating managerial tasks to others, leaving 79% of principals continuing with their traditional responsibilities.

The findings of this study align with those of the research referenced in Chapter 2. Specifically, learning-focused leadership provides a good model for the transition by principals toward instructional leadership. A significant result of this research was the ability to provide voice for the Washington Elementary Principal negotiating the implementation of the teacher/principal evaluation pilot. These principals are striving to perform difficult work for the sake of what policy makers hope to accomplish through this policy: improving the success of our students. This research adds to the literature on principal socialization and the process principals go through in order to be role-makers as new policies are implemented.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, there are nine recommendations aimed to inform teacher and principal evaluation policy-makers and professional development providers:

1. Increase principal socialization opportunities. Survey results reflect low frequency of professional learning occurring. Increasing these opportunities will help create a higher level of inter-rater reliability, decrease principal isolation, and provide opportunities for principals to contextualize the criteria to specific situations within their schools. A significant way to accomplish increased socialization will be to utilize a variety of learning formats, especially networking, professional
learning communities, and coaching.

2. Increase principal contextual learning opportunities. Principals identified a strong desire to learn from other principals who have had experience addressing problems of practice. Specifically, they valued the ability to dialogue in order to better understand solutions.

3. Provide supports for district office administrators regarding the evaluation process. Many principals expressed concern about the lack of understanding by central office administrators, since supports of principals are affected by decisions made at the local district level. Providing supports for central office administrators will allow districts and principals to better partner in finding solutions to their process.

4. Refine the evaluation process. In order to ensure further progress toward improving classroom instruction, the evaluation process needs to facilitate more time for authentic problem-solving between principal and teacher. Since the amount of contact time is limited, recommendations are to consider narrowing the scope a comprehensive evaluation covers. Additionally, consider reframing the student growth rating process in order to allow for a long-term perspective.

5. Increase systematic support for principals. In order to reduce barriers to teacher evaluation, district processes need to be clarified, logistical supports increased, and principal roles defined. Legislature may consider allowing districts the discretion to streamline the evaluation process and clarify vague agreements among bargaining units. Districts should redefine supporting roles of staff in order to manage building logistics or increase the number of principals in order to accommodate the volume of teachers being evaluated.
6. Develop principal certification programs aligned with the new evaluation criteria in order to prepare new principals to the field. With the potential for a large number of established principals retiring in the next ten years, programs should be encouraged to recruit and qualify candidates to meet the new demands of learning-focused leadership. An essential part of these new demands are two layers of principal learning: a) technical skills and knowledge; and b) contextual application of skills and knowledge.

7. As implementation progresses, adjust support for differentiated learning needs and emergent challenges. With all principals beginning in the same place, differentiated learning needs were not evident in this study; however, as new principals come into the practice, the literature suggests that learning needs will diversify.

8. Phase in future iterations of the evaluation criteria at different times to allow full and effective implementation. Survey results identified that the simultaneous convergence of both principal and teacher evaluations are causing principals conflicts with the use of their time and resources.

9. Improve professional development content. Principals identified preferred learning topics as they pertained to both teacher and principal evaluation criteria. Content should be developed to provide knowledge and skills centered on these topics. Low preference topics espoused by the literature should be especially developed in order for principals to better understand the value and ways of fostering sustainable practices. In short, most preferred topics shouldn’t equate to the most important.
Future Research

Following are six recommendations for further research topics:

1. The effects of learning-focused leadership on improved student performance.
   
   Because the desired outcome of the TPEP policy is to improve student performance, further study documenting empirical results would contribute to policy implementation and effectiveness.

2. Principal contextual learning strategies and practices. As the literature suggests, principals’ effectiveness rests on their ability to determine the needs of the school and to orchestrate organizational learning. Examining the complexity of how principals enact this concept will be important to practice and research.

3. Principal socialization. This research demonstrated the significance principal socialization may have on educational reform policies. Further understanding of how policy makers and district leaders can facilitate learning through socialization in order to increase policy effectiveness will be important.

4. Principal evaluation ratings and the relationship to teacher evaluation ratings.
   
   Research studying the effectiveness of principals as it relates to teacher growth will contribute to improved practices.

5. How integrated technology can support the principal in teacher evaluation.
   
   Technology, within this research, has been reported to be a hindrance to the evaluation process. Further research in this area would contribute to improved supports for principals and teachers.

6. Longitudinal study of principal behaviors and preferences as they relate to professional development around teacher and principal evaluation. This research
could provide valuable feedback to policy-makers and central office administrators on the transitions principals are making through the implementation of the new evaluation criteria. Additionally, it would support the successful implementation of evaluation policy.
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## Appendix A: Survey Content Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do you agree to participate in this research?</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>Dillman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>Crow (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How many years have you been an administrator at your current school?</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>Whole numbers in years completed</td>
<td>(Crow, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How many years have you worked in school administration?</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>Whole numbers in years completed</td>
<td>(Crow, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How many years have you worked in education, including your experience as a classroom teacher and school administrator?</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>Whole numbers in years completed</td>
<td>(Crow, 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6       | In which content area did you spend the majority of your career as a classroom teacher? (please select one) | Categorical | a) Elementary/General Education.  
b) Reading/Literacy  
c) Math  
d) Science  
e) Social Studies  
f) Arts (Art, Music, Dance)  
g) Career and Technical  
h) Media and Library Services  
i) I was never a classroom teacher  
j) other (write-in) | (Franz Coldren & Spillane, 2007)  
(Fink & Resnick, 2012)  
(Stien & Nelson, 2003) |
| 7       | What Educational Service District are you associated with?                   | Categorical |                                            | (Crow, 2010)  
(Hallinger & Heck, 2010)  
(Dillman, 2007)  
(Fink & Resnick, 2012) |
| 8       | Please select your school's type:                                            | Categorical |                                            | Crow, 2010  
Hallinger & Heck, 2010  
Dillman, 2010 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>What percentage of students at your school qualify for free-or-reduced price lunch?</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Fink, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What percentage of students at your school are Caucasian?</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Crow, 2010; Hallinger &amp; Heck, 2010; Dillman, 2010; Fink, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>How many students currently attend your school?</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Hallinger, 1996; Scribner, 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>On the most recent state assessment, what percentage of students met standard in English/Language Arts?</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hallinger, 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Please rank the following improvement priorities for your school for the current school year?</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>a) Improving literacy instruction (ELA, Reading, writing)</td>
<td>Greenfield, 1985; Hallinger, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Improving math instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Improving school climate (i.e., student behaviors or teacher working conditions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Improving parent and community involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Improving assessment practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) Improving data use and data-driven decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) Improving processes and structures (Response to Intervention, PLC, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Does your school have an assistant principal or vice principal?</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>Greenfield, 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A1: Survey Content Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Do you have a dean of students, secretary, or administrative assistant who supports you?</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>Greenfield, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Do you currently have access to a tablet or other mobile device that can be used to evaluate classroom instruction?</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>Greenfield, 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17       | How frequently have you engaged in the following leadership activities in the past three months?  
  a) Developing/aligning curriculum.  
  b) Working with teams to build consensus.  
  c) Addressing team norms/expectations.  
  d) Meet with public members to advocate for school.  
  e) Talk with district personnel to advocate/educate about school needs.  
  f) Participating in district committees.  
  g) Observing classroom instruction.  
  h) Providing feedback on classroom instruction to specific teachers.  
  i) Informally talking with teachers about instruction.  
  j) Talk with staff to advocate/educate about a district initiative. | Likert    | Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Less than once a month, N/A | AWSP Leadership Framework, 2012  
 Hallinger, 1985  
 Hallinger, 2010  
 Heck, 1992  
 Horng, 2006  
 Horng, 2010  
 Hord, 1997  
 Huggins, 2007  
 Knapp, 2010  
 Peterson, 1996 |
| 18       | How frequently have you engaged in the following professional learning activities in the past three months?  
  a) Observing classroom instruction with another administrator.  
  b) Developing/aligning curriculum.  
  c) Informally talking with peer administrators about instruction. | Likert    | Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Less than once a month, N/A | AWSP Leadership Framework, 2012  
 Brown-Ferrigno, 2005  
 Crow, 2010  
 Hord, 1997  
 Horng, 2010  
 Huggins, 2011  
 Peterson, 1996 |
## Appendix A: Survey Content Validity

### Table A1: Survey Content Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19      | In what form has the majority of professional development related to the state’s new teacher and principal evaluation criteria been presented to you? (Select any that apply). | Boolean        | a) Independent reading
                      b) Web resources
                      c) workshop provided by ESD or School District
                      d) Conference or Seminar
                      e) University Program
                      f) Professional Learning Community
                      g) Networking with other principals
                      h) Mentoring (learning from a supervisor or other district administrator)
                      i) Coach (learning from a person outside of district)
                      Other (Please specify) | Brown-Ferrigno, 2005 Crow, 2010 Peterson, 1996 Wei, 2009 |
| 20      | Given the new teacher evaluation criteria, how much do the following professional development topics interest you?  
                      a) Conferencing strategies with teachers.  
                      b) Collaboration with parents and community.  
## Appendix A: Survey Content Validity

### Table A1: Survey Content Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Development of assessments for student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Strategies for creating classrooms of equity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Pedagogy of student math development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Pedagogy of student literacy development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Instructional strategies to increase student engagement and independence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Writing lesson goals, targets and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Given the new principal evaluation criteria, how much to the following professional development topics interest you?</td>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>Very Interested, Somewhat Interested, Slightly Interested, Not Interested.</td>
<td>Crow, 2010 Portin, 2004 Peterson, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Strategies for closing the achievement gap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Resource management to support improved student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Development of teams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Improving instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Curriculum development or alignment to Common Core State Standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Developing a collaborative school culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Creating a safe learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Planning with Data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Community Involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>How well would the following types of professional development support your growth as a leader?</td>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>Very well, Somewhat well, Not well, Not at all</td>
<td>Grissom, 2010 Crow, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Independent reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Web resources (e.g., blogs, websites, webinars, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Workshop (district/ESD/Private)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Professional association conference or meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table A1: Survey Content Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>University seminar or conference.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) No support from assistant or vice principal</td>
<td>Borman, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) No support from secretary or administrative assistant.</td>
<td>Brundage, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Informal networking with other principals that may have solved the same issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) No support from the central office or district (e.g., Human Resources)</td>
<td>Darling-Hammond, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Too many teachers to evaluate</td>
<td>Fink, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Too many steps in the evaluation process</td>
<td>Honig, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) Too much time required to conduct evaluations</td>
<td>Heneman, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) Lack of information about evaluation practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h) Limited understanding of the evaluation models (e.g., Danielson, Marzano, Cell5D+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) Limited technology to support data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>What is the most significant barrier you face when attempting to evaluate classroom teachers?</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td>Write-in</td>
<td>Creswell, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dillman, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fink, A., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>How have you responded or attempted to respond to the barrier you selected in the previous question?</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td>Write-in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Do you have any further recommendations about the kinds of support that would be helpful for you as the state continues to implement new teacher evaluation</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td>Write-in</td>
<td>Creswell, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dillman, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fink, A., 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Survey Content Validity

Table A1
Survey Content Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Principal Survey Invitation

From: AWSP [webmaster@awsp.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2014 1:38 PM
To: Caroline Brumfield
Subject: Principal Matters

Trouble viewing? Here’s the web version.

Principal Matters

EDUCATION NEWS FROM THE ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

2012-13 Award Winner

March 18, 2014

From Gary Kipp

Survey

TPEP Implementation Support for Principals

AWSP has partnered with John Mancinelli, a principal in the Richland School District and a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Washington State University, to develop a survey regarding the professional development principals feel they need to implement the state’s new teacher and principal evaluation criteria.

The survey results will assist AWSP in helping principals like you to be successful, given the new expectations for your work and those of your teachers. The survey should take about 20 minutes and will close Friday, April 4. Thanks in advance for your support!

Figure B1. AWSP Newsletter Announcement. AWSP = Association of Washington School Principals. TPEP = Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot.
Appendix C: Survey Follow-up Letters

From: Gary Kipp/AWSP [webmaster@awsp.org]
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 10:50 AM
To: Caroline Brumfield
Subject: TPEP Implementation Survey

TPEP Implementation Survey

Dear AWSP Members,
You may have read in last week's issue of Principal Matters that AWSP has partnered with John Mancinelli, a principal in the Richland School District and a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Washington State University, to develop a survey regarding the professional development principals feel they need to implement the state's new teacher and principal evaluation criteria.

The survey results will assist AWSP in helping principals like you to be successful, given the new expectations for your work and those of your teachers. The survey should take about 20 minutes and will close Friday, April 4. If you haven't already done so, you can [take the survey here](https://www.awsp.org). Thanks in advance for your support!

Sincerely,

Gary Kipp
Executive Director
Association of Washington School Principals

Figure C1. AWSP Non-respondent follow-up email #1. AWSP = Association of Washington School Principals.
TPEP Implementation Survey

Dear AWSP Members,

This is just a reminder that AWSP has partnered with Jonn Mancinelli, a principal in the Richland School District and a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Washington State University, to develop a survey regarding the professional development principals feel they need to implement the state’s new teacher and principal evaluation criteria.

The survey results will assist AWSP in helping principals like you to be successful, given the new expectations for your work and those of your teachers. The survey should take about 20 minutes and will close Friday, April 4. If you haven’t already done so, you can take the survey here. Thanks again for your support.

Sincerely,

Gary Kipp
Executive Director
Association of Washington School Principals

Figure C2. AWSP Non-respondent follow-up email #2. AWSP = Association of Washington School Principals.
Figure C3. Non-respondent Principal final email solicitation. AWSP = Association of Washington School Principals.
Appendix D: Survey Welcome Letter

Figure D1. Survey Welcome Letter and opt-in form.
Appendix E: Survey Questions

### Figure E1. Survey Page 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What supports do principals need in order to implement the TPEP?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics and Professional Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following questions ask about you and your professional background. This information is intended for analytic purposes only and will not be attached to your responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. What is your gender?</strong></td>
<td>Male, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. How many years have you been an administrator at your current school?</strong></td>
<td>Number field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. How many years have you worked in school administration?</strong></td>
<td>Number field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. How many years have you worked in education, including your experience as a classroom teacher and school administrator?</strong></td>
<td>Number field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. In which content area did you spend the majority of your career as a classroom teacher? (Please select one.)</strong></td>
<td>Elementary/General Education, Reading/Literacy, Math, Science, Social Studies, Physical Education, Arts (Art, Music, Dance), Career and Technical, Media and Library Services, I was never a classroom teacher, Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What supports do principals need in order to implement the TPEP?

**School Context**

7. What Educational Service District are you associated with?

8. Please select your school’s type:

9. What percentage of students at your school qualify for free-or-reduced price lunch?

10. What percentage of students at your school are Caucasian?

11. How many students currently attend your school?

12. On the most recent state assessment, what percentage of students met standard in English/Language Arts?

Figure E2. Survey Page 2
What supports do principals need in order to implement the TPEP?

School Context

The following section collects information about the context of your school.

13. Please rank the following improvement priorities for your school for the current school year? (1 = High Priority to 7 = Low Priority) [Note: some browsers require drag and drop in order rather than drop down fields]

- Improving literacy instruction (ELA, Reading, writing)
- Improving math instruction
- Improving school climate (i.e., student behaviors or teacher working conditions)
- Improving parent and community involvement
- Improving assessment practices
- Improving data use and data-driven decision-making
- Improving processes and structures (Response to Intervention, PLC, etc.)

14. Does your school have an assistant principal or vice principal?

- Yes
- No

15. Do you have a dean of students, secretary, or administrative assistant who supports you?

- Yes
- No

16. Do you currently have access to a tablet or other mobile device that can be used to evaluate classroom instruction?

- Yes
- No

Figure E3. Survey Page 3.
### What supports do principals need in order to implement the TPEP?

#### Principal Leadership

The following questions ask you about your current leadership practice.

17. **How frequently have you engaged in the following leadership activities in the past three months?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Less than once a month</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing/aligning curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with teams to build consensus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing team norms/expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with public members to advocate for school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with district personnel to advocate/educate about school needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in district committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing classroom instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback on classroom instruction to specific teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informally talking with teachers about instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with staff to advocate/educate about a district initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **How frequently have you engaged in the following professional learning activities in the past three months?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Less than once a month</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing classroom instruction with another administrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing/aligning curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informally talking with peer administrators about instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring other administrator(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in district workshop/clinic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in a peer learning group (Professional Learning Community)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received mentorship from another district administrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received coaching from a person outside of your district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. In what form has the majority of professional development related to the state’s new teacher and principal evaluation criteria been presented to you? (Select any that apply.)

- Independent Reading
- Web Resources
- Workshop provided by ESD or School District
- Conference or Seminar
- University Program
- Professional Learning Community
- Networking with other principals
- Mentoring (learning from a supervisor or other district administrator)
- Coach (learning from a person outside of district)

Other (please specify)

Figure E5. Survey Page 5
### Principal Leadership Development

20. Given the new teacher evaluation criteria, how much do the following professional development topics interest you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Slightly Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing strategies with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with parents and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing student growth goals with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of assessments for student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for creating classrooms of equity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of student math development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of student literacy development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies to increase student engagement and independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing lesson goals, targets and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Principal Leadership Development

21. Given the new principal evaluation criteria, how much do the following professional development topics interest you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Slightly Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for closing the achievement gap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management to support improved student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of teams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development or alignment to Common Core State Standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a collaborative school culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a safe learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning with Data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How well would the following types of professional development support your growth as a leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Professional Development</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not well</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web resources (e.g., blogs, websites, webinars, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop (District/ESD/Private)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association conference or meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University seminar or conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal networking with other principals that may have solved the same issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What supports do principals need in order to implement the TPEP?

Barriers to Evaluating Classroom Teachers

23. What is the most significant barrier you face when trying to evaluate classroom teachers?
   - No support from assistant or vice principal
   - No support from secretary or administrative assistant
   - No support from the central office or district (e.g., Human Resources)
   - Too many teachers to evaluate
   - Too many steps in the evaluation process
   - Too much time required to conduct evaluations
   - Lack of information about evaluation practices
   - Limited understanding of the evaluation models (e.g., Danielson, Marzano, CEL5D+)
   - Limited technology to support data collection

   Other (please specify)

24. How have you responded or attempted to respond to the barrier you selected in the previous question?

25. Do you have any further recommendations about the kinds of support that would be helpful for you as the state continues to implement new teacher evaluation criteria?