

12-2013

ADVOCATING A SUCCESSFUL POLICY FOR IMPLEMENTING STATE-MANDATED REFORMS TO TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES

Christina R. Heyde

National Louis University, c-heyde@comcast.net

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/pa>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Heyde, Christina R., "ADVOCATING A SUCCESSFUL POLICY FOR IMPLEMENTING STATE-MANDATED REFORMS TO TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES" (2013). *Policy Advocacy*. Paper 4.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Professional Practice Dissertations (2013 -) at Digital Commons@NLU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Policy Advocacy by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@NLU. For more information, please contact rob.morrison@nl.edu.

ADVOCATING A SUCCESSFUL POLICY FOR IMPLEMENTING
STATE-MANDATED REFORMS TO TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES

Christina R. Heyde, M.S. Ed., J.D.

National Louis University

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of

Doctor of Education

in the Foster G. McGaw Graduate School

National College of Education

National Louis University

November 2013

Approved December 2013

NLU Digital Commons Document Origination Statement

This document was created as *one* part of the three-part dissertation requirement of the National Louis University (NLU) Educational Leadership (EDL) Doctoral Program. The National Louis Educational Leadership EdD is a professional practice degree program (Shulman et al., 2006).

For the dissertation requirement, doctoral candidates are required to plan, research, and implement three major projects, one each year, within their school or district with a focus on professional practice. The three projects are:

- Program Evaluation
- Change Leadership Plan
- Policy Advocacy Document

For the **Program Evaluation** candidates are required to identify and evaluate a program or practice within their school or district. The “program” can be a current initiative; a grant project; a common practice; or a movement. Focused on utilization, the evaluation can be formative, summative, or developmental (Patton, 2008). The candidate must demonstrate how the evaluation directly relates to student learning.

In the **Change Leadership Plan** candidates a plan that considers organizational possibilities for renewal. The plan for organizational change may be at the building or district level. It must be related to an area in need of improvement, and have a clear target in mind. The candidate must be able to identify noticeable and feasible differences that should exist as a result of the change plan (Wagner et al., 2006).

In the **Policy Advocacy Document** candidates develop and advocate for a policy at the local, state or national level using reflective practice and research as a means for supporting and promoting reforms in education. Policy advocacy dissertations use critical theory to address moral and ethical issues of policy formation and administrative decision making (i.e., what ought to be). The purpose is to develop reflective, humane and social critics, moral leaders, and competent professionals, guided by a critical practical rational model (Browder, 1995).

Works Cited

- Browder, L. H. (1995). An alternative to the doctoral dissertation: The policy advocacy concept and the policy document. *Journal of School Leadership*, 5, 40-69.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shulman, L.S., Golde, C. M., Bueschel, A. C., & Garabedian, K. J. (2006). Reclaiming education’s doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 25-32.
- Wagner, T. et al. (2006). *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Copyright by Christina R. Heyde, 2013

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

This Policy Advocacy paper is the third in a three-part dissertation on the effect of new Illinois laws on teacher evaluation in suburban Chicago elementary districts. The Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) of 2010, as modified by Senate Bill 7, was signed into law in June 2011 and contains provisions that take effect over several years. Beginning in 2012-2013, districts were required to move to a four-rating performance evaluation system and begin to use these rankings, instead of seniority, to make job-related decisions. In fall 2013, I completed a second round of the survey that I had conducted in fall 2011 for the first part of my dissertation, in order to measure whether teacher and administrator attitudes toward teacher evaluation had changed in two districts (Districts A and B) after a year of implementation. Results from this second-round survey are presented in this paper. In general, these results show that teachers and administrators in District A, which made more aggressive changes than District B did, are more satisfied with their new evaluation system and with the change process. The paper then takes this information, along with results from my Program Evaluation and Change Plan papers, as a starting point for advocating a policy approach that districts should take in order to implement changes in teacher evaluation so as to accomplish the objective of making evaluations more effective while maintaining credibility among teachers. This policy approach calls for a “whole-hearted” approach to reforming teacher evaluation practices, combined with a significant and pro-active communications effort to build understanding of and buy-in for the change process.

PREFACE

This Policy Advocacy paper wraps up a three-part examination of a single dissertation topic: teacher and administrator perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher evaluation practices and the impact that new Illinois legislation on teacher evaluation is having on those perceptions. For my Program Evaluation paper in fall 2011, I gathered background data on teacher and administrator attitudes toward teacher evaluation as it was practiced prior to the passage of PERA. I interviewed human resource directors and surveyed administrators and teachers in three suburban Chicago elementary districts (Heyde, 2011). For my Change Plan paper in the second year, I interviewed human resource administrators, building administrators, teachers, and union leaders who had participated in the change process in two of these three districts (Heyde, 2012).

In fall 2013, I completed a second round of the survey that I conducted in fall 2011 in order to measure whether teacher and administrator attitudes toward teacher evaluation had changed after the first year of implementation of several of PERA's requirements. Results from this second-round survey are presented in this paper. In addition, this paper takes the information I have gathered over the past few years as a starting point to advocate a policy approach that districts should take in order to implement changes in teacher evaluation so as to accomplish the objective of making evaluations more effective while maintaining credibility among teachers.

The data I collected in fall 2013, in some ways, are counter-intuitive and lead to some important leadership lessons for me. Specifically, the survey results show that, of two elementary school districts, the district that had adopted the more aggressive change plan was able to attain greater teacher understanding and confidence in the new teacher evaluation system. In contrast, teachers in the district that had elected to make only the

minimum-required changes were more critical of both their evaluation system and the process of change. This is counter-intuitive, in part because one leadership lesson from the Change Plan paper was to consider moving slowly to build consensus and buy-in. The fall 2013 survey results, however, suggest a countervailing consideration for leadership: sometimes, it may be better to embrace change whole-heartedly and push for a more complete change in one move, rather than to spread out the change process over multiple steps or years.

The data collected in fall 2013 show that it is possible for districts to roll out significant changes in teacher evaluation so that, by the end of the roll-out process, teachers perceive the changes as positive and believe the evaluation system is fairer and more accurate. Districts can do this by using a policy approach that: (1) embraces the need to change evaluation practices, instead of trying to make only the smallest changes allowed; (2) articulates clearly the need for change; (3) involves teachers in the process of making the change; and (4) educates teachers on the changes that are occurring. By adopting this approach, districts can increase their chance of making the required changes meaningful and successful, while simultaneously maintaining credibility and buy-in among teachers.

A related leadership lesson that I gained through this research and analysis relates to the malleability of teacher perceptions. Within a single school year, perceptions can change significantly, depending upon the depth and frequency of communication between administrators and teachers. If administrators consistently and systematically support teachers through a change process, they can develop greater confidence in and comfort with change. Combining these leadership lessons suggests that whole-hearted change is

possible, as long as deep, frequent communications occur and teachers can see the benefits of change once the change process is complete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

PREFACE iii

SECTION ONE – VISION STATEMENT 1

SECTION TWO – ANALYSIS OF NEED 4

 Educational Analysis 6

 Social/Political Analysis 7

 Moral and Ethical Analysis 9

SECTION THREE – FALL 2013 SURVEYS OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS 11

 Background 11

 Methodology 12

 Teacher Evaluation Practices in District A and District B 14

 2013 Survey Results 15

SECTION FOUR – IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDED POLICY 29

 Implications from the Data 29

 Statement of Recommended Policy 30

SECTION FIVE – POLICY ARGUMENT 33

SECTION SIX – POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 37

SECTION SEVEN – POLICY ASSESSMENT PLAN 42

SECTION EIGHT – SUMMARY IMPACT STATEMENT 44

REFERENCES 47

TABLES AND APPENDICES 49

SECTION ONE – VISION STATEMENT

This paper is the third paper in a three-part dissertation. I continue my examination of the same topic I investigated for the first two papers (the “Program Evaluation” and “Change Plan” papers): teacher and administrator perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher evaluation practices and the impact that the new Illinois legislation on teacher evaluation is having on those perceptions. This teacher evaluation topic is a critical problem for Illinois school districts as they struggle to plan for and implement the changes required by new Illinois law, the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 (PERA) (Public Act 96-861), as modified by Senate Bill 7 (Public Act 97-008).

In fall 2011, I gathered background data on teacher and administrator attitudes toward teacher evaluation as it was practiced prior to the passage of PERA. Specifically, I interviewed human resource directors, and I conducted an extensive survey of administrators and teachers in three suburban Chicago districts that would need to change their teacher evaluations during the next year in order to comply with the new law. Data from these surveys and interviews is presented in my Program Evaluation paper (Heyde, 2011).

During the second year, I interviewed human resource administrators, building administrators, teachers, and union leaders who had participated in the change process as two of the three school districts planned how to revise teacher evaluation procedures and rubrics in light of the new requirements imposed by PERA. Details of these interviews are presented in my Change Plan paper (Heyde, 2012).

In fall 2013, I completed a second round of the survey I conducted in fall 2011 in order to measure whether teacher and administrator attitudes toward teacher evaluation have changed after the first year of implementation of several of PERA's requirements. Results from this second-round survey are presented in this paper. In addition, this paper takes the information I have gathered over the past few years as a starting point to advocate a policy approach that, I will argue, districts should take in order to implement changes in teacher evaluation so as to accomplish the objective of making evaluations more effective while maintaining credibility among teachers.

I became aware of this policy issue during the Illinois General Assembly's consideration and passage of PERA and Senate Bill 7. These two new statutes require significant change in current teacher evaluation practices over a series of years, beginning with 2011-2012, when districts were required to change from a seniority-based system of teacher reductions-in-force (RIFs) to one based on performance evaluations. In addition, districts were required, if they had not done so already, to recast their evaluations so that they have four categories: excellent, proficient, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. Pub. Act 97-008 (2011), § 5, adding 105 ILCS 5/24-12(b).

These new laws work a major change in the practice of teacher evaluations, and they raise critical issues, both for the quality of the teaching workforce and for morale within schools. The laws, of course, are designed to increase the quality of the teaching workforce by making evaluations more accurate, in particular by increasing the degree to which evaluations can recognize stronger teachers and identify weaker ones. By tying evaluation results to RIFs, the laws aim to move weaker teachers out of the profession.

At the same time, change in evaluation practices has the potential to cause a serious impact on morale among teachers. This creates a critical need for a policy approach that districts can take so as to realize the teacher quality goals of the new laws without sacrificing teacher morale.

As discussed later in the paper, the data show that it is possible for districts to roll out significant changes in teacher evaluation so that, by the end of the roll-out process, teachers perceive the changes as positive and believe the evaluation system is fairer and more accurate. Districts can do this by using a policy approach that: (1) embraces the need to change evaluation practices, instead of trying to make only the smallest changes allowed; (2) articulates clearly the need for change; (3) involves teachers in the process of making the change; and (4) educates teachers as a whole on the changes that are occurring. We might refer to this as a “whole-hearted” approach to changing the teacher evaluation process.

By adopting a policy of whole-hearted change, districts can increase their chance of making the required changes meaningful and successful, while simultaneously maintaining credibility and buy-in among teachers. This paper will develop this policy approach more fully, beginning with an analysis of need. The paper will then present the data from the fall 2013 surveys. Drawing from those data and prior information from my first two papers, the paper then articulates a policy statement that I advocate. The final sections of the paper develop the argument for this recommended policy, present a policy implementation plan, a policy assessment plan, and a summary impact statement.

SECTION TWO – ANALYSIS OF NEED

As my Program Evaluation and Change Plan papers argued, a prominent approach to “fixing” public education is to focus on “fixing” teachers by improving teacher evaluations (Heyde, 2011; Heyde, 2012). In particular, the idea is to change the evaluation system so that teacher evaluations more readily identify weaker teachers who can then be weeded out of the system. Several states, including Illinois, have passed legislation that requires school districts to completely overhaul their evaluation systems to this end.

Since the State of Illinois has made a policy decision to overhaul the teacher evaluation system, this creates a need for districts to adopt policy approaches that can achieve this state-mandated objective. At the same time, districts have several additional interests related to the teacher evaluation system. First, districts want to ensure that teacher evaluations continue to be perceived as fair and accurate. That is, districts want to make sure that their teacher evaluation practices appear credible to teachers. Districts also want to ensure that the evaluations continue to serve their other purposes, such as providing formative suggestions for growth, making sure that the evaluation process does not lose credibility with teachers. Finally, it is particularly important to districts to maintain or, if possible, even improve teacher morale so that districts can count on a fully-engaged faculty for all of the other improvements that districts want or need to make, such as adopting new curriculum or improving instructional practices.

Faced with this policy need, districts have to decide their own policy approaches for accomplishing these goals. For example, a district might decide that it should protect morale by making only the changes to teacher evaluations that are absolutely required

and trying to stay as close to the previous system as possible. Alternatively, a district might decide to push for more significant changes. Districts may also differ in how quickly or slowly to adopt change and in how much teacher involvement they should seek when planning for and implementing change.

To sort through these issues, districts typically analyze the problem from a number of perspectives, including educational, economic, social, political, and moral/ethical perspectives. In this case, I focus on four of these perspectives and, in one case, group two perspectives together. First, I approach educational analysis through review of the literature on the educational benefits of reforming teacher evaluation. I then address the social and political analyses together, focusing on the data I have collected and their lessons for the social and political impacts that change has on teachers. Third, I address the moral/ethical analysis, with an aim of discussing explicitly some of the value judgments that might otherwise be assumed but not stated directly. Economic analysis is not discussed directly, as this issue affects teachers primarily and has at most an indirect, attenuated impact on any differentials in student opportunities or achievement. Moreover, any policy that succeeds in improving teacher quality while preserving teacher morale is likely to have a positive impact on students, regardless of their economic background. In addition, the policy approaches I discuss are not costly; therefore, there is not likely to be an economic differential in districts' ability to follow the recommended policy approach.

Educational Analysis

The ultimate goal of any policy for change in teacher evaluation practices is to increase student learning and engagement by improving the quality of teachers in the classroom. In enacting reforms, state legislatures in some cases are motivated by the sense that students in struggling schools are disproportionately exposed to teachers who are of middling to unacceptable quality. This desire to improve educational outcomes has triggered both the movement toward tying teacher evaluations to student performance and, in Illinois, the broader overhaul that also includes adopting a four-tier evaluation system and tying that system to RIFs and teacher recalls. Pub. Act 97-008 (2011), § 5, adding 105 ILCS 5/24-12(b).

For our purpose, however, the relevant educational analysis focuses less on the state-level decision to overhaul the teacher evaluation system in the state and more on the subsequent district-level choice of how strongly to embrace this overhaul and how to proceed in implementing change. Since the passage of the new Illinois laws, a number of educators have expressed concern over how carefully districts may or may not proceed in implementing change. My Change Plan paper reviews these concerns (Heyde, 2012). For example, an open letter from 88 Chicago-area educational researchers highlighted concerns with school districts' readiness to identify measures of student growth that correlate well with teacher effectiveness (CREATE, 2012). A group of teachers called the Illinois New Millennium Initiative warned that school districts must take time to develop and validate meaningful assessments before including student growth in evaluations (Illinois New Millennium Initiative, 2011). This group notably highlighted the

importance that issues including supportive school culture play in making changes in teacher evaluation successful.

Finally, achieving the educational objectives of teacher evaluation reform is complicated by the disconnect between legislators and reformers, on one hand, and school principals, on the other, regarding evaluation practices (Heyde, 2012). A 2011 study found that many principals do not feel confident in their effectiveness as instructional leaders and do not currently include student achievement growth data as a factor in a teacher's evaluation (Illinois Educational Research Council, 2011).

This educational analysis highlights the importance of succeeding in an overhaul of teacher evaluation practices if the expected educational goals are to be met. (However, the literature does not include "high-quality evidentiary support" that the Illinois laws will have their intended educational effect (CREATE, 2012).) At the same time, the concern among educational researchers, teachers, and principals alike indicates that poorly-executed change in this area could cause reform fatigue, which could have a significant negative effect on morale within schools and ultimately a negative impact on students' education (Ravitch, 2010, p. 224).

Social/Political Analysis

The social/political analysis of teacher evaluation changes focuses primarily on the reaction of teachers and the administrators who evaluate them to the changes in the teacher evaluation system. Districts differ greatly in the distribution of practical political power among central-office administrators, school principals, and teachers. The distribution of political power is likely to have a substantial effect on the success of any

effort to change the teacher evaluation process (Drago-Severson, 2009, pp. 107-110). Even with a state-mandated change, a hostile political structure within a district can ensure that whatever change occurs is merely “window-dressing” and stymie any real, fundamental change.

Teacher morale and confidence in the evaluators and the district’s evaluation system also has a social dimension. Districts must care about a positive social climate among staff in a school because that climate, positive or negative, may have corresponding effects on students. Even putting effects on students aside, however, districts that can offer a positive social climate are more likely to attract and retain good teachers and administrators.

To analyze how different policy approaches toward changing teacher evaluations affect the social/political climate in districts, I present, in the next section, the results of my fall 2013 surveys of teachers and administrators in two districts that have taken different approaches to the speed and scale of changes they have made to their teacher evaluation systems. One district made relatively extensive changes to the evaluation system, adopting a Danielson framework, adding a fourth summative rating, and taking advantage of that fourth rating to shift many teachers from receiving an “excellent” rating to receiving a “proficient” rating. This district also emphasized, in communicating with teachers, the scope of the changes. The other district made more modest changes that included adding the fourth summative rating but not emphasizing its use to differentiate “excellent” and “proficient” teachers, and in its communications, playing down the scope of change. The results of the data have implications for the best policy approach for

districts to take, and I address those implications in the survey section and in the section that articulates the statement of recommended policy.

Moral and Ethical Analysis

At the level of the State of Illinois' decision to overhaul teacher evaluation, a moral/ethical analysis revolves around the idea that students have a right to a good education and, therefore, a right to a quality teacher. If one believes that teacher evaluation reform will lead to an improvement in teacher quality – either by removing poor teachers from the classroom or by providing professional development to improve teachers' performance – then the right of students to a good education leads to a conclusion that the new Illinois laws are important for securing this right.

This paper focuses, however, on the policy response of districts to these new laws and how districts will implement the reform of teacher evaluation. One question is how vigorously districts should implement the new laws: whether they should aim to effect real change in their evaluation practices, or whether they should make only those changes that the laws specifically require and attempt to preserve as much of their existing systems as possible. For this question, the same moral/ethical analysis applies. If one believes that teacher evaluation reform will improve teacher quality, then the right of students to a good education demands that districts embrace teacher evaluation reform whole-heartedly.

Districts must also make a procedural choice as to *how* to change their evaluation systems, for instance, whether to involve teachers in the process, whether to make substantial changes quickly or phase them in slowly, and how to communicate changes to

teachers. Here it is insufficient simply to apply the right of students to a good education to reach any conclusion. For these decisions, a moral/ethical analysis might focus on the social good of a well-functioning school community and how to implement policy in a way that strengthens, rather than weakens, the sense of community within a school (Block, 2009, pp. 29-32, 47-53, 73-81). A well-functioning community is a moral good in itself. In addition, a well-functioning school community also leads to better student learning; as a result, the right of students to a good education may also weigh in favor of effecting change through inclusive processes (pp. 52-53).

SECTION THREE – FALL 2013 SURVEYS OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Background

In fall 2013, I surveyed teachers and administrators in two suburban Chicago school districts, “District A” and “District B.” This is a second-round of surveys, in follow-up to surveys I conducted in 2011 for my Program Evaluation paper (Heyde, 2011). That paper provides extensive detail on the research design, including participants, data gathering techniques, data analysis techniques, and the demographics of the two districts studied. I summarize this information briefly here and then present the results of the fall 2013 round of surveys. (Districts retain the same “A” and “B” designations in both 2011 and 2013.)

One change from fall 2011 is that the fall 2013 surveys did not include a third district, “District C,” that was included in the fall 2011 round of surveys. The fall 2011 data collection did not include a sufficient number of responses from District C to be able to make statistically-meaningful comparisons of results from 2011 to 2013 in that district. In addition, the interviews I conducted of human resources administrators, school principals, and teachers (summarized in Heyde, 2012) did not include District C. These interviews provide the basis for understanding the changes that occurred in each district between 2011 and 2013. Since the vast majority of my 2011 responses were from Districts A and B, and the 2012 interviews focus exclusively on these districts, the fall 2013 surveys also focus exclusively on the two districts.

Methodology

Participants for the fall 2013 surveys, like the fall 2011 surveys, are teachers and administrators in two suburban elementary school districts. These include “District A,” the district in which I teach, and “District B,” the district in which I live and in which I formerly served as a school board member.

As with the fall 2011 surveys, my research questions focus on three sub-topics: the current structure of the evaluation system; perception of the teacher evaluation system and awareness of changes; and the process for making those changes, including whether survey respondents are involved in those changes personally and whether teachers generally are involved (Heyde, 2011). In addition, the fall 2013 surveys added research questions around a fourth sub-topic: awareness and attitudes toward changes in the system that have occurred since the fall 2011 surveys.

As described in my Program Evaluation paper, District A is a K-8 district in an affluent, North-Shore suburb of Chicago (Heyde, 2011). In 2011, its enrollment was 3,360 students, it had a per-pupil operating expenditure of \$13,122, and a pupil-staff ratio of 10.7 to 1. Its students included only 1 percent low-income, and its students were 79.8% white, 10.2% Asian, 5.4% multiracial, and 4.1% Hispanic. District A had 330 teachers (287 FTE) with an average experience level of 10.8 years. District B is a somewhat less-affluent but still well-off school district in a northwest suburb of Chicago (Heyde, 2011). Its 2011 enrollment was 4,281 students, and it had a per-pupil operating expenditure of \$13,450 and a pupil-staff ratio of 11.3 to 1. Its students were 4% low-

income, and 86.4% white, 7.7% Hispanic, 3.3% Asian, and 2.2% multiracial. District B had 400 teachers in 2011 (321 FTE), with an average experience level of 14 years.

Fall 2013 surveys were made available to all teachers in Districts A and B and to all administrators in those districts who evaluate teachers. In District A, I received 75 responses from teachers, and in District B, I received 33 responses from teachers. I received seven administrator responses in District A and four administrator responses in District B. District A had 330 teachers in 2011, giving a District A teacher response rate of 23% (ignoring any minor changes in total number of teachers between 2011 and 2013). District B had 400 teachers, yielding a District B teacher response rate of 8% (again, ignoring any minor changes in total number of teachers between 2011 and 2013). District A has ten principals and assistant principals; the seven responses represent a 70% response rate. District B has 13 principals and assistant principals; the four responses yield a 31% response rate.

The results presented in the next sub-section include descriptive statistics and inferential methods. Many questions, particularly the questions on awareness and perception of the teacher evaluation system and the changes to the system, produced Likert-scale responses. In evaluating teacher responses, I used t-tests to compare those responses on four dimensions: (1) District A over time (2011 vs. 2013); (2) District B over time (2011 vs. 2013); (3) District A vs. District B in 2011; and (4) District A vs. District B in 2013. Results were judged significant if the null hypothesis of no differences between means could be rejected at the 95 percent confidence level (i.e., $p < 0.05$).

Use of t-tests is appropriate for the teacher responses because a sufficient number of responses was received to ensure, via the Central Limit Theorem, that the sample means are expected to be normally-distributed. In contrast, an insufficient number of administrator responses were received to make this same assumption for administrators. As a result, I do not present inferential statistical tests for administrator results (except for demographic questions that did not use a Likert scale), or comparing administrator results to teacher results. Trends in administrator results are characterized in text, with care taken not to ascribe statistical significance to any differences over time or between districts.

Teacher Evaluation Practices in District A and District B

During the 2011-2012 school year, District A implemented significant changes to its evaluation system (Heyde, 2012). The human resource director convened a committee of five administrators and nine teachers to plan the changes that the new Illinois laws required. Over the course of six meetings, the committee worked to align its teacher evaluation system and rubric to the framework outlined in Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (Danielson, 2007). This included revising the system to include four summative ratings from "excellent" to "unsatisfactory." Teachers would receive one of the four ratings in each of Danielson's four quadrants, such that an "excellent" rating would be worth four points; a "proficient" rating, three points; a "needs improvement," two points; and an "unsatisfactory," one point. To receive an "excellent" rating, a teacher must receive at least 15 points; a teacher must receive 11 points to be rated "proficient." Implementation included

negotiation of new contract language with the teacher's union and formal adoption by the board of education. The new system was then implemented in the 2012-2013 school year, so that teachers received their first evaluations under the new system in spring 2013.

District B also made changes to the evaluation system in the 2011-2012 school year, but they were significantly more modest than in District A (Heyde, 2012). A group of three administrators and three teachers worked to convert the district's existing teacher evaluation plan to include four summative ratings, instead of three. District B, however, did not adopt the Danielson or any other framework for evaluations, and District B did not expect any change in its then-current practice of giving most teachers an "excellent" rating. District B's changes to the evaluation system were approved by the teacher's union and an administrative council (in which all administrators participate), but changes to the evaluation system were not presented to the board of education for approval or otherwise highlighted as significant. District B sees the next significant change as incorporating student growth measures into evaluations, as the new Illinois laws require be done by 2016. The changes so far, thus, are seen as only minor steps, with the more significant changes yet to come.

2013 Survey Results

Demographic Questions

Table 1 presents data on the number of teachers that each administrator respondent is responsible for evaluating. In 2011, District A and B differed significantly in the number of teachers each administrator was responsible for evaluating. (District A mean = 19.5; District B mean = 43.3; $p = 0.01$). In 2013, the difference was no longer

significant. (District A mean = 21.0; District B mean = 26.3; $p = 0.24$). Any changes over time in the two districts were also not significant.

Tables 2(a) and 2(b) present data on the experience level of teachers. Table 2(a) presents results on the total number of years of teaching that a teacher has. In 2011 and 2013, District A teachers tended to have less experience than District B teachers. (District A mean = 12.2; District B mean = 15.8; $p = 0.01$.) The average experience for District A teachers increased significantly between 2011 and 2013. (2011 mean = 12.2; 2013 mean = 15.0; $p = 0.04$.) As a result, in 2013, there was no significant difference in mean total experience between the two districts. However, as Table 2(b) shows, teachers in District A have significantly less experience in their current district than teachers in District B. (For 2011, District A mean = 9.1; District B mean = 11.6; $p = 0.02$. For 2013, District A mean = 9.7; District B mean = 14.1; $p < 0.01$.)

Views of the Current Evaluation System

In both 2011 and 2013, administrators and teachers were asked whether the current evaluation system does a good job of recognizing stronger teachers. Table 3(a) presents results for administrators. While inferential methods could not be applied, District A administrators appear to agree with this statement more than District B administrators, and administrators in both districts appeared to agree more in 2013 than in 2011. Table 3(b) presents results for teachers. In 2011, there was no significant difference in how teachers in the two districts viewed this question, with teachers in both districts relatively evenly balance among agreeing/strongly agreeing, neutral, and disagreeing/strongly disagreeing. By 2013, District A teachers agreed with the statement

significantly more. (2011 mean = 2.86¹; 2013 mean = 3.70; $p < 0.01$.) As a result, the two districts differed significantly in 2013. (District A mean = 3.70; District B mean = 2.82; $p < 0.01$.)

Respondents were also asked whether the current system does a good job of identifying weaker teachers, and Tables 4(a) (administrators) and 4(b) (teachers) present the results. In both 2011 and 2013, District A administrators appear to agree with this statement more than District B administrators, and there are no apparent differences in each district between years. Among teachers, however, attitudes in District A changed significantly between the two years. In 2011, teachers in the two districts did not differ significantly in their attitudes, with both districts averaging between “disagree” and “neutral.” District A teachers agreed with the statement significantly more in 2013, however. (2011 mean = 2.64; 2013 mean = 3.48; $p < 0.01$.) As a result, District A teachers in 2013 agreed with the statement significantly more than District B teachers. (District A mean = 3.48; District B mean = 2.79; $p < 0.01$.)

Tables 5(a) (administrators) and 5(b) (teachers) report agreement with the statement that the current system allows for meaningful, formative suggestions for teacher growth. Virtually all administrators in both districts and both years agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Teachers slightly agreed with this statement in both 2011 and 2013 (averaging between “neutral” and “agree”). District A teachers increased their agreement between 2011 and 2013 to a small, but significant degree. (2011 mean =

¹ Likert-scale responses were converted to a 1 to 5 scale, with strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, neutral = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. Other Likert-scale responses were similarly converted to five- or three-point scales, as appropriate.

3.50; 2013 mean = 3.84; $p = 0.02$.) Other differences, whether between years or between districts, were not significant.

Respondents were asked whether the current ratings are fair; Tables 6(a) and 6(b) present the results for administrators and teachers, respectively. Administrators showed little change in agreement with this statement between 2011 and 2013. Means for both districts and both years ranged from 3.43 and 3.67, indicating slight agreement with the statement, but less so than for other statements. Teachers mildly agree with this statement, and their means are similar to those of administrators. (Teachers' means range from 3.29 to 3.68.) Teachers' mean ratings did not change significantly over time or across districts.

Table 7 reports administrators' level of agreement with the statement that teachers find the formative suggestions in evaluations to be helpful. (Teachers were not asked this question.) Between 2011 and 2013, District A administrators increased their level of agreement with this statement. (2011 mean = 3.38; 2013 mean = 4.14.) District B administrators did not experience any change over time. (2011 mean = 2013 mean = 3.67.)

Finally, administrators and teachers were asked whether administrators have the training and guidance they need to produce fair evaluations; results are in Tables 8(a) and 8(b). Between 2011 and 2013, District A administrators increased their agreement with this statement. (2011 mean = 3.75; 2013 mean = 4.57.) District B administrators did not experience any change. (2011 mean = 2013 mean = 4.00.) Teachers in 2011 in both districts averaged between "neutral" and "agree." Between 2011 and 2013, District B

administrators agreed with the statement significantly less. (2011 mean = 3.44; 2013 mean = 2.89; $p = 0.02$.) There was no significant corresponding change in District A. As a result, in 2013, teachers in the two districts differed significantly, with District B teachers significantly less likely to believe that their administrators had the training and guidance they need to fairly evaluate teachers. (District A mean = 3.35; District B mean = 2.89; $p = 0.04$.)

Items That Would Improve the Evaluation System

Administrators and teachers were each asked two questions to elicit their views as to what types of changes would improve the teacher evaluation system. Tables 9(a) reports results from a question that asked administrators which of the following changes, if any, would significantly help you deliver more differentiated evaluations to your teachers. Table 9(b) reports results from a similar question that asked teachers which changes would significantly contribute to making evaluations more accurate and fair. In both cases, respondents were given choices of “none,” more formal observations, more informal observations or walk-throughs, student performance or growth data, information on how students and parents view teachers, teacher journals or classroom artifacts, or “other.”

In 2011, a majority of administrators in the two districts suggested more informal observations or walk-throughs (73%), student performance or growth data (73%), and teacher journals or classroom artifacts (64%). In 2013, the only idea that still commanded a majority of the respondents was more informal observations or walk-throughs (82%). Student performance or growth data had dropped to 36%, as had teacher

journals or classroom artifacts. These changes were driven by District A administrators. In 2011, a majority of District A administrators had suggested several items. In 2013, five out of seven respondents suggested more informal observations or walk-throughs. Three out of seven suggested student performance or growth data, and no more than two District A administrators suggested anything else.

In both years, approximately 60-70 percent of teachers suggested more informal observations or walk-throughs. This consistency, however, masks changes in the two districts. Over the two years, the share of District A teachers suggesting this dropped from 75% to 54%. In District B, however, the share of teachers suggesting this *rose* from 56% to 86%. No other suggestion garnered a majority of responses, in either district or in either year. Finally, in each year, about 13 percent of teachers answered “none”; in contrast, no administrators answered “none” in either year. In District A, the share of “none” respondents rose from 8% in 2011 to 15% in 2013. In District B, the share declined from 22% in 2011 to 7% in 2013.

Both administrators and teachers were specifically asked how helpful student performance or growth data would be for improving evaluations; responses were on a five-point Likert scale (helpful = 5; neutral = 3; unhelpful = 1). Table 10(a) reports the results for administrators. Administrators, in both years and both districts, unanimously agreed that student performance or growth data would be helpful or somewhat helpful. No patterns appear between districts or years. Table 10(b) reports similar results for teachers. Teachers’ mean scores ranged from “neutral” to “somewhat unhelpful,” with

means for individual districts and years ranging from 2.60 to 2.97. Differences between districts and between years were not significant.

Information and Involvement

Administrators and teachers were asked three questions regarding the level of information they had about any planned, future changes to the evaluation system and about their expectations for their own involvement and for teacher involvement in any coming changes. The questions were asked about planned changes, rather than changes already made, in both 2011 and 2013. In 2013, however, it is expected that the results are strongly suggestive of the level of involvement that respondents and teachers generally actually had in any changes between 2011 and 2013.

Tables 11(a) and 11(b) report results, for administrators and teachers, to the question of how well-informed the respondent feels about any planned future changes. Results were on a three-point Likert scale (well-informed = 3; somewhat-informed = 2; not informed = 1). Administrators reported approximately the same level of information in both years, with their responses generally ranging between “well-informed” and “somewhat-informed.” It is possible that District B administrators felt less well-informed in 2013 than District A administrators, but any differences are subtle. Teachers felt less informed than administrators, with means for three of the four district/year combinations falling between 1.5 (about halfway between “not informed” and “somewhat-informed”) and 2 (“somewhat-informed”). The mean District A response increased significantly between 2011 and 2013. (2011 mean = 1.79; 2013 mean = 2.08; $p = 0.03$.) As a result,

District A teachers felt significantly more informed about possible future changes in 2013 than District B teachers felt. (District A mean = 2.08; District B mean = 1.63; $p < 0.01$.)

Respondents were asked to report, on a five-point Likert scale, their agreement with the statement that they expect personally to be involved in any change. Table 12(a) reports results for administrators. Most administrators agreed or strongly agreed that they would be involved in any changes. Averages for both districts for 2011 and for District A for 2013 are all greater than 4 (“agree”). The average for District B for 2013 is only 3.5 (halfway between “neutral” and “agree”). It is not possible to tell if this lower mean is significantly different or due to chance. Table 12(b) reports results for teachers. Teachers are less sure than administrators that they will be involved in any changes; means for most districts and years hover around 3 (“neutral”). In 2011, District A teachers were significantly less likely to agree that they will be involved than District B teachers. (District A mean = 2.81; District B mean = 3.46; $p < 0.01$.) Between the two years, District A teachers became significantly more likely to agree that they would be involved. (2011 mean = 2.81; 2013 mean = 3.19; $p = 0.04$.) As a result, the two districts were no longer significantly different in 2013.

Tables 13(a) and 13(b), for administrators and teachers, report results from a similar question (also on a five-point Likert scale) as to whether respondents expected that teachers generally would be involved in any change. As with the previous question, most administrators agreed or strongly agree that teachers would be involved in any changes. Averages for both districts for 2011 and for District A for 2013 are all greater than 4.5 (halfway between “agree” and “strongly agree”). The average for District B for

2013 is only 3.25 (slightly above “neutral”). It is not possible to tell if this lower mean is significantly different or due to chance. Table 13(b) reports results for teachers. Teachers generally agreed that teachers will be involved in any changes, although their agreement appears to be not as strong as that of administrators. In 2011, District B teachers were significantly more likely than District A teachers to agree. (District A mean = 3.80; District B mean = 4.37; $p < 0.01$.) By 2013, there was no significant difference between the two districts. However, there was also not significance to any changes between 2011 and 2013 in either result; as a result, it is not possible to determine why the 2011 difference between the two districts is no longer significant.

Assessment of Changes Since 2011

The final group of questions asked administrators and teachers who were in at least their third years in their districts to assess the changes in teacher evaluation that their districts had put into place since 2011. These questions were similar to the questions respondents were asked to elicit their views of the current system, and, except for one question, these questions were also based on five-point Likert scales (5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neutral; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree). The first question was the one question that was not on a five-point Likert scale. This question asked whether the respondent’s district “had made changes” to its teacher evaluation system in the past two years. Permissible responses included “yes, significant changes,” “yes, minor changes,” or “no.” (Respondents could also indicate that they had been in their districts for two or fewer years, in which case their responses were not averaged in with the others.)

Tables 14(a) and 14(b) present results, for administrators and teachers, to the question about whether the district had made changes since 2011. All District A administrators agreed that District A had gone through significant changes in the past two years. Both District B administrators who completed this part of the survey replied that District B had gone through minor changes in the past two years. These responses track the results of the interviews described above and in my Change Plan paper (Heyde, 2012). Similarly, over 90 percent of District A teachers described the changes in District A as significant. In contrast, a majority (54%) of District B teachers described changes as minor, with another 39% of District B teachers saying that no change had occurred. Means for a three-point Likert scale were significantly different between the districts. (District A mean = 2.92; District B mean = 1.69; $p < 0.01$.) The administrator and teacher responses track the results of the interviews described above and in my Change Plan paper (Heyde, 2012).

Respondents were asked whether the changes were positive; Tables 15(a) (administrators) and 15(b) (teachers) report the results. Administrators in both districts overwhelmingly found the changes to be positive. Out of eight administrators, only one (in District B) responded “neutral”; the rest responded “agree” or “strongly agree.” Teachers generally agreed that their districts’ changes were positive, but not as overwhelmingly as administrators. Nearly three quarters of District A teachers agreed that the changes were positive; half of District B teachers agreed. The district means did not differ much or significantly. (District A mean = 3.70; District B mean = 3.44; $p = 0.30$).

Tables 16(a) and 16(b) report administrators' and teachers' responses, respectively, as to whether the revised system does a better job of recognizing stronger teachers. Administrators in District A overwhelmingly agreed with this statement, with only one respondent answering "neutral" and the rest answering "agree" or "strongly agree." Of the two District B administrators who responded, one agreed and one answered "neutral." Teachers in District A also tended to agree with the statement; 70% agreed or strongly agreed. Only 16% of District B teachers, however, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The difference in mean responses between the two districts is significant, with District A teachers agreeing significantly more than District B teachers. (District A mean = 3.67; District B mean = 2.79; $p < 0.01$.)

Respondents were also asked whether the revised system does a better job of identifying weaker teachers, and Tables 17(a) and 17(b) report the results for administrators and teachers, respectively. Administrators in District A were split between agreeing/strongly agreeing and neutral, with 50% in each category. The two District B administrators answered "neutral" and "disagree." Similarly, District A teachers tended to agree, with 61% agreeing or strongly agreeing. In contrast, only 5% of District B teachers agreed or strongly agreed, and the difference in means was significant. (District A mean = 3.72; District B mean = 2.53; $p < 0.01$.)

Tables 18(a) and 18(b), for administrators and teachers, report responses to whether the revised system does a better job of providing meaningful, formative suggestions to teachers. District A administrators unanimously agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, while the two District B administrators split between "neutral" and

“disagree.” Teachers in District A also tended to agree, with 75% agreeing or strongly agreeing. District B teachers tended to agree less, with 42% agreeing or strongly agreeing (although the District B mean was still slightly above “neutral”). The mean response differed significantly between districts, with the District A mean significantly higher than the District B mean. (District A mean = 4.67; District B mean = 3.72; $p = 0.03$.)

Administrators (Table 19(a)) and teachers (Table 19(b)) were also asked whether the revised system produces summative ratings that are fairer than under the prior system. District A administrators unanimously agreed or strongly agreed. Both District B administrators answered “neutral.” Teacher responses in both districts were relatively neutral, with averages slightly above “neutral.” (District A mean = 3.31; District B mean = 3.16.) The difference in means was not significant. However, the distribution of teacher responses within districts appeared to differ. In District B, a majority of teachers (58%) answered “neutral.” In District A, only 28% answered neutral, but larger numbers either agreed/strongly agreed (48%) or disagreed/strongly disagreed (23%).

Respondents were asked whether, under the revised system, evaluators had improved skill, training, and guidance. Table 20(a) reports results for administrators, and Table 20(b) reports results for teachers. All administrators in both districts agreed or strongly agreed. A majority of District A administrators, in fact, strongly agreed, while both District B administrators who answered the question agreed. Teachers were more neutral on this statement. In District B, the mean was 3.0 (“neutral”), with equal numbers agreeing/strongly agreeing and disagreeing/strongly disagreeing (26% each). In District

A, the mean was 3.44, with 59% agreeing/strongly agreeing and 19% disagreeing/strongly disagreeing. The difference in means, however, was not significant. ($p = 0.08$.)

Respondents were asked whether they understand the revised system; Tables 21(a) and Tables 21(b) report results for administrators and teachers. All but one administrator in both districts agreed or strongly agreed, with the remaining administrator (a District B administrator) answering “neutral.” The mean response for District A administrators was 4.83; the mean for District B administrators was 4.00. District A teachers overwhelmingly agreed or strongly agreed (81%), giving District A a mean response of 3.97. District B teachers also agreed, but with 59% agreeing/strongly agreeing, they did so to a significantly lesser extent. (District A mean = 3.97; District B mean = 3.41; $p = 0.02$.)

Tables 22(a) and 22(b) report results, for administrators and teachers, to a question asking whether teachers were involved in designing the revised system. All but one administrator in both districts agreed or strongly agreed, with the remaining administrator (a District B administrator) disagreeing. The mean administrator response in District A was 4.50; the mean response in District B was 3.00. Teachers were split on this question, in both districts, with means very close to 3.0. (District A mean = 3.07; District B mean = 2.94; $p = 0.68$.) These means reflected substantial disagreement among teachers. In District A, 39% of teachers agreed/strongly agreed that teachers had been involved, while 37% of teachers disagreed/strongly disagreed. In District B, 31% of teachers agreed/strongly agreed, with the same percentage disagreeing/strongly disagreeing.

Finally, respondents were asked whether the changes in the evaluation systems were communicated well. Table 23(a) presents results for administrators, and Table 23(b) presents results for teachers. For administrators, the results matched those of the previous question exactly. All but one administrator agreed or strongly agreed; the remaining administrator, in District B, disagreed. Teachers in District A overwhelmingly agreed: 72% agreed or strongly agreed, with a mean response of 3.72. District B teachers differed significantly, tending to disagree. Only 24% of District B teachers agreed or strongly agreed, leading to a mean of 2.65. (District A mean = 3.72; District B mean = 2.65; $p < 0.01$.)

SECTION FOUR – IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDED POLICY

Implications from the Data

District A underwent more change than District B did in the two-year period from 2011 to 2013. It also communicated clearly that it intended to change its evaluation system significantly, and it did not attempt to downplay the change. In contrast, District B undertook only the minimal amount of change that the new laws required for this time period. While I take this characterization largely from the interviews of human resource directors that I conducted for my Change Plan paper (Heyde, 2012), the 2013 survey data also bears this out, with teachers and administrators overwhelmingly agreeing in District A that they had experienced significant change, while teachers and administrators in District B overwhelmingly characterizing that district's change as minor.

Nonetheless, even though teachers and administrators in the two districts had similar attitudes toward their evaluation systems in 2011, by 2013, District A teachers and administrators tended to have more positive attitudes about their revised evaluation system than did District B teachers and administrators. Among teachers, the differences were statistically significant across a number of comparisons. District A teachers were significantly more likely than District B teachers to say that their 2013 system was good at recognizing stronger teachers, identifying weaker teachers, and providing meaningful formative suggestions. District A teachers were also significantly more likely than District B teachers to say that the recent changes had improved their evaluation system in these same dimensions. District A teachers were also significantly more likely than District B teachers to say that their administrators had the requisite training, skill, and

guidance to perform fair evaluations, even though administrators in both districts had received significant, state-mandated evaluation training in the summer of 2012.

District A teachers also felt significantly more informed in 2013 than District B teachers did. Moreover, they felt they understood their current system significantly more than District B teachers did. District A teachers also overwhelmingly agreed that the changes were communicated well, while District B teachers tended to disagree that the change they experienced was well-communicated. Finally, District A closed a gap that had existed in 2011 regarding teachers' expectations of being involved: although District B teachers had a greater expectation of involvement in 2011, by 2013, teachers in both districts had similar expectations of involvement in any further change going forward.

These results suggest that District A was both able to accomplish more substantive change in the two-year period, and that District A was able to do so to a relatively positive reception from its administrators and teachers. In contrast, even though District B sought to maintain the status quo except for the changes that the new laws specifically required in the 2011-2013 time period, District B teachers ended the two-year period without creating more positive impressions of the teacher evaluation system or their role in changing it.

Statement of Recommended Policy

These results suggest that districts could profitably pursue a set of related policies regarding teacher evaluation reform. First, districts should whole-heartedly embrace the effort to reform teacher evaluation practices to make evaluations more meaningful, better able to identify stronger and weaker teachers, and more accurate. Second, districts

should pursue these reforms promptly and openly, rather than prolonging the time needed for change. Third, districts should communicate frequently about the changes to ensure that all participants in the system understand the changes as they occur. We might refer to this set of policies as a “whole-hearted” approach to teacher evaluation reform, as opposed to an incremental approach.

A whole-hearted approach to teacher evaluation reform has several goals. It seeks to realize the benefits of improved teacher evaluation practices more quickly than an incremental approach can achieve. It also seeks to minimize the period of uncertainty among teachers and evaluators. Finally, it seeks to give teachers a feeling of control by ensuring that they understand the process of change as it occurs and encouraging them to feel involved in the changes.

The whole-hearted approach to teacher evaluation reform also serves the needs of students, in that it is intended to result in a quicker, more complete adoption of teacher evaluation reform, which should lead to greater teacher effectiveness and greater student learning. It also serves the needs and preferences of teachers by reducing the period of uncertainty and giving teachers a sense of control and involvement. In turn, this should increase the degree of respect teachers feel and foster a sense of professionalism in schools. The goal of increasing student learning is an appropriate one because it allows schools to achieve their basic mission more completely. The goal of giving teachers a sense of control, involvement, and respect also is a legitimate goal, particularly because it complements, rather than competes, with the goal of increasing student learning.

One caveat is particularly important in describing the recommended policy. The quantitative data and qualitative information I have collected support a whole-hearted approach to the kind of teacher evaluation reform that the Illinois laws required in the 2011-2013 time period and that District A adopted. This includes creating additional categories of summative assessment, using those categories to avoid categorizing all or nearly all teachers as “excellent,” and aligning the evaluation system to a clear evaluation framework such as the Danielson framework. It does not necessarily include tying teacher evaluations to student performance or growth data based on standardized testing. As described in my Program Evaluation and Change Plan papers, there are extensive criticisms and cautions regarding the use of student performance or growth data in evaluations (Heyde, 2011; Heyde, 2012). This literature suggests that a whole-hearted approach to that particular “reform” of teacher evaluation may not serve the goals of improving teacher performance, and this “reform” is particularly unlikely to serve the goals of giving teachers a sense of control, involvement, and respect.

SECTION FIVE – POLICY ARGUMENT

For the most part, the argument for a whole-hearted approach to teacher evaluation reform comes from the empirical data described in the previous sections of this paper. Both a whole-hearted approach, as District A undertook it, and the more incremental approach that District B pursued are intended to improve the quality of teacher evaluations (and, thus, teacher quality and student learning) while also respecting teachers' desire for a sense of control and involvement. The argument for the whole-hearted approach is that the data show that this approach achieves these goals more fully than an incremental approach.

As described above, the two districts studied were relatively similar in 2011. They were similar demographically, in that both districts were affluent, had low percentages of low-income students, and had ample resources for public education (Heyde, 2011). They also were similar in terms of administrators' and teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation and the degree to which they were aware of potential changes in teacher evaluation practices. The two districts were *not* similar, however, in the policy approaches they took in response to the state mandate to change their teacher evaluation systems. As a result, the two districts offer a good empirical test of different policy approaches toward teacher evaluation reform.

The 2013 survey results indicate that the whole-hearted approach not only accomplishes more substantively, but also leaves administrators and, particularly, teachers feeling more positive about the system and the process of change. Teachers in both districts knew whether their districts were undertaking significant or only minor change. Yet the teachers who experienced significant change were significantly more

likely to say that the change had produced evaluation systems that accomplished the goals of a teacher evaluation reform, including identifying stronger and weaker teachers and providing meaningful formative suggestions. The teachers who had experienced change also felt significantly more informed, had a significantly greater feeling of understanding, and were pleased with how the changes were communicated. This gives a strong, empirical argument in support of a whole-hearted approach to teacher evaluation reform.

Absent the empirical evidence, it would be tempting to predict that an incremental reform would serve the goal of giving teachers a feeling of involvement, control, and respect better than a whole-hearted approach. One could argue that it is better not to overwhelm teachers with rapid, significant change (Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009, pp. 110-111). One might predict that teachers would feel a greater sense of control if the status quo were changed slowly over time, rather than with a big, potentially disorienting change that pulls teachers out of their "comfort zones" (Wagner et al., 2006, p. 207). The empirical data, however, indicate that this more incremental approach leaves less positive feelings about the evaluation system and less satisfaction about teachers' level of understanding and involvement. While the data do not explore why this is, one possibility is that a longer, more incremental change process leaves teachers feeling unsettled and anxious about the changes that are still yet to come. Put another way, teachers under an incremental approach may be left waiting for "the other shoe to drop."

A third potential response to the new state laws regarding teacher evaluation is to resist them outright. Even the incremental approach assumes that the district genuinely

intends to reform its teacher evaluation system but is choosing a more gradual path in doing so. Some may argue, however, that districts should do the bare minimum to comply with the new laws, not as the first step in a gradual transformation, but in an attempt to make as little total change as possible. A district following this approach might, for example, comply with the mandate to change from three to four categories of summative evaluation, but then assure teachers that the district will continue to rate all teachers as “excellent” (as long as there are no particular problems with a teacher that would lead the district to want to terminate that teacher). Similarly, a district intent on nullifying state-mandated change might officially incorporate student performance data into evaluations, but set the thresholds for student performance low enough or allow teachers to focus on growth in only a small subset of students so that nearly all teachers have “excellent” student performance data.

The empirical data from the 2011 and 2013 surveys do not assist in evaluating a resistance approach to teacher evaluation reform. Prior literature, however, provides reason to think that this approach is not productive (Glazerman et al., 2010; Donaldson, 2009; Tucker & Stronge, 2005). These authors advocate the importance of districts working actively and quickly to make teacher evaluations more meaningful. They advocate that districts must revise their teacher evaluation systems to meaningfully and reliably differentiate based on teacher effectiveness, including observations, parent feedback, teacher self-reflections, and student growth data. They caution that it is important for administrators to examine "multiple years of [student growth] data in

combination with other sources of information to increase reliability and validity"

(Glazerman et al., 2010, p. 5).

Among these three policy responses to the state mandate for teacher evaluation reform, the existing literature indicates that districts should embrace the ultimate goal of evaluation reform (although not necessarily the use of student performance or growth data). In turn, the empirical data from the 2011 and 2013 surveys supports a whole-hearted approach to teacher evaluation reform, rather than a more incremental approach.

SECTION SIX – POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Implementation of a “whole-hearted” approach to reforming teacher evaluation requires attention both to substance and process. The substance, of course, is the actual redesign of the teacher evaluation system so that it better serves the function of differentiating among teachers and encouraging an improvement in teacher quality. The process of making these substantive changes, however, arguably is just as important as the substance itself for meeting the goal of attaining teacher buy-in for the revised teacher evaluation system.

The substantive changes to the teacher evaluation system should center on three basic changes to the system. First, to the extent a teacher evaluation system has only three summative categories of evaluation, a district must modify the system to include a fourth summative category. While this may seem to be a minor detail, having the fourth category may be psychologically important for evaluators to have if they are to differentiate among teachers. Particularly in suburban school districts, evaluators are likely to feel that their “average” teachers are, in a more global sense, “above average”; these evaluators will be reluctant to place teachers in the middle of three categories, especially if the bottom category is labeled “needs improvement.” With four categories, in contrast, evaluators may be more likely to use both “excellent” and “proficient” for the majority of their teachers.

Second, evaluators need to be encouraged to differentiate among teachers when conducting evaluations. In some suburban school districts, the prevailing culture holds that *all* teachers are “excellent” and that distinctions should not be made among the bulk of teachers who are not “having trouble.” If this culture is not changed, any redesign to

the system will not succeed. Changing the outlook among evaluators is a matter of training. Districts can take advantage of new, state-mandated training that attempts to place more definition to what classroom practices deserve an “excellent,” versus a “proficient” rating. In addition, districts may need to supplement this training with their own training. At a minimum, districts need to reassure evaluators that they have “permission” to differentiate among teachers. Moreover, separating "excellent" and "proficient" teachers into distinct categories will have implications for staff development. For example, "excellent" teachers may be recruited as teacher-leaders to share their teaching strategies and present successful lessons to their peers during staff and department meetings, which will provide additional formative assistance to help "proficient" teachers increase their skills.

Third, a reformed teacher evaluation system should be firmly grounded in a framework for teacher evaluation; otherwise, the summative categories will not have any real meaning. The most obvious framework that districts could use in reforming their systems is Danielson’s framework. As described extensively in my Program Evaluation and Change Plan papers, Danielson’s framework is the most prominent of several evaluation frameworks (Heyde, 2011; Heyde, 2012). In addition, the state-mandated evaluation training for administrators uses the Danielson framework as its basis. Whether a district chooses this framework or an alternative, it needs to make sure that its evaluation system adopts a clear, shared understanding of the evaluation framework.

The process of implementing a “whole-hearted” approach to teacher evaluation aims to make sure that teachers and administrators understand and accept the goals of the

change, feel that they have input into the specific changes that are made, and understand how the revised evaluation system works. Districts may be well-served in following four basic steps in implementing change in the evaluation system. These steps are:

1. Publicize the need for change. Data from 2011 show that teachers in both Districts A and B had limited understanding that any change was coming in teacher evaluations, even though the change was required by state law. This suggests an opportunity to raise understanding of the need to change more quickly than either District A or B was able to do. Districts could do this by convening a focus group, a study group, or other opportunities for conversation, around what currently works and does not work in the district's teacher evaluation system. Administrators, during the course of these discussions, could share information about the state mandate for change and work it into the discussion. Alternatively, districts could use professional development time periodically to report to teachers on trends and other coming issues in education, including the changes needed in teacher evaluation, so that teachers felt informed about the issue, even before any solutions or specific changes are devised.

2. Develop the framework to be used. If a district does not have an explicit framework for its evaluation system, choosing one is the next concrete step in changing the system (after publicizing the need for change). Districts should form a teacher-administrator joint committee to study alternative frameworks and recommend a specific framework. (Since state law requires a union-administration committee to decide how to incorporate student performance data into evaluations, the same committee structure might be used to choose a framework.) In addition, because the choice of framework

involves, at least to some extent, a value statement about how to evaluate teachers, districts may want to consider involving their boards of education and parent representatives in this part of the process.

3. Develop the specifics of the revised evaluation system. Once a district selects a framework for the evaluation system, it needs to devise the details of how to apply that framework and generate summative ratings. Examples include how to weight different domains in a framework and how to allocate “points” that determine the ultimate summative rating a teacher receives. Districts should make sure teachers remain involved at this stage. They could do so either by continuing the work of the committee described in Step 2. Alternatively, they could create an opportunity for additional teachers to get involved by having a second committee perform this work. Because this is more detailed work, districts may prefer not to involve their boards of education or parent communities directly in this work, although they will want to keep these stakeholders informed.

4. Publicize the results of the change process. Finally, to ensure that both administrators and teachers feel they understand the new system, and understand its benefits, districts should provide numerous opportunities to learn about the new system and how summative ratings are expected to change under the new system. Districts should consider sharing as much information as possible as widely as possible. For example, it may be helpful to share training material for administrators with teachers, under the same theory that teachers routinely share grading rubrics with their students. In addition, districts may want to develop a sample portfolio of evidence demonstrating

"excellent" planning, instruction, classroom management, and professionalism. A sample portfolio of evidence of "excellent" teaching will help teachers understand the evaluators' expectations under the new teacher evaluation system.

If districts pay careful attention to the process of changing their evaluation systems, as well as to the substance of the changes, they can maximize the chance that the reform of their evaluation systems meets all of the goals of a whole-hearted approach to evaluation reform. These steps should lead to a situation in which evaluations are perceived to differentiate better, and actually do differentiate better, as well as a widespread belief that the new evaluation system is fair, accurate, and meaningful.

SECTION SEVEN – POLICY ASSESSMENT PLAN

Although the substantive changes and procedural steps described in Section Six should lead to an evaluation system that meets the goals of “whole-hearted” evaluation reform, it is important to assess any major change to make sure that it has achieved the expected results. The assessment approach should be selected to match the results that are expected. For example, since a whole-hearted approach to evaluation reform is expected to produce both a system that differentiates better among teachers and a situation in which teachers and administrators have greater confidence in the system, it makes sense to collect data on teacher and administrator attitudes. In contrast, because the connection between an improved evaluation system and student performance is indirect at best, it might be difficult for districts to try to analyze data on student performance or growth to decide whether teacher evaluation reform has worked.

In particular, the types of data I collected for this paper and my Program Evaluation paper would be particularly helpful for assessing a district’s implementation of a whole-hearted evaluation reform. The 2013 surveys described above measured teacher attitudes and understanding of the teacher evaluation system, the changes that have been made, and the process of making those changes. Districts could administer a similar survey to their teachers and administrators. To the extent the whole-hearted approach works, districts should see substantial agreement on many of the Likert questions in the 2013 survey.

An even better assessment approach would include two rounds of surveying, akin to the 2011 and 2013 surveys I took. While this would take additional time and resources, having two rounds of surveying would allow a baseline look at teacher and

administrator attitudes and understanding, followed by a “post-change” look at these same issues. In addition, the first round of surveying – especially if conducted and publicized heavily by the district administration, rather than an outside researcher – would provide some of the initial publicity around the need for change that I describe above as the first step in the change process.

When evaluating the baseline and post-change data, districts would expect to see an improvement in the number of teachers and administrators who agree with many of the Likert measures in the surveys. If districts see this type of improvement in the survey results, then they know that the changes they have made have been both substantively and procedurally successful. If districts see unexpected results, they may need to consider whether additional changes to the system, additional training, or additional communication is needed in order to achieve a district’s goals.

SECTION EIGHT – SUMMARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Evaluating teachers well is a critical function for school districts, for numerous reasons. At its core, the teacher evaluation system assures that students are taught by strong, effective teachers. A good teacher evaluation system also gives teachers good, formative ideas on how to improve their practice. It also gives signals both to stronger teachers, to give them confidence that their work is appreciated, and to weaker teachers (even if they are not weak enough to require remediation), that they need to find ways to improve. Finally, an effective teacher evaluation system should help improve teacher morale because teachers believe in the system and have confidence that the ratings it produces are fair, accurate, and meaningful.

States such as Illinois have taken a significant policy step by requiring school districts to make substantial changes to their teacher evaluation systems. In Illinois, this has included mandating a four-rating system, forcing a connection between teacher evaluation and RIFs and teacher recalls, and (eventually) requiring teacher evaluations to be based in part on student performance or growth data. Individual school districts, in turn, have to choose between competing policy approaches on how to respond to these state mandates.

This paper has advocated a policy of “whole-hearted” embrace of these reforms (although districts will still need to consider the continuing research on the issue of using student performance or growth data directly in evaluations). The whole-hearted approach involves embracing the goals of teacher evaluation reform, making substantive changes to evaluation systems so that they differentiate among teachers better and produce fair and accurate evaluations. At the same time, the whole-hearted approach also involves a

collaborative process in making those changes, so that teachers and administrators feel a stake in the need for change, the change process, and ultimately the revised evaluation process.

Data from two suburban school districts show a significant difference in teacher attitudes toward the evaluation systems and the change process after two years of different approaches toward change. District B, which made only minor changes and did not emphasize those changes, saw little change in the way that teachers and administrators viewed the system. In contrast, District A, which made significant changes and emphasized the practical change that would result in teachers' summative ratings, saw significant improvements in teachers and administrators' understanding of the system and belief in the system's usefulness, fairness, and accuracy. These data provide a principal argument in favor of a whole-hearted approach to evaluation reform.

Districts undertaking a whole-hearted approach to evaluation reform need to pay attention both to the substance of the changes being made and to the process by which these changes are made. Key changes to the system include implementing a four-category system, training evaluators to use multiple categories in practice, and adopting a clear evaluation framework. Critical steps in the process of implementation include publicizing the need for change, working collaboratively to adopt an evaluation framework, continuing that collaboration to define the details of the evaluation, and then providing extensive communication and training on the revised system.

If districts are careful to monitor the implementation of change, they should be able to see, through survey data similar to the data I have described here, that teachers

and administrators feel significantly greater understanding of and confidence in the teacher evaluation system. If this is achieved, likely impacts include improved ability of administrators to differentiate among teachers in making personnel decisions, improved ability of teachers to discover new ways they can improve, greater teacher morale, and ultimately, improved teaching and learning.

REFERENCES

- Block, P. (2009). *Community: the structure of belonging*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: a framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Donaldson, M. (2009). *So long, Lake Wobegon? Using teacher evaluation to raise teacher quality*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2009). *Leading adult learning: supporting adult development in our schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Glazerman, S., Loeb, S., Goldhager, D., Staiger, D., Raudenbush, S., & Whitehurst, G. (2010). *Evaluating teachers: The important role of value-added*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution, Brown Center on Education Policy.
- Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Heyde, C. (2011). *Teacher and administrator perceptions of the effectiveness of current teacher evaluation practices and the impact of the new Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 (PERA)* (Partial doctoral dissertation). National Louis University, Chicago.

- Heyde, C (2012). *Analysis of change plans in two elementary school districts for teacher evaluation practices following the new Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 (PERA)* (Partial doctoral dissertation). National Louis University, Chicago.
- Public Act 96-861 (2010). Performance Evaluation Reform Act.
- Public Act 97-008 (2011).
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: how testing and choice are undermining education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tucker, P., & Stronge, J. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wagner, T., et al. (2006). *Change leadership: a practical guide to transforming our schools*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

TABLES AND APPENDICES

Table 1

How many teachers are you responsible for evaluating?
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Average	19.50	43.33	21	26.25
St Dev	8.14	17.56	2.52	10.81
Min	5	25	18	15
Median	20	45	20	24
Max	31	60	26	41

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -3.213$, $df = 9$, $p = 0.01$ (significant)

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = -1.274$, $df = 9$, $p = 0.24$

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -0.466$, $df = 13$, $p = 0.65$

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 1.608$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.13$

Table 2(a)

How many years have you been teaching?
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	67	47	75	33
Average	12.16	15.81	14.97	16.58
St Dev	7.58	7.21	8.21	7.27
Min	0	3	2	2
Median	10	15	13	18
Max	34	31	35	31

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -2.578$, $df = 112$, $p = 0.01$ (significant)

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = -0.967$, $df = 106$, $p = 0.34$

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -2.111$, $df = 140$, $p = 0.04$ (significant)

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -0.467$, $df = 78$, $p = 0.64$

Table 2(b)

How many years have you been teaching in this district?
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	67	47	75	32
Average	9.09	11.62	9.69	14.06
St Dev	5.80	5.47	6.26	6.48
Min	0	1	1	2
Median	7	12	9	14
Max	24	28	31	24

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -2.343$, $df = 112$, $p = 0.02$ (significant)

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = -3.270$, $df = 105$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -0.594$, $df = 140$, $p = 0.06$

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -1.809$, $df = 77$, $p = 0.07$

Table 3(a)

Our evaluation system does a good job of recognizing teachers who are stronger than their peers.
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Agree / strongly agree	50.0%	33.3%	85.7%	50.0%
Neutral	25.0%	33.3%	14.3%	25.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	25.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%
Average	3.25	3.00	4.29	3.25

Table 3(b)

Our evaluation system does a good job of recognizing teachers who are stronger than their peers.

(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	64	41	73	28
Agree / strongly agree	32.8%	36.6%	68.5%	25.0%
Neutral	26.6%	36.6%	16.4%	35.7%
Disagree / strongly disagree	40.6%	26.8%	15.1%	39.3%
Average	2.86	2.96	3.7	2.82

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -1.345$, $df = 103$, $p = 0.18$

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 4.350$, $df = 99$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -5.218$, $df = 135$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 1.290$, $df = 67$, $p = 0.20$

Table 4(a)

Our evaluation system does a good job of identifying teachers who are weaker than most of their peers but not weak enough to require remediation.

(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Agree / strongly agree	50.0%	33.3%	57.1%	25.0%
Neutral	12.5%	0.0%	14.3%	25.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	37.5%	66.7%	28.6%	50.0%
Average	3.13	2.67	3.57	2.50

Table 4(b)

Our evaluation system does a good job of identifying teachers who are weaker than most of their peers but not weak enough to require remediation.
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	64	41	73	28
Agree / strongly agree	17.2%	24.4%	53.4%	25.0%
Neutral	31.3%	34.1%	31.5%	28.6%
Disagree / strongly disagree	51.6%	41.5%	15.1%	46.4%
Average	2.64	2.78	3.48	2.79

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -0.785$, $df = 103$, $p = 0.43$

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 3.495$, $df = 99$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -5.556$, $df = 135$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -0.023$, $df = 67$, $p = 0.98$

Table 5(a)

Our evaluation system allows us to provide meaningful, formative suggestions for teacher growth.
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	75.0%
Neutral	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Average	4.00	4.00	4.86	3.75

Table 5(b)

Our evaluation system allows us to provide meaningful, formative suggestions for teacher growth.

(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	64	41	73	28
Agree / strongly agree	67.2%	75.6%	78.1%	53.6%
Neutral	14.1%	12.2%	12.3%	32.1%
Disagree / strongly disagree	18.8%	12.2%	9.6%	14.3%
Average	3.50	3.83	3.84	3.50

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -1.945$, $df = 103$, $p = 0.06$

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 1.578$, $df = 99$, $p = 0.08$

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -2.348$, $df = 135$, $p = 0.02$ (significant)

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 1.513$, $df = 67$, $p = 0.135$

Table 6(a)

Our teachers feel the summative ratings our evaluation system produces are fair.

(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Agree / strongly agree	62.5%	66.7%	57.1%	50.0%
Neutral	25.0%	33.3%	28.6%	50.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	12.5%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
Average	3.5	3.67	3.43	3.5

Table 6(b)

Our teachers feel the summative ratings our evaluation system produces are fair.
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	64	40	73	28
Agree / strongly agree	54.7%	67.5%	53.4%	39.3%
Neutral	34.4%	22.5%	23.3%	42.9%
Disagree / strongly disagree	10.9%	10.0%	23.3%	17.9%
Average	3.45	3.68	3.36	3.29

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -1.342$, $df = 102$, $p = 0.18$

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 0.332$, $df = 99$, $p = 0.74$

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 0.631$, $df = 135$, $p = 0.53$

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 1.806$, $df = 66$, $p = 0.08$

Table 7

Our teachers find the formative suggestions in their evaluations to be helpful.
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	3
Agree / strongly agree	50.0%	33.3%	85.7%	33.3%
Neutral	25.0%	66.7%	14.3%	66.7%
Disagree / strongly disagree	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Average	3.38	3.67	4.14	3.67

Table 8(a)

I am comfortable with the training and guidance I have received to evaluate teachers accurately and fairly.
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Agree / strongly agree	62.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Neutral	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Average	3.75	4.00	4.57	4.00

Table 8(b)

Our evaluators have the skill, training, and guidance to evaluate teachers accurately and fairly.
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	64	41	72	28
Agree / strongly agree	43.8%	63.4%	52.8%	25.0%
Neutral	28.1%	14.6%	23.6%	42.9%
Disagree / strongly disagree	28.1%	22.0%	23.6%	32.1%
Average	3.20	3.44	3.35	2.89

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -1.231$, $df = 103$, $p = 0.221$

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 2.141$, $df = 98$, $p = 0.04$ (significant)

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -0.856$, $df = 134$, $p = 0.39$

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 2.464$, $df = 67$, $p = 0.02$ (significant)

Table 9(a)

Which of the following changes would significantly help you deliver more differentiated evaluations to your teachers?
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	11	7
None – the process works well now	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
More formal observations	12.5%	33.3%	18.2%	14.3%
Informal observations or walk-throughs	62.5%	100.0%	72.7%	71.4%
Student performance or growth data	75.0%	66.7%	72.7%	42.9%
How students or parents view teachers	50.0%	33.3%	45.5%	28.6%
Teacher journals or classroom artifacts	75.0%	33.3%	63.6%	14.3%
Other	12.5%	33.3%	18.2%	0.0%

Table 9(b)

Which of the following changes, if any, would significantly contribute to making evaluations more accurate and fair?
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	63	41	71	28
None – the process works well now	7.9%	22.0%	15.5%	7.14%
More formal observations	6.4%	14.6%	1.4%	17.9%
Informal observations or walk-throughs	74.6%	56.1%	53.5%	85.7%
Student performance or growth data	4.8%	12.2%	12.7%	14.3%
How students or parents view teachers	33.3%	19.6%	31.0%	25.0%
Teacher journals or classroom artifacts	27.0%	26.8%	22.5%	35.7%
Other	20.6%	12.2%	22.5%	14.3%

Table 10(a)

How helpful would data on student performance or growth be in assigning fair and accurate ratings to teachers?
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Very helpful / somewhat helpful	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Neither	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Very unhelpful / somewhat unhelpful	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Average	4.25	4.33	4.14	4.25

Table 10(b)

How helpful would data on student performance or growth be in assigning fair and accurate ratings to teachers?
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	63	40	73	28
Very helpful / somewhat helpful	33.3%	22.5%	42.5%	32.1%
Neither	33.3%	40.0%	23.3%	28.6%
Very unhelpful / somewhat unhelpful	33.3%	37.5%	34.2%	39.3%
Average	2.90	2.60	2.97	2.89

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -0.433$, $df = 42$, $p = 0.67$

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 1.305$, $df = 61$, $p = 0.20$

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -0.519$, $df = 76$, $p = 0.61$

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 1.029$, $df = 27$, $p = 0.31$

Table 11(a)

If your district plans to make changes, how well-informed do you feel about those possible changes?
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Well-informed	50.0%	33.3%	57.1%	25.0%
Somewhat informed	50.0%	66.7%	42.9%	50.0%
Not informed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Average	2.50	2.33	2.57	2.00

Table 11(b)

If your district plans to make changes, how well-informed do you feel about those possible changes?
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	58	37	63	27
Well-informed	15.5%	5.4%	30.2%	3.7%
Somewhat informed	48.3%	48.6%	47.6%	55.6%
Not informed	36.2%	45.9%	22.2%	40.7%
Average	1.79	1.59	2.08	1.63

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = 1.601$, $df = 47$, $p = 0.12$

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 3.197$, $df = 43$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -2.253$, $df = 61$, $p = 0.03$ (significant)

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 0.195$, $df = 29$, $p = 0.85$

Table 12(a)

I expect to be involved in formulating those changes.
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Agree / strongly agree	87.5%	100.0%	85.7%	50.0%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	12.5%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
Average	4.25	4.67	4.43	3.5

Table 12(b)

I expect that I will be involved in formulating those changes.
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	59	41	67	27
Agree / strongly agree	27.1%	46.3%	34.3%	37.0%
Neutral	39.0%	46.3%	47.8%	40.7%
Disagree / strongly disagree	33.9%	7.3%	17.9%	22.2%
Average	2.81	3.46	3.19	3.15

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -3.146$, $df = 98$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 0.204$, $df = 92$, $p = 0.84$

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = -2.136$, $df = 124$, $p = 0.04$ (significant)

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 1.257$, $df = 66$, $p = 0.21$

Table 13(a)

I expect teachers in my district will be involved in formulating these changes.
(Administrators, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	8	3	7	4
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Average	4.50	5.00	4.57	3.25

Table 13(b)

I expect teachers to be involved in formulating these changes.
(Teachers, by district)

	2011		2013	
	District A	District B	District A	District B
Count	60	41	67	27
Agree / strongly agree	78.3	85.4	58.2	88.9
Neutral	8.3	12.2	29.9	3.7
Disagree / strongly disagree	13.3	2.4	11.9	7.4
Average	3.80	4.37	3.75	4.15

2011 – District A vs. District B: $t = -2.880$, $df = 99$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = -1.583$, $df = 92$, $p = 0.12$

District A – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 0.279$, $df = 125$, $p = 0.78$

District B – 2011 vs. 2013: $t = 0.914$, $df = 66$, $p = 0.36$

Table 14(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Has your district made changes to its evaluation system in the past two years? (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Yes, significant changes	100.0%	0.0%
Yes, minor changes	0.0%	100.0%
No	0.0%	0.0%
Average	3.00	2.00

Table 14(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Has your district made changes to its evaluation system in the past two years? (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	62	26
Yes, significant changes	93.5%	7.7%
Yes, minor changes	4.8%	53.8%
No	1.6%	38.5%
Average	2.92	1.69

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 12.125$, $df = 86$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

Table 15(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Overall, the changes in our evaluation system were positive. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	100.0	50.0
Neutral	0.0	50.0
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0	0.0
Average	4.50	4.00

Table 15(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Overall, the changes in our evaluation system were positive. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	18
Agree / strongly agree	73.4%	50.0%
Neutral	15.6%	33.3%
Disagree / strongly disagree	10.9%	16.7%
Average	3.70	3.44

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 1.038$, $df = 80$, $p = 0.30$

Table 16(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Our evaluation system now does a better job of recognizing teachers who are stronger than their peers. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	83.3%	50.0%
Neutral	16.7%	50.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%
Average	4.17	3.50

Table 16(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Our evaluation system now does a better job of recognizing teachers who are stronger than their peers. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	19
Agree / strongly agree	70.3%	15.8%
Neutral	10.9%	52.6%
Disagree / strongly disagree	18.8%	31.6%
Average	3.67	2.79

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 3.652$, $df = 81$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

Table 17(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Our evaluation system now does a better job of identifying teachers who are weaker than most of their peers but not weak enough to require remediation. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	8
Agree / strongly agree	50.0%	0.0%
Neutral	50.0%	50.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	50.0%
Average	3.67	2.50

Table 17(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Our evaluation system now does a better job of identifying teachers who are weaker than most of their peers but not weak enough to require remediation. (Asked in 2013 only.)

(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	19
Agree / strongly agree	60.9	5.3
Neutral	18.8	52.6
Disagree / strongly disagree	20.3	42.1
Average	3.47	2.53

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 4.168$, $df = 81$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

Table 18(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Our evaluation system now better allows us to provide meaningful, formative suggestions for teacher growth. (Asked in 2013 only.)

(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	0.0%
Neutral	0.0%	50.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	50.0%
Average	4.67	2.50

Table 18(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Our evaluation system now better allows us to provide meaningful, formative suggestions for teacher growth. (Asked in 2013 only.)

(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	19
Agree / strongly agree	75.0%	42.1%
Neutral	10.9%	31.6%
Disagree / strongly disagree	14.1%	26.3%
Average	3.72	3.21

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = - 2.258$, $df = 81$, $p = 0.03$ (significant)

Table 19(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: The summative ratings (e.g., excellent, proficient, etc.) our evaluation system produces are now fairer. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	0.0%
Neutral	0.0%	100.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%
Average	4.33	3.00

Table 19(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: The summative ratings (e.g., excellent, proficient, etc.) our evaluation system produces are now fairer. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	19
Agree / strongly agree	48.4%	26.3%
Neutral	28.1%	57.9%
Disagree / strongly disagree	23.4%	15.8%
Average	3.31	3.16

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 0.618$, $df = 81$, $p = 0.54$

Table 20(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: I now have improved skill, training, and guidance to evaluate teachers accurately and fairly. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	100.0%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%
Average	4.67	4.00

Table 20(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Our evaluators now have improved skill, training, and guidance to evaluate teachers accurately and fairly. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	19
Agree / strongly agree	59.4%	26.3%
Neutral	21.9%	47.4%
Disagree / strongly disagree	18.8%	26.3%
Average	3.44	3.00

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 1.779$, $df = 81$, $p = 0.08$

Table 21(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: I understand the new evaluation system.
(Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	50.0%
Neutral	0.0%	50.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	0.0%
Average	4.83	4.00

Table 21(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: I understand the new evaluation system.
(Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	17
Agree / strongly agree	81.3	58.8
Neutral	12.5	17.6
Disagree / strongly disagree	6.3	23.5
Average	3.97	3.41

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 2.381$, $df = 79$, $p = 0.02$ (significant)

Table 22(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Teachers were involved in designing the changes to our evaluation system. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	50.0%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	50.0%
Average	4.50	3.00

Table 22(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: Teachers were involved in designing the changes to our evaluation system. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	57	16
Agree / strongly agree	38.6%	31.3%
Neutral	24.6%	37.5%
Disagree / strongly disagree	36.8%	31.3%
Average	3.07	2.94

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 0.420$, $df = 71$, $p = 0.68$

Table 23(a)

If this is at least your third year in your district: The changes were communicated well to teachers while they were happening. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Administrators, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	6	2
Agree / strongly agree	100.0%	50.0%
Neutral	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0.0%	50.0%
Average	4.50	3.00

Table 23(b)

If this is at least your third year in your district: The changes were communicated well to teachers while they were happening. (Asked in 2013 only.)
(Teachers, by district)

	District A	District B
Count	64	17
Agree / strongly agree	71.9	23.5
Neutral	12.5	29.4
Disagree / strongly disagree	15.6	47.1
Average	3.72	2.65

2013 – District A vs. District B: $t = 4.036$, $df = 79$, $p < 0.01$ (significant)

Appendix A-1

Administrators – What are two strengths and two weaknesses of your district’s evaluation system?

District A – 2011 (Strengths and Weaknesses Combined)

Strengths - the opportunity to give feedback in narrative form, and goal setting. Weaknesses - the lack of a structure for conducting informal walk-throughs, lack of rubrics for evaluating staff
Strengths: - holding pre and post conferences for each observation - self-reflection component is nice for the teachers and informative for me as an administrator Weaknesses: - no goal setting for pre-tenured staff, moreover goal meetings could be improved - need more focus like Smart Goals
Strengths - it's collaborative and teachers can target areas of development and set goals Weaknesses - it lacks some key questions such as how does data impact your teaching and how do you reflect upon the lesson taught?
Strength: Domains used capture many areas that are critical for a teacher in our district. Strength: Differentiation is doable through the system (first year to experienced teacher). Weakness: Not the easiest to apply to non-teachers (i.e. social workers) Weakness: For tenured teachers during "informal" years, there is very little required.
1. The system is manageable. 2. It is in compliance with the law. 1. It does not differentiate for the unique needs of some staff- i.e. special education teachers. 2. It is not a meaningful process, rather hoops to jump through and boxes to check off.
Strengths - process with pre-observ conf, observation, and post-observ conference; self-reflection for non-tenure teachers weaknesses - time line that evaluations must be complete by beginning of March; goal setting for tenure teachers
Strengths: Allows for good conversation about teaching techniques, curriculum implementation, etc. Assures a longer "presence" in the classrooms. Weaknesses: By the nature of the actual paper evaluations, tenured staff receive more written feedback than nontenured. If a tenured teacher has great faults, the system takes years to evaluate them out of a position.

District A – 2013 – Strengths

It's very detailed and gives a great level of feedback to our staff.
Having a rubric the evaluator training
We give good actionable feedback to teachers to help them improve teaching and learning. The process seems collaborative and allows for input from both the teacher and administrator.
Rubrics we use to guide us Pre and Post conference conversations
1. The new system allows for more teacher self-reflection 2. Staff are having very valuable conversations about how to improve their instruction under this new rubric and it's working!
The training and detailed plan.
The teacher reflection piece, the evidence for discussions

District A – 2013 – Weaknesses

It's still so new! It's frightening to staff.
The time it takes to create the feedback form lack of guidance for a post-conference
The timeline is very short (I realize this is a function of the State's rules). We have too many teachers to evaluate to really be effective.
lack of formalized walk throughs timeline of March for pretenured teachers (state requirement, but it is tough)
1. Many staff were rated overall "excellent" in the old system and now are only "excellent" in 1-2 domains with an overall rating of "proficient." No matter how hard we try, this change is a blow to people's egos. It will be better next year after everyone has been through the new process at least one.
Need for more inter rater reliability training and the need for more examples of evidence
Having to write down evidence and not being able to interact with students as much, it's so time consuming that we can't get into classes as much as we would like

District B – 2011 (Strengths and Weaknesses Combined)

strengths: the tool is flexible and leaves room for personalizing it for your needs. weaknesses: the tool is vague and subjective.
Strength - tenure staff reflect and determine goals to grow as a teacher, collaborative process Weakness - hard to rate the level of impact a staff member's goal has had on instruction at times. If you identify a goal for a tenure teacher they do not have to address it
Strengths: 1. Collaborative approach to goal setting and evaluation 2. Four potential options of evaluation with one structured plan and three alternative options for tenured teachers. This allows strong, highly qualified teachers to expand their goal setting and collaboratively share their skills in a peer model. Weaknesses: 1. Time (It is not the model, it is the job and finding adequate time to do it well) 2. There should be more observation time, both structured and unstructured, done by evaluators.

District B – 2013 – Strengths

Strong collaboration among teacher/administrator. Teachers are interested in growing and improving.
focus on instruction peer evaluation and collaboration if selected

District B – 2013 – Weaknesses

The evaluation tool for tenured teachers is weak. It has no way to provide specific feedback in a variety of areas. 2. We need a new model like Danielson.
-Very difficult to "rate" teacher between Excellent and Proficient -Difficult to provide constructive feedback
Limited on professional behavior assessment and evaluation Alternate Evaluation

limits focusing on issues as they may arise.

Appendix A-2(a)

Teachers - What are two strengths of your district's evaluation system?

District A – 2011

The system is organized. Teachers receive direct feedback.
Somewhat uniform process Time with administration for individual feedback
It offers choices of various plans to the person being evaluated.
Easy to fill out forms
good question - i am pretty neutral with this stuff
Frequency (3X/yr) We are encouraged to take risks in our lessons
Feedback is in narrative form as opposed to check boxes.
Principals are actually in the classroom to observe. Opportunity to meet before an after observation.
1) teacher evaluation IS NOT tied to student standardized testing performance 2) once tenured, teachers set goals for themselves to reach
Time to meet with administrator and set goals. A fresh set of eyes on my instruction to help me improve.
That you have a pre-conference with your administrator prior to your administrator evaluating your lesson, you meet with them after to go over what was put in your evaluation. It's nice that you have meeting with your evaluator after all of your observations are done for the year, so that the administrator can go over your summative evaluation with you.
Connecting to students Creating interactive lessons
building student relationships utilizing various resources to build lessons
It supports giving teachers timely feedback. It allows for teacher choice regarding area of focus.
1. It offers an opportunity for the teachers to dialogue with the administrators about their teaching style. 2. It gives the teacher time to reflect on their teaching.
Teachers are encouraged to make their own goals, as opposed using district goals.
The narrative we get from the principals, I can't think of any others.
I like the every other year format. I like the follow up meeting and input I receive during my evaluation year.
The strength of the administrator in evaluating The ability to help create goals together with administrator.
The evaluation system is very limited. We are only evaluated a few times in the year.
Frequent communication between administrators and staff on your performance, and it provides an excellent opportunity to stop and assess your performance. This doesn't necessarily happen for me on non-evaluation cycle years.
It provides me with feedback throughout the year so that I can improve on weaknesses. It allows me the opportunity for my administration to see me in action.
They do not happen every year Teachers are given an opportunity to add input to the narrative, if necessary
-variety of administrators (principal, assistant principal, etc) who evaluate you brings

different perspectives and suggestions -detailed feedback provided by narrative component
It evaluates teachers on more than just classroom performance. Pre/post observations are a great way to direct the feedback toward areas for growth.
1) A chance to meet with administrators and discuss our teaching abilities on a personal level. 2) I like that I get to choose when the administrator comes to observe in my classroom so that the lesson really shows my strengths as an educator.
1. Employees set professional goals. 2. Teachers are observed by an administrator.
-Predictable schedule, expectations, and forms -Good communication from evaluator
* required pre and post observation conferences * teacher input in summative evaluation
1) goal setting, observation, evaluation- tiered process 2) Educators allowed to self evaluate
multiple times to be observed
* Constructive criticism & suggestions * Quick turn-around with communication
Effective descriptions and expectations of guidelines. Appropriate constructive feedback.
Clarity of process/timeline Well delineated areas of observation
1.Prompt and constructive feedback with principal 2.Able to set own goals
-feedback almost immediately -a time for the administrator to come into the room to see you teaching
1. Teachers have autonomy in developing their personal goals. 2. Personal professional conversations with one's administrator is part of the evaluation process.
1. Gives constructive criticism 2. The pre and post meetings give extra discussion time
discussion with the administrator (pre-meeting and post-meeting to discuss) freedom to decide what is going to be observed
Pre observation meeting and post observation meeting
1. Structured system - clear expectations of when I will be evaluated. 2. I like the goal-setting emphasis for tenured teachers.
*Provides meaningful positive feedback *Evaluators remember what it was like to be in the classroom.
Variety of evaluations We can ask for a different evaluator
1.) Somewhat laid back in the fact that I have never felt uncomfortable sitting and talking with my admin or having them in my classroom. 2.) Manageable at 2-3 times a year.
1. Our evaluation system allows us teachers to fine tune our weaknesses. For example, I can tell my administrator to focus on X in my lesson so I can improve upon it. It's a great tool for self-reflection.
1. Teacher can set own goals. 2. Tenured teachers are evaluated regularly as well as non-tenured.
--The Union does a great job of protecting the teacher evaluations --The schedule of Preob, Ob, and PostOb
It allows for self-reflection and goal setting by the teachers. Non-tenured teachers are

formally observed 2-3x per year.
Setting goals keeps us reflective and accountable. Having the opportunity to meet with an administrator before and after a lesson helps with planning and reflection.
organized feedback in a timely manner
It is open ended and flexible.
1. Pre-observation and Post Observation meetings with evaluator. 2. Ability to build a good relationship with evaluator
Lesson planing behavior management
-pre and post discussions -same evaluator who can then see improvement as well as understand style and personality of teacher
It provides opportunity for reflection on how a lesson on how things could have been done differently. The pre/post observation allow the teacher to explain the dynamics of the classroom which can have a huge impact on how the lesson goes and plays out.
teacher and administrator input setting goals
Flexibility, it allows us to choose and expand upon a lesson of our choice. Opportunity to sit down with an administrator and discuss what is going right, and what could be improved upon.
teacher has element of choice as to which lessons will be observed teacher is part of goal-setting process
-Meeting with evaluator before teaching lessons to explain the context of lesson and set up experience. -
I have never felt that an administrator was trying to "get me". It has always been a positive experience even before I was tenured.
1. Teachers need to set goals - it's important to have teachers do this 2. Teachers have an opportunity to gain "an outsider's perspective" on instruction, class management, etc.
1. It keeps teachers accountable to be observed. 2. Pre Obs, Obs, and Post Obs gives teachers and administrators an opportunity to communicate more effectively about teaching.
--forces administrators to provide feedback
I like the narrative portion, in that it allows administrators to talk more about what they've seen in the classroom, rather than just having to "check a box" or "pick a number" on a rating scale. I also like that the teacher/administrator mutually agree upon lessons to observe, as I think it allows the teacher to have a say, and allows him/her to be observed in a situation where he/she feels "at their best".
Evaluators Process of evaluations

District A – 2013

It measures many different areas of teaching and teachers must reflect on what they are doing.
It is comprehensive You don't have to be excellent in all 4 areas to be considered a good teacher.
I liked the new Danielson framework for my observation last year. I feel like I was able to look at the 4 categories and reflect upon myself as a teacher in each section. The 4

sections helped me to better understand my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.
Very thorough I don't know of 2!
* Well defined * High standards for teachers
1. The domains are a strength, because they help parse out the different attributes of a strong teacher. Plus, they give administration and teaching staff a common language. 2. Because teachers are evaluated on a regular basis, administrators have a chance to go into classrooms and see the work of their teachers that they might not see without this structure in place.
The authentic conversations with the principal on improving instructional practices. I think the evaluation system that District 39 uses is giving the staff a common language to look at instructional practices.
1. clear framework 2. values the teacher in a variety of domains
comprehensive
Teacher involvement Reflection
I haven't been through the new evaluation system yet so I'm not sure, but I do know it's comprehensive
Very personal and thoughtful Covers are major areas of the teaching profession
*Teacher Input *Multi-faceted
Following the Danielson (sp?) model. District working hard to educate staff on the model.
requires thoughtful self reflection and finding evidence of proficiency in one's teaching; interactive process with evaluator
dialog about instruction rubric
Well organized and explained. Clear cut expectations.
It makes you reflect on your teaching practices. It helps to include all that you do in the four domains.
Plenty of support for teachers leading up to formal evaluations. Plenty of support after evaluations.
The dialogue between teacher and admin. The reflection piece for teachers.
1. Great amount of support given in terms of what should be included or discussed. 2. There are classes in which we can work with others to gather ideas about the Danielson model.
Moving away from the idea that it's okay for everyone to be Excellent. Having teachers collect evidence to support/show the good techniques and methods they are using in and out of the classroom.
The rubric is clear as to what is expected.
Weeding out teachers who have tenure but may not be the best teachers. Being able to show evidence of your excellence in a category.
The ability for the person being evaluated to show what their strengths are.
the areas target broader aspects of the teaching process
consistent criteria focus on student learning, not teacher "performing"
more thorough looks at a more complete picture of the teacher as a professional
It looks at 4 different aspects of teaching. You get a ranking in each category, which

allows for specific focus on specific areas.
1. Opportunity to address other areas of school/team/district contributions. 2. Area for teachers to reflect on strength of lesson, and what could be improved upon.
It helped me look at my teaching and make decisions about how I could improve.
in depth self reflection
Collaboration Behavior management
* Specific rubric, so we know what we are being evaluated on. * High standards
1. Informative 2. Gets principals in our classrooms
Very thorough system; 4 domains are solid ways to showcase instructional aptitude
It takes into considerations a greater variety of teacher job responsibilities.
Allows for reflection and guaranteed time to sit down and talk with admin about performance
Good communication about evaluations Encourages a reflective process for teachers
1- teachers are really reflecting on all areas of teaching 2- the behind the "scenes" areas are acknowledged
* The domains are easy to understand and provide us a good way to organize and develop goals. * The format: pre-obs, observation, post-obs.
Allows for teacher input and multiple meetings with evaluators prior to and after observations. It is flexible in order to meet the needs of teachers in diverse subjects and grade levels.
reflection and quality conversation with Administrator
It makes you look closely at your practice to see what could be changed for the better. It clearly spells out the expectations.
It is more meaningful than previous evaluations. It considers all aspects of what teachers do.
1) Focus on continuous growth. 2) Multiple domains to separate different areas of expectation
Principal encouragement and support Building/ colleague morale and support
Predictable Evaluations done in a timely fashion, evaluators are usually flexible and work with individual schedules
Domains Rubric
The Danielson book Rotating schedule of evaluations
matching to standards self-reflection
Substantive feedback to help me grow as a writer. Clear rubric.
Clear expectations and online resources
1. It holds teachers accountable in all four domains. 2. Many specific examples are provided so that teachers know what the evaluator is looking for.
very explicit well-balanced in the sense that it addresses things beyond just the lesson itself; i.e. what contributions does the teacher make to the District and school community
- We've had a lot of professional development on the new system - The opportunity to provide a portfolio of your choice to supplement your observations
Requires considerable reflection Requires keeping up to date on best practice

Comfort and approachability of administration Clear expectations from administration amount of feedback rubric
- It is rigorous and pushes teachers to genuinely improve their teaching. - It is consistent from teacher to teacher (pre-observation, observation, post-observation) for specific times of year per year of teacher in the district.
1. every other year for tenured teachers 2. not graded too harshly
1. Rubric clearly identifies expectations 2. Emphasizes reflective teaching
assessed in many different domains specific feedback for different domains and ability to reflect on your own strengths and needs
Encourages reflection. Allows conversations with supervisor about professional and personal growth.
Formal plan in place many flexible areas of growth for teachers
The new system encourages more collaborative discussions about teaching practices. The new system requires administrators to know more about their staff members.
Clearly defined objectives Outlined continuum
Self-reflection Evaluator reflection

District B – 2011

1. classroom management 2. communication
the principal and assistant principal take turns evaluating so there is more than one perspective of your performance evaluations keep you on your toes
emphasizes the positive geared toward teacher goals (Teachers are asked what they would like the observer to focus on during the observation.)
alternate evaluations
1. The system was created collaboratively with teachers involved. 2. It provides opportunity for authentic evaluation.
the feedback peer evaluation
Choices in evaluation process. Feedback from administrators.
options for different evaluations encourages one to look at their own self
1. Optional evaluation types after reaching tenure w/excellent evaluations. 2. Opportunity to collaborate with school administration.
1. Teachers can prepare for evaluation 2. Tenured teachers given option of alternative assessment
after tenure is achieved there is opportunity for different types of evaluation, e.g., setting goals, self-evaluation, peer coaching, etc.
Consistent and timely
We have diverse evaluation methods. We are able to select a professional goal and focus each year.
Options for evaluation and flexibility on what is evaluated.
There are flexible options for staff to use for evaluation, including peer evaluation and goal setting. Both are reflective processes and are shared with the principal.
I can choose what type of evaluation to use for my evaluation.
Self-reflection

observation and feedback from principal goal setting option
Evaluations are all based on the same criteria. Administrators (4 in my years here) are all knowledgeable about the criteria and offer valuable insights based on their observations.
I have a say in how and when I'm evaluated. Goal oriented.
Allows teachers to individualize their goals based on their needs. Positive feedback from your peers and administrators.
-After you are tenured, you have options to do alternative evaluations. -Facilitates personal interaction between you and your administrator
We have choices of evaluation procedures. We have time with the administration.
Great feedback, and appropriate expectations.
goals set up prior to being evaluated opportunity to ask for feedback
1. Rotating assistant principal & principal every year for the evaluations 2. The evaluators usually give a good amount of positive feedback & constructive criticism or different ways of thinking about things & completing things in the classroom
Provides teachers with an "alternative system" of evaluation once tenured so the teacher can enhance an area of teaching with the assistance of the administrator.
It is intended on being individualized It is only 1 time in two years
-observation -feedback
We have choices about the format of our evaluation and we have a say in our goals.
There are optional methods of evaluation, besides supervisor observations.
Evaluation is completed every other year. Different options to choose the way you would like to be evaluated for tenure teachers.
Diverse choices for evaluation Always get feedback, both positive and constructive
1. I receive direct feedback from the principal and assistant principal. 2. They help me structure goals for myself each year.
The evaluators are supportive and helpful. Goals help identify and guide improvement.
Choice Collaboration with colleagues
-Many options to choose from for evaluation. -Evaluation is done every other year.
options in methods of evaluation. chances to see other teachers teach when using the peer evaluation format.
1. options 2. only once after tenure
Collaborative Innovative
alternative methods of evaluation able to comment on evaluators observations
Tenured teachers have alternative eval. options which foster creativity and professional development.
focused on helping teachers develop their craft focused on creating the best possible classroom, school and community climate
choice of evaluation type -- (when tenured) clearly spelled out criteria/timeline
Collectively bargained. Range of options.
Alternative eval options such as goal setting Very structured expectations as far as when things are supposed to happen.

District B – 2013

You can chose which evaluation type you want, and the options to chose from are excellent.
Variety of evaluation types - observation, goal setting, peer evaluation. Numerous opportunities for discussion with administrator.
individualized to each teacher once tenured evaluated every two years
Multiple options for evaluation. Does not use student test scores
Meetings are held to explain what the contract has accepted as to the different forms of possible evaluation. Meetings with administration are set in advance so that both parties know when they will be meeting and know when paperwork is due.
Options for tenure teacher evaluations, detailed write up by administration
The options available to tenured teachers and the structuring of conferences that frame, monitor and reflect on the evaluation cycle.
Teachers have the option of how they can be evaluated such as goal setting or having the principal observe your teaching style.
Having a choice of what type of evaluation to use once you are tenured. The ability to do peer coaching.
1. All evaluation components are relevant to the daily practice of teaching. 2. All evaluation components are easily accessible to and understood by all teachers among a wide range of schools and grade levels.
Teacher choice in type of evaluation
direct decisive
trust teachers as professionals autonomy
There are multiple options for tenured teachers to work on goal areas. It is a collaborative process.
We still have the choice of alternative evaluations. The evaluations are not yet tied to a set of student test results.
1. Choice of options for tenured staff 2. Administrators that have evaluated me really cared about making this a meaningful interaction---they did not want a dog and pony show. consequently, I have gained great knowledge from most of these evaluations.
input from employee options for evaluation
Ability to do alternative projects for self identified areas of growth.
Allows teachers choice in the process, once they have proven themselves in the general "principal observation" format. Teachers can self-evaluate, set professional goals or participate in peer coaching. It gives you the opportunity to challenge yourself in areas that are meaningful to you.
Many categories, Based on overall performance instead of only two 45 minute observations
The present system allows teachers to prove themselves with observations by administrators. After proving yourself, the teacher is given the choice to work in an area they want to improve in, i.e. website development, audio-visual creations for step by step procedures, better PowerSchool descriptions for students and parent communication.

Meeting with our principal and having a chance to reflect on practice
peer evaluation every other year evals
1Meaningful goal setting. 2Respectful process
1. you can choose what eval process you want 2. the eval process is very thorough
teacher choice goals are set on items you wish to improve upon
Provide Feedback Useful project-based options for tenured teachers
Option of goal setting

Appendix A-2(b)

Teachers - What are two weaknesses of your district's evaluation system?

District A – 2011

Poor teachers are kept in the system. There is no informal observation first for the admin to get to know the class.
Those observing have not always had classroom teaching experience. One size fits all
It is too rigid in format.
Different evaluator every year with different expectations
feed back is pretty generic
I am almost always in a team-teaching situation when I am being observed. In specials, we are typically observed by someone who does not have a specials background.
Administration constantly changing so one's evaluator is always changing.
There are only two observations. Kind of ominous final product that goes in personal file.
1) feedback for improvement is given, but there aren't any formalized supports to help a teacher develop in the areas identified 2) evaluation time frames and amount of evaluations an administrator needs to complete is very time consuming for them. May not allow them to be available to address other concerns due to being swamped with evaluations.
Listing things that were seen 1-time events with the implication that it is an ongoing problem. Feedback needs to be more well-rounded. We should get feedback input from peers, students, and others who interact with us more often than the 1-2 times per year that our administrator drops by.
One weakness is that a single administrator is assigned too many teachers to observe/evaluate, so there are many scheduling conflicts with finding times for the pre & post conferences. as well as the actual observations of lessons. Another weakness would be that although the administrator critiques your lesson, they don't really give valuable feedback (I think that's because they have not been classroom teachers for such a long time, they forget or get a little "rusty"). I would like to see administrators help teachers more through the evaluation process, so that it is more of a professional learning experience for teachers, rather than viewed as administrative "technicality" that has to be completed within a particular time window. Perhaps administrators could offer resources to the teachers at the post conference for ways to enhance their instruction, and then actually FOLLOW up with that teacher.
Curriculum knowledge Assessments
organization consistency with management
It is too concentrated in the school year just for more "paper work" reasons.
1. At times, former principals have added in what other teachers have said about the person they are evaluating and that teacher is often caught off-guard about the random comment. 2. It makes for a pressure-cooker type of environment if the only two times the administrator is in your class is for an evaluation.
Since all evaluations have to be completed by March, there sometimes isn't a lot of time

for growth between observations. All observations are done by the same administrator every year. Perhaps there could be a rotation system from year to year so you receive different feedback from many administrators over the years.
They happen only at the beginning of the year, they are done by January and I have to set a goal, just to set a goal.
I feel that it should be a pop in not set up time to be evaluated, It would be a more true evaluation.
The weakness of the administrator in evaluating. The lack of understanding of the curriculum of individual subject areas.
It doesn't matter if you are a good or bad teacher. If the administration wants you out for any reason, then they will lie in your evaluation to get you out. Students should have some say in a teacher's evaluation. Parents should also have a say. Our administrators have too much power over teacher evaluations.
The teacher evaluation system is used with psychologists so many aspects of the evaluation are not relevant to our duties. Perhaps this is a weakness only for psych evals but I don't take goal setting seriously.
It does not feel like an authentic evaluation, I would prefer someone to pop in, I have nothing to hide. I feel like three evaluations does not give the evaluator enough of a glimpse into who I am as an educator.
Comments are not personalized or individualized regarding our teaching accomplishments/goals, but rather are a "form letter" type style with little depth or specific details given; similar comments appear time and again Some administrators are not experienced as teachers themselves to effectively evaluate classroom teaching, ie our use of integrated curriculum and/or creative lesson planning
Evaluators are too busy and only evaluate teachers when they have to; there isn't enough time to just stop in and see teachers on a day-to-day. It's hard to get realistic feedback as a result.
1) I do not feel like the administrators really know who I am as a teacher since they are only in my classroom 2 times a year, every other year. 2) I feel like some teachers receive recognition for the different activities/committees they participate in while others do not. It would be great if our teacher evaluation system would allow our administrators to really get to know us as teachers and for them to be able to recognize what we contribute to our school.
1. Administrators are allowed to make generalizations based on hearsay and put them in the narrative portion of the evaluations. 2. Individual administrators have large numbers of evaluations to do each year and can't devote time to really working to develop teacher strengths and give new teachers adequate support.
-Lack of real feedback that could help me become a better teacher -Easy to always do my 'best' lesson and not be truly evaluated on what I really do in my classroom
* the form is quite lengthy * not much guidance when it comes to making goals for the year
1) Does not reach the heart of the issue of teachers who should not be teaching. 2) Not much follow through on needs for improvement
time consuming for the principal to make so many observations

* Administered by an evaluator who has never been a gen-ed teacher * The wording often alludes to problems or room for growth that are insignificant or don't exist
Administration does not have content knowledge background. Evaluations take place too early in the school year.
Poorly designed for related service professionals. My observer has very limited availability
1. Lessons feel "staged" and not indicative to everyday routine 2. Principal never visits classroom unless doing a formal observation. Thus, all feedback is based on only being in classroom twice in a given year.
-only getting formally observed a few times each year -being "judged" on those few times
1. It doesn't seem to affect any lasting or permanent change; teachers see it as a "hoop to jump through." 2. Administrators seem to view it as something to "check off their to-do list" rather than an opportunity for truly helping their staff members improve their craft.
1. Only happens a few times a year 2. Only happens in certain classes
lack of suggestions for improvement from administration not true reflection of the job
Poor feedback from administer who is observing
1. Evaluator not familiar with content and not helpful with comments
*Sometimes the areas for growth and improvement given to a teacher are a stretch meant to ensure that something critical is said. Often, it isn't relevant or accurate. *The pre-observation form is a bit clunky as in not user-friendly.
A lot of pressure Changes in HR - much more "by the book."
1.) Some years, those 2-3 visits were the only times an admin stepped in my classroom and on my tenured non-formal years, I didn't see them at all! 2.) While the positive feedback is nice, more constructive criticism would be beneficial.
1. The teachers are able to select their lesson. It allows the teacher to fully prepare, beyond what they normally do, and any weaknesses can be easily hidden. It's not a true evaluation. It's merely a pre-selected snapshot. 2. The use evaluation reports result in "cookie-cutter" responses by administration. Most of my evaluations read exactly the same as the previous years.
1. Scheduling is sometimes tough. 2. Inconsistency in format.
--There is rarely constructive criticism, our former administrator would give criticism that was connected with SIP that he put on EVERYONE'S room for improvement list no matter what you did in your lesson --I think there should be some unannounced visits because some teachers perform well on evaluations even when they make poor educational decisions on a regular basis
Tenured teachers are not observed every year. Many teachers earn the highest rating, even though their job performance varies greatly.
Not enough observations throughout the year. Why does it have to be exclusively administrators evaluating us? Why not incorporate informal peer evaluations as well?
It is very subjective and easily manipulated if the teacher is not doing what is expected.
1. Form for summative is confusing/vague 2. Evaluator does not always have knowledge in area (special ed for example) to be able to give valuable constructive

criticism/ideas
organization time management
-doesn't benefit non tenure teacher over a tenure teacher in case of job availability -
It's only a snapshot of the teacher. They don't get to experience what they do in the classroom on a daily basis. One lesson that has gone wrong can have a huge impact on your overall evaluation.
I am not evaluated by someone in my department. I am an LBS and my principal and asst. principal are not special educators
I don't like the descriptors of Satisfactory or Excellent. It can still be very subjective, rather than objective.
weak teachers can put on a "dog and pony show" since visits are unannounced if principal and teacher have personality clash, may be somewhat subjective
-Evaluation is generally based only off of 2 or 3 planned lessons -Teachers who are "stuck in a rut" continue to stay that way
I rarely get specific feedback for instructional changes. I am not sure how comfortable many of our administrators are with actually teaching in the classroom
1. No observations are unannounced... so it can just be a dog and pony show. 2. Perhaps don't trust the evaluator or value his/her opinion.
1. Observation results are not always done in a timely manner. 2. Observations can be very subjective.
--not relevant for my role in the building/district --I don't think the pre-tenure process allows for very rich goal-setting or is very directive
Too many teachers are probably rated at the highest level, when that should be reserved for the top of the top. Am not sure how I feel about superintendents rating certain teachers, as I think there's a perception from the teachers that the person rating them might not be the best given that the administrator isn't in the classroom on an ongoing basis, and might not be present in the building often enough to see the teacher's overall contributions to the building.
Feedback Timeliness

District A – 2013

The system is too subjective. The system is too subjective. One little thing in a domain and you lose a point for the entire domain.
It can cause one to lose all semblance of work/life balance. It requires too much documentation.
Still not sure that administrators really know us as teachers. They see us for formal observations twice a year but are not in on the day to day teaching. Although I liked the new Danielson format for teacher evaluations it took A LOT of extra time to be observed last year.
Takes SO MUCH time for the teacher to prepare I feel it is information that administrators should KNOW about their teachers. They should have some responsibility for knowing what is occurring and not place the onus on the teacher for reporting the information.

* Can be too strict/almost impossible to get "excellent" rating * Hard to know what to include in evidence binder/website/folder
- Doesn't encourage teachers to grow and try new things. Need to "put on a show" for the evaluations - doesn't support risk taking/experimentation with new ways of teaching or initiatives. - Negative tone overshadows positive tone
1. In the 4 domains, there are a group of educators mis-represented. I am one, for example, because while about 35-45% of my job involves direct instruction with students, the rest of my time is spent collaborating with and planning with teachers. Therefore, I am assessed on a scale used for teachers, with equal weight given to an area that I don't have as much time in - instruction, and domains where the majority of my job lies: planning and preparation and professional responsibilities, don't get more weight. 2. It's close to impossible for an administrator to see all the complexities and talents from a tenured teacher in just 2 observations. I was given a goal from one observation for something that I already do, but the administrator had to give me some form of feedback, so that's the feedback I got. I think the feedback would be more genuine and fit to my professional development if the administrator were able to see me more frequently, and perhaps in smaller doses.
Too many objectives to focus on during the evaluation period. Too much paper work.
1. tenured teachers only evaluated every other year. 2. too much work goes into the summative portfolio
confusing subjective
A LOT of work/meetings for the evaluators ... can't think of any others;)
rubrics don't quite apply to teachers who aren't general education classroom teachers
None, this evaluation system is much better than the one in place at my previous school.
*Too many components *Confusion on End-Product/Summative
Inconsistencies with how teachers are evaluated with departments. Administrators being too busy to check in more with teachers.
time consuming for teachers to fill out self reports; hard to narrow down evidence
can be vague learning curve
The self assessment write up is very time consuming. Can't think of another.
It takes a huge amount of time to complete compared to the old system. It can be a daunting process.
Evaluation differs depending on administrator which could lead to feelings of inequity among staff. Core teachers and specials/related arts/WL are all dealing with student growth on such varying levels, in time this will be hard to measure.
The evidence piece is time consuming. The write-ups are time consuming.
1. Different evaluators look at different things even though they are looking at the same rubric (they have different foci). 2. Seemingly constant change
The fact that the principal has to write down everything I do and say during a class period. I didn't find those notes to be useful to me, nor were they a good use of the principal's time. I feel like she had to concentrate so much on what I was doing, she didn't have the opportunity to see the learning that was taking place because she was paying more attention to everything that was coming out of my mouth.

I think it looks more at jumping through hoops and doing razzle dazzle lessons rather than what the real classroom is like. It doesn't take into account that many times a direct instruction rather than an open ended lesson decide by kids is what is needed-yet you can't be excellent unless kids are directing the work. It seems more like Board Certification which is a lot of work to show certain things but really has nothing to do with quality teaching. It does not take into account the varied jobs of our teachers rather than instruction with a group of students- this is especially true for our support staff. It is much more time consuming for the administrator and the teacher in doing the paper work portions or evidence.
It takes a very long time to gather the evidence for your evaluation. I spent 6 hours preparing mine. It is very detailed.
The ability to differentiate for different jobs.
very time consuming - the evidence
I haven't used the new system yet since I am on rotation this year but it looks time consuming for both the teacher and principal.
not always a good fit for specials and specialists some elements difficult to quantify amount of preparation time for the teacher and administrator
Sometimes things end up in the evaluation and the person who put it in there doesn't know the entire situation. For example, it may be recommended that someone collaborates or observes another teacher. However, they are already collaborating or meeting with that teacher regularly.
The portions the teachers fill out are very repetitive. I also feel that this could lend more towards subjectivity, rather than objectivity.
I didn't like the part about showing evidence. If your principal didn't observe a certain standard then it was up to you to prove it and I felt that it was objective about whether you showed enough evidence. Although I was happy with my evaluation, the areas I was marked down in were actually the areas where I feel the strongest as a teacher.
time consuming consistency between evaluators
Written work Seeking outside professional development
* Feedback seems to be nitpicky * The tone seems to be more negative overall
1. The lengthy part of the evaluation that teachers need to complete at the end of the year. 2. There is a lot of different criteria in each domain
Everyone (teachers, specialist positions, etc) are all being scored on the same domains/rubric as though everyone has a classroom teaching position. This makes it difficult for specialists to know what their admin is looking for from them and what they are not looking for and which areas to focus on only. It's too confusing. Classroom teachers then have a more objective evaluation experience because the rubric matches their role, whereas specialists have a more subjective evaluation experience. There should be more than one rubric; portfolio/evidence folder information is scattered, different at each building, and the expectation for completing this remains confusing
Not all aspects of the domains and rubrics apply to all teachers.
Overwhelming and can be time consuming
will come too often for the amount of extra work required In some ways unsuited to specialty teaching areas

1- It requires A LOT of work that would be better spent in one of the categories. 2-For teachers to be the top level, they do not have time for themselves. Without working hours outside the school day it is really challenging to exceed in all categories, let alone have a family.
-admins only see snippets of what you do; would love to see her come in more often on a weekly basis so that she know what is truly happening in my class vs a dog and pony show like others can do
* Different administrators have different expectations. Even though we shouldn't, observed teachers still talk and it easily frustrates people if they have the feeling that one evaluator is "easier" or "harder" on teachers. * The summative evaluation/evidence "folder" is A TON of work on the teacher.
Administrators can still be subjective during the observation evaluation. The open ended nature and flexibility can leave confusion about what exactly is expected. The ambiguity especially in the areas of teacher communications can worry the teacher about whether they can prove what they do or not.
Lots of time required, not all spent in a good way: meetings, paperwork, etc I think it is confusing. New things have a tendency to be confusing, but this seems a bit extreme.
It is subjective. One principal may feel that what you are doing is excellent while another may not. It is time consuming to prove that you are excellent for 22 different objectives.
-Evaluator is not in the classroom doing 'on the fly observations' (only observed 2-3 times a year depending on your year in the district) -Not enough planning time to collect and maintain artifacts for each domain
It is very labor intensive. It may cause competition and not useful competition among teachers.
1) Population of students is not directly considered in the language of the evaluation. 2) Inconsistencies on expectations for evidence.
Lack of Samples and Examples Lack of training
Evaluators are subjective (some are considered "easier" evaluators than others Too much paperwork and time to "show and tell" our craft ... dog and pony show
Subjectivity of observer I question the inter-rating-reliability
Opinions can still be subjective, depending upon your relationship with your evaluator Still not clear how much "evidence" is needed to obtain an excellent rating and this leads to one-upmanship on the part of colleagues, secretiveness, and fosters unwanted competition
-the time to put into an evaluation lesson is very overwhelming. -worrying about all the parts and knowing that I will probably never be an "excellent" rated teacher again.
Way, way too much paperwork & time needed outside of the classroom to plan & complete everything
Teachers spending way too much time on their portfolios, which I think wasn't the point. Teachers joining committees and sponsoring clubs just because it's an evaluation year, and then they plan not to continue with those commitments.
Administrators are subjective and some are VERY inexperienced as evaluators
1. It can be subjective, even though there are standards. 2. There are some things that

are difficult to measure.
-I might be able to better speak to this after I've gone through the evaluation process itself; so far the only drawbacks I see are the amount of time it requires(assembling binder, preparing for meetings by filling out forms, etc...)
Teachers are struggling to completely understand the final written evaluation requirements and expectations Administrators are struggling to completely understand the final written evaluation requirements and expectations for teachers
Danielson framework is very overwhelming Data incorporation is still unclear
time commitment for documentation confusion over what is expected for documentation
1. lack of clear training for new system 2. lack of explanation for "evidence"
1. It seems very difficult to get an excellent rating, which feels somewhat defeating 2. No goal setting procedures
all disciplines evaluated using the same tool- not as applicable to specific disciplines pre, post and reflection are time consuming
Non-classroom teachers have the same rubric as classroom teachers which is difficult/unfair to evaluation of different roles. Time consuming process.
Observations and final evaluations are often pushed back, moved, altered for tenured staff Hardly any informal "walk through" observations occur due to busy schedules
The new system is (still) very subjective and open to broad interpretation by administrators. The new system kind of pits teachers against each other in a more competitive way.
Consistency among evaluators One size fits-all
Amount of paperwork required Based on a very limited observation -- principals should know teacher's classroom better

District B – 2011

1. differentiation
poor performers can "put on a good show" for evaluators for the period then go back to their usual self performance should not be based on student scores. There are too many variables to consider ie. the level of the students and the most important fact for every human being is we all learn at different rates
While some would disagree, it is too "set-up." Anyone can look good when they get to pick the exact date and time. Because it is so formal, it is not natural.
some administrators don't know how to evaluate properly because they have forgotten what's it's like to work with kids and/or they have no clue about your job
1. There should be more options for the alternative evaluations.
in areas of non classroom teachers, such as therapists, principals know little of what to look for difficulty administrators have in dismissing incompetent teachers
Purpose of evaluation is not evident. Are teachers evaluated so the district has evidence that an administrator has been in their classrooms or is the purpose to help teachers improve their craft?
can be abused

1. Have not always had evaluations completed by administration. 2. Now that our evaluations will be somewhat student progress determined.
1. No way to get rid of a tenured teacher who is doing a bad job 2. No unexpected "drop-ins" to evaluate teachers when not expecting it
One day teacher evaluation is not representative of teacher quality or effectiveness
The time frame is unpredictable. We are often evaluated by people who are unfamiliar with our expertise.
Senate Bill 7 will wipe out both strengths.
It can be daunting to know how to do this..sometimes it is hard to schedule peer evaluation time. If the principal is not familiar with the process; there can be difficulties.
I'd like more administration in seeing me teach more often.
Evaluating administrator does not have the background knowledge about my field of teaching.
Confusing system in terms of timing and type of evaluations
They are based on one observation after the first two years. In another district we had three separate observations for one evaluation (there were two each year in the first two years as is here.) The administrator got a better idea of the teacher's work with three observations. I can't think of a second weakness at the moment.
Bi-annual event. Comes up too quickly. Extra meetings to go over evaluations in an already crammed schedule.
-With the traditional evaluation of untenured staff, there are only two formal evaluation times during the year. I think there should be more structured interaction to discuss teaching strengths/weaknesses. -After tenure, it is every-other year but I feel that some staff need to be evaluated every year to ensure top quality performance.
Some of the choices are not necessarily productive. The end of the process always seems rushed.
Only one class evaluated. No rubric.
too formalized write-ups too generic
1. The evaluations have nothing to do with our tenure or whether or not we get "RIF'd" at the end of the year 2. The evaluations often seem much more formal than they would be if you were to come in to see the room on a random day.
Not enough meeting time with evaluator
It is only 1 time in 2 years Administration makes it global and not very individualized
-pre observation meetings -time
Sometimes need more direction about a goal to set and different evaluators expect more or less from the teacher.
It's hard to find the time to write up the report if choosing an optional means of evaluation like goal setting or peer evaluation.
The process is not explained very well. Teachers could receive more detailed information regarding this.
Only occurs once every three years? I'm not sure one evaluation truly shows the teacher's ability
1. I teach music, so it is sometimes challenging to receive feedback from an expert in

my field. 2. Evaluations occur 1-2 times a year as a new teach in the district, but especially as a first and second year teacher, I could have used a lot more feedback than those two visits each year.
Number of times to meet and discuss progress towards goals are limited. Veteran teachers are not held accountable to current practices.
Some options give little feedback to your teaching from administrators. Some options are too time consuming.
-Evaluation options unclear and hard to understand. -Some are more time consuming than others.
tenured teachers might not get observed by administration if a teacher prefers other methods of evaluation.
1. just a snapshot 2. not necessarily reality
One shot wonder effect Doesn't have a lot meaning
if I choose alt. evaluation and get that project done, other issues may not be addressed. limited to very few observations
New administration in the past three years has made eval confusing and for many, very negative.
a 30 minute or hour snapshot doesn't show the stages of learning. there are a lot of hours of preparation and planning that go into the lessons and while teachers try to plan for the unexpected it is also important to be able to modify lessons and cater to the needs of the class in any given moment. These are not always factored into the evaluation process
some principals do not adhere to the "rules" when doing an observation eval, you always put on your "best show"
Principals are poorly trained to do it. Disconnect between what prescribed and what is done.
There are so many evaluations done in the years leading to tenure. Other than that, I like our system.

District B – 2013

Administration have too many to do, and therefore they are not done well.
Minimal administration observations Lack of awareness of struggling teachers due to minimal contact.
â€ Administration does not use evaluation to weed out ineffective teachers prior to receiving tenure â€ Only happens every two years after tenure
I am not clear about what new evaluation processes will be happening in the future and so while I just completed my evaluation year last year, I am not aware of how it will change in this district.
The formality of the process, which steers evaluation away from the daily performance of teachers in their classrooms. Principals are tied up with evaluation and unable to see or value the ongoing work going on by teachers.
Evaluations should be based on more than just one observation. Teachers who need improvement often fall through the cracks.

Seems like it could be a lot for administrators to manage.
1. Evaluations are generic. Sure, you're "proficient" in building relationships and teaching methods (professional practices), but do you KNOW how to teach literacy? Do you KNOW how to teach math? Evaluations lack analysis of a teacher's content-specific knowledge. 2. Evaluations lack the aspect of student growth. If you're a "proficient" instructor, then why are more than 1/2 of your students not making growth targets?
TOO much teacher choice in type of evaluation. Tenured teachers have no fear of getting a poor evaluation and being let go.
objectionable-pending on evaluator (not all follow same guidelines)
artificial measurements failure of administrators to be regular observers of teaching "every day"
There is not a clearly defined rubric. It does not seem to be getting us ready for the PERA changes.
The front office has no one in authority that has been in the district longer than 3 years.
1. In a building this size, it's hard to know if administrators really get a good picture of what is going on in the classrooms, and 2 or 3 observations could be misleading. 2. I'm not sure everyone is getting evaluated (ie all the meetings required are held in the timeframe needed) and/or in a quality manner
not easy to get feedback on general job performance subjective still
The standard evaluation that is based on a one time observation in the classroom sometimes done by a principal who was not ever a teacher (example a principal who was a social worker).
The principal is not always knowledgeable about my content area. It makes it difficult to get useful constructive criticism or to brainstorm about explicit skill development as part of the evaluation process. With teacher evaluation changes needing to go into effect in 2016-17, we have not started (I am on the committee) having much discussion of potential changes.
Rating scale is not clearly defined between buildings, evaluations take place too early in the school year.
The one I have worked under since [previous principal] is not flawed.
-Tenured teachers get lazy -Doesn't really take into account parent or colleague relationships
Principal's evaluating areas they have no expertise in and principals being removed from the classrooms, not understanding what it's like to "teach in the trenches"
Evaluators do not know my area
In the current educational atmosphere, our system is so superior that I'd hate to quibble about minor shortcomings.
1. There needs to be more new options to choose from for teachers with many many years of experience 2. too frequently given
incompetent teachers can slide by principals often don't know which teachers are doing what
Sometimes one snapshot is not enough to get a sense of a teachers strengths/weaknesses.

Too focused on single observations Very subjective--effectiveness of feedback really depends on the strength of the evaluator

Appendix B-1

Administrators – Has your district made changes to the evaluation system in the last five years? What were they? Were those changes positive or negative? (Question asked in 2011 only)

District A

not sure
We recently added a rating scale to the nontenured summative evaluation form.
I too new to know
not sure
Changes are currently in progress
No significant changes have been made.
Consistent observation form – positive
Yes, the pretenure evaluation changed. I think the changes were positive.

District B

Has not changed the system.
No
No

Appendix B-2

Teachers – Has your district made changes to the evaluation system in the last five years? What were they? Were those changes positive or negative? (Question asked in 2011 only)

District A

n/a
The paperwork has changed
I don't think they have made any changes in the last five years,
Not sure
I am not sure - it think every year depending on your years of service, the process is different
Not sure.
not sure
We changed our system to 5 points, I think?
I have no idea! Yikes!
I don't know.
No
I don't know.
No
Not for teachers. But we have eliminated the administrative evaluation system.
No
It seems like it has become more formal and standardized, which is positive.
I have not been in the district long enough to adequately answer this question.
I an unaware of any changes
None that I know of.
I believe there are changes happening this year. I believe that we are moving to a teacher evaluation system that rates teachers as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
I believe changes have been made to the system for non-tenured teachers, but as I tenured teacher, I was not directly affected.
No - they are talking about making changes with the new state laws, but no changes have been made recently
I don't believe so but am not sure.
Expecting changes in evaluation based on student performance
not for tenured teachers
I have had different evaluators each year and each "ran" the process differently. I can't really say that the district has changed the system - more-so just the administrators change.
No changes that I am aware of.
NO
I am not aware of any changes within the past 5 years.
I honestly don't know
Some minor changes that went unnoticed

Yes
Not that I am aware of.
I don't really know. I don't care to be involved with the process very much.
No changes that I know of?
I have no idea. To be honest, our district is absolutely horrible at communicating changes to us. For example, we have no idea what is happening on our 10/10 pro dev day. There is a BoE report that says PD will be changing, but how many teachers actually read that (aside from me).
Not sure. It has been inconsistent.
I don't know
I have only been employed in the district for the past three years. Since then, there haven't been any changes. However, changes are being planned for upcoming school years.
Honestly, I'm not sure if there have been changes.
?
I don't think so.
Yes, they've made changes to how the evaluation forms are written up.
not sure
There have been a few changes. I don't know yet if they are positive or negative.
I think our form was revised somewhat, not exactly sure of specific changes.
Not sure!
Not that I know of.
Not sure.
No.
don't have enough time here to comment
Unsure
No

District B

no
Not that I know of.
They did add one new option on the alternative evaluation.
not that I have seen
Not to my knowledge.
No changes that I know of
not that I am aware
No.
Senate Bill 7 has changed our evaluation.
No changes
Not that I am aware of.
no
No, not that I am aware of.
Not that I am aware of

Not that I'm aware of
None
No
No
I don't think they have
peer evaluations
Perhaps giving us more choice in the types of evaluations.
I don't know.
I am not aware of any changes made.
There are more choices as to how to be evaluated (individual, peer evaluation, self evaluation. . .) This is a positive change.
None that I am aware of... [My new principal] has been a very involved principal and makes an effort to walk-through classrooms and give feedback which is much appreciated.
I'm not sure as I have only been here two years. With the new principal, I feel that the evaluation system will improve.
no
no
No
not that I know of
No.
None so far. Changes are coming though.

Appendix C-1

Administrators – What are your district’s plans, if any, for changing the teacher evaluation system over the next few years?

District A – 2011

We will be including some sort of data on student progress and growth. How that will look is still unclear.
We have discussed ways to use student performance - especially in the area of making "gains". We are brainstorming ideas now and have plans to improve the system in the future.
They will align our system with the state requirements
aligning the expectations with the strategic plan's CONNECTED goals
To comply with PERA, we are moving towards a system (eventually) that captures student progress/growth.
We will be changing the evaluation plans so that they are in legal compliance.
Will follow the state guidance to include student achievement data in evaluations
It is certain based on the new laws to evaluate teachers based on student performance.

District A – 2013

None that I am aware of.
adding the student growth goal
Adding in student growth
We do plan to add a student growth goal as required by the state. As principals and assistant principals we are doing this now as part of our admin goals.
We will add student growth
Adding student growth

District B – 2011

Will be changing beginning next year.
We will be reviewing the plan to meet the change in the law as established by Senate Bill 7.
I believe there are plans for review and revision in the next year.

District B – 2013

Our joint committee, comprised of teachers and administrators will begin working on a new evaluation system this year.
A committee is being put together now. I am very excited about this.
New evaluation system in 2 years
I believe it will be addressed with the teachers union in the upcoming year

Appendix C-2

Teachers – What are your district’s plans, if any, for changing the teacher evaluation system over the next few years?

District A – 2011

I am not sure if there are any plans.
I have heard that the rating categories might change and that student performance might play a role in teacher evaluation.
There is a new system from the state of IL that will be upcoming in [this district].
not sure
no idea
To base it more on student achievement.
not sure
Changing the rating scale. Changing pre-tenure assessment tool.
Don't know.
I have no idea! Yikes!
To adapt a four standard rating system instead of three.
There is an evaluation committee being formed, but it does not sound like there will be significant changes.
I don't know
To follow the new rules outlined by the state of IL.
New state goals upcoming
The district intends to make seniority based on performance instead of years in the district. Therefore teachers will be competing against each other for a job. I'm not going to help any of my colleagues because they might get a better evaluation and move ahead of me on the seniority list. A fifth year teacher can have seniority over a 30 year teacher now. Then the district will fire the 30 year teacher instead of the 5 year teacher to save money. Administrators will intentionally give older teachers a lower evaluation to allow the district to RIF older teachers and save money.
Don't know.
I know that the plan is to use student progress as part of the evaluation system.
Not sure
I believe that student growth and performance may become a factor in evaluating teachers.
It's going to change to suit the newer tenure and retention laws.
Not sure.
Given state legislation and national trends, I imagine that our district will comply with new guidelines for teacher evaluations.
I know it will include student growth somehow, but they hadn't decided how at the last meeting I went to
we have a mentoring program, but I don't know if this is related
Same as above.
NA

This year non-tenured teachers will receive ratings for the first time.
I do not know.
I am unaware of any plans
Yes, per new state guidelines.
-state changes in non tenured evaluations
I am not aware of any upcoming changes.
I think they are changing it to be based on students' progress
I think they want to link teacher evaluation to student performance
I don't know
None as far as I know.
I don't know
I don't know.
The state law is going to mandate changes to our evaluation system. We have to have a 4-tiered ranking system and student scores will be incorporated (or a district-based assessment will be used in lieu of ISAT scores).
I believe we are going to follow the state plan for changing how teachers are being evaluated.
I don't really know, but I heard through the gossip mill that they are going to start tracking student progress and using that to evaluate teachers.
Part of teachers' ratings will be based on student performance and/or growth. The rating scale for teachers will be changed, which will allow for non-tenured teachers with a higher rating to maintain a job over a tenured teacher with a lower rating.
Not sure.
?
I don't know.
trying to align with state evaluation changes
Not sure.
know there are changes in the works to incorporate test scores but I'm not sure how this will effect special education
I don't know.
They intend to use student performance as a piece of teacher evaluation.
We will be going to the 4 levels of competency model mandated by the state.
To be in accordance with IL state law and federal law.
They are waiting to see what the state decides and model our structure off that.
don't know
They will be changing to be aligned with the state's new evaluation system.

District A – 2013

in 2014, student growth will be a part of teacher evaluation Hopefully, the district will realize how "out of control" the artifact collection has become, and will put some more concrete, realistic expectations for this part of the process
Unknown
no plans for changing

I believe teacher evaluations are going to be tied to student growth. This does not seem fair since we as teachers are not permitted to "choose" which students make-up our classes. Plus a teacher is only one part the growth of a student. Parents and family life are part of the equation.
None have been communicated
The only major change that I know of is that data will be used to determine part of the teacher's rating. From my understanding, this is a requirement of the state.
I believe in a few years that student performance on standardized assessments will be part of a teacher's evaluation.
Unknown
don't know of any
None that I know of.
Using student data to add to evaluation.
???
unsure
adding student growth
We have just made big changes in our system. In the upcoming years they will be adding the component of students growth to be a factor.
They just changed to Danielson's model so I don't think they will be changing anything again very soon.
We are trying to stay a year or two ahead of the state agenda so that our teachers are ready when the official system rolls out.
We will be adding the student growth piece.
Student progress will be included
unsure
unknown
not sure
adding student growth factor
I am trying to keep up with all the changes and don't know what future changes are coming.
Incorporating student growth goals
We are all new to this process. Last year, we began the transition from the former evaluation tool to the present one being used.
There was a committee, but I am not sure what their conclusions were.
I am not sure
I believe that our evaluations will be tied to gains students make on a standardized test in the upcoming years.
I believe the district is going to maintain the new system that is only just in its second year of implementation. There may be more continued training planned.
none
Don't know
We just aligned to IL standards last year.
? follow the state

Not sure.
We never know. It seems to change or parts get added or clarified each year. By the time we, the teachers, understand how to prove our effectiveness, a new system will likely take its place.
We are in the second year of putting our evaluation process in place. I don't see it changing anytime soon.
I believe that a component about student growth will be added.
Not sure--I think most things will stay the same.
I am not sure but I assume to continually make the expectations clear and equitable for all teachers.
none
Eventually, I've heard we are using scores from kids to add to our evaluation.
None that I know of.
I haven't a clue; it hasn't been shared with the faculty as a whole
all going to Danielson's model by 2016
Comment on #6: Some teachers get more very high or low kids. It's not fair to penalize them by the score results. Classes are not equal.
Don't know
I am not sure- perhaps changes related to the Common Core.
I don't know if our District has plans to make changes. Seems like a major overhaul just happened and we are in its second year?
Not sure, they just underwent a change.
Minor tweaks, but otherwise, my evaluation process is almost identical to last year's process
We are moving to the Danielson framework.
I have no idea
Outline a process for artifacts, more training on differences between proficient and excellent
Just changed the system last year. Looking to refine the system.
Have a new system in place, will be tweaking the system over the next few years, I'm sure
Not sure.
They have already changed the system
we moved to Danielson
Not privy to this information

District B – 2011

don't know
None that I know of.
I do not know.
complying with the new mandate
Plans are underway. Teachers will collaborate with some administrators to rewrite our

system of evaluation.
None that I know of
there is talk of relating evaluations to student progress
The district is currently meeting with a representative group to redefine the evaluation process.
Students' test score part of our evaluation. From a three tier to a four tier evaluation.
I think we are changing the rating system from 3 to a 4 tiered rating.
To tie it in some way to student achievement
to comply with state and federal guidelines, when mandated.
I'm not sure.
None that I am aware of
Test scores used to evaluate Special Education Teachers like myself are not an appropriate tool.
I do not know of any changes
I have not heard if there are any plans for changing the teacher evaluation system.
I haven't heard
I don't know.
Do not know.
I do not know.
I do not see the district making plans. State forces though seem to want more teacher accountability and CPS use new measurements to evaluate its teachers. Many of which seem not fair.
none
talk during the negotiations of the new contract to tie them to student progress somehow
I know there is talk of changes but I don't know what they will be
?
It's always a topic for each new negotiation period.
To be bargained based on PERA.
Have to get in line with state expectations that tie part to tests. I'm very unhappy about this.

District B – 2013

I don't know.
Additional weight on student growth and test scores
move toward student growth factoring in
We will comply with PERA but do are in no rush to do so. We will need to base a portion of our evaluations on student performance.
That is a great question that I do not know the answer to!
I don't know the specifics
not sure
We will have a joint committee to determine an evaluation system that complies with SB7.

I have not heard of any changes.
Don't know- waiting on the Illinois State Board of Education for direction I think or IEA (union)
Sorry--don't know.
The district will require student growth data to be a part of the evaluation system in 2 (?) years.
I believe none
it's changing...but not sure how. Poor communication about, preparation for changes
Not sure yet, but there are changes coming.
I'm not sure...I hear things about the changes, but I do not know much about them.
this has not been clearly communicated to date.
I believe that our system will primarily stay the same, but we will find a way to weave in external requirements.
Rating system to comply with state legislature.
Still up in the air.
???
not informed
changing to meet state requirements
We are 'in process.' Committees formed, but haven't met yet.
don't know
More in line of making proficient the new norm, as opposed to everyone getting excellent
not sure

Appendix D-1

Administrators – Suggestions for improving evaluations or the process of changing evaluations (Question asked only in 2013)

District A

Teachers should have to evaluate each other or themselves at least once per year. This evaluation is only shared between the teacher(s).
I like the informal walk throughs to see what is really going on in the classroom. I wish the procedure was a little bit more formalized - it is an ongoing battle.
I think it's been covered.

District B

We need to develop clear descriptors to delineate the various levels of performance.
We need to follow a model like Danielson so we can give teachers feedback in a variety of key areas.
I prefer a model that requires us to look at the whole teacher and all they contribute as an educator, employee, colleague and life long learner.

Appendix D-2

Teachers – Suggestions for improving evaluations or the process of changing evaluations
(Question asked only in 2013)

District A

I would suggest providing emotional support to help teachers better cope with these changes. I think it is difficult when you are spending countless hours at your job to be told you are "proficient." It is also very demotivating when the bar is set so high that most people cannot reach it.
More visible administrators in an informal setting
While I understand the importance of student growth, I am not convinced that tying that growth to our evaluations is the right answer. Luckily, we work in a school district that sees student growth, but what about teachers in areas where education is not a priority? And since I do not get to "choose" the students on my team it seems that some teachers may have an unfair advantage once student growth is tied to our overall evaluation system.
I think that the wording within the write-ups needs to be carefully worded, so that it really gets across what the evaluator means. Last year, even with some ratings that were high, I came away from post-observation meetings feeling deflated.
I think more opportunities for the process to be explained to teachers should still be offered. The expectations for the portfolio of evidence should be made very clear. Administrators should provide suggestions for improvement only after giving the teacher a chance to show whether he or she currently does the task. It seems that administrators make suggestions for improvement based on limited knowledge of the teacher.
I think it would have been beneficial to have a peer group to work the various stages of the evaluation process as we were going through it. It is hard to remember from the one hit workshop and quick coverage in staff meetings.
Evaluators need to be prepared to deliver difficult message with no sugar coating.
I believe it will improve in time as teachers and administrators become more comfortable with it.
none
No.
Better aligning the goals/focus points of the various educators (ex: decide on same two or three aspects of teaching to focus on)
Make it less time consuming for teachers and administrators.
maybe some clearer expectations if possible on what amount of evidence is enough for proficient, like every item covered, etc.
give more examples of evidence in each category
I am not comfortable with ratings being consistent given the different backgrounds, experience and how well the administrators know their teachers.
In an ideal world, I would love it to be less about the rating and more about what areas teachers could improve in.
I think the process is too time consuming, for both the teacher and the principal.

For teachers with unique positions or positions other than general education teachers I'd like to make sure the evaluation fairly and accurately can evaluate these teachers.
I believe that the tone of the post-observation meetings should be more positive than it has felt recently. Many teachers are feeling like they have to be "perfect" to have a chance of receiving an excellent rating.
no
Tenured teachers should have 2 years between formal evaluations now that it is so time-consuming.
I think that the "evaluators" all need to be on the same page..not changing the "evaluation" system.
I believe that specials teachers need to be evaluated differently. There are many districts that take into account the responsibilities that vary between classroom teachers, art teachers, librarians, gym teachers etc.
no
When teachers figure out how to play the system, it's now about collecting and showing... doesn't really weed out weak teachers, just may weed out ones who aren't savvy.
I think a single evaluator would be better. I question the reliability of the evaluation when subjected to the varying views of multiple evaluators in the building. I do not believe everyone received a fair rating. Some got better ratings because they were evaluated by the Principal vs. the Assistant Principal.
not at this time
CPS has more latitude & choice. There seems to be much discrepancy between districts as to how "strictly" teachers are rated.
More training for administrators
Recognize the contributions that veteran teachers have made...allow for variations within the "system". Recognize career "status"-differentiate goals for teachers, just like we do for students.
No. But I may have an opinion after I've had a chance to be evaluated.
Not at this time.
A presentation during a staff meeting on the changes in the evaluation system for this year would be very helpful
I think there should be a goal setting piece that is tied into the reflective conversations.
variations for specific disciplines
More informal observations must be encouraged.

District B

A single observation tells little about a teacher's ability. Numerous observations are needed along with input on how to improve teaching and follow-up to any suggestions.
It does need to be changed but I don't have strong feelings about how that needs to be done. I do believe that evaluators need to pull data from a variety of sources (students, parents, colleagues, informal evals, formal evals, etc.) and consider all of that data.
As was indicated earlier, we need to know what is happening and what changes are

being made.
Attempt to identify and constructively remediate ineffectual teachers.
It would be better to use a framework such as the Danielson model to make expectations and definition of excellence clear to all.
Student Progress is a touchy subject. Numbers don't always show a true picture of how well a teacher is preparing students. If this becomes part of the evaluation process, then how students are placed in classes will become tainted.
I'd like to see student achievement incorporated into evaluations. This does not necessarily have to be the main component, or the largest component. Having said that, I think student growth may be a "wake up call" to some educators who have thought themselves to be "proficient" over the years....
Seriously consider how to include student growth data in the evaluation. Make the evaluations fair but also make it meaningful for teachers. Encourage tenured teachers to want to do well so that they get good evaluation.
The evaluators I sure were trained, but it hasn't been accurate.
It should include teacher input, and perhaps, include peer coaching, input.
I don't know. I feel that some teachers have gotten a lower rating because they were new, not because they deserved a lower rating. I never felt that before the last 2 years. I don't know how to make it better, when I feel that it may have been a directive from above, rather than an honest evaluation. I don't know how to change that.
Teachers need to be part of the process. It would be less effective if the alternative projects are no longer an option for teachers.
We just need to get moving on making changes that are required by current legislation.
More teacher collaboration, rather than just administration.
No
Involve teachers more; communicate changes better
I feel the principal needs to more integral in the evaluation. Ideally, I would prefer if principal was a rotating position that is elected by teachers. The principal would rotate between being a staff member and managing the staff.
IN CERTAIN SPECIALTIES, MUSIC ART ETC. BRING IN SPECIALISTS TO EVALUATE
Finding a good teacher is about as scientific as finding a good NFL quarterback. The move toward quantitative evals is a misguided policy of the highest order.
If you receive excellent ratings 2 times in a row you don't have to be evaluated so often
Teachers need to be held accountable for doing their job. Some are very poor, and it goes on due to no one wanting to address it.

Appendix E-1

Administrators – Other comments

District A – 2011

Teacher evaluation is definitely an area of growth for us. I feel strongly that both administrators and teachers should be involved and invested in the new process.
I think that the walk-throughs and unscheduled observations often give more information than the planned observations.

District A – 2013

non
Good luck!

District B – 2011

Evaluations and teacher goal setting are the most important role of the instructional leader. Our job is to develop and support our teachers and assure they are doing the best job possible to meet the needs while also providing challenge for all students. We need to make sure they have the proper materials and training to do so and foster their development and desire to improve their craft. I believe in a collaborative model between teacher and evaluator that is transparent and goal oriented. Increasing frequency of observations and review would be a significant improvement, but would also be a difficult thing to accomplish.
--

District B – 2013

I feel we are in the midst of change and that was held back by a contract recently negotiated. I believe the union was waiting to see how the rest of the local districts manage the new model.

Appendix E-2

Teachers – Other comments

District A – 2011

<p>Evaluating for "non" classroom teachers is difficult and I question how this will evolve with the new upcoming laws.</p>
<p>I love teaching and being in the classroom. Unfortunately, the rest of the teaching profession sucks. It sucks the life out of teachers. Just get the administrators and politicians out of schools. Make the teachers accountable to students and parents. Let the students and parents evaluate teachers. They know who's good and who's bad.</p>
<p>Hard to say whether evaluation results are fair or not, as I only know my results. I don't know if teachers have left the school due to poor evals or for other reasons. I don't know if teachers have changed their practices due to their evaluations.</p>
<p>I feel that I feel best evaluated by someone who has been in my field before evaluating. Someone who is unfamiliar with my job and my caseload may not be able to adequately see my strengths and weaknesses.</p>
<p>For question 4, I marked "disagree" for the first two statements. It's not so much that I do not agree with what the statements say, but rather, that I did not realize that such comparisons were taking place.</p>
<p>I don't feel it is fair to rate teachers on student growth since the classes are not equally balanced. Some teams have the gifted cluster while others are assigned to work with the ELL, Life Skills and other populations that require additional support. I also don't feel like the IEP students are always divided in a way where each team can be compared. If administrators are going to rate teachers according to their students growth then the classes need to be more similar in regards to identified & unidentified students with needs.</p>
<p>I love walk-throughs - I think they are a GREAT way to see what is really happening in different classrooms day to day</p>
<p>As I said, I've had three different administrators evaluate me in three years. This can be a little unnerving. I understand that it provides me with different perspectives, but it also inhibits the evaluator from seeing growth over a long-range period. In addition, each evaluator looks for different things and has different expectations of the teacher he/she evaluates. Each year, I find myself worrying "What if this administrator doesn't like how I teach like last year's did?" Last, as a non-tenured teacher, I'm concerned how the newly-implemented scoring system will affect the rehire of non-tenureds. How much emphasis will be placed on that single word and not the big picture?</p>
<p>Evaluation is so complex I'm not convinced that there is a single standard or structure for evaluating all teachers. Making objective decisions about a subjective task like teaching effectiveness seems to be an exercise in failure. The variables for measurement are too numerous to apply to the business model used in accounting and sales effectiveness.</p>
<p>Most of our teachers are strong. We have a few who never should have received tenure, and I am not sure why they did.</p>
<p>I am not informed or take interest in these issues as some other teachers do</p>

District A – 2013

<p>I think it's interesting that we feel so strongly about this system being best for teachers, but if we ever ran a grading system like this, the complaints from parents would be relentless.... If only a select few kids could ever achieve the "A" status, or the high-achievers would have to work relentlessly to try to get there, I would expect parents to target the unrealistic expectations and the level of pressure this type of system provides.</p>
<p>Our district does a horrible job of communicating from the MEC to buildings and then to individual teachers.</p>
<p>I don't think that it was communicated with teachers how important parent opinion is on their evaluation. We are increasingly becoming focused on parents as our "customers", and we are in the business of customer service. Not only has this NOT been communicated, but it being part of our evaluations has been even more of a hidden agenda. Due to the conflict of interest in that being our role, I believe it to be a HUGE issue.</p>
<p>I think that the evaluation system is well defined and that teachers were involved in establishing the new evaluation system. However, I think that our district has made it too difficult (almost impossible) for many wonderful teachers to receive an "excellent" rating. This leads to teachers feeling less appreciated or recognized by the administration.</p>
<p>I think it is too soon to tell whether our new system will differentiate the strong from the weak. When I see/hear/experience what some tenured teachers get away with, I tend to question HOW they could possibly still have a job!</p>
<p>The professionalism is amazing in this district and I enjoy being pushed by my administrators to be better.</p>
<p>This is my first year being evaluated with the new model, so I am unfamiliar with how it all works. I will find out this year!</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>As a related arts teacher, I am curious about how student data/student performance will affect my evaluations. How will this be applied to my evaluation and measured fairly?</p>
<p>In the case of a new or newer administrator who does not have experience at or near the grade level she is evaluating, how accurate is the evaluation?</p>
<p>It is frustrated that people have become preoccupied with their rating. We have many fabulous teachers in the district who do a fantastic job. Yet. many of them felt deflated in getting a proficient rating. I think all the teachers have their strengths and weaknesses so I am discouraged by the "comparing of teachers."</p>
<p>I have always received an excellent rating. This district is filled with outstanding teachers. I am afraid that people who deserve to be excellent will not get the rating because excellent is only supposed to go to the top few. I think we have more than a few teachers at the top in this district. We may not be a bell curve.</p>
<p>this system still is subjective and with "RA" areas, how much with the evaluator know to give a good evaluation for me?</p>
<p>I was lucky to be rated well. It could have gone the other way. There is an</p>

INCREDIBLE amount of pressure on everyone. How is this beneficial to our teaching, self-esteem or confidence?
Maybe an administrator from another building evaluates you so it is more objective
The new evaluation system sets up a "competitive" atmosphere, since we are being judged against our peers, rather than being judged for personal/professional growth.
I feel that some of the teachers who have an issue with the new system are teachers who need to improve. I understand the sensitivity-this profession is a teacher's identity--and it's hard to be called proficient. But I do feel we have teachers who have room for improvement.
My answers are based on being a new teacher and not knowing how much teacher input went into this process prior to my connection to the district. Administrators are still learning the system along with the teachers, but they have been incredibly available to answer questions for teachers. While the process is still developing, I found the reflective pieces of the processes to be extremely helpful to me as I evaluated my teaching from the perspective of student learning.
As it currently stands, evaluators are not giving specific feedback about how to go from a proficient to an excellent. I think that evaluators need to be prepared to offer teachers this kind of feedback.

District B – 2011

Basing teacher evals on student performance is ridiculous since many kids are below level in the first place; have family issues that impact; just don't care and answer C to everything; there are tons of factors that go into student progress and test scores are not the best form of judging the student's progress or the teacher's performance
the union may have an opportunity to provide input , but I do not know how open the district administrators or BOE would be to soliciting comments from any/all teachers.
Student performance should not be a factor in evaluating teachers for the purpose of job retention. Teachers should evaluate student performance so they can ascertain what students are learning and if a different approach is required/needed.
Because I am a music teacher, I am concerned with the idea that student performance will be tied to teacher evaluations. There is currently no reliable assessment of musical achievement.
The state of Illinois has changed our evaluations and we don't know what is going on.
As a specials (encore) teacher, I am concerned at the elementary level especially about how the district intends to tie evaluation to student achievement. And yet, I feel that my subject (music) is just as important to a child's education as his/her core classes.
Evaluations should not be based on test scores or student growth. Children are all different, therefore from year to year, the amount of growth is different as is you methods for teaching.
Politicians should not make educational decisions. School administration officials are better qualified.
I wrote that observation is both a strength and a weakness. I feel that to have a fair assessment, one needs to be assessed more often and across multiple settings. I don't

think a true evaluation can be made one time every other year.
I think that this is a very interesting topic, and hope that you can share your findings with our district's administration.
If teacher evaluations/pay are tied to student performance there will be less collaboration amongst teachers and possible unethical behavior. Also, will any teacher want the special needs children? Will they be willing to share their most creative lessons?
Links between teacher performance reviews and so-called student growth measures are a political, not an educational proposal.

District B – 2013

For the comments on whether or not our system is able to judge teachers that are better than their peers or not is difficult to answer as I am not privy to others evaluation results. In addition, what I think of a teacher's abilities in my school or district may not be accurate as I may only see them teach occasionally. My assessment may not match an administrators since I don't do formal assessments of their teaching. Lastly, while I understand that administrators are the ones evaluating us, I don't necessarily agree that they know the ways we need to improve. What may have worked for them in their classroom may not work with what I teach or with the group of students I have. I am sure they have training on the topic, but that doesn't mean they understand all the variables that may take place within a classroom for a specific content area.
Allowing different administrators evaluate when possible has enriched my practice and allowed for new and varied feedback and guidance.
Our new evaluation system will include student growth. This is easy for math teachers to use MAP or other concrete data. How does this work for a foods teacher? A PE teacher? Is it fair that math teacher will very likely have "worse" student growth data than a foods teacher? Will he/she be evaluated harsher? I love the idea of including student growth but as a core teacher, it does not seem fair.
Not sure how student performance should affect teacher evaluations when students could intentionally do poorly to derail a teacher. We already have elementary students who see testing as something to judge the teacher or principal.
There are social emotional components to our work that do not show up in standardized test scores. The drive for data misses key strengths of the system. I feel that some things teachers give kids don't show up for years, but those types of data are not easily assessed, and are thus not considered.
Since I chose an alternative for my evaluation last year, I don't know how the normal operation changed. The ratings on the form I was given in spring of 2012 had the same 3 classifications that all of my prior evaluations had - excellent, satisfactory, and unsat.
We used to have a curriculum content person in each curricular area that partnered with principals to complete teacher evaluations. I felt like it helped, especially in special subjects.
Everything is up in the air.
Assess the classroom ecosystems, and judge the teacher by their stewardship of that

system.

I don't think ratings should have anything to do with student test or performance scores as more inclusion is occurring and everyone learns at a different rate ie. they don't understand 6th grade math till they are in 7th grade

Thanks for looking into this.