



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Education, Human Development,  
and the Workforce

---

## **North Mason School District: Case Study Report**

A Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP)  
Case Study Prepared for the Washington  
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

JANUARY 2012

# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction.....	1
District Overview/Description .....	1
Case Study Overview .....	1
Method .....	2
Final District Sample.....	3
Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Teacher Evaluation .....	4
Evaluation Framework and Goals.....	4
Performance Measures .....	4
Professional Development.....	6
Communication Strategies .....	8
Time and Resources .....	8
Culture Shifts.....	9
Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Principal Evaluation.....	11
Evaluation Framework and Goals.....	11
Performance Measures .....	11
Professional Development.....	12
Communication Strategies .....	13
Time and Resources .....	13
Culture Shifts.....	14
Summary and Conclusions .....	15
Appendixes	
Appendix A. Agreement Tables.....	A-1
Appendix B. Teacher Survey Frequencies .....	B-1
Appendix C. Principal Survey Frequencies .....	C-1

# Introduction

## District Overview/Description

Located in the Hood Canal area of Washington, the North Mason School District<sup>1</sup> had a 2010–11 total enrollment of 2,222 students and employed approximately 130 teachers at its two elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one alternative high school. Of the 2,222 students enrolled in 2010–11:

- 1.31 percent are American Indian or Alaskan Native.
- 1.44 percent are Asian or Pacific Islander.
- 1.04 percent are African American.
- 11.75 percent are Hispanic.
- 72.91 percent are White.
- 4.44 percent are transitional/bilingual.
- 45.45 percent are eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

## Case Study Overview

On March 29, 2010, Washington Governor Christine Gregoire signed into law Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6696 (E2SSB 6696),<sup>2</sup> which set forth new and more rigorous criteria for evaluating teachers and principals with the intent of improving teaching and learning statewide. The Washington Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP) is one component of this law, which went into effect on June 6, 2010.

Since fall 2010, American Institutes for Research (AIR) has been working with the Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to conduct case studies of nine pilot sites, including eight districts and one district consortium, selected to develop and pilot new teacher and principal evaluation systems between fall 2010 and spring 2012. The purpose of these case studies is to document the experiences of the pilot sites, understand what it takes to implement a new evaluation system, and apply lessons learned from the pilot to support statewide implementation in 2013–14, when all districts statewide will be required to implement new systems.

During the pilot's first year (2010–11), district sites focused on understanding the requirements of the new law, creating new instructional frameworks and rubrics that aligned to new evaluation criteria, and developing more rigorous evaluation processes and procedures. During this second year of the pilot (2011–12), district sites have begun to implement their new evaluation systems, including the new frameworks, measures, and evaluation processes developed in the project's first year, as well as districtwide training and communication strategies to support this rollout. These interim case study reports focus on the pilot sites' experiences during the first semester of the 2011–12 school year, as pilot districts had just begun implementing their new systems. More

---

<sup>1</sup> Information concerning North Mason School District was found at the district's website (<http://www.nmsd.wednet.edu/site/default.aspx?PageID=1>) and the Washington State Report Card (<http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/DataDownload.aspx>).

<sup>2</sup>The education reform law is available online at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/WSLdocs/2009-10/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Law%202010/6696-S2.SL.pdf>.

specifically, in each case study, we briefly describe the district’s new evaluation design, document the implementation process thus far, and discuss the major facilitators and barriers to implementation as they relate to the following areas:

- Evaluation framework and goals
- Performance measures
- Professional development
- Communication
- Time and resources
- Culture shifts

## Method

The purpose of these case studies is to document the work of the pilot sites and share their experiences with OSPI. Case studies are useful and appropriate for studying innovation sites because cases explain what individuals do, how innovations are realized, and why innovations occur. The following two features of the case study method have been employed to enhance the credibility of our findings:

- **Triangulation.** Triangulation incorporates the collection and convergence of information and perspectives from multiple sources (e.g. multiple interviewees and survey respondents).
- **Collection of Rich and Detailed Contextual Data.** Our reliance on multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data enables us to capture the common and unique contextual influences shaping districts’ evaluation approaches and planning processes.

Individual case studies were conducted with each of the nine pilot sites, which included eight districts and one consortium of nine districts. Below, we describe the data collection methods used to inform the individual and cross-case reports submitted in January 2012.

## Surveys

On December 1, 2011, AIR sent online surveys to all pilot teachers, principals, and administrators.<sup>3</sup> Teachers, principals, and district administrators each took unique surveys regarding their experiences and perceptions as they relate to implementation of the new systems. The survey closed on December 15, 2011, allowing approximately two weeks for respondents to take the survey. A researcher from AIR sent two follow-up e-mails between December 1 and December 15, 2011, which reminded participants of the survey and encouraged those who had not yet completed the survey to participate. Items comparing percentages of teachers and principals who agreed strongly or somewhat with similar survey questions are presented in Appendix A, item-

---

<sup>3</sup> A separate survey of pilot teachers, principals and administrators also was administered in early September 2011. The purpose of this earlier survey was to learn about the hopes and worries of pilot participants related to the implementation of the new evaluation system. Results of this survey were presented to the evaluation steering committee and OSPI; however, they are not included in this report. A summary of these results will be included in the final year-end report in June 2012.

level results of the teacher survey are provided in Appendix B, and item-level results of the principal survey are provided in Appendix C.

## **Interviews**

When possible, we conducted interviews with the evaluation pilot leads, a district union representative, three principals, and three teachers. We selectively sampled the evaluation pilot leads and union representative and based our selection criteria on position title and the extent of involvement in the pilot. Typically, the pilot leads included the district superintendent and/or a district cabinet member charged with overseeing the pilot project.

Using a district-provided list of all pilot participants, we randomly selected three principals and three teachers to participate in the interviews. To ensure maximum variability among principal interviewees, we stratified the sample to ensure that one elementary, one middle school, and one high school principal were interviewed whenever possible. When three or fewer principals in total were listed as pilot participants, we attempted to interview all of them. We used a similar process to select one K–2 teacher, one middle school core subject-area teacher (core subjects included language arts and mathematics), and one high school noncore subject-area teacher. During the random selection process, up to five alternates were identified for both principals and teachers. In cases in which the individual selected for the interview declined participation, we proceeded to contacting the first alternate, then the second, and so on, until a willing participant was identified.

## **Other Self-Report Data**

To supplement the surveys and interviews, we asked administrators in each district to estimate the total time and resources invested thus far in professional development focused on communicating about and implementation of the new evaluation systems. We asked districts to provide a list of state and local assessments they currently administer in their district, which *could* be used as a measure of teacher growth. Although results of the assessment inventory were not reported in the interim report, a summary of results were provided to OSPI and the evaluation steering committee in a separate document.

## **Final District Sample**

In North Mason School District, 13 teachers completed the Teacher Evaluation Survey (response rate = 54 percent), while four principals (response rate = 57 percent) and two administrators (response rate = 67 percent) completed their respective surveys.<sup>4</sup> For the interviews in North Mason School District, two district administrators, two principals, one assistant principal, and three teachers were selected and agreed to participate. Unique interview protocols were used for teachers, principals, and district administrators given their unique responsibilities; therefore, not all interviewees may have responded to a given question.

It is important to remember that the purpose of these case studies is to provide a snapshot of districts' evaluation policies and procedures at a given time. Because the work of the pilot districts is ongoing, the information provided in this interim report may no longer reflect the current state of implementation in the district.

---

<sup>4</sup> A response rate for this survey is not available because the list of eligible teacher and principal participants was not provided.

# Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Teacher Evaluation

## Evaluation Framework and Goals

One hundred percent of teacher and principal respondents indicated that they understood the goals of the new teacher-evaluation system. Seven of the eight interviewed individuals saw the key purpose of North Mason School District's new teacher-evaluation system as providing a growth model so that teachers could become more effective. One interviewee saw the key goal as creating a more equitable evaluation system, where expectations were better defined. The district is using the Charlotte Danielson *Framework for Teaching* to guide its teacher evaluation system, although one teacher interviewee was not able to name the framework specifically. Two interviewees noted that the district had to realign Danielson's four domains with the eight criteria set forth by OSPI. Two interviewees noted that the district also made small additions to the existing framework. One hundred percent of both principals and teachers who responded to the survey believe that the new instructional framework provides clear guidance on what effective instruction should look like.

Six of six interviewees agreed that the Danielson *Framework* is being used by all the pilot teachers and only those teachers, which include 25 percent of all teachers in the district. Two interviewees noted that those who do use the framework use it a lot throughout the observation cycle (e.g., in preobservation and postobservation meetings). Five of six interviewees believed the framework was either shifting practice or changing the nature of conversations in their schools. Only one interviewee disagreed that such culture changes were happening at this early point in time. Four interviewees concurred that such changes were limited because of the limited number of teachers involved; only 5e percent of teachers were in the pilot in 2010–11, and 25 percent of teachers are in it at present. Those who did see changes in their school culture described evaluation as being seen less as just a hoop to jump through and more as teachers becoming more aware and more intentional in their work.

## Performance Measures

More than 86 percent of teachers and 100 percent of principals agree that the new evaluation process is both clear and fair. Additionally, 93 percent of teachers and 100 percent of principals agree that the measures being used to evaluate teachers incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance. There was broad agreement among the eight interviewees that the key measures used for teacher evaluation are observations and the collection of evidence. One interviewee also mentioned instructional visits and walk-throughs, attendance at committee meetings, and teachers' self-assessment and goal-setting.

## Observations and Evidence Collection

Observations in North Mason School District include both a formal observation and multiple informal observations. These were seen by eight of eight interviewees as a key component of teacher evaluations. All eight interviewees also noted that evidence collection by the teacher is also part of the evaluation; several interviewees emphasized that this "natural harvest" was intended to not require additional work on the part of teachers; rather, teachers include items that they already have created. These items may include sample student work, newsletters or e-mails to parents, lesson plans, or other evidence. One interviewee described how for each component

of each domain, at least three different pieces of evidence were required. One interviewee stated that there is a list of the types of evidence teachers can draw upon, but another interviewee stated that no such formal list exists. A third interviewee said that the list is on the OSPI website, and added that it is not inclusive of all types of evidence that a teacher is allowed to use. About 75 percent of those surveyed had been observed or conducted a teacher observation already this year, and 93 percent of teachers and 100 percent of principals agree that the measures used in the evaluation will provide a comprehensive picture of teacher performance.

The eight interviewees were in agreement that the district does *not* currently use student achievement or growth data in teacher evaluations, although three interviewees clarified that such data is certainly used to inform teaching and could possibly be incorporated into some teachers' evaluations. However, there was disagreement as to whether the district is considering using such data in the future. Two interviewees thought the district was considering using student achievement data down the road, although they were not sure; two interviewees stated that the conversation on this topic had not yet been had; and four interviewees believed that the use of student achievement data for evaluations was not on the table, although one added the caveat that this situation would of course change if the state mandated its use.

There was near consensus that the various criteria and evidence used in measuring teachers' performance through observations and evidence collection were all weighted equally. But one interviewee said the district is in the process of working this out and, therefore, the question could not be answered at this point in time. Another interviewee relayed that there have been many discussions about this situation and the district is in the process of trying to determine how to assign values to the eight state criteria, after having determined that certain red flags, such as showing a negative impact on students, would be more heavily weighted than other factors. North Mason School District has not yet determined how summative evaluations will be determined. Three of eight interviewees noted that there will be a range within teachers' scores, which will generate another score; but two of these interviewees were clear that the details of this process are still being developed. Five of the eight interviewees conveyed that the process for deciding summative evaluations has not yet been determined; four of eight interviewees described how principals will holistically look at a teacher's ratings and, through discussions with the teacher, determine a score.

All eight interviewees concurred that the evaluation rubric does a good job of distinguishing the different levels of teacher performance. Four interviewees thought the most helpful aspect of the rubric was that the large and overwhelming document was broken down into the four domains, 22 components, and many elements for each component from which teachers could choose which specific items to focus on at a given point in time. Two interviewees noted the clear continuum of effective practice that the rubric spells out, and two interviewees similarly cited the wording and common language that the rubric provides. One interviewee thought the fact that the rubric was research-based and had been refined and tested over time was its most helpful feature. One interviewee thought that most helpful was Level 3 (Proficient) because it laid out the standard that was expected of all teachers. As for the least helpful aspects of the rubric, three interviewees specifically said that nothing about it was *not* helpful. One interviewee said that having 22 components waters down each individual one. One interviewee noted that the language describing what is meant by "Distinguished" could be made clearer. One interviewee would like to see specific examples of teaching and learning included on the rubric. And one

interviewee believed a weakness was that a system of support to help teachers advance from level to level was needed alongside the rubric.

To support the new teacher-evaluation system, North Mason School District has developed or revised a large range of tools. All eight interviewees mentioned the new, 22-component evaluation rubric. But on top of this, a goal-setting document was mentioned by two interviewees, a goal summary document was mentioned by two interviewees, a preconference question sheet was mentioned by five interviewees, a postconference question sheet was mentioned by five interviewees, a tool for teachers to explain what is going on in their classroom was mentioned by one interviewee, an instructional model document based on Danielson's *Framework* but specific to the district was mentioned as a tool by one interviewee, training videos were mentioned by two administrator interviewees, an observation form document for evaluators was mentioned by two interviewees, a shorter version of the rubric containing only the two observable components was mentioned by one interviewee, a large reference document containing all the elements of the four domains was mentioned by one interviewee, and a process document that aligns to the district's contract language and spells out each step and the timeline for evaluation was mentioned by one interviewee. But six of the six teacher and principal interviewees agreed that the most helpful measure or tool in terms of providing teachers helpful feedback was the way everything comes together to lead to productive conversations between teachers and their evaluators.

## **Professional Development**

### **Aligning Evaluation Results**

In North Mason School District, although 100 percent of teachers and principals who responded to the survey agreed that evaluation results will be helpful in informing professional development decisions, not all pilot participants see evaluation results as tied formally to professional development at present. One interviewee indicated that they will be tied in the future; two interviewees indicated that although the two are not tied, the goal-setting process professional development is affected by evaluations; and five interviewees believed that, at least for some teachers, evaluations are indeed tied to their individual professional development. One teacher interviewee noted that a teacher might be provided with a mentor or asked to observe teachers who are distinguished; or, in the case of very poor performance, a teacher might be offered intensive assistance during a short period of time based on his or her evaluation. Another teacher interviewee noted that evaluation results sometimes drive what takes place in professional learning communities or staff meetings. Two of two interviewees agreed that training was provided specifically to help evaluators tie evaluations and professional development.

### **Time and Resources for Professional Development**

To train educators on the new system, North Mason School District first held one full-day (7½ hour) training session for eight teacher evaluators. This session took place in late August 2011. The session provided evaluators with an overview of the new teacher-evaluation pilot program and the Danielson *Framework*. The evaluators:

- Learned about how the different performance levels differ.
- Watched training videos.

- Discussed the difference between evidence and judgments.
- Practiced using the framework and calibrating their ratings.

This session was part of a two-day training that also covered principal evaluations (see the Principal Evaluation section on page 11). The training was provided by the Danielson Group. One interviewee noted that this training of the administrators was more valuable than any of the tools that were created for the new evaluation system, although one quarter of teacher and principal survey respondents did not believe that administrators' own evaluations would take into account how effective they were at evaluating teacher performance.

In addition to training administrators, four teachers were trained by the Danielson Group. On August 29 and again on September 15, 2011, two trainings were provided for the new pilot teachers, first for the middle and high school teachers and then for the elementary teachers. The district reported that the sessions were 7½ hours each, although interviewees recalled the sessions lasting 2½ to 4 hours. The TPEP committee members provided this training, and some principals and nonpilot teachers also attended. Total teacher attendance was 30 (15 at each meeting). The teachers:

- Learned how to use the materials
- Learned why the rubric is written the way it's written
- Reviewed the evaluation process and procedures, the various forms available to them, and each of the components in the rubric.

### **Support and Stakeholder Engagement**

There was agreement among interviewees that the training provided was helpful. Likewise, 100 percent of teacher and principal survey respondents indicated the training they received helped them understand the new evaluation processes and procedures. The aspects of the training that were seen as most helpful varied. For one teacher interviewed, it was reassuring to teachers that this new system would not add more work to their plate and also helpful to be pulled out of class to spend a large chunk of time on this. Three of six interviewees thought having conversations with other teachers or administrators to see how they view the rubric was most helpful. Two interviewees mentioned that watching videos of teachers and rating their performance was most helpful.

As for what was least helpful, five of six interviewees did not find any aspect of training unhelpful. One interviewee pointed out that they had not yet been trained in assessing teachers' professionalism. There was agreement among those interviewed that the training was meant to be ongoing. Two interviewees noted that future training would be better if there was more time so that it did not feel rushed and participants could take in everything they were learning. Three of six interviewees thought it would be helpful to have additional administrator training on calibrating scores to ensure consistency across raters. One teacher interviewee thought it would be helpful to have training that involved hearing what people think having now gone through the process. As for the approach for future trainings, the three teacher interviewees agreed that the training would best be delivered at the building level. There was disagreement about the ideal length of sessions, with one interviewee suggesting keeping sessions to a half-day so that they

are manageable and another interviewee suggesting eight-hour sessions. Two of three administrator interviewees noted that future trainings should continue to be delivered by the Danielson Group.

## **Communication Strategies**

Aside from the formal training provided, other communication about the new teacher-evaluation system has largely come from presentations at staff meetings. This communication has been going on for two years. One interviewee also noted communication that took place at other meetings, such as staff collaboration meetings and department head meetings. There was some disagreement as to the extent of online communication about the new system. One interviewee received e-mail communications while another specifically expressed no such communication was received. Also, one interviewee believed the district was embarking on creating an online system to communicate about the new system while another interviewee said that there already is a TPEP page and blog on the district website but that staff are not being directed to it.

All three teacher interviewees agreed that there are opportunities to provide two-way feedback, primarily during the staff meetings where information is communicated; they also agreed that they understood the requirements and expectations of the new system. The five teachers and administrators agreed that the district is communicating a core message that this is a growth model to improve teacher effectiveness, rather than a “gotcha” model aimed at getting rid of teachers.

Ninety-three percent of teacher respondents to the survey agreed that the district has effectively communicated information about the pilot to pilot teachers, and four out of five interviewees believed that there were no areas of misunderstanding, at least for the pilot teachers. The nonpilot teachers receive all the same information as pilot teachers except for the formal trainings. Two interviewees thought that among nonpilot teachers, there was a lack of understanding about whether this new system would require more work on their part. One interviewee thought there was a misunderstanding that a teacher must demonstrate everything every time they were evaluated. Another interviewee thought there was some misunderstanding among nonpilot teachers about the details of the system, how comprehensive it is, and how teachers play an active role in it.

Four of five interviewees stated that communications could best be improved through simply more face-to-face time either in staff meetings or more formal day-long trainings. However, they were in agreement that no specific future communication activities were planned.

## **Time and Resources**

The three principals interviewed stated they currently spend 2–3 hours, 3–4 hours, and 5+ hours per teacher, respectively, for each of the two observation cycles now, compared to just 1–1.5 hours in past years. One interviewee clarified that the total amount of time spent on teacher evaluation is 20–25 hours so far this year, compared to only 5–6 hours in past years. The three teacher interviewees reported spending 0 to 30 minutes on their own evaluations in previous years, compared to 1–2 hours per evaluation cycle under the new system. Half of teachers and principals who responded to the survey reported that the time they spent on evaluation activities this semester is “much greater,” compared to time spent under the previous evaluation system.

One interviewee stated that the district has been working on this project every week since August 2009. Another interviewee noted that the district has spent about a year on the “what,” much of which was spent refining the system, which underwent four separate revisions, and then spent about 1½ years on the “how.” That interviewee observed that the district leader has spent about 85 or 90 hours so far this year supporting the new evaluation system, compared to just 12 hours or so supporting teacher evaluation in previous years.

In addition to human resources, North Mason School District spent, according to one interviewee, about \$11,000 or \$12,000 on Danielson Group consultant trainers (and they are planning to spend more money on this), \$2,500 or \$3,000 on refreshments and photocopying, and additional resources for room space. The district also reported that total costs for training teachers was \$3,723 and the total costs for training principals (both on the teacher and the principal evaluation system) were \$1,989. Another interviewee noted that about \$100,000 is being spent each year on this, and added that several thousand dollars were spent buying Danielson books for all pilot participants and administrators, iPads were purchased for tracking evaluation data, substitute teachers had to be paid to cover teacher attendance at task force meetings, and consultant fees were paid at around \$1,500 a day plus expenses; in addition, travel costs, conference attendance, refreshments, and instructional materials had to be paid for.

## **Culture Shifts**

A robust teacher-evaluation system not only provides reliable evaluation results but encourages conversations among teachers and administrators about instruction, student achievement, and professional growth. It also changes the perception of teacher evaluation from a negative requirement of the profession to a useful tool for improvement. In short, it shifts the professional culture of the district.

One hundred percent of teachers and 75 percent of principals who completed the survey agreed that they have more productive conversations with colleagues because of the district’s new teacher-evaluation system. But when considering conversations that go beyond those between the teacher and his or her evaluator, interviewees were split about whether the evaluation results have changed the nature of conversations among teacher teams, schools, and the district. Four interviewees did see such culture changes taking place. Specifically, they mentioned a greater level of conversation, more conversation focused specifically on student learning data, and a common language that is used to advance schoolwide goals in professional learning communities, grade-level meetings, and during collaboration time. However, the other four interviewees did not think that conversations had changed as a result of the new evaluation system. They believed that too few individuals were evaluated under the new system to change the nature of conversations outside of those between the evaluator and evaluatee, and that conversations about instruction already were taking place among teachers regardless of changes to teacher evaluation.

One teacher noted that conversations are really changing for the better among reflective, strong teachers, who are eager to know the areas where they still need to improve, as well as for teachers with 25 or more years of experience who are able to see that, despite their experience, they still are “Basic” in certain areas, a perspective that had not previously been raised. But another interviewee noted that the greatest anxiety about this is coming from these teachers with 25 or more years of experience, who are concerned that it will be a “gotcha” system.

Despite these anxieties, 85 percent of surveyed teachers and 100 percent of surveyed principals agreed that the new evaluation system is better than the previous system in terms of helping teachers improve their practice. Two of eight interviewees were not convinced that most teachers, on the whole, perceive this system as better than the old system because of teacher concerns about the time it will take, the higher expectations they'll be held to, and the concern that "this too shall pass." Still, six of eight interviewees believed the majority of teachers, though not all of them, agree that this is a stronger system.

# Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Principal Evaluation

## Evaluation Framework and Goals

North Mason School District has five principals, and they are all participating in the evaluation pilot program. At the time that the interviews took place, the district was not yet as far along in the development of its evaluation system for principals and assistant principals as for its teacher evaluation system. One interviewee expressed lacking knowledge about the new system because he or she had not yet had any evaluation under it. This person was sometimes unsure as to whether elements of principal evaluation were part of the old or new system, and this lack of clarity is reflected in some of the reporting below.

One hundred percent of principal respondents reported that they understood the goals of their district's new principal-evaluation system. Four of five interviewees agreed that the goal of the new principal-evaluation system is to help principals and other school leaders be stronger leaders so they can improve student learning. One interviewee felt too inexperienced with the principal evaluation system to comment on the system's key goals. There was some confusion about what leadership framework was used as a basis for the new principal-evaluation system. Of the five interviewees, two thought that the district was using the Danielson *Framework* for principals' evaluations, and three thought that they were using Marzano's *Classroom Instruction That Works*. One interviewee clarified that the district had worked with Marzano's 21 Leadership Responsibilities for several years, and then plugged these into the state's eight criteria to create a new principal-evaluation rubric.

Four of the five interviewees agreed that this framework at present is not really used by principals in their schools, although two interviewees believed it is used by principals in the goal-setting process and two interviewees noted that culture changes have been observed. One of these interviewees clarified that the culture changes have stemmed from the district office through professional development book studies, rather than directly through a leadership framework. Among the survey respondents, not a single principal reported either personally consulting their district's leadership framework on a regular basis when making decisions about professional practice or noticing district administrators regularly referencing the district's leadership framework.

## Performance Measures

With respect to the measures used for principal evaluations, three quarters of principal survey respondents believed that the measures used for principal evaluation are fair and provide a comprehensive picture of principal performance. Quite in contrast to these survey findings, three of five interviewees either did not know what measures were used or believed that those were on the agenda for discussion for an upcoming meeting, having not yet been determined. Two interviewees thought that the rubric would be supported by the following measures: self-evaluations, observations, and a natural harvest portfolio.

There was some disagreement about the use of student test score data for principal evaluations. One interviewee stated that such data are not being used and that there were no plans that he or she knew of for their future use. But two interviewees maintained that the district always has

included student learning data in principals' evaluations. These data include Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing, end-of-course testing, common assessments for different grade levels and courses, and classroom assessments. One of these interviews also stated that test scores have a strong weight in a principal's evaluation, although the other interviewees did not think that weights of measures had yet been decided for the new evaluation system.

There also was some disagreement about whether principal experience or school context was taken into account when measuring principal effectiveness. Two interviewees thought that these factors were not taken into account—that anyone hired was expected to be able to do the job; in contrast, two interviewees thought that these factors were taken into account, although not necessarily intentionally. The district had not yet decided how principals' summative evaluations would be arrived at.

As to whether tools have been created to support the new system, three of five interviewees saw the rubric, which was still in development at the time of the interviews, as the only tool. Two interviewees stated that tools were in the process of being developed and refined. One of these interviewees believed that some online tools from Teachscape would be implemented; the other interviewee knew only that the principal evaluation tools would be aligned with the teacher evaluation tools.

The rubric was seen by two of five interviewees, but 100 percent of principal survey respondents, as effectively differentiating among principals. The most helpful aspects of the rubric were seen by two interviewees as the clarification of what it means to be "Proficient" and by one interviewee as the language that comprises a continuum of improvement that is spelled out so principals can see what it would look like to do their job as well as possible. Still, two of five interviewees saw the rubric as needing some work before it would do a good job differentiating among different levels of principal effectiveness. In particular, they thought improvements could be made to the performance-level definitions, the flow from one performance level to the next, the clarity around what supports could help a principal move to higher performance levels, and to specific sections that they found confusing. One interviewee had not yet seen the rubric so could not comment.

## **Professional Development**

Interviewees did not report that training was provided specifically on using evaluation results to inform professional development, and the interviewed principals did not see professional development as being directly tied to their evaluation results. Three quarters of principal survey respondents agreed that they did not see evaluation results as being helpful in informing decisions regarding professional development needs and selection. But two interviewees did share that they see evaluators as helping principals develop professionally through the goal-setting that takes place in their evaluations.

As far as training principals on how they will be evaluated, there was no consensus. Three interviewees stated that such training on the system had not yet occurred. Yet one interviewee stated that there had indeed been intense, ongoing training that was required for principals on their own evaluation system. The district reported providing the two individuals evaluating principals with 7.5 hour trainings at the end of August and in mid-September (e.g., during the training provided to pilot teacher participants that are described in the Teacher Evaluation section above). There was a similar lack of consensus in the survey data. Eighty-five percent of

responding principals agreed that the training provided helpful information about the new system and their specific responsibilities under the system; yet only 25 percent of responding principals reported that they understood their responsibilities under the new principal-evaluation system.

## **Communication Strategies**

One hundred percent of principal survey respondents agreed that their district has effectively communicated information about principal evaluation to them this year and 79 percent reported understanding what they need to do to obtain a high rating under the new principal-evaluation system. But, as with their training, there was a lack of consensus among interviewees about the extent of communication about the new principal-evaluation system. Two of five interviewees stated that this topic is a standing agenda item discussed at administrator meetings nearly every week. These two interviewees agreed that the district communication efforts have been successful in ensuring that principals understand the new system. One of these interviewees could not see how more communication was needed for principals on top of all that had received already in their weekly administrator meetings. However, the other three of five interviewees disagreed that communication about the new principal-evaluation system had taken place beyond giving them the rubric to review and scheduling conversations with their evaluator. One of these interviewees said they did, however, have two or three opportunities to e-mail their feedback about the system, and two of these interviewees believed communication activities were being planned. As a result of the facts that the rubric and processes are still in development and communication efforts have been scant, there remain many misunderstandings about the new system, including the number of components on which principals will be evaluated, the cut scores, and how summative scores will be determined.

## **Time and Resources**

It was estimated by one interviewee that the district staff most involved with principal evaluations spent at least 40 hours between them so far this year, as well as a small amount of time at the end of the 2010–11 school year supporting the design and implementation of the new evaluation system. Two interviewees agreed that it was the principal rubric development that has taken the most time so far. One interviewee estimated the total costs associated with principal evaluation, excluding people's time, has amounted to \$15,000 to date. These costs included conferences and workshops on the Marzano framework and some training at the educational service district level. However, a second interviewee saw the only costs directly associated with the principal evaluation system to date as equaling about \$500, for expenditures such as photocopying. This level of expenditure was closely aligned with what the district reported spending on principal evaluator training: \$497.

One interviewee believed principal evaluators would spend at least 90 hours during the course of the year to prepare for, complete, and review the results of principal evaluations; for each principal, the evaluator would spend about three hours completing three evaluations during the course of the year, totaling nine hours per principal. This amount was seen as three times as much time as in previous years. Another interview stated that principal evaluators would likely spend 10–15 hours per principal on their evaluations and that this time was not very different from the amount of time spent on principal evaluation in previous years; although the process for principal evaluation would be better spelled out and slightly different things would be measured,

the activities and the time needed for them were expected to be similar, according to this interviewee.

Two interviewees responded that principals themselves need between one and three hours to complete activities related to their own evaluation. One interviewee thought this time was about the same amount of time principals spent on their own evaluation in past years, while the other interviewee said that the amount of time principals spent on their evaluations varied from year to year. Half of those who responded to the principal survey reported that the time they spend on evaluation activities under the new principal-evaluation system is “greater” or “much greater” than under the previous system.

## **Culture Shifts**

In answering whether principals see the new evaluation system overall as better than the old one, three of five interviewees said yes. Interviewees saw the new system as providing clearer expectations and a common language. Eighty-six percent of principal survey respondents agreed that the new evaluation system is better in terms of helping principals improve their practice, and 93 percent reported having more productive conversations with district administrators because of their district’s new principal-evaluation system. But two of five interviewees did not know whether the new system was perceived as better than the old system or not. One of these individuals thought that probably each school leader would answer that question differently.

## Summary and Conclusions

Of the eight interview respondents, two viewed the biggest strength of the new teacher-evaluation system as the fact that it is a growth model that focuses on teachers improving and doing so at whatever performance level they are at. Relatedly, two interviewees viewed the biggest strength of the new system as the conversations that will occur that did not happen before and the common language that now could guide these conversations. One interviewee saw the greatest strength as using this common language around the instructional framework so that good instruction was no longer the subjective opinion of an evaluator. One interviewee saw the teacher's role in the process, particularly through goal setting, as the system's greatest strength. And one interviewee believed that the specificity of the rubric, and its separation into different domains and components, was the new teacher-evaluation system's greatest strength.

Of the four interviewees that felt familiar enough with the new principal-evaluation system to comment on its overall strengths and weaknesses, there were four different responses to the greatest strength of the new system. One interviewee saw its greatest strength as helping a principals see where they are and how they can improve; one interviewee saw the greatest strength as providing a common language and research-based foundation; one saw the greatest strength as setting a standard for proficiency; and one saw the greatest strength as the new system's focus on a principals' leadership to support students rather than focusing on a principal as a manager.

Regarding areas for improvement and challenges to implementing and sustaining the new teacher-evaluation system, six of eight interviewees mentioned capacity—specifically in terms of time for the conversations to take place, time for the rest of the teachers to become accustomed the system, more training, more money overall, and more money specifically to support online tools. Two of eight interviewees cited the challenge of determining a consistent, systematic way for supporting teachers who are “Basic” in becoming “Proficient.” One interviewee saw simply getting teachers to understand that they will be supported in their continual improvement was a key challenge. Two of eight interviewees noted that a key challenge was that the rubric was too large and cumbersome. One interviewee viewed the language in the “Distinguished” category of the rubric as an area most in need of improvement. Another interviewee stated that aligning the Danielson *Framework*, in which they have been trained, with the state's eight criteria, will be the biggest challenge. Another interviewee was concerned about getting the remainder of the teachers on board and feeling positive about the new system. And a final interviewee saw the incorporation of student work into teachers' evaluations as a key challenge area.

Two of the four principal evaluation interviewees saw the area most in need of improvement for principal evaluations as refining the rubric, and one interviewee saw it as figuring out how to use the rubric for evaluations. As far as challenges to the implementation and sustainability of the new system, one interviewee saw time for evaluator/evaluatee conversations as the biggest challenge; one saw district staff turnover, and the loss of their expertise on the system as the greatest challenge; and another interviewee saw the biggest challenge as the systematic testing for proficiency and inter-rater reliability.

In summary, the areas of strength and weakness are fairly similar for the teacher and principal evaluation systems, even though there is much more work left to do for principal evaluations. North Mason School District's creation of a growth model that creates a common language about expectations and promotes professional conversations among teachers and principals is seen as a

key strength. Most likely due to its slower pace of development, there are much more varied views around the new principal-evaluation system than the new teacher-evaluation system, both in terms of the elements of the new system and the future concerns that exist. For both systems, the issue of teacher and principal time, both to be fully trained and to hold the meaningful conversations that are intended, was a commonly voiced concern.

## Appendix A. Agreement Tables

### *Teacher Evaluation*

The following tables compare the extent of agreement between teachers and principals on similar items. Each table presents the percentage and number (in parentheses, below percentages) of teachers who positively endorsed a survey item (e.g., selected “agree” or “strongly agree”). These tables are useful for determining the extent to which teachers and principals may (or may not) share similar perceptions about aspects of the new teacher-evaluation system.

#### Evaluation and Framework Goals

**Table A1. Percentage of Pilot Participants Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” by Position\***

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
I understand the goals of my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=15)	I understand the goals of my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.	100.0% (n=15)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s instructional framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective classroom instruction should look like.	100.0% (n=15)	My district’s instructional framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective classroom instruction should look like.	100.0% (n=4)
Under the district’s new evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district’s instructional framework.	93.3% (n=15)	Under the district’s new evaluation system, I evaluate teachers against practices that are embedded in my district’s instructional framework.	100.0% (n=4)
I understand the design of my district’s instructional framework.	93.3% (n=15)	I understand the design of my district’s instructional framework.	100.0% (n=4)
I consult my district’s instructional framework on a regular basis to inform my professional practice.	80.0% (n=15)	Teachers in my school consult my district’s instructional framework on a regular basis to inform their professional practice.	75.0% (n=4)
Other <i>pilot teachers in my school</i> have begun to reference the district’s instructional framework.	66.7% (n=15)		

\*See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

## Performance Measurement

**Table A2. Percentage of Pilot Participants Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” by Position\***

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
Have you reviewed your district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of teacher practice across four levels of effectiveness?***	100.0% (n=15)	Do you often reference your district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of teacher practice across four levels of effectiveness?***	75.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.	100.0% (n=15)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of my teaching position.	86.7% (n=15)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of each teaching position.	100.0% (n=4)
My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate my teaching.	93.3% (n=15)	My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate teaching.	100.0% (n=4)
The measures used to evaluate my teaching (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) will provide a comprehensive picture of my performance as a teacher.	93.3% (n=15)	The measures used to evaluate teachers (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) will provide a comprehensive picture of teacher performance.	100.0% (n=4)
The measures used to evaluate my teaching are fair.	86.7% (n=15)	The measures being used to evaluate teachers are fair.	100.0% (n=3)
The measures used to evaluate my teaching incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.	93.3% (n=15)	The measures being used to evaluate teachers incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.	100.0% (n=4)
The measures used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve instructional practice.	100.0% (n=15)	The measures used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to help teachers improve instructional practice.	100.0% (n=4)
Have you been observed <i>for the purpose of evaluation</i> under the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?***	73.3% (n=15)	Have you conducted observations <i>for the purpose of evaluation</i> for the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?***	75.0% (n=4)
The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is clear to me.	100.0% (n=15)	The new process being implemented this year to evaluate teacher performance is clear to me.	100.0% (n=4)
The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is fair.	93.3% (n=15)	The new process being implemented this year to evaluate teacher performance is fair.	100.0% (n=4)

\* See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

\*\*\*Response options for these items included *yes*, *no*, and *uncertain*.

Note. Indented items include responses from the subgroup of respondents that selected “yes” to the item above it.

## Professional Development

**Table A3. Percentage of Pilot Participants Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” by Position\***

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
Have you received any formal training to understand the new teacher-evaluation system and how you will be evaluated?***	100.0% (n=15)	Have you received any formal training on conducting evaluations for the new teacher-evaluation system?***	100.0% (n=4)
The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.	100.0% (n=15)	The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.	100.0% (n=4)
I understand my responsibilities under the new evaluation system.	86.7% (n=15)	I understand my responsibilities as an evaluator under the new teacher-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=4)
The evaluation training I received provided helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations.	53.3% (n=15)	Did the evaluation training you received provide helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations?***	25.0% (n=4)
My district provided helpful training about how I could use data generated by the new teacher-evaluation system to inform my teaching practice.	86.7% (n=15)	My district provided helpful training on how I could use data generated by the new teacher-evaluation system to help teachers improve their teaching practice.	75.0% (n=4)
Have you received any training materials to help you understand the new evaluation system and how you will be evaluated? (Examples of training materials include evaluation handbooks, rubrics, observation instruments, or handouts that provide information about the new process.)**	100.0% (n=15)	Have you received any training materials (e.g., evaluation handbooks, rubrics, observation instruments, or handouts) to help you understand the new evaluation system and how you will conduct evaluations?***	100.0% (n=4)
To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?***	100.0% (n=15)	To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be conducting evaluations?***	100.0% (n=4)
To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?***	100.0% (n=15)	To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new teacher-evaluation system?***	100.0% (n=4)
Evaluators in my district are well prepared to evaluate my performance this year by <i>using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</i>	86.7% (n=15)	I am well-prepared to evaluate teacher performance this year <i>using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</i>	100.0% (n=4)
		I am confident that teacher evaluators have been sufficiently trained to rate teachers consistently under the new evaluation system.	100.0% (n=4)

<b>Teachers</b>	<b>%/n</b>	<b>Principals</b>	<b>%/n</b>
Are principals in your district being held accountable for implementing the new evaluation system?***	93.3% (n=15)	Are you being held accountable for implementing the new teacher-evaluation system?***	100.0% (n=4)
Will principals in your district be evaluated on how effective they are at evaluating teacher performance?***	26.7% (n=15)	Will you be evaluated on how effective you are at evaluating teacher performance?***	25.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning.	78.6% (n=14)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning.	75.0% (n=4)
My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.	100.0% (n=14)	Teacher evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding teachers’ professional development needs and selection.	100.0% (n=4)

\*See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies.

Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

\*\*Response options for these items included *yes*, *no*, and *uncertain*.

Note. Indented items include responses from the subgroup of respondents that selected “yes” to the item above it.

\*\*\*Indicates the percent responding very helpful or somewhat helpful.

## Communication

**Table A4. Percentage of Pilot Participants Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” by Position\***

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
		My district has effectively communicated information about the teacher evaluation pilot to principals participating in the pilot.	100.0% (n=4)
		My district either has solicited or has plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from evaluators participating in the pilot.	100.0% (n=4)
My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>teachers involved in the pilot</i> this year.	92.9% (n=14)		
My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>nonpilot teachers</i> .	61.5% (n=13)		
My district either has solicited or plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from teachers participating in the pilot.	64.3% (n=14)		
I understand what criteria are included in my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=14)	I understand what criteria are included in my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=4)
I understand what measures are used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system to measure my performance.	92.9% (n=14)	I understand what measures are used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system to measure teacher performance.	100.0% (n=4)
I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new teacher-evaluation system.	92.9% (n=14)		

\* See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

## Time and Resources

**Table A5. Percentage of Pilot Participants Reporting “Much Greater” by Position\***

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
In comparison to your district’s previous teacher evaluation system, the time spent by teachers on evaluation activities for the new teacher-evaluation system is:	50.0% (n=14)	In comparison to your district’s previous teacher evaluation system, the time spent by principals on evaluation activities under the new teacher-evaluation system is:	50.0% (n=4)

\* See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies.

Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

## Culture Shifts

**Table A6. Percentage of Pilot Participants Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” by Position\***

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is better than the previous teacher evaluation system in terms of helping me improve my practice.	84.6% (n=13)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is better than the previous teacher evaluation system in terms of helping teachers improve their practice.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is more objective than the previous teacher evaluation system.	78.6% (n=14)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is more objective than the previous teacher evaluation system.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which I need to improve.	92.9% (n=14)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which a teacher needs to improve.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in my performance.	92.9% (n=14)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in a teacher’s performance.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that I can take to improve areas of weakness.	64.3% (n=14)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that a teacher can take to improve areas of weakness.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.	92.3% (n=13)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.	84.6% (n=13)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.	100.0% (n=4)

<b>Teachers</b>	<b>%/n</b>	<b>Principals</b>	<b>%/n</b>
The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system.	69.2% (n=13)	The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system.	75.0% (n=4)
I have more productive conversations with colleagues because of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=13)	I have more productive conversations with teachers because of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.	75.0% (n=4)

\* See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

## *Principal Evaluation*

The following tables indicate the percentage and number (in parentheses, below percentages) of principals who positively endorsed a survey item (e.g., selected *agree* or *strongly agree*).

### Evaluation and Framework Goals

**Table A7. Percentage of Pilot Principals Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”\***

Item	%/n
I understand the goals of my district’s new principal-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective leadership.	100.0% (n=4)
My district’s leadership framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective school administration should look like.	75.0% (n=4)
Under the district’s new principal-evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district’s leadership framework.	75.0% (n=4)
I understand the design of my district’s leadership framework.	25.0% (n=4)
Do you consult your district’s leadership framework on a regular basis when making decisions about professional practice?***	0.0% (n=4)
District administrators regularly reference the district’s leadership framework.	0.0% (n=4)

\* See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

\*\*\*Response options for these items included *yes*, *no*, and *uncertain*.

## Performance Measurement

**Table A8. Percentage of Pilot Principals Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”\***

Item	%/n
Have you reviewed your district’s new principal-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of principal practice across four levels of effectiveness?***	75.0% (n=4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between different levels of principal practice.	100.0% (n=3)
My district is using data from multiple measures to evaluate principals.	75.0% (n=4)
The measures (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) being used to evaluate principals will provide a comprehensive picture of principal performance.	75.0% (n=4)
The measures being used to evaluate my performance are fair.	75.0% (n=4)
The measures being used to evaluate my performance incorporate the most important aspects of principal performance.	75.0% (n=4)
The measures used by my district’s new principal-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve my practice as a school leader.	100.0% (n=4)
The new process being implemented this year to evaluate principal performance is clear to me.	25.0% (n=4)
The new process being implemented this year to evaluate principal performance is fair.	50.0% (n=4)

\* See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

\*\*\*Response options for these items included *yes*, *no*, and *uncertain*.

## Professional Development

**Table A9. Percentage of Pilot Principals Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”\***

Item	%/n
Have you received any formal training to understand the new principal-evaluation system?***	0.0% (n=4)
The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.	—
I understand my responsibilities under the new principal-evaluation system.	25.0% (n=4)
My district provided helpful training on how I could use data generated by the new principal-evaluation system to improve my practice.	0.0% (n=4)
Have you received any training materials to help you understand the new evaluation system and how you will be evaluated? Examples of training materials include evaluation handbooks, rubrics, observation instruments, or handouts that provide information on the new process.**	0.0% (n=4)
To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?***	—
To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?***	—
Evaluators in my district are well-prepared to evaluate my performance this year <i>using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</i>	25.0% (n=4)
District administrators in my district are being held accountable for implementing the new principal-evaluation system.**	0.0% (n=4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system feeds into districtwide professional development planning.	0.0% (n=4)
My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.	25.0% (n=4)

\*See Appendix B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

\*\*Response options for these items included *yes*, *no*, and *uncertain*.

\*\*\* Indicates the percent responding very helpful or somewhat helpful.

Note. Results not reported if fewer than three principals responded to the question.

## Communication

**Table A10. Percentage of Pilot Principals Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”\***

Item	%/n
My district has effectively communicated information about the <i>principal evaluation pilot</i> to <i>principals involved in the pilot</i> this year.	25.0% (n=4)
My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>nonpilot principals</i> .	25.0% (n=4)
My district either has solicited or has plans to solicit feedback concerning the new principal-evaluation system from principals participating in the pilot.	25.0% (n=4)
I understand what criteria are included in my district’s new principal-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=4)
I understand what measures are used by my district’s new principal-evaluation system to measure principal performance.	100.0% (n=4)
I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new principal-evaluation system.	50.0% (n=4)

\*See Appendixes B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

## Time and Resources

**Table A11. Percentage of Pilot Principals Who Responded “Much Greater” or “Greater”\***

Item	%/n
In comparison to your district’s previous principal evaluation system, the time spent by principals on evaluation activities under the new principal-evaluation system is:	25.0% (n=4)

\*See Appendixes B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

## Culture Shifts

**Table A12. Percentage of Pilot Principals Who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”\***

Item	%/ <i>n</i>
My district’s new principal-evaluation system is better than the previous principal evaluation system in terms of helping principals improve their practice.	75.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system is more objective than the previous principal evaluation system.	75.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which a principal needs to improve.	50.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in a principal’s performance.	75.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system provides clear steps that a principal can take to improve areas of weakness.	50.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of principal performance.	75.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system encourages better school administration.	75.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive principal evaluation system.	50.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)
I have more productive conversations with district administrators because of my district’s new principal-evaluation system.	75.0% ( <i>n</i> =4)

\*See Appendixes B and Appendix C for a list of the complete response options and for detailed frequencies. Percentage agreement is based on non-missing responses.

## Appendix B. Teacher Survey Frequencies

This appendix provides the item-level results of the Fall 2011 Washington TPEP Teacher Evaluation Survey. This online survey was administered to all teachers who participated in the evaluation pilot during the 2011–12 school year. Response frequencies (i.e., total number of participants who selected a particular response option) and frequency percentages are provided for each item in the survey. Results for table rows labeled “missing” represent the survey participants who did not select any response option for a particular item (respondents who did not answer any question were removed from the data prior to analysis).

Some questions, which are indented in the following table, applied only to a subset of respondents (e.g., only to teachers who reported being observed for the purpose of evaluation). The missing category in these indented items includes both respondents who did not answer the question because they were not asked the question and also respondents who did not answer the question for unknown reasons. Questions with multiple response items have been marked with a note in the table below. Specifically, some questions allowed respondents to choose more than one category (e.g., through which means have teachers been informed about the teacher evaluation pilot). In these cases, the total number of responses can exceed the total number of respondents and the total percentage can exceed 100 percent. To prevent a disclosure violation, items in which less than three people responded are not presented.

**Table B1. Item-Level Results of the Fall 2011 Washington TPEP Teacher Evaluation Survey**

	Frequency	%
I am a: <sup>a</sup>		
General education teacher	9	60.00%
Core content teacher (e.g., math, science, reading)	3	20.00%
Noncore content teacher (e.g., physical education, music)	1	6.67%
English language teacher	1	6.67%
Special education teacher	2	13.33%
Support provider (e.g., school psychologists, occupational therapists, guidance counselors)	0	0.00%
Mentor, coach, or other instructional leader (e.g., reading specialists)	2	13.33%
Nonteaching staff (e.g., administrative assistants, custodians)	0	0.00%
Other	1	6.67%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	

<sup>a</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

	Frequency	%
<b>I am a:</b>		
Continuing contract teacher	15	100.00%
Provisional status teacher	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>I understand the goals of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	12	80.00%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.</b>		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district's instructional framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective classroom instruction should look like.</b>		
Agree strongly	9	60.00%
Agree somewhat	6	40.00%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
Under the district's new evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district's instructional framework.		
Agree strongly	9	60.00%
Agree somewhat	5	33.33%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%

I understand the design of my district's instructional framework.		
Agree strongly	8	53.33%
Agree somewhat	6	40.00%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%

I consult my district's instructional framework on a regular basis to inform my professional practice.		
Agree strongly	3	20.00%
Agree somewhat	9	60.00%
Disagree somewhat	2	13.33%
Disagree strongly	1	6.67%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%

Other <i>pilot teachers in my school</i> have begun to reference the district's instructional framework.		
Agree strongly	2	13.33%
Agree somewhat	8	53.33%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	1	6.67%
Uncertain	4	26.67%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%

	Frequency	%
<b>Have you reviewed your district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of teacher practice across four levels of effectiveness?</b>		
Yes	15	100.00%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%
<b>My district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%
<b>My district’s new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of my teaching position.</b>		
Agree strongly	8	53.33%
Agree somewhat	5	33.33%
Disagree somewhat	2	13.33%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%
<b>My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate my teaching.</b>		
Agree strongly	12	80.00%
Agree somewhat	2	13.33%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%

	Frequency	%
The measures used to evaluate my teaching (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) will provide a comprehensive picture of my performance as a teacher.		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

The measures used to evaluate my teaching are fair.		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	2	13.33%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

The measures used to evaluate my teaching incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.		
Agree strongly	9	60.00%
Agree somewhat	5	33.33%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

The measures used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve instructional practice.		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Have you been observed for the purpose of evaluation under the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?</b>		
Yes	11	73.33%
No	4	26.67%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Which of the following kinds of observations have taken place?<sup>b</sup></b>		
Full-length, formal (i.e., included in your overall summative evaluation rating)	9	60.00%
Walk-through	8	53.33%
Informal (i.e., not included in your overall summative evaluation rating)	8	53.33%
Announced (i.e., you knew about the observation ahead of time)	9	60.00%
Unannounced (i.e., you did not know beforehand that the observation would occur)	4	26.67%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system.	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	

<sup>b</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

<b>What was the average time that an observer spent in your classroom during each formal observation so far this semester?</b>		
Less than 30 minutes	0	0.00%
30–60 minutes	11	73.33%
More than 60 minutes	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.00%
Missing	4	26.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>How many times have you been formally observed this semester?</b>		
One time	10	66.67%
Two times	1	6.67%
Three or more times	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.00%
Missing	4	26.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>How many times have you participated in walk-through observations this semester?</b>		
One time	0	0.00%
Two times	5	33.33%
Three or more times	4	26.67%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
I have not participated in any walk-through observations under the new teacher-evaluation system	1	6.67%
Missing	4	26.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>What was the average time that an observer spent in your classroom during each walk-through observation so far this semester?</b>		
Less than 5 minutes	1	6.67%
5—10 minutes	8	53.33%
11—20 minutes	1	6.67%
21—30 minutes	0	0.00%
More than 30 minutes	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
I have not participated in any walk-through observations under the new teacher-evaluation system	1	6.67%
Missing	4	26.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Who observed your instruction during these observations?</b>		
Principal	9	60.00%
Vice principal	1	6.67%
Master teacher	0	0.00%
Instructional coach	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.00%
Other	1	6.67%
Missing	4	26.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Were the observation results discussed with you?</b>		
Yes	9	60.00%
No	1	6.67%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Missing	4	26.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Have you incorporated feedback from the observation results into your practice?</b>		
Yes	9	60.00%
No	2	13.33%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	4	26.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is clear to me.</b>		
Agree strongly	9	60.00%
Agree somewhat	6	40.00%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is fair.</b>		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Have you received any formal training to understand the new teacher-evaluation system and how you will be evaluated?</b>		
Yes	15	100.00%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Training for teachers regarding the new evaluation system has been offered.</b>		
One time	0	0.00%
A couple of times	12	80.00%
On an ongoing basis	3	20.00%
Not at all	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.</b>		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand my responsibilities under the new evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	9	60.00%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The evaluation training I received provided helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	26.67%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	5	33.33%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	2	13.33%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district provided helpful training about how I could use data generated by the new teacher-evaluation system to inform my teaching practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	7	46.67%
Agree somewhat	6	40.00%
Disagree somewhat	2	13.33%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Have you received any training materials to help you understand the new evaluation system and how you will be evaluated? (Examples of training materials include evaluation handbooks, rubrics, observation instruments, or handouts that provide information about the new process.)</b>		
Yes	15	100.00%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?</b>		
Very helpful	11	73.33%
Somewhat helpful	4	26.67%
Not very helpful	0	0.00%
Not helpful at all	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?</b>		
Very helpful	9	60.00%
Somewhat helpful	6	40.00%
Not very helpful	0	0.00%
Not helpful at all	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Evaluators in my district are well prepared to evaluate my performance this year by using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	9	60.00%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	2	13.33%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Are principals in your district being held accountable for implementing the new evaluation system?</b>		
Yes	14	93.33%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Will principals in your district be evaluated on how effective they are at evaluating teacher performance?</b>		
Yes	4	26.67%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	11	73.33%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	15	100.00%

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning.</b>		
Agree strongly	7	46.67%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	3	20.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
Total	15	100.00%

<b>My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.</b>		
Agree strongly	9	60.00%
Agree somewhat	5	33.33%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
Total	15	100.00%

<b>Through which of the following means have <i>teachers participating in the pilot</i> been informed of expectations, changes, updates, and results of the district's new teacher-evaluation pilot?<sup>c</sup></b>		
Memoranda and newsletters	8	53.33%
Faculty meetings	9	60.00%
Q&A documents	2	13.33%
Q&A meetings	6	40.00%
Webcasts or other online meetings	0	0.00%
Training sessions for pilot participants	14	93.33%

	Frequency	%
Detailed information posted on district website	4	26.67%
Focus groups	3	20.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Other	0	0.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	

<sup>c</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

Through which of the following means have nonpilot *teachers* been informed of the district's new evaluation system and ongoing pilot?<sup>d</sup>

Memoranda and newsletters	4	26.67%
Faculty meetings	13	86.67%
Q&A documents	0	0.00%
Q&A meetings	1	6.67%
Webcasts or other online meetings	0	0.00%
Training sessions for pilot participants	1	6.67%
Detailed information posted on district website	1	6.67%
Focus groups	0	0.00%
All teachers in my district are participating in the pilot	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Other	0	0.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	

<sup>d</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to teachers involved in the pilot this year.

Agree strongly	10	66.67%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to nonpilot teachers.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	13.33%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	6	40.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	2	13.33%
Missing	2	13.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district either has solicited or plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from teachers participating in the pilot.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	26.67%
Agree somewhat	5	33.33%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	5	33.33%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>I understand what criteria are included in my district's new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	12	80.00%
Agree somewhat	2	13.33%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>I understand what measures are used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system to measure my performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	66.67%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	11	73.33%
Agree somewhat	2	13.33%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Under the new teacher-evaluation system, how much total time have you spent preparing for evaluation activities, completing evaluation activities, and reviewing evaluation results, on average?</b>		
Less than 1 hour	1	6.67%
1–2 hours	6	40.00%
3–4 hours	4	26.67%
5–6 hours	1	6.67%
7–8 hours	0	0.00%
More than 8 hours	2	13.33%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>In comparison to your district’s previous teacher evaluation system, the time spent by teachers on evaluation activities for the new teacher-evaluation system is:</b>		
Much greater	7	46.67%
Slightly greater	5	33.33%
About the same	1	6.67%
Slightly less	0	0.00%
Much less	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	6.67%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system is better than the previous teacher evaluation system in terms of helping me improve my practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	66.67%
Agree somewhat	1	6.67%
They are about the same	1	6.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	1	6.67%
Missing	2	13.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system is more objective than the previous teacher evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	7	46.67%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
They are about the same	1	6.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	1	6.67%
It is still too early to know	1	6.67%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which I need to improve.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	66.67%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	1	6.67%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in my performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	66.67%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	1	6.67%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that I can take to improve areas of weakness.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	26.67%
Agree somewhat	5	33.33%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	1	6.67%
It is still too early to know	3	20.00%
Missing	1	6.67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	8	53.33%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	0	0.00%
Missing	2	13.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	8	53.33%
Agree somewhat	3	20.00%
Disagree somewhat	1	6.67%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	1	6.67%
Missing	2	13.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	5	33.33%
Agree somewhat	4	26.67%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	1	6.67%
It is still too early to know	3	20.00%
Missing	2	13.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Frequency      %**

I have more productive conversations with colleagues because of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	5	33.33%
Agree somewhat	8	53.33%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Missing	2	13.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

- | What are the strengths of your district's new teacher-evaluation system?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• * Organized materials * intentional design * clearly communicated objectives</li> <li>• At this point there has been no mention of student test scores as a basis for evaluation. Growth is okay, MSP scores would not be okay with me at this time.</li> <li>• Great for getting more objective feedback to fine tune your practices.</li> <li>• Like the 4 areas and rubric. Better than "satisfactory" or not,</li> <li>• Multiple measures of assessment of teachers. Varying levels of practice/skill - not just bad vs. Acceptable. Room for improvement - growth oriented model.</li> <li>• Our new teacher-evaluation system provides opportunities for teachers to have clear standards of performance -- with our rubrics -- clarifying the proficient standard at which we want all educators to perform. We are currently in the process of implementing supports for teachers at a basic level of performance, in terms of mentoring, professional development opportunities, etc. This system provides an excellent opportunity for educators to perfect the art and science of teaching: in planning and preparation, in establishing a positive classroom environment, in the engagement of students at high levels of rigor in the instructional process, and developing professionally as well.</li> <li>• The conversations are progressive and meaningful. They will help me improve my practice in a supportive way.</li> <li>• The evaluation process has a more objective feel to it.</li> <li>• The strength of this new system is that it is inclusive of all the work I do as a teacher. I feel this system is clear about my expectations as a teacher, and how I can improve in specific areas.</li> </ul> |

**Frequency      %**

**What are the *weaknesses* of your district's new teacher-evaluation system?**

- \* Nonpilot members' involvement
- Administrators and teachers both are having difficulty deciphering the "spirit" and rules of the rubric. Scoring protocol still has confusing language, for instance, 3 pieces of evidence on a 20 minute informal observation to be able to score a section of the rubric makes it very difficult to get more than one section scored.
- All students with the exception of one may be participating or be able to be redirected to on task behavior, and the teacher can be considered as not meeting proficiency because the one student refuses to cooperate. Several redirecive moves may be tried and the student may stop disruptive behaviors and the lesson can be completed. The teacher was able to keep the class on task and didn't have to remove the offender, but the student didn't participate. This student is a disruptor in most classes and spends much time in the office. Teachers are trying to meet the student's needs and maintain the classroom learning environment for other students. Yet the teacher gets dinged because the offending student refuses to comply with expected behaviors while everyone else is.
- It is overwhelming due to the breadth. It seems difficult for my supervisor to evaluate all areas. I am already pressed for time and not sure how the pre and post conferencing and paperwork will be able to get squeezed in. I would rather cover less more deeply.
- It seems to be over-whelming at first, but once we narrowed the focus to 22 areas it is more understandable.
- Some vague wording. Teachers and admin are not entirely familiar with protocol so we make paperwork mistakes.
- Time: this new system does take time to adapt to. The trainings and time out of my classroom have been a bit burdensome--but needed. Scheduling the time to debrief with my administrator has been difficult. The time it takes to discuss the evaluations is much longer and a bit cumbersome. I'm not sure how you would streamline this, though.
- Too much to do for teachers and principals. Isn't there something in between?
- We are currently in the process of clarifying the levels of support necessary to bring a teacher from a level 2/basic to a level 3/proficient. We also want to provide incentives for those teachers who are at a distinguished level.
- We have not identified what supports will be in place for professional development.

**What grade levels do you teach?<sup>°</sup>**

Early childhood	0	0.00%
Elementary (K-5)	6	40.00%
Middle (6-8)	5	33.33%
High school	2	13.33%
Missing	2	13.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	

<sup>°</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>What is your gender?</b>		
Male	3	20.00%
Female	9	60.00%
Missing	3	20.00%
Total	15	100.00%

<b>What is your current teacher certification status?</b>		
Provisional status	0	0.00%
Continuing contract	12	80.00%
Other	1	6.67%
Missing	2	13.33%
Total	15	100.00%

<b>In total, how many years have you worked as a certified teacher?</b>		
Less than 5 years	1	6.67%
5–10 years	3	20.00%
11–20 years	7	46.67%
More than 20 years	1	6.67%
Missing	3	20.00%
Total	15	100.00%

## Appendix C. Principal Survey Frequencies

This appendix provides the item-level results of the Fall 2011 Washington TPEP Principal Evaluation Survey. This online survey was administered to all principals who participated in the evaluation pilot during the 2011–12 school year. Response frequencies (i.e., total number of participants who selected a particular response option) and frequency percentages are provided for each item in the survey. Results for table rows labeled “missing” represent the survey participants who did not select any response option for a particular item (respondents who did not answer any question were removed from the data prior to analysis).

Some questions, which are indented in the following table, applied only to a subset of respondents (e.g., only to principals who reported receiving training on the new evaluation system). The missing category in these indented items includes both respondents who did not answer the question because they were not asked the question and also respondents who did not answer the question for unknown reasons. Questions with multiple response items have been marked with a note in the table below. Specifically, some questions allowed respondents to choose more than one category (e.g., through which means have teachers been informed about the teacher evaluation pilot). In these cases, the total number of responses can exceed the total number of respondents and the total percentage can exceed 100 percent. To prevent a disclosure violation, items in which less than three people responded are not presented.

**Table C1. Item-Level Results of the Fall 2011 Washington TPEP  
Principal Evaluation Survey**

### *Teacher Evaluation System*

	Frequency	%
I understand the goals of my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.		
Agree strongly	3	75.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
My district's instructional framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective classroom instruction should look like.		
Agree strongly	3	75.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

Under the district's new evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district's instructional framework.		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

I understand the design of my district's instructional framework.		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

Teachers in my school consult my district's instructional framework on a regular basis to inform their professional practice.		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

**Frequency      %**

Do you often reference your district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of teacher practice across four levels of effectiveness?		
Yes	3	75.0%
No	1	25.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

My district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

My district’s new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of each teaching position.		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate my teaching.		
Agree strongly	3	75.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
The measures used to evaluate teachers (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) will provide a comprehensive picture of teacher performance.		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

The measures being used to evaluate teachers are fair.		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
Total	4	100.0%

The measures being used to evaluate my teachers incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

The measures used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to help teachers improve instructional practice.		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>Have you conducted observations <i>for the purpose of evaluation</i> under the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?</b>		
Yes	3	75.0%
No	1	25.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>What kinds of observations have taken place?<sup>a</sup></b>		
Full-length, formal observation (i.e., included in a teacher's overall summative evaluation rating)	2	50.0%
Walk-through	2	50.0%
Informal (i.e., not included in a teacher's overall summative evaluation rating)	1	25.0%
Announced (i.e., you let the teacher know about the observation ahead of time)	3	75.0%
Unannounced (i.e., you did not let the teacher know about that the observation would occur beforehand)	1	25.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
I have not observed teachers under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
Total	4	

<sup>a</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

<b>What was the average time that you spent on each formal observation so far this semester?</b>		
Less than 30 minutes	0	0.0%
30–60 minutes	3	75.0%
More than 60 minutes	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
I have not observed teachers under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>On average, how many times this semester have you formally observed each teacher participating in the pilot?</b>		
Once	3	75.0%
Twice	0	0.0%
Three or more times	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
I have not formally observed teachers under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>On average, how many walk-through observations have you conducted for each teacher participating in the pilot?</b>		
None	0	0.0%
One	2	50.0%
Two	1	25.0%
Three or more	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>What was the average time spent in each classroom during walk-through observations so far this semester?</b>		
Less than 5 minutes	0	0.0%
5–10 minutes	0	0.0%
11–20 minutes	3	75.0%
21–30 minutes	0	0.0%
More than 30 minutes	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
I have not conducted any walk-through observations under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Who else at your school observes teachers?</b>		
I am the only observer	1	25.0%
Vice principal	1	25.0%
Master teacher	0	0.0%
Instructional coach	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Other	1	25.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Did you discuss the observation results with the teacher after you completed the observation?</b>		
Yes	3	75.0%
No	0	0.0%
Not yet, although I plan to do so	0	0.0%
Though I would like to do so, other issues will likely prevent me from discussing results with teachers this semester	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Have teachers incorporated feedback from their observation results into their practice?</b>		
Yes	3	75.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>The new process being implemented this year to evaluate teacher performance is clear to me.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>The new process being implemented this year to evaluate teacher performance is fair.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>Have you received any formal training on conducting evaluations for the new teacher-evaluation system?</b>		
Yes	4	100.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b><i>Training for evaluators on the new teacher-evaluation system has been offered.</i></b>		
Once	0	0.0%
A couple of times	4	100.0%
On an ongoing basis	0	0.0%
Not at all	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand my responsibilities as an evaluator under the new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	3	75.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Did the evaluation training you received provide helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations?</b>		
Yes	1	25.0%
No	3	75.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district provided helpful training on how I could use data generated by the new teacher-evaluation system to help teachers improve their teaching practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Have you received any training materials (e.g., evaluation handbooks, rubrics, observation instruments, or handouts) to help you understand the new evaluation system and how you will conduct evaluations?</b>		
Yes	4	100.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be conducting evaluations?</b>		
Very helpful	3	75.0%
Somewhat helpful	1	25.0%
Not very helpful	0	0.0%
Not helpful at all	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?</b>		
Very helpful	2	50.0%
Somewhat helpful	2	50.0%
Not very helpful	0	0.0%
Not helpful at all	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>I am well-prepared to evaluate teacher performance this year using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>I am confident that teacher evaluators have been sufficiently trained to rate teachers consistently under the new evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	4	100.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Are you being held accountable for implementing the new teacher-evaluation system?</b>		
Yes	4	100.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>Will you be evaluated on how effective you are at evaluating teacher performance?</b>		
Yes	1	25.0%
No	3	75.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	1	25.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>Teacher evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding teachers' professional development needs and selection.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>Through which of the following means have you been informed of expectations, changes, updates, and results of the district's new teacher-evaluation pilot?<sup>b</sup></b>		
Conversations with a district administrator	3	75.0%
Memoranda and newsletters	1	25.0%
Q&A documents	0	0.0%
Q&A meetings	0	0.0%
Webcasts or other online meetings	1	25.0%
Trainings for pilot participants	1	25.0%
Detailed information posted on the district website	0	0.0%
Focus groups	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	

<sup>b</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

<b>My district has effectively communicated information about the teacher evaluation pilot to principals participating in the pilot.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district either has solicited or has plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from evaluators participating in the pilot.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand what criteria are included in my district's new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	3	75.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>I understand what measures are used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system to measure teacher performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>I understand how to rate teachers under the new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Under the new teacher-evaluation system, how much total time have you spent preparing for evaluation activities, completing evaluation activities, and reviewing evaluation results for each teacher participating in the pilot, on average?</b>		
Less than 10 hours	1	25.0%
10–20 hours	1	25.0%
21–30 hours	1	25.0%
31–40 hours	1	25.0%
41–50 hours	0	0.0%
51–60 hours	0	0.0%
More than 60 hours	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Frequency      %**

In comparison to your district’s previous teacher-evaluation system, the time spent by principals on evaluation activities under the new teacher-evaluation system is:

Much greater	2	50.0%
Slightly greater	2	50.0%
About the same	0	0.0%
Slightly less	0	0.0%
Much less	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is better than the previous teacher-evaluation system in terms of helping teachers improve their practice.

Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
They are about the same	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is more objective than the previous teacher-evaluation system.

Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
They are about the same	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which a teacher needs to improve.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in a teacher's performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that a teacher can take to improve areas of weakness.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	4	100.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	100.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>I have more productive conversations with teachers because of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	3	75.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>What are the <i>strengths</i> of your district's new teacher-evaluation system?</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and purposeful - I have been able to have whole staff professional development focused on instructional practice while also aligning to the new teacher-evaluation process - love it!</li> <li>• Researched and is a nationally used system.</li> <li>• The rubric is used during the pre-observation meeting, the observation, and the post-observation meeting. It sets the bar fairly high for proficiency and really causes proficient teachers to reflect on what it would take to become distinguished.</li> </ul>		

<b>What are the <i>weaknesses</i> of your district's new teacher-evaluation system?</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is designed as a professional growth system and does not easily rate teachers like the state is requiring.</li> <li>• It's not clear how "much" evidence is required to be proficient or distinguished. Some teachers believe they are proficient and/or distinguished in an area just because they can point to one incidence of student input or involvement. Need more direction in this.</li> <li>• The process is cumbersome and restricts the opportunities for meaningful conversations.</li> </ul>		

### ***Principal Evaluation System***

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand the goals of my district's new principal-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>My district's new principal-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective leadership.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	4	100.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
My district's leadership framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective school administration should look like.		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
My district has not adopted a leadership framework	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

Under the district's new principal-evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district's leadership framework.		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
My district has not adopted a leadership framework	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

I understand the design of my district's leadership framework.		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	2	50.0%
My district has not adopted a leadership framework	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>Do you consult your district's leadership framework on a regular basis when making decisions about professional practice?</b>		
Yes	0	0.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
My district has not adopted a leadership framework	0	0.0%
Missing	4	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>District administrators regularly reference the district's leadership framework.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
My district has not adopted a leadership framework	2	50.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Have you reviewed your district's new principal-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of principal practice across four levels of effectiveness?</b>		
Yes	3	75.0%
No	1	25.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
My district has not developed a principal evaluation rubric	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new principal-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between different levels of principal practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district is using data from multiple measures to evaluate principals.</b>		
Yes	3	75.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>The measures (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) being used to evaluate principals will provide a comprehensive picture of principal performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>The measures being used to evaluate my performance are fair.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>The measures being used to evaluate my performance incorporate the most important aspects of principal performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>The measures used by my district's new principal-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve my practice as a school leader.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>How many times have you met with your evaluator this semester to discuss your progress toward meeting your performance goals?</b>		
Once	3	75.0%
Twice	0	0.0%
Three or more times	0	0.0%
I have not yet met with my evaluator this semester	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Have you incorporated feedback from these meetings into your practice?</b>		
Yes	3	75.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
I have not received evaluation results from the new principal-evaluation system this year	0	0.0%
Missing	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>The new process being implemented this year to evaluate principal performance is clear to me.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>The new process being implemented this year to evaluate principal performance is fair.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	2	50.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>Have you received any formal training to understand the new principal-evaluation system?</b>		
Yes	0	0.0%
No	3	75.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>Training for principals on the new principal-evaluation system has been offered.</b>		
Once	0	0.0%
A couple of times	0	0.0%
On an ongoing basis	0	0.0%
Not at all	0	0.0%
Missing	4	100.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	4	100.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand my responsibilities under the new principal-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	1	25.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district provided helpful training on how I could use data generated by the new principal-evaluation system to improve my practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	3	75.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Have you received any training materials to help you understand the new evaluation system and how you will be evaluated? Examples of training materials include evaluation handbooks, rubrics, observation instruments, or handouts that provide information on the new process.</b>		
Yes	0	0.0%
No	3	75.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?</b>		
Very helpful	0	0.0%
Somewhat helpful	0	0.0%
Not very helpful	0	0.0%
Not helpful at all	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	4	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?</b>		
Very helpful	0	0.0%
Somewhat helpful	0	0.0%
Not very helpful	0	0.0%
Not helpful at all	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
Missing	4	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Evaluators in my district are well-prepared to evaluate my performance this year <i>using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</i></b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	1	25.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>District administrators in my district are being held accountable for implementing the new principal-evaluation system.</b>		
Yes	0	0.0%
No	0	0.0%
Uncertain	4	100.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new principal-evaluation system feeds into districtwide professional development planning.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	3	75.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	3	75.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

Through which of the following means have <i>principals participating in the pilot</i> been informed of expectations, changes, updates, and results of the district's new principal-evaluation pilot? <sup>a</sup>		
Conversations with a district administrator	2	50.0%
Memoranda and newsletters	0	0.0%
Q&A documents	0	0.0%
Q&A meetings	0	0.0%
Webcasts or other online meetings	0	0.0%
Trainings for pilot participants	0	0.0%
Detailed information posted on district website	0	0.0%
Focus groups	0	0.0%
Uncertain	2	50.0%
Other	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<sup>a</sup>Respondents could have selected more than one response and therefore percentages sum to more than 100 percent. Missing indicates the number of respondents who did not select any category.

	Frequency	%
Through which of the following means have <i>nonpilot principals</i> been informed of the district's new principal-evaluation system and ongoing pilot?		
Memoranda	0	0.0%
Q&A documents	0	0.0%
Open forum meetings	0	0.0%
Webcasts	0	0.0%
Trainings	0	0.0%
Detailed information on website	0	0.0%
Focus groups	0	0.0%
Uncertain	3	75.0%
All principals in my district are participating in the pilot	0	0.0%
Other	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

My district has effectively communicated information about the <i>principal evaluation pilot</i> to <i>principals involved in the pilot</i> this year.		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	3	75.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>nonpilot principals</i> .		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	0	0.0%
All principals in my district are participating in the pilot	2	50.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>My district either has solicited or has plans to solicit feedback concerning the new principal-evaluation system from principals participating in the pilot.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Uncertain	3	75.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>I understand what criteria are included in my district's new principal-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	4	100.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>I understand what measures are used by my district's new principal-evaluation system to measure principal performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	4	100.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new principal-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Under the new principal-evaluation system, how much total time have you spent preparing for activities related to your evaluation and reviewing evaluation results?</b>		
Less than 1 hour	2	50.0%
1–2 hours	1	25.0%
3–4 hours	1	25.0%
5–6 hours	0	0.0%
7–8 hours	0	0.0%
More than 8 hours	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>In comparison to your district’s previous principal evaluation system, the time spent by principals on evaluation activities under the new principal-evaluation system is:</b>		
Much greater	1	25.0%
Slightly greater	0	0.0%
About the same	2	50.0%
Slightly less	0	0.0%
Much less	0	0.0%
Uncertain	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

<b>My district’s new principal-evaluation system is better than the previous principal evaluation system in terms of helping principals improve their practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
They are about the same	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new principal-evaluation system is more objective than the previous principal evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
They are about the same	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new principal-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which a principal needs to improve.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	2	50.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new principal-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in a principal's performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>My district's new principal-evaluation system provides clear steps that a principal can take to improve areas of weakness.</b>		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	2	50.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Frequency	%
My district's new principal-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of principal performance.		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

My district's new principal-evaluation system encourages better school administration.		
Agree strongly	1	25.0%
Agree somewhat	2	50.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	1	25.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive principal-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	2	50.0%
Agree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
It is still too early to know	2	50.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

I have more productive conversations with district administrators because of my district's new principal-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	0	0.0%
Agree somewhat	3	75.0%
Disagree somewhat	1	25.0%
Disagree strongly	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%

	Frequency	%
<b>What are the <i>strengths</i> of your district's new principal-evaluation system?</b>		

- Clear and thorough - i know exactly where my growth area(s) are.
- That we have a rubric that identifies effective leadership in this role.
- What "proficiency" looks like is much clearer.

<b>What are the <i>weaknesses</i> of your district's new principal-evaluation system?</b>		
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

- The language keeps changing so it's hard to nail down the meaning.
- The process is not as clear as the teacher evaluation system.
- We need more info on how this rubric can best be used. Also the rubric is "home grown" and, although is based on solid researched based leadership standards is not as clearly written as the teacher rubric.

<b>At what type of school do you serve as principal or assistant principal?</b>		
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Elementary school	1	25.0%
Middle/junior high school	2	50.0%
Freshman high school	0	0.0%
High school	1	25.0%
Other	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>What is your gender?</b>		
-----------------------------	--	--

Male	2	50.0%
Female	2	50.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>In total, how many years have you worked as a school administrator?</b>		
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Less than 5 years	1	25.0%
5–10 years	2	50.0%
11–20 years	1	25.0%
More than 20 years	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200  
Naperville, IL 60563-1486  
800.356.2735 | 630.649.6500

**[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)**

*Making Research Relevant*