



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Education, Human Development,
and the Workforce

Anacortes 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

	Page
Introduction.....	1
District Overview/Description	1
Case Study Overview	1
Method	2
Final District Sample.....	3
Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Teacher Evaluation	5
Evaluation Framework and Goals.....	5
Performance Measures	5
Professional Development.....	8
Communication Strategies	10
Time and Resources	10
Culture Shifts.....	11
Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Principal Evaluation.....	12
Evaluation Framework and Goals.....	12
Performance Measures	12
Professional Development.....	12
Communication Strategies	13
Time and Resources	13
Culture Shifts.....	13
Summary and Conclusions	14
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

Anacortes School District¹ serves approximately 2,750 students through its three elementary schools, one middle school, two high schools, and one early childhood education center. This district is located 60 miles north of Seattle, and its student population is as follows:

- 1.96 percent are American Indian or Alaskan Native.
- 3.52 percent are Asian or Pacific Islander.
- 1.74 percent are African American.
- 6.97 percent are Hispanic.
- 33.31 percent are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Case Study Overview

On March 29, 2010, Washington Governor Christine Gregoire signed into law Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6696 (E2SSB 6696),² 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 the rollout.

¹ Information concerning Anacortes School District was found at the district's website (<http://www.asd103.org/>) and the Washington State Report Card (<http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/DataDownload.aspx>).

² 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>.

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 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 Strategies
- 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.

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.³ 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

³ 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.

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-level results of the teacher survey are provided in Appendix B, and item-level results of the principal survey are provided in Appendix C.⁴

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 Anacortes School District, 27 teachers completed the Teacher Evaluation Survey, while one principal and two administrators completed their respective surveys.⁵ For the interviews, two district administrators, three principals, one teacher, and one union representative were selected and agreed to participate. Unique interview protocols were used for teachers, principals, district

⁴ Principal agreement results (typically in Appendix A) and principal survey results (typically in Appendix C) are not available in this district because less than three principals responded to the survey.

⁵ A response rate for this survey is not available because the list of eligible teacher and principal participants was not provided.

administrators, and union representatives 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.

Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Teacher Evaluation

Evaluation Framework and Goals

When asked about the goals and purposes of the new teacher-evaluation system, it was clear that developing a system that encourages professional growth is important for Anacortes School District. In fact, six of the seven interviewees cited professional growth as the primary goal of the new teacher-evaluation system. One interviewee felt that the primary purpose of the new system is to provide certain guiding criteria for teachers that outline exemplary performance. Interviewees also mentioned increased student achievement and accountability as byproducts of the system. Moreover, more than 80 percent of teachers who responded to the survey reported understanding the goals of the new evaluation system and agreed that their district's new instructional framework provided clear guidance about what effective instruction should look like.

Anacortes School District has incorporated the University of Washington's Five Dimensions of Teaching and Learning instructional framework⁶ into its new teacher-evaluation system. This approach was confirmed by all interviewees. The district was using this instructional framework throughout the district prior to the development of the new teacher-evaluation system. Six interviewees mentioned additions that were made to the instructional framework to ensure its compliance with the state criteria. According to two interviewees, these additions were made in close partnership with the University of Washington's Center for Educational Leadership, which created the original framework.

When asked about the extent to which the framework is relied upon to inform instruction, one of the interviewed teachers explained that she relies heavily upon the document to inform her pedagogy and the purpose of her teaching. Two principals mentioned that this framework is the foundation of the district's mission statement and that it provides a consistent vocabulary for teachers in regard to teaching and learning. However, one principal believes that there is still room for improvement in regard to integrating the instructional framework into professional conversations between school administrators and teachers. All four of these individuals believe that the instructional framework is shifting practice within schools because of its focus on purpose and specificity of language. One survey respondent believes that a great strength of the district's new teacher-evaluation system is that it is "focused on our instructional model with input from experts in the field. I feel like [evaluation] just becomes a part of everyday teaching instead of an event during the school year."

Performance Measures

Six of the interviewees explained that Anacortes School District has settled on three main measures of teacher performance, each of which has multiple components: (1) observation and instructional framework, (2) self-assessment and reflection, and (3) student growth. Approximately 77 percent of teacher survey respondents agreed that the district is using more than data from observations to evaluate their teaching. One survey respondent cited a great strength of the new teacher-evaluation system:

⁶ Information on this framework is available at <http://www.k-12leadership.org/services/5-dimensions/>.

“The evaluation takes multiple ideas into consideration instead of one or two observations. This model allows for reflection and a cycle to improve your practice. I love how our rubric is tied exactly to the professional development (5D-CEL) that we have been working on for the last four years.”

Observation and Instructional Framework

The first measure consists of the instructional framework rubric, which will be used for observations as well as collecting artifacts. Two interviewees mentioned that the number of observations required for a given teacher will depend on that teacher’s assigned “pathway.”

Self-Assessment and Reflection

The second measure is a teacher self-assessment and reflection tool. Teachers will reflect on their practice, identifying areas of strength and weakness. These areas of weakness will then be targeted throughout the evaluation process as areas of potential growth. During this reflection process, teachers also will provide a baseline of their own understanding of the instructional framework.

Student Growth

The third measure concerns student growth. This measure is the least developed of the three measures and has yet to be defined. However, interviewees related that all teachers, both core and noncore, will be responsible for demonstrating how they use student growth to inform instruction and increase student achievement. Possible artifacts for this measure include students’ standardized test scores, students’ performance on classroom assessments, or other measures relevant to the teacher’s content area. However, one survey respondent is concerned that the new teacher-evaluation system “doesn’t seem to account for diverse populations like special education students that don’t necessarily meet the same standards or have the same curriculum as their peers. The system doesn’t seem to take this into account with ‘always’ and ‘never’ statements.”

One of the interviewed teachers was not aware of the measures that would be used and considered the instructional framework rubric still under development. However, this situation should not come as a surprise, given Anacortes School District’s pilot schedule. As will be expounded upon in the Professional Development section (page 8), the district is slowly rolling out the components of the new teacher-evaluation system in an effort to ensure teacher understanding and buy-in. This situation was confirmed by the survey results in that 76.7 percent of teachers reported that they have yet to be observed this year. (Only 10 percent have been observed thus far.)

The district has developed numerous tools to address the goals of the new teacher-evaluation system. First is the instructional framework rubric that serves as the foundation of the evaluation system. Rubrics have been developed for observations, scoring student growth as well as teacher self-reflection and assessment. The district also has developed tools to assist teachers in completing a cycle of inquiry where they identify areas for growth and improvement. In addition, an electronic evaluation tool is being piloted this year, which provides an electronic shared space for teachers and administrators to store documents, schedule observations, and other information. All interviewed principals believe that the observation rubric will be the most useful tool for providing feedback to teachers. One principal cautioned that teachers may not be providing

reliable assessments of their ability, thus not using the self-assessment tool as fully intended. One of the teachers hoped that peer evaluations will eventually be included as a measure in the new system and felt that the self-assessment and reflection tool is very useful. However, this teacher also expressed concern about the number of measures that are being used and hopes that the district will place more weight on “concrete” measures such as student data.

In Anacortes School District, each teacher will be placed on a professional pathway following an initial assessment of that teacher’s practice. There are four pathways. The first is a provisional growth pathway for teachers on provisional contracts. The second is a mandatory growth pathway for teachers who received a summative score of 1 on the previous year’s evaluation. The third is a continued growth pathway for those who scored a 2 on the previous year’s evaluation, and the fourth is a pathway for those who scored a 3 or 4 the previous year; this pathway is focused on collaborative/professional growth. Depending on which pathway a teacher is assigned, the measures used and the frequency of evaluation activities could change. These pathways also serve as a means of tying evaluation results to professional growth.

Although all interviewees confirmed that the method for determining teachers’ summative evaluation scores has not been established, they all believe that the instructional framework rubric is a good tool for differentiating levels of teacher effectiveness. On this note, interviewees mentioned that there is a clear progression between levels and indicated that the indicators included in the rubric provide guidance to teachers on how to progress from one level to another. Two interviewees confirmed that a psychometrician from the University of Washington has worked with the district to ensure that the “jumps” between each level are consistent.

Interviewees found varying aspects of the instructional framework rubric helpful. Two interviewees cited the meaningful conversations between administrators and teachers that the tool will incite; three interviewees mentioned the number of indicators that are included to guide teachers’ performance; and another interviewee appreciated the rubric’s focus on classroom environment and culture.

Three interviewees expressed their belief that the measures and tools that have been developed will allow evaluators to provide helpful feedback to teachers in regard to improving instruction. One interviewee appreciates the fact that the new teacher-evaluation system allows the teacher to bring evidence of professional growth, while the cycle of inquiry serves as a vehicle for continual discussions with administrators concerning areas of weakness and student growth. Another interviewee feels that the new evaluation system will help frame conversations among teachers and administrators, based upon the common language of the instructional framework rubric. These sentiments were confirmed in the survey in that 82 percent of the respondents agreed that the measures used by their district’s new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve instructional practice.

About 25 percent of survey respondents disagreed that the new evaluation system collects information to account for the unique aspects of their specific teaching positions. Although 75 percent of teacher respondents agreed that the measures used to evaluate teacher performance are fair, 25 percent disagreed with this statement. Similarly, about the same percentage of teachers disagreed that the new process to evaluate their performance is fair.

Professional Development

Aligning Evaluation Results

As was mentioned previously, the professional pathways will serve as a vehicle for tying evaluation results to professional growth. Anacortes School District is still developing a strategy for how evaluation results will specifically inform professional development. As each measure has been introduced to teachers, there has been a focus on how that measure can be used to foster professional growth. For example, during the pilot, teachers have completed their self-assessment and reflection and have begun to use these results to inform their cycle of inquiry, which includes their own plans for improvement during the year. That said, one of the interviewed teachers has not seen a link between evaluation results and professional development plans.

Time and Resources for Professional Development

Training for Teacher Evaluators. Between March 1, 2011, and September 30, 2011, Anacortes School District reported 54.5 session hours for the training of teacher evaluators on the teacher evaluation system. Seven sessions were formal training sessions done on a student-attendance day; one session was a book study; and one session was a presentation to another district. Session topics included the following:

- Learning to use the instructional framework rubric
- A review of the teacher evaluation system, including observations
- Multiple measures; ways to derive a summative score using multiple measures
- Using a cycle of inquiry to collect data over two points in time
- Introduction to the eVAL tool
- Teacher effectiveness

Total session attendance was 93. Most of the training was provided by district personnel; however, several external partners assisted. A majority of those who responded to the teacher survey reported uncertainty about whether their principals will be evaluated on how effectively they evaluate teachers. Close to 1/3 (about 30 percent) of respondents were uncertain about whether principals will be held accountable for implementing the new evaluation system.

Training for Teachers. During the same period, 34 hours were spent training teachers on the new teacher-evaluation system. Total attendance at these sessions was 528. Three of the sessions were late-start days; three sessions were formal training sessions done on a non-student attendance day; and two sessions followed other formats. Session topics included:

- Introducing the rubric
- Introducing the evaluation system
- University of Florida *Reflective Teacher's Guide to Classroom Instruction*
- Self-assessing on the new criteria

- Classroom research training
- Training teacher leaders

All teacher survey respondents indicated that training has been offered this year on the evaluation system. Slightly less than 80 percent found the training helpful for understanding the new system; however, teachers are split evenly as to whether they believe the training provided helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations. The vast majority of teachers reported receiving training materials on the new evaluation system. More than 80 percent of teachers who responded found the training materials helpful in terms of understanding how they will be evaluated, as well as their responsibilities under the new system. For example, one survey respondent commented, “The time that the district is taking to ‘instruct’ the teachers on how the new system works has been very helpful. Another strength of our district’s evaluation system is that teachers have been actively involved in developing the system.”

Everyone interviewed confirmed that this training would be ongoing. During this academic year, training has been very purposive in that each session is focused on an aspect of the new teacher-evaluation system. Given that almost all teachers are participating in the Anacortes pilot, all teachers attend professional development offerings and training sessions. Although Anacortes School District has partnered with outside consultants (University of Washington and University of Florida) to develop the training, each building has a teacher leader who is highly involved with training delivery.

Support and Stakeholder Engagement

Six of the interviewees thought that the professional development has positively influenced how the new evaluation system is perceived. Those interviewed are very cognizant of the fact that this process can seem overwhelming for some teachers. One interviewee has visited every building in the district to discuss teachers’ concerns about the system. This interviewee has received very little negative feedback concerning the training or system in general. One interviewee credits the fact that the entire district is being trained on the new system at the same time. This approach keeps everyone on the same page and provides a venue for discussion among teachers in the district.

All principals in the district have been involved with the development of the new teacher-evaluation system. According to two interviewees, principals have received specific training on the new system in regard to evaluation; however, all principals interviewed expect many more training sessions for evaluators in the near future.

Communication Strategies

Interviewees cited several different communication events concerning the new teacher-evaluation system. Prior to the start of pilot implementation, the district superintendent and head of the teachers union gave presentations concerning the new teacher-evaluation system. The union presidents also have been working with the district's TPEP committee. One of their responsibilities is to visit each building and make themselves available to discuss the new evaluation system, one-on-one, with teachers. TPEP committee members also play a vital role in communicating activities relating to the new teacher-evaluation system, particularly to teachers in their school. This is one example of a communication activity that allows for two-way feedback. Teachers also are asked to complete a feedback form at the end of training activities.

As was mentioned previously, Anacortes School District has been rolling out its new system one aspect at a time. To assist with this endeavor, the district has created a binder system for all teachers. Every time a new component of the system is unveiled to teachers, that section is added to each teacher's binder. This binder will be used throughout the evaluation process.

When asked about the core message the district is communicating, two respondents mentioned teacher and student growth, one interviewee cited increased accountability, and one interviewee cited the participatory nature of the new teacher-evaluation system.

Although four of the interviewees mentioned that there have been minimal systematic misunderstandings concerning the goals and requirements of the new evaluation system, two of those interviewees mentioned concerns about future misunderstandings, specifically concerning teacher ratings and the expectations of movement from one rating to another. However, one of the interviewed teachers felt that the trainings and communication activities have been very clear in breaking down each dimension and what is expected of the teacher. Four of 27 teachers responding to the survey (about 15 percent of respondents) disagreed that they understood how they can obtain a high rating under the new teacher-evaluation system.

Time and Resources

Time and resources were continually cited as an ongoing concern among district administrators, principals, and teachers. Interviewees were hesitant to estimate the amount of time they have spent working on the pilot; however, they all iterated that the process has been very time-intensive. One district administrator indicated spending at least 70 percent of his or her time this year supporting the implementation of the new evaluation systems. Another district administrator estimated spending at least 50 percent of his or her time this year on developing and implementing the new teacher-evaluation system. This concern also was iterated through survey responses. One respondent was unsure "how much time will be needed from a teacher to document and justify satisfactory teaching at the expense of contact time with students." Another respondent noted, "We have been given time to work on the evaluation tool during this pilot year. I'm afraid that we will not be given as much time in future years. And this process takes time!"

Although principals have yet to conduct a full teacher-evaluation cycle during the pilot, the interviewed principals estimated that the new system will definitely be more time-intensive than the current system. The interviewed teachers also mentioned that the new system will be more time-intensive than the current system. Teachers interviewed reported that under the current

system, they spent less than an hour on evaluation activities each year, on average; however, the self-reflection component of the new evaluation system alone has taken more than an hour to complete. This situation was confirmed by survey results in that almost half of the respondents to the teacher survey reported spending more than eight hours completing activities this year related to the new evaluation. About 85 percent of teachers reported that the time they spent on teacher evaluation activities this year is “much greater” than under the previous evaluation system.

Interviewees also were also hesitant to estimate the amount of time that it has taken to devise the new teacher-evaluation system given the enormity of the task. However, interviewees mentioned crosswalking the instructional framework to the state criteria, developing the tools, working with university partners, and conducting training as being particularly time intensive undertakings.

Culture Shifts

A robust teacher-evaluation system not only provides reliable evaluation results but also 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.

All interviewees felt that the introduction of the new teacher-evaluation system has changed the nature of the types of conversations among teachers. Three of the interviewees mentioned increased conversations and collaborations among teachers surrounding the components of the new teacher-evaluation system. One interviewee focused on teachers’ enthusiasm to engage with questions surrounding student achievement. These sentiments were supported by the survey results in that 67 percent of respondents to the teacher survey reported having more productive conversations with colleagues because of their new teacher-evaluation system; however, 33 percent disagreed with this statement. One survey respondent commented:

“[The new teacher-evaluation system] creates an attitude of instructional improvement throughout the entire district. We’re more likely to be cooperative with our colleagues because we know we’re all learning about this model as ‘rookies’ even though we already have plenty of teaching experience.”

When asked about teachers’ perception of the new system, all interviewees mentioned that a vast majority of the teachers were accepting of the system—although they were a bit overwhelmed by the requirements of the new system, especially in comparison to the current system. One interviewee mentioned that teachers recognize that they have a more active role in their evaluation under the new system given that they can provide evidence of their performance.

Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Principal Evaluation

Anacortes School District is still in the process of developing its new principal-evaluation system; therefore, the following information is only preliminary and subject to change.

Evaluation Framework and Goals

When asked about the goals of the new principal-evaluation system, three interviewees mentioned the importance of personal and professional growth. Four interviewees also mentioned accountability as a main goal.

Anacortes School District has adopted the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) leadership framework. However, one of the principals interviewed felt that the leadership framework had yet to be clearly articulated to principals. While constructing its rubrics, Anacortes School District is currently undertaking the process of assuring that the AWSP leadership framework aligns with the state criteria.

Performance Measures

Although specific measures have yet to be decided upon, two interviewees mentioned the importance of multiple measures; however, the district has yet to decide if some measures will be weighted more than others. Four of the interviewees also mentioned the importance of incorporating student achievement data, specifically as it relates to the achievement gap in their school. Two interviewees also thought that perception and survey data would be useful. One interviewee mentioned observations by the superintendent as a likely measure. One interviewee felt that the principal measures would mirror the teacher measures: observations, evidence of student growth, and self-reflection and assessment.

All evaluation tools are still under development, including the leadership framework rubric.

The district has yet to determine how a principal's summative evaluation score will be derived.

Professional Development

Between March 1, 2011, and September 30, 2011, 37 attendees received 17 hours of training on the new principal-evaluation system. Moreover, five principal evaluators received three hours of training on the new principal-evaluation system.

One of the interviewees mentioned that this training is intended to be ongoing and will be more robust when the components of the new principal-evaluation system have been finalized.

As was mentioned previously, principals also are receiving ongoing training on the evaluation of teachers.

Communication Strategies

When asked about the communication of the goals and requirements of the new principal-evaluation system to principals, two interviewees felt that the goals had been clearly articulated; however, one interviewee felt that the district could continue to provide more information concerning developments. Although mechanisms for two-way feedback have yet to be determined, one interviewee felt confident that this would be an important part of the pilot process given the focus that has been afforded to garnering feedback on the teacher evaluation system.

When asked about the core message that the district is communicating concerning the new-principal evaluation system, one interviewee mentioned the importance of a principal's professional growth in regard to better teaching and learning. Another interviewee focused on the articulation of the criteria and expectations as a core message, while another interviewee focused on accountability as a core message.

Time and Resources

Interviewees also cited concerns about time and resources when asked about the principal evaluation system. Given that principals have not undergone a full evaluation cycle this year, interviewees could not estimate the amount of time a complete evaluation would take.

Culture Shifts

Given the infancy of the new principal-evaluation system, interviewees did not comment on specific culture shifts; however, several interviewees mentioned that Anacortes School District had previously been using the AWSP leadership framework, and that the new principal-evaluation system will be more a formalization of practices that have already been implemented in previous years.

Summary and Conclusions

When asked about the greatest strengths of the new teacher-evaluation system, answers varied. Four interviewees once again mentioned the focus on professional and personal growth; one interviewee mentioned accountability; one interviewee focused on the fact that the evaluation rubrics are focused on a robust instructional framework; and one interviewee felt that the new evaluation system provides a goal for which teachers can aspire. Approximately seven survey respondents suggested that a strength of the new evaluation system is the clear and cohesive link between the instructional framework and the evaluation.

When asked about the greatest challenges to teacher evaluation implementation, five interviewees cited time and resources, while two interviewees mentioned teacher buy-in and aversion to change. About nine survey respondents suggested a concern about the time available to implement the new system effectively. These respondents shared the concern that this new evaluation process takes more time to understand and implement.

When asked about the greatest strengths of the new principal-evaluation system, one interviewee mentioned professional growth; one interviewee mentioned accountability; one interviewee cited clear expectations; and one interviewee cited increased opportunities for conversations with district administrators. When asked about the greatest challenges to implementation, three interviewees mentioned time and resources while another interviewee mentioned district support

It is evident that a great amount of thought and work has gone into the construction and implementation of Anacortes School District's new teacher-evaluation system. Although the district has an extended implementation timeline, its unveiling of the new system has been purposive and strategic. More robust information will be available concerning time and perceptions after the first evaluation cycle has been completed and further data have been collected about implementation in spring 2012. It also is evident that there is much work to be done concerning the principal evaluation system. Whereas the new teacher-evaluation system often was described as a 180-degree change, most interviewees described the new principal-evaluation system as a formalization of many practices that are currently taking place. That said, there are still decisions to be made concerning, measures, tools, scoring, and professional development.

In short, Anacortes School District has made great strides in regard to its new teacher and principal evaluation systems in a relatively short amount of time. This situation is evidenced in the fact that one survey respondent believes that the new evaluation system is "much more comprehensive than the old system and more meaningful/informative than just satisfactory/unsatisfactory. [It is] potentially a lot more useful as well." However, there is still work to be done.

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.	96.4% (n=28)	I understand the goals of my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.	92.6% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.	—
My district’s instructional framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective classroom instruction should look like.	85.7% (n=28)	My district’s instructional framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective classroom instruction should look like.	—
Under the district’s new evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district’s instructional framework.	89.3% (n=28)	Under the district’s new evaluation system, I evaluate teachers against practices that are embedded in my district’s instructional framework.	—
I understand the design of my district’s instructional framework.	92.6% (n=27)	I understand the design of my district’s instructional framework.	—
I consult my district’s instructional framework on a regular basis to inform my professional practice.	66.7% (n=27)	Teachers in my school consult my district’s instructional framework on a regular basis to inform their professional practice.	—
Other <i>pilot teachers in my school</i> have begun to reference the district’s instructional framework.	71.4% (n=28)		

*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.

Note. Fewer than three principals responded to the survey and therefore frequencies are not reported.

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?***	92.9% (n=28)	Do you often reference your district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of teacher practice across four levels of effectiveness?***	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.	88.5% (n=26)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of my teaching position.	67.9% (n=28)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of each teaching position.	—
My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate my teaching.	82.1% (n=28)	My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate teaching.	—
The measures used to evaluate my teaching (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) will provide a comprehensive picture of my performance as a teacher.	67.9% (n=28)	The measures used to evaluate teachers (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) will provide a comprehensive picture of teacher performance.	—
The measures used to evaluate my teaching are fair.	75.0% (n=28)	The measures being used to evaluate teachers are fair.	—
The measures used to evaluate my teaching incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.	82.1% (n=28)	The measures being used to evaluate teachers incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.	—
The measures used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve instructional practice.	82.1% (n=28)	The measures used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to help teachers improve instructional practice.	—
Have you been observed <i>for the purpose of evaluation</i> under the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?***	10.7% (n=28)	Have you conducted observations <i>for the purpose of evaluation</i> for the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?***	—
The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is clear to me.	78.6% (n=28)	The new process being implemented this year to evaluate teacher performance is clear to me.	—
The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is fair.	78.6% (n=28)	The new process being implemented this year to evaluate teacher performance is fair.	—

* 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.

Note. Fewer than three principals responded to the survey and therefore frequencies are not reported.

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=28)	Have you received any formal training on conducting evaluations for the new teacher-evaluation system?***	—
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures. 	85.2% (n=27)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures. 	—
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I understand my responsibilities under the new evaluation system. 	78.6% (n=28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I understand my responsibilities as an evaluator under the new teacher-evaluation system. 	—
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation training I received provided helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations. 	50.0% (n=28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the evaluation training you received provide helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations?*** 	—
My district provided helpful training about how I could use data generated by the new teacher-evaluation system to inform my teaching practice.	78.6% (n=28)	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.	—
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.)**	89.3% (n=28)	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?***	—
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?*** 	83.3% (n=24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be conducting evaluations?*** 	—
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?*** 	87.0% (n=23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new teacher-evaluation system?*** 	—
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>	63.0% (n=27)	I am well-prepared to evaluate teacher performance this year <i>using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</i>	—

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
		I am confident that teacher evaluators have been sufficiently trained to rate teachers consistently under the new evaluation system.	—
Are principals in your district being held accountable for implementing the new evaluation system?***	70.4% (n=27)	Are you being held accountable for implementing the new teacher-evaluation system?***	—
Will principals in your district be evaluated on how effective they are at evaluating teacher performance?***	46.2% (n=26)	Will you be evaluated on how effective you are at evaluating teacher performance?***	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning.	88.9% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning.	—
My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.	77.8% (n=27)	Teacher evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding teachers’ professional development needs and selection.	—

*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*.

Note. Fewer than three principals responded to the survey and therefore frequencies are not reported.

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.	—
		My district either has solicited or has plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from evaluators participating in the pilot.	—
My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>teachers involved in the pilot</i> this year.	85.2% (n=27)		—
My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>nonpilot teachers</i> .	53.8% (n=26)		—

Teachers	%/n	Principals	%/n
My district either has solicited or plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from teachers participating in the pilot.	74.1% (n=27)		—
I understand what criteria are included in my district’s new-teacher evaluation system.	92.6% (n=27)	I understand what criteria are included in my district’s new-teacher evaluation system.	—
I understand what measures are used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system to measure my performance.	81.5% (n=27)	I understand what measures are used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system to measure teacher performance.	—
I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new teacher-evaluation system.	81.5% (n=27)		—

* 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.

Note. Fewer than three principals responded to the survey and therefore frequencies are not reported.

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:	85.2% (n=27)	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:	—

* 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.

Note. Fewer than three principals responded to the survey and therefore frequencies are not reported.

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.	74.1% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is better than the previous teacher evaluation system in terms of helping teachers improve their practice.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is more objective than the previous teacher evaluation system.	73.1% (n=26)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system is more objective than the previous teacher evaluation system.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which I need to improve.	85.2% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which a teacher needs to improve.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in my performance.	81.5% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in a teacher’s performance.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that I can take to improve areas of weakness.	77.8% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that a teacher can take to improve areas of weakness.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.	74.1% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.	—
My district’s new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.	74.1% (n=27)	My district’s new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.	—
The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system.	88.9% (n=27)	The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive teacher-evaluation system.	—
I have more productive conversations with colleagues because of my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	66.7% (n=27)	I have more productive conversations with teachers because of my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	—

* 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.

Note. Fewer than three principals responded to the survey and therefore frequencies are not reported.

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: ^a		
General education teacher	11	36.7
Core content teacher (e.g., math, science, reading)	13	43.3
Noncore content teacher (e.g., physical education, music)	5	16.7
English language teacher	1	3.3
Special education teacher	2	6.7
Support provider (e.g., school psychologists, occupational therapists, guidance counselors)	0	0.0
Mentor, coach, or other instructional leader (e.g., reading specialists)	0	0.0
Nonteaching staff (e.g., administrative assistants, custodians)	0	0.0
Other	2	6.7
Missing	0	0.0
Total	30	

^aRespondents 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	%
I am a:		
Continuing contract teacher	29	96.7
Provisional status teacher	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Other	1	3.3
Missing	0	0.0
Total	30	100.0

I understand the goals of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	17	56.7
Agree somewhat	10	33.3
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

My district's new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.		
Agree strongly	14	46.7
Agree somewhat	11	36.7
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

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	17	56.7
Agree somewhat	7	23.3
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	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	18	60.0
Agree somewhat	7	23.3

	Frequency	%
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
Uncertain	1	3.3
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

I understand the design of my district’s instructional framework.		
Agree strongly	16	53.3
Agree somewhat	9	30.0
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	1	3.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

I consult my district’s instructional framework on a regular basis to inform my professional practice.		
Agree strongly	8	26.7
Agree somewhat	10	33.3
Disagree somewhat	7	23.3
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

Other <i>pilot teachers in my school</i> have begun to reference the district’s instructional framework.		
Agree strongly	8	26.7
Agree somewhat	12	40.0
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
Uncertain	5	16.7
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

Have you reviewed your district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of teacher practice across four levels of effectiveness?		
Yes	26	86.7
No	2	6.7
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

	Frequency	%
My district's new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.		
Agree strongly	15	50.0
Agree somewhat	8	26.7
Disagree somewhat	2	6.7
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0
My district's new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of my teaching position.		
Agree strongly	9	30.0
Agree somewhat	10	33.3
Disagree somewhat	4	13.3
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
Uncertain	2	6.7
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0
My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate my teaching.		
Agree strongly	15	50.0
Agree somewhat	8	26.7
Disagree somewhat	3	10.0
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	2	6.7
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0
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	36.7
Agree somewhat	8	26.7
Disagree somewhat	6	20.0
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
Uncertain	1	3.3
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

	Frequency	%
The measures used to evaluate my teaching are fair.		
Agree strongly	12	40.0
Agree somewhat	9	30.0
Disagree somewhat	6	20.0
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

The measures used to evaluate my teaching incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.		
Agree strongly	9	30.0
Agree somewhat	14	46.7
Disagree somewhat	4	13.3
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

The measures used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve instructional practice.		
Agree strongly	18	60.0
Agree somewhat	5	16.7
Disagree somewhat	4	13.3
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	1	3.3
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

Have you been observed for the purpose of evaluation under the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?		
Yes	3	10.0
No	23	76.7
Uncertain	2	6.7
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

Which of the following kinds of observations have taken place?^b

Full-length, formal (i.e., included in your overall summative evaluation rating)	2	6.7
Walk-through	3	10.0

	Frequency	%
Informal (i.e., not included in your overall summative evaluation rating)	3	10.0
Announced (i.e., you knew about the observation ahead of time)	2	6.7
Unannounced (i.e., you did not know beforehand that the observation would occur)	2	6.7
Uncertain	0	0.0
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system.	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	

^b 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.

What was the average time that an observer spent in your classroom during each formal observation so far this semester?		
Less than 30 minutes	2	6.7
30–60 minutes	1	3.3
More than 60 minutes	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.0
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	100.0

How many times have you been formally observed this semester?		
One time	2	6.7
Two times	0	0.0
Three or more times	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system	1	3.3
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	100.0

How many times have you participated in walk-through observations this semester?		
One time	0	0.0
Two times	1	3.3
Three or more times	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
I have not participated in any walk-through observations under the new teacher-evaluation system	2	6.7
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	100.0

Frequency %

What was the average time that an observer spent in your classroom during each walk-through observation so far this semester?

Less than 5 minutes	1	3.3
5–10 minutes	2	6.7
11–20 minutes	0	0.0
21–30 minutes	0	0.0
More than 30 minutes	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
I have not participated in any walk-through observations under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.0
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	100.0

Who observed your instruction during these observations?

Principal	1	3.3
Vice principal	1	3.3
Master teacher	0	0.0
Instructional coach	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system	0	0.0
Other	1	3.3
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	100.0

Were the observation results discussed with you?

Yes	3	10.0
No	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	100.0

Have you incorporated feedback from the observation results into your practice?

Yes	3	10.0
No	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	27	90.0
Total	30	100.0

	Frequency	%
The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is clear to me		
Agree strongly	11	36.7
Agree somewhat	11	36.7
Disagree somewhat	4	13.3
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is fair		
Agree strongly	13	43.3
Agree somewhat	9	30.0
Disagree somewhat	6	20.0
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

Have you received any formal training to understand the new teacher-evaluation system and how you will be evaluated?		
Yes	28	93.3
No	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

Training for teachers regarding the new evaluation system has been offered		
One time	0	0.0
A couple of times	3	10.0
On an ongoing basis	25	83.3
Not at all	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures		
Agree strongly	14	46.7
Agree somewhat	9	30.0
Disagree somewhat	3	10.0
Disagree strongly	1	3.3

	Frequency	%
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

I understand my responsibilities under the new evaluation system		
---	--	--

Agree strongly	13	43.3
Agree somewhat	9	30.0
Disagree somewhat	3	10.0
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
Uncertain	1	3.3
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

The evaluation training I received provided helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations		
--	--	--

Agree strongly	3	10.0
Agree somewhat	11	36.7
Disagree somewhat	10	33.3
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
Uncertain	2	6.7
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

My district provided helpful training about how I could use data generated by the new teacher-evaluation system to inform my teaching practice		
---	--	--

Agree strongly	10	33.3
Agree somewhat	12	40.0
Disagree somewhat	4	13.3
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
No training was provided	0	0.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

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.)		
--	--	--

Yes	25	83.3
No	0	0.0
Uncertain	3	10.0
Missing	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

Frequency %

To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?

Very helpful	12	40.0
Somewhat helpful	8	26.7
Not very helpful	4	13.3
Not helpful at all	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	6	20.0
Total	30	100.0

To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?

Very helpful	8	26.7
Somewhat helpful	12	40.0
Not very helpful	3	10.0
Not helpful at all	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	7	23.3
Total	30	100.0

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

Agree strongly	6	20.0
Agree somewhat	11	36.7
Disagree somewhat	3	10.0
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
Uncertain	4	13.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

Are principals in your district being held accountable for implementing the new evaluation system?

Yes	19	63.3
No	0	0.0
Uncertain	8	26.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

Will principals in your district be evaluated on how effective they are at evaluating teacher performance?

Yes	12	40.0
No	0	0.0

	Frequency	%
Uncertain	14	46.7
Missing	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0

My district's new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning		
Agree strongly	18	60.0
Agree somewhat	6	20.0
Disagree somewhat	2	6.7
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	1	3.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.		
Agree strongly	16	53.3
Agree somewhat	5	16.7
Disagree somewhat	3	10.0
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	3	10.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

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? ^c		
Memoranda and newsletters	14	46.7
Faculty meetings	23	76.7
Q&A documents	5	16.7
Q&A meetings	16	53.3
Webcasts or other online meetings	0	0.0
Training sessions for pilot participants	22	73.3
Detailed information posted on district website	12	40.0
Focus groups	8	26.7
Uncertain	2	6.7
Other	1	3.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	

^cRespondents 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 nonpilot <i>teachers</i> been informed of the district's new evaluation system and ongoing pilot? ^d		
Memoranda and newsletters	8	26.7
Faculty meetings	14	46.7
Q&A documents	4	13.3
Q&A meetings	10	33.3
Webcasts or other online meetings	0	0.0
Training sessions for pilot participants	9	30.0
Detailed information posted on district website	7	23.3
Focus groups	3	10.0
All teachers in my district are participating in the pilot	12	40.0
Uncertain	2	6.7
Other	2	6.7
Missing	4	13.3
Total	30	

^dRespondents 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 <i>pilot to teachers involved in the pilot</i> this year.		
Agree strongly	15	50.0
Agree somewhat	8	26.7
Disagree somewhat	2	6.7
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	2	6.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>nonpilot teachers</i> .		
Agree strongly	11	36.7
Agree somewhat	3	10.0
Disagree somewhat	2	6.7
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	10	33.3
Missing	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0

	Frequency	%
My district either has solicited or plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from teachers participating in the pilot.		
Agree strongly	15	50.0
Agree somewhat	5	16.7
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
Uncertain	6	20.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0
I understand what criteria are included in my district's new teacher-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	17	56.7
Agree somewhat	8	26.7
Disagree somewhat	2	6.7
Disagree strongly	0	0.0
Uncertain	0	0.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0
I understand what measures are used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system to measure my performance.		
Agree strongly	13	43.3
Agree somewhat	9	30.0
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
Uncertain	2	6.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0
I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new teacher-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	14	46.7
Agree somewhat	8	26.7
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
Uncertain	1	3.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0
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?		
Less than 1 hour	1	3.3

	Frequency	%
1–2 hours	3	10.0
3–4 hours	6	20.0
5–6 hours	2	6.7
7–8 hours	2	6.7
More than 8 hours	13	43.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

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:

Much greater	23	76.7
Slightly greater	1	3.3
About the same	1	3.3
Slightly less	0	0.0
Much less	0	0.0
Uncertain	2	6.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

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

Agree strongly	18	60.0
Agree somewhat	2	6.7
They are about the same	0	0.0
Disagree somewhat	0	0.0
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
It is still too early to know	4	13.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

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

Agree strongly	12	40.0
Agree somewhat	7	23.3
They are about the same	1	3.3
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	2	6.7
It is still too early to know	3	10.0
Missing	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0

	Frequency	%
My district's new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which I need to improve.		
Agree strongly	16	53.3
Agree somewhat	7	23.3
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
It is still too early to know	2	6.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

My district's new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in my performance.		
Agree strongly	16	53.3
Agree somewhat	6	20.0
Disagree somewhat	2	6.7
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
It is still too early to know	2	6.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that I can take to improve areas of weakness.		
Agree strongly	14	46.7
Agree somewhat	7	23.3
Disagree somewhat	3	10.0
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
It is still too early to know	2	6.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.		
Agree strongly	12	40.0
Agree somewhat	8	26.7
Disagree somewhat	2	6.7
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
It is still too early to know	2	6.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

	Frequency	%
My district's new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.		
Agree strongly	16	53.3
Agree somewhat	4	13.3
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
It is still too early to know	3	10.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	19	63.3
Agree somewhat	5	16.7
Disagree somewhat	1	3.3
Disagree strongly	1	3.3
It is still too early to know	1	3.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

I have more productive conversations with colleagues because of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.		
Agree strongly	9	30.0
Agree somewhat	9	30.0
Disagree somewhat	6	20.0
Disagree strongly	3	10.0
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| What are the <i>strengths</i> of your district's new <i>teacher</i>-evaluation system? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It creates an attitude of instructional improvement throughout the entire school district. We're more likely to be cooperative with our colleagues because we know we're all learning about this model as "rookies" even though we already have plenty of teaching experience. • Our new evaluation system correlates well with identified best practices in our district. • The time that the district is taking to "instruct" the teachers on how the new system works has been very helpful. Another strength of our district's evaluation system is that teachers have been actively involved in developing the system. • It itemizes guidelines that may be viewed in a classroom that could improve teaching techniques. • Teacher voice, classroom imbedded • Our Instructional Framework is a huge strength. | | |

- Focused on our instructional model with input from Experts in the field. I feel like it just becomes a part of everyday teaching instead of an event during a school year.
 - That it looks good on paper so that Legislators can claim that something important was accomplished.
 - Teacher involvement and reflection
 - closely tied with our instructional framework; led by teachers
 - clearly outlined standards and goals
 - It helps me reflect on my own teaching practices.
 - more levels
 - The clear identifiers within each rubric to help identify both student and teacher observables.
 - It is good that we have conversations and reminders that help teach and reach our students.
 - More like National Board Certification. Artifacts can be linked to observations and everything can be done online.
 - Much more comprehensive than the old system and more meaningful/informative than just satisfactory/unsatisfactory. Potentially, a lot more useful as well.
 - RUBRICS
 - Closely tied to instructional model. Clearly an improvement model, not just a punishment, or sorting model. Teachers have been involved in the whole process.
 - It gives us targets to work towards.
 - The strengths are that the evaluation takes multiple ideas into consideration instead of one or two observations. This model also allows for reflection and a cycle to improve your practice. I love how our rubric is tied exactly to the professional development (5D-CEL) that we have been working on for the last four years.
 - Opportunity for growth Clear targets Objective vs. subjective Detailed feedback More complete view of teaching
-

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

- It is very broad in scope and overwhelming to both the teacher and the evaluator. We'll definitely need to focus on selected parts each year instead of the whole thing.
- It isn't necessarily the district's weakness but because our jobs are so demanding and take so much extra time out of our paid work day it is difficult to find enough time to develop the teaching materials I need to use in my classroom and continue to "research" how I can improve my teaching. I am already working around 13 hours a day and I wonder where I can squeeze out the extra time to "do one more thing."

- It is unclear how much time will be needed from a teacher to document and justify satisfactory teaching at the expense of contact time with students. Many line items lend themselves to interpretation by teacher/principal as to whether the evaluation is a 1,2, 3 or 4, even though it has been stressed that the principals will be trained to delineate the difference. The pilot does not seem to really be a pilot, since we are unaware of any changes made to the document after teachers have verbal input at the building level. Overall, this document comes under question as to how it will improve student academic growth. An instructor's teaching techniques may be visible and appear to be effective, when in reality so much time is spent on documenting teaching strategies and justifying that the end result is not student growth because of so much time being spent on whether a teacher is a 1, 2, 3, or 4, with 4 being almost impossible to achieve.
- Time consuming to do well
- Time...always time. We need time.
- Some of the indicators are still a bit fuzzy... words like "always" etc. can be a bit tricky...but I think they will be fine tuned during this testing year.
- That it is so unwieldy that it is almost unusable. I would love to develop an evaluation process for OSPI and our state Legislature as convoluted as the one my school district has been forced to developed.
- time to implement fully
- much additional paperwork expected to support expected practices
- We have been given time to work on the evaluation tool during this pilot year. I'm afraid that we will not be given as much time in future years. And, this process takes time!
- still a best just a snapshot of a very complex process
- Still working out details in terms of how the evaluation system is applied to specialists.
- Doesn't seem to account for diverse populations like special education students that don't necessarily meet the same standards or have the same curriculum as their peers. The system's language doesn't seem to take this into account with always and never statements.
- Negative attitudes from some teachers.
- Incredibly cumbersome. There is no way a teacher can internalize and systemize all the facets of the new system. And . . . still too subjective. Two evaluators can walk into a classroom and have two different reactions. And . . . in some cases, the language (words like "all" or "never" or "always") is a sticking point. Makes 4's unattainable . . . which, in theory, is okay if we're striving to use this tool as a way to make us better teachers, but if I have a 3 because my administrator is following the rubric to the letter of the law . . . and the guy across town is just giving teachers 4 (because he knows "always is impossible"). Problematic. It's just impossible to take a profession that is so infinitely complex, and reduce it to a document that captures all the things that teachers do, and then evaluate them. I'd write more, but I'm too busy.
- **IT DOES NOT TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE 'EXTRA BAGGAGE' A GROUP OF CHILDREN MAY BRING TO THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.**
- There is a sense that we are all dancing to a political tune that changes and that does not take time and the very intense nature of our jobs into account. It is difficult to take an evaluation system that requires significantly more of teachers seriously, when the Legislature is increasing student numbers and support systems and decreasing our salary.

	Frequency	%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are too many rubrics to read and keep track of. How do you keep track of all these areas and how do you know where to focus? If you do focus on one area it will take your attention from other parts of your job. The evaluation is time consuming and stressful. Teachers need time to plan and focus on their lessons while meeting the needs of all their students, rather than collecting data. • A weakness would be having not tested out the entire system, would this process be workable by a teacher who is already doing so much. • Time 		

What grade levels do you teach? ^c		
Early childhood	0	0.0
Elementary (K-5)	11	36.7
Middle (6-8)	8	26.7
High school	11	36.7
Missing	4	13.3
Total	30	

^cRespondents 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.

What is your gender?		
Male	7	23.3
Female	20	66.7
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

What is your current teacher certification status?		
Provisional status	2	6.7
Continuing contract	24	80.0
Other	1	3.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

In total, how many years have you worked as a certified teacher?		
Less than 5 years	1	3.3
5–10 years	4	13.3
11–20 years	9	30.0
More than 20 years	13	43.3
Missing	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

Appendix C. Principal Survey Frequencies

Fewer than three principals responded to the survey; therefore, frequencies are not reported.

ABOUT AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Established in 1946, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., American Institutes for Research (AIR) is an independent, nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research and delivers technical assistance both domestically and internationally. As one of the largest behavioral and social science research organizations in the world, AIR is committed to empowering communities and institutions with innovative solutions to the most critical challenges in education, health, workforce, and international development.



AIR[®]

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH[®]

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

www.air.org

Making Research Relevant