



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Education, Human Development,  
and the Workforce

---

## **Wenatchee 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 .....	5
Evaluation Framework and Goals.....	5
Performance Measures .....	6
Professional Development.....	9
Communication Strategies .....	11
Time and Resources .....	13
Culture Shifts.....	14
Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Principal Evaluation.....	16
Evaluation Framework and Goals.....	16
Performance Measures .....	16
Professional Development.....	18
Communication Strategies .....	19
Time and Resources .....	20
Culture Shifts.....	21
Summary and Conclusions .....	22
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

Wenatchee School District, located in the central part of Washington state, serves approximately 7,700 students in its seven elementary schools, three middle schools, alternative high school, 4A high school, academy for home-schooled students, and skills center.<sup>1</sup> Its student population is as follows:

- 0.43 percent are American Indian or Alaskan Native.
- 1.06 percent are Asian or Pacific Islander.
- .45 percent are African American.
- 45.27 percent are Hispanic.
- 49.97 percent are White.
- 57.44 percent are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

The district employs approximately 495 certificated staff, 61.6 percent of whom have at least a master's degree.

## 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 the 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Information concerning Wenatchee School District was found at the district's website (<http://home.wsd.wednet.edu/>) 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>.

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. 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
- 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 an online survey to all pilot teachers, principals, and administrators.<sup>3</sup> Teachers, principals, and district administrators each took unique surveys regarding their

---

<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.

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

## **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 lead 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 using a district-provided list of all pilot participants. To ensure maximum variability among principal interviewees, we stratified the sample to ensure that one elementary school, one middle school, and one high school principal was 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 contact 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 communication 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 was provided to OSPI and the evaluation steering committee in a separate document.

## **Final District Sample**

In Wenatchee School District, a total of 23 teachers completed the Teacher Evaluation Survey, a teacher response rate of 48.9 percent. One principal and two administrators completed their respective surveys, a response rate of 9.1 percent and 66.7 percent respectively.<sup>5</sup> Due to the small

---

<sup>4</sup> Principal agreement results in Appendix A and principal survey results in Appendix C are not available in this district because fewer than three principals responded to the survey.

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

number of principal and administrator survey respondents, their survey results will not be discussed in the narrative of the case study or reported in the appendixes. For the interviews, one district administrator, three principals, three teachers, and one union representative were selected and agreed to participate. Unique interview protocols were used for teachers, principals, district 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

The eight interviewees from Wenatchee School District cited multiple varied but interrelated goals behind the design of the new teacher-evaluation system. All three teacher-respondents suggested that the primary goal of the new teacher-evaluation system was to create a framework and rating scale that more comprehensively reflected the complexity of instructional practice, providing teachers with more nuanced and clear feedback than the former *satisfactory* and *unsatisfactory* ratings. The eight criteria and four-tiered rating scale allow teachers to reflect deeply on their practice without fear of being penalized by distinguishing the areas in which they could excel from areas in which they might need to grow.

In order to help teachers improve in areas of weakness, a related goal of the new system is to more effectively align the evaluation system and its results with targeted professional development efforts. Three respondents stated that by developing a more accurate measure of teacher effectiveness, evaluations can act as a better tool for accountability. Finally, three respondents mentioned that an underlying goal of the state law was to standardize evaluation systems across districts and schools. All teacher survey respondents indicated that they understood the goals of the new teacher-evaluation system.

Prior to participating in TPEP, Wenatchee School District did not have a districtwide instructional framework in place. However, one respondent related that for about five years, the district had been utilizing the Marzano model to inform instructional practice. During the planning process to implement the new pilot teacher-evaluation system in the 2011–12 school year, the district collaborated with the Marzano group to develop a framework and rubric that aligned the Marzano model for teaching with the eight criteria provided by the state in SB 6696. All the teachers responding to the survey believed that the new instructional framework provides clear guidance on what effective instruction should look like.

Interviewees reported that the resulting framework and rubric were being utilized among pilot teachers in numerous ways to inform instructional practice in the classroom. Four of six respondents explained that the district was offering professional development training sessions focused on each different criterion of the framework throughout the school year. Teachers were able to choose individual training sessions based on their evaluation goals and identified areas for growth. On a similar note, two respondents mentioned that several pilot teachers, as well as nonpilot teachers, were participating in weekly book study groups focused on the Marzano model. Four respondents believed that pilot teachers were actively trying to incorporate the criteria of the framework into lesson plans and daily instructional practice in the classroom, particularly targeting their identified areas for improvement. One teacher interviewee stated, "[The framework is] definitely in the forefront of my head as to what sort of criteria I'm trying to hit with each one of the lessons that I teach." Approximately 73 percent of teachers responding to the survey reported that they consulted the district's instructional framework on a regular basis to inform their professional practice. However, only 39 percent of teachers responding to the survey agreed that other pilot teachers in their school have begun to reference the district's instructional framework.

In addition to the teachers' use of the framework, all three principal respondents and one teacher respondent emphasized that principals were attending not only the training sessions on how to effectively evaluate teachers using the Marzano framework but every one of the professional development sessions offered on each of the criteria, so that they fully understood the Marzano model. This heightened understanding of the framework was helping principals focus their formal and informal observations and feedback on visible demonstrations of the criteria in the classroom, as well as guide their extended one-on-one self-reflection and goal-setting conversations with teachers.

All three teacher-respondents agreed that the new framework was shifting practice and driving culture change within the schools. Given the detailed picture of highly effective instructional practice and the opportunity to reflect on their craft, teachers were engaging in more purposeful and focused instructional strategies, particularly to improve in areas of weakness. One teacher interviewee had begun to set learning targets for students that were aligned with instruction and assessments so that students knew exactly what they were expected to learn. One teacher responding to the survey explained, "The evaluation system focuses on the fundamental aspects of teaching. Teachers are expected to focus on these aspects to improve their ability to teach students at a wide range of academic levels. It also allows for teachers to define clear goals for improving instruction." The three principal respondents believed that it was still too early in the process for the framework to be driving cultural change within schools, but they did comment that the framework had helped focus and increase the frequency of conversations and interactions between teachers and principals. For example, one principal interviewee shared that it had become more common for pilot teachers to approach him or her directly to request that the principal stop by the classroom to observe a specific criterion being integrated into practice. One teacher responding to the survey similarly noted that "[administrators] are more involved with the teachers and instruction. I've seen them out of their offices and in classrooms more this year than in the past."

## **Performance Measures**

Wenatchee School District is using multiple measures of effectiveness to evaluate teacher performance. All or almost all interviewees mentioned three different measures that would be used to evaluate teacher effectiveness: formal and informal observations, a collection of evidence to demonstrate teachers' performance on criteria that were not observable in the classroom, and student growth measures. All eight interviewees agreed that measures would be weighted equally in the summative evaluation score. Eighty-one percent of teachers responding to the survey agreed that the measures being used in the evaluation (e.g., observations, portfolios, and student data) would provide a comprehensive picture of teacher performance.

### **Observations**

The evaluators conduct two to four formal observations during the school year, each of which includes a pre- and post-conference with the evaluator. All the teachers responding to the survey reported having been observed for the purpose of evaluation so far this year.

### **Collection of Evidence**

Interviewees mentioned several examples of evidence that might demonstrate effectiveness on criteria that were not observable in the classroom, including but not limited to the following:

- Examples of student work
- Documentation of participation in professional growth training sessions or meetings
- Parent call logs
- Letters home to parents

Teachers were able to use eVAL, an electronic filing system, to store throughout the school year documents and other artifacts that they would like to be considered in their summative evaluation. Teachers could choose which documents their evaluators were able to access and could remove documents if they no longer thought that they were applicable to their goals or summative evaluation.

### **Student Growth**

Interviewees explained that evidence of student growth would be one of multiple measures used to assess part of a criterion examining teacher impact on student progress. Due to the fact that the district will not receive the results of statewide standardized test scores until after the school year concludes, teachers and their evaluators will reference several different types of assessments, depending on the particular characteristics of the classroom. The teacher and evaluator jointly determined the student-growth measures that will be considered in the teacher's evaluation during the individual goal-setting sessions at the beginning of the school year. Student growth measures that interviewees mentioned as possible sources of evidence included the following:

- Pre- and posttests
- Teacher-created classroom assessments
- Charts that graphed student success over time in special education classrooms
- Department-created common assessments
- District benchmark assessments
- Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments

Interviewees expressed conflicting viewpoints about whether the district had developed methods of measuring student growth in noncore teachers' classrooms. Six interviewees believed that the district intended to use measures of student growth in noncore teachers' evaluations but had not yet settled on a method. On the other hand, two interviewees stated that the district had identified measures of student growth for noncore classrooms, based on state standards and assessments for art, physical education, health, and social studies, as well as district benchmark assessments. Other interviewees were familiar with these state standards but did not think that there had been any corresponding tools developed to measure student growth according to the standards over time. Only 59.1 percent of teachers responding to the survey agreed that the district's new teacher-evaluation system collected information to account for the unique aspects of their teaching positions.

Overall, 85.7 percent of teachers responding to the survey agreed that the measures being used to evaluate teachers incorporated the most important aspects of teaching performance, and 90.5 percent of teachers responding to the survey agreed that the new evaluation process was both clear and fair.

Wenatchee School District has developed or revised several tools to help address the goals of the new teacher-evaluation system. The district first created the rubric itself (which serves as the foundation of all other evaluation activities) and has adapted it into a short version, long version, and a “really long” version. In addition, the district has done the following:

- Revised the formal observation form, as well as supplied evaluators with a 50-page, full-form classroom observation document that dissects each criterion and subcriterion into possible forms of evidence, observable actions in the classroom, artifacts, and student impacts.
- Distributed a one-page districtwide walk-through checklist for informal observations. One interviewee also mentioned that three or four administrators have created individual walk-through tools that they are in the process of sharing with the district.
- Revised the goal-setting form, created a new self-assessment form, and is in the process of piloting new pre- and post-observation forms.
- Developed four versions of the summative assessment form, each representing a different level of rigor in the scoring rubric, ranging from very lenient to very strict (for more detail, see the discussion of the summative rating scoring process on page 9).

The district has also created a page on the district website devoted solely to TPEP, on which many of these forms can be found and downloaded. All teachers responding to the survey reported that they had received training materials, such as evaluation handbooks, rubrics, observation instruments, or handouts that provided information about the new evaluation system. All survey respondents believed that the training materials have helped them understand how they will be evaluated.

When asked about which measures and tools might provide teachers with the most helpful feedback to improve instruction, one principal interviewee conjectured that the “sheer magnitude” of information contained in the rubric itself, the observations, the conversations about the collection of evidence, and the summative report would collectively offer teachers very robust feedback. One principal and one teacher stated that the most useful source of feedback would be the first observation and goal-setting process, during which teachers could reflect on their own practice, rate themselves, and compare their own ratings with those of the evaluator. A teacher responding to the survey agreed, explaining, “The self-assessment seems vital in this new evaluation process, for the emphasis appears to be changing from merely observing a lesson, to observing how a teacher can personally ‘improve’ by ‘formulating their professional growth areas,’ and focusing on ‘chosen’ criterion targets.” One teacher and one principal interviewee cited the continual formal and informal observations more generally as the most useful forms of feedback. Another teacher respondent thought that analyzing student data would help teachers plan lessons and differentiate instruction to target students who might not be grasping key concepts. Finally, a teacher interviewee mentioned the specific descriptions of the criteria and subcriteria found in the “Wenatchee Classroom Teacher Evidence and Measures Specificity by Criterion” tab in the notebook that the district distributed to all pilot teachers in the summer training session. One teacher responding to the survey expressed a similar sentiment, stating, “I really like the specific rubric elements that I can look to for guidance in improving my teaching and becoming more effective.”

Near the end of the school year, evaluators and teachers will engage in a final reflective conference and examine evidence from the multiple measures to assess progress made on the goals set at the beginning of the year. The district has established a “ranges and conditions” numerical method of calculating the overall summative score. The scores of each of the subcriteria, which are between 1 and 4, are added together, and the sum is assigned a rating of 1, 2, 3, or 4 for the corresponding criterion, based on established numerical ranges for each of the performance levels. The same process is employed to assign the sum of the criteria scores an overall summative rating of 1 to 4. However, Wenatchee School District is experimenting with four different scales that are intended to rate teachers more strictly or leniently by defining broader or narrower numerical ranges for the different performance levels of the criteria and summative evaluation scores. One method defines a stricter range for the rating scale of both the criteria and the summative evaluation score; another method assigns a looser range for the rating scale of the criteria but a stricter range for the summative score; one method has a stricter range for the criteria scores but a looser range for the summative score; and finally, one method employs a looser range for the rating scale of both the criteria and the final summative score. The district intends to calculate summative scores for pilot teachers using all four scales to see how the distribution of scores varies. The district will then determine which strategy most effectively and fairly rates teachers.

Six of eight interview respondents believed that the rubric differentiated between the four levels of teacher performance relatively well. These respondents highlighted the specific examples and descriptors under each criterion and subcriterion as particularly helpful in distinguishing between different levels of effectiveness. However, two respondents noted that although the district’s rubric is definitely improving, there is still work to be done to refine the language and ensure consistency in ratings across evaluators and schools. One of these interviewees mentioned specifically that the distinction between the *basic* and *proficient* levels was clear, but that the language used in the *proficient* versus *distinguished* categories is “still a bit foggy.” A teacher responding to the survey expressed a similar sentiment, stating, “I believe our evaluation rubric needs more clarity on the difference between the levels such as the difference between *distinguished* and the next level down.” Two interviewees also commented that given its length, the rubric is overwhelming for evaluators and teachers to utilize but added that these feelings might dissipate as pilot participants become more familiar with the tool. One teacher responding to the survey cited the same concern, explaining, “The evaluation document is really big.... The skills are broken down so far or so detailed, that it is overwhelming... I get lost in the details!”

## **Professional Development**

### **Aligning Evaluation Results**

All eight of the interviewees agreed that the professional development training sessions being offered during the pilot were aligned with the evaluation system. Wenatchee School District is using the grant dollars that it received as part of participating in the pilot to partner with the Marzano Research Laboratory to offer professional development sessions aligned with each of the criteria of the framework. After teachers engage in the goal-setting process and identify areas of weakness for professional growth, they can choose to attend training sessions that are devoted to the specific criteria in which they would like to improve their instructional skills.

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

Wenatchee School District has provided a series of professional development training sessions to familiarize teachers and their evaluators with the TPEP evaluation system and framework. In June 2011, the district partnered with the Marzano Research Laboratory to host two full-day, required training sessions, attended by 42 teachers and 29 of their evaluators. The Marzano Research Laboratory presented an overview of the Marzano teaching model and explained how it aligned with the eight criteria of the framework and the rating scale. The district distributed notebooks that described the rubric in detail, listed the professional development offerings available throughout the year, and included examples of the various evaluation forms. In September 2011, 47 pilot teachers and 25 evaluators attended an optional two-hour training session in which district personnel presented a summary overview of the TPEP timeline and the goal-setting process. Since September, the district has also been continually offering professional development sessions run by the Marzano group that provide in-depth explanations of specific criteria of the framework. Evaluators are required to attend all 12 of these sessions; teachers can choose to attend sessions that meet their professional development needs. The Washington Education Association also conducted multiple one- to three-hour training sessions in September 2011 to introduce teachers and their evaluators to the functions of the eVAL electronic filing system.

All three teacher interviewees believe that the training sessions have been valuable. Two of the three emphasized that the alignment between the professional development training sessions and the evaluation framework has been particularly useful in helping them improve in their areas of weakness. Another teacher added that each session presented a few strategies that the teacher could immediately apply in the classroom. Two of the three teacher respondents requested that future training sessions continue to offer in-depth instruction on each of the eight criteria. One of these respondents thought that it would be useful also to receive additional guidance on how to gather evidence in preparation for the summative evaluations, particularly in regard to student growth measures. The final respondent thought that future professional development sessions should instruct teachers on practicing self-reflection, because in that respondent's view, many teachers participating in the pilot had conducted only a superficial evaluation of their own practice. According to one teacher interviewee, future training sessions would most conveniently be offered during the school day rather than after school or on weekends. One respondent thought that training sessions should eventually occur at the department level, perhaps pairing appointed faculty mentors who had already participated in the evaluation system with a teacher that was just entering the pilot. The final respondent suggested that trainings should remain at the district level because it exposed teachers to ideas from outside their building.

All teachers responding to the survey reported having received formal training on the new teacher-evaluation system. Of these respondents, all teachers indicated that the training had helped them understand the new evaluation processes and procedures. However, only 42.9 percent of teachers agreed that the evaluation training provided helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations. One teacher responding to the survey explained, "I work at an alternative school with a nontraditional approach to instruction, and I am confused at times how I am supposed to evaluate myself with regard to some of the rubric elements." In total, Wenatchee School District estimates that it has spent \$73,968 to train pilot teachers on the evaluation system.

The district has also offered extensive training sessions in the new evaluation system for evaluators of teachers. The teacher evaluators have attended all of the same training sessions as the teachers. In addition to participating in the same professional development sessions as the pilot teachers, evaluators of teachers have also attended the following training sessions:

- In September 2011, the Marzano Research Laboratory conducted three full-day, required training sessions with 32 evaluators in attendance. The training sessions focused on how to use the teacher evaluation tool and conduct walk-throughs. For one of these three days, the evaluators visited a school to practice applying the rubric in the classroom.
- The district conducted three 1.5-hour formal training sessions during the summer to provide an overview of the new teacher-evaluation system process and timeline. Thirty to 40 evaluators attended each session.
- Evaluators meet monthly for three hours of training on the teacher-evaluation system, as well as once a month to participate in an instructional round, during which they practice using the evaluation tool in the classroom to improve interrater reliability.

Wenatchee School District estimates that it has spent \$22,000 to train the evaluators of teachers.

When asked to report the number of hours of training in which they have participated, the three principal respondents all made a statement of similar effect: “I couldn’t even tell you because it is so much.” All three respondents believed that the most helpful aspect of the training was the opportunity to deepen their understanding of the framework so that they could recognize and understand how specific criteria were applied in the classroom. Only one respondent mentioned a drawback to the training, which was that it had required principals to spend close to a dozen days out of their buildings so far this year. However, the respondent conceded that she or he thought that the training was an important investment in the system and critical to its long-term success.

### **Support and Stakeholder Engagement**

Four of five respondents believed that the training sessions for pilot teachers have positively influenced how the new teacher-evaluation system is perceived, and one respondent was not sure. Three interviewees explained that supporting the framework and evaluation tool with the aligned professional development helped garner teacher buy-in. Another respondent added that the professional development helped clarify the expectations of the model.

### **Communication Strategies**

In addition to the training sessions, respondents also stated that teachers receive information about TPEP in the following modes:

- E-mail reminders
- Monthly district newsletters
- The notebook that the district distributed during the first training session
- Information about the pilot in the local newspaper
- The page on the district website devoted to TPEP

- Discussions in the education association meetings and through other union communications
- Updates on the *Facebook* page
- Announcements from their principals

All teacher respondents agreed that the district had effectively communicated information to pilot teachers. One teacher responding to the survey cited “great information provided to pilot participants” as an overall strength of the new teacher-evaluation system.

All five interviewees agreed that nonpilot teachers are receiving communications about TPEP but clarified that their awareness and understanding of the new system was not as in-depth as pilot teachers. Nonpilot teachers received the same monthly newsletters from the district and had access to the TPEP website. In addition, nonpilot teachers attended the meetings conducted the previous year in every school building that provided a summary overview of the rubric and ratings. One interviewee suggested that the district should organize another similar series of meetings in the next few months to update nonpilot teachers on the pilot’s progress. Only 42.9 percent of teachers responding to the survey agreed that the district had effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to nonpilot teachers.

All five responding interviewees confirmed that there were opportunities for two-way feedback between teachers participating in the pilot and the district. Three respondents explained that because the district is relatively small, many of these feedback processes are informal, such as teachers engaging in conversations with members of the design committee, writing e-mails to the district, or contacting the human resources director (who has an open-door policy and is “very approachable”). In addition, the district sets aside time in meetings to solicit teachers’ feedback. Teachers have completed several surveys and time logs, which alerted administrators and committee members to the extra amount of time that teachers devoted to evaluation activities. Two of the teacher interviewees identified the notebook as the most helpful resource for information about the pilot program. One teacher added that the monthly newsletter updates have also been helpful. The final teacher respondent thought that the trainings had provided the most effective venue for communication. About 90.5 percent of teacher respondents reported that the district had solicited or planned to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system.

When asked about the core message that the district is communicating, four of five responding interviewees stated that the teacher evaluation system is a growth model to help teachers improve their craft and student learning. Another interviewee elaborated that the standards-based approach to evaluating teachers sets high expectations for growth and delineates exactly what teachers need to do to meet standards.

To the extent that misunderstandings might still exist about the goals and requirements of the new evaluation system, two interviewees explained that some pilot teachers still feel uncertain about the emphasis that will ultimately be placed on the summative score. One of these respondents explained that it was still shocking for many teachers to be rated lower than expected. The other interviewee elaborated that although the district had consistently reaffirmed that the new evaluation system was a professional growth model, the national backdrop of the pilot was an ongoing conversation about whether to institute teacher merit pay, use value-added scores, and publicly rank teachers. Two interviewees suggested that some pilot teachers are still

wondering whether there will be enough evidence to evaluate teachers effectively and fairly on each of the criteria and subcriteria in the summative evaluation. One of these interviewees proposed that it might be helpful for the district to touch base with teachers about how much and what types of evidence they should be gathering for the final “collection of evidence” product. Another interviewee mentioned that the district still had not announced whether every teacher would be evaluated under this system every year, or if there would be a process similar to the current short- and long-form systems, in which only a few teachers were evaluated on the more rigorous and time-consuming long form each year. The same interviewee also queried whether the district had solidified policies regarding how long teachers would be allowed to remain at the *basic* level, both under normal circumstances and after having changed subjects or grade levels.

In terms of improving communications, one teacher respondent proposed that the district create a *Moodle* site for TPEP, which other committees used as a forum for teachers to post questions and provide feedback to each other. Two teacher interviewees emphasized the critical role that evaluators play in communication efforts and expressed concern that teachers might be receiving fewer communications if their evaluators have not embraced the system. One respondent believed that it might be helpful for the district and education association to conduct more face-to-face events together. Finally, one respondent pointed out the need for a formal communication event to reach out and inform the community about TPEP.

## **Time and Resources**

Three of the four teacher and union representative interviewees indicated that the amount of time they spent on teacher evaluation activities had significantly increased this year. Three of these respondents estimated that they had spent between six and 12 hours so far this year on evaluation activities, compared to 20 minutes to three hours during the course of an entire year under the previous evaluation system. One of these teacher respondents specified that she had so far spent five hours examining the materials and aligning lesson plans with the criteria and 1½ hours aligning professional goals with the new tool. The final teacher respondent stated that he or she had spent approximately 30 minutes in the preobservation meeting with the principal, 30 minutes being observed, and 30 minutes in the post-observation meeting, which was about the same amount of time as in previous years. These findings were supported by survey responses, in which 66.7 percent of teachers reported that the time they spent on evaluation activities this semester was “much greater” compared to time spent under the previous evaluation system.

Principals’ estimates of the amount of time that they previously had spent evaluating a teacher on a “long form” ranged from two to five hours across the entire year. By contrast, one principal reported that he or she had spent seven to 10 hours per teacher so far this year. The other two principal respondents hypothesized that total evaluation activities throughout the school year would range from 12 to 25 hours per teacher participating in TPEP. One principal stated that the first observation with its pre- and post-conferences had taken four hours per teacher to complete and the goal setting conversation one hour per teacher. A teacher responding to the survey cited the time requirement for principals as one of the weaknesses of the new system, listing: “administrator work load. . . . The position entails so much more than evaluating staff, but I can foresee that this new system (once it is building-wide rather than just three teachers) will engulf their time.”

The district administrator respondent was hesitant to estimate the number of hours that he or she had personally committed to developing, supporting, and implementing the new teacher-evaluation system because it had required so much time. The district administrator mentioned that there had been eight full days of training this year, several other meetings, and perhaps an additional eight to 12 hours of logistical work on top of those other activities. Under the former teacher-evaluation system, the interviewee had spent a very limited amount of time on teacher-evaluation activities, consisting mainly of meeting contractual obligations. The district administrator was not certain whether the amount of time that he or she devoted to teacher evaluation activities would continue to stay around this level; the time commitment depended on funding streams, since the pilot grant money is currently supporting the professional development and stipends for teachers participating in the pilot.

Respondents were also challenged to estimate the amount of time the district had spent during the past two years developing the various aspects of the new teacher-evaluation system, with one interviewee responding, “I cannot even estimate for you, it has been so much. It was just amazing.” The district administrator devoted six or seven days a month to the planning process, and the committee met every month for at least one full day. One respondent suggested that it had been hundreds of hours in total. In terms of resources that the district committed outside of individuals’ time, the district utilized grant money to cover the costs of photocopying, providing notebooks for pilot participants, and other similar costs.

## **Culture Shifts**

All seven interviewees agreed that the new evaluation system has changed the nature of conversations occurring in schools. The three teacher respondents noted that the specificity of the rubrics has helped target conversations among colleagues about how to improve instructional areas of weakness, which has, in turn, been driving the focus of collaboration time and encouraging teachers to share best practices. One teacher respondent mentioned that teachers in her school are focusing in particular on diving deeper into student data to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of lessons and identify students who might still be struggling to grasp a concept. Survey results generally support these findings, but with slightly fewer teachers in agreement: 61.9 percent of teachers responding to the survey agreed that they have more productive conversations with colleagues because of the district’s new teacher-evaluation system. The three principal respondents all believed that the new evaluation system had changed the nature of their conversations with teachers, rendering them more focused on professional goals, how to improve in areas of weakness, the timeline of events, and the collection of evidence.

Four of eight interviewees agreed that most teachers perceive the new system as better than the previous system in terms of enhancing their craft and improving student learning. These respondents explained that the specificity of the criteria and subcriteria of the rubrics, in addition to the four distinguished levels of performance, provide clear pathways for improving instruction. In the previous evaluation system, the simple *satisfactory* and *unsatisfactory* ratings did not provide any insight into how to improve instructional practice. These comments were supported by survey findings, in which 71.4 percent of teachers agreed that the new evaluation system provided clear steps that a teacher could take to improve in areas of weakness. In addition, two interviewees commented that the new evaluation system offered more varied ways to demonstrate successful instruction and to showcase efforts that go above and beyond the basic job requirements. Supporting these findings, 66.7 percent of teachers agreed that the new

evaluation system provided a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance, and 85.7 percent of teachers agreed that the use of multiple measures of student growth was an integral part of a comprehensive teacher-evaluation system.

Although the four remaining interviewees conceded that most teachers perceive the new evaluation system as better, they cited additional concerns that some teachers have about the amount of time and work that the new evaluation system requires, as well as the increased pressure to perform, due to the four different rating levels. Survey results seem to reflect these conflicting feelings about the benefits and drawbacks of the new evaluation system, with 95.2 percent of teachers agreeing that the district's new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance, but only 53.3 percent of teachers agreeing that the new evaluation system is better than the previous system in terms of helping teachers improve their practice.

# Pilot-Year Implementation Findings: Principal Evaluation

## Evaluation Framework and Goals

The four interviewees in Wenatchee School District cited varied but interrelated goals and purposes of the new principal-evaluation system. Two respondents stated that the primary goal was to clearly define practices of high-quality leadership in the criteria and subcriteria of the new framework, which helps principals identify areas of strength and weakness for improvement. Three respondents stated that an additional purpose of the new evaluation system was to increase accountability; over time, evaluation ratings would help determine which principals were retained or dismissed. Two respondents mentioned that setting clear expectations for performance and increasing accountability helped promote professional growth. Finally, one respondent noted that the new system would make the process of evaluating principals more consistent across the district and the state.

Prior to participating in TPEP, Wenatchee School District did not have a district leadership framework in place. The framework that the district designed for the principal-evaluation system references Marzano's *School Leadership That Works* and aligns Marzano's 21 leadership behaviors to the eight criteria provided by the state. However, the district also drew from elements of multiple leadership frameworks, combining aspects of the Association of Washington School Principal standards, WestEd's rubrics based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards, and other evaluation tools from around the country.

The activities and requirements that are integrated into the principal-evaluation process in Wenatchee School District help ensure that the leadership framework is consistently informing principals' practice in their schools. The principals meet once a month as a group with their supervisors to delve deeply into examining one specific criterion. During these discussions, the group collectively reviews the rubric, shares relevant best practices, and distributes applicable journal articles and additional resources. Each principal then meets with his or her evaluator for a separate monthly one-on-one meeting to discuss the progress in implementing that particular criterion in his or her school and to provide evidence demonstrating its effects.

All four interviewees believe that the new framework is shifting practice and driving culture change among principals in the district. One respondent attributed the monthly meetings to playing a major role in helping shift practice. Although these meetings were prior to TPEP, the framework has helped shift the discussions away from generally describing what is occurring in the school toward analyzing one criterion and its implementation. Two interviewees mentioned that participation in TPEP has rendered conversations with colleagues more productive, particularly in terms of discussing challenges and sharing best practices related to the clear and specific rubrics. The final respondent noted that there is a lot of energy and excitement around creating a shared understanding of the rubric, even as principals provide feedback to help tweak and improve it throughout the pilot process.

## Performance Measures

The required evaluation activities refer to performance measures consistently evaluated throughout the year in the goal-setting process, monthly one-on-one and group meetings, the

midyear evaluation, and the summative evaluation. The performance measures on which principals will be evaluated include the following:

- A collection of evidence that principals actively build throughout the year for each indicator
- Perception surveys taken by teachers, support staff, and parents on the nine characteristics of highly effective schools
- Observations and informal walk-throughs by the evaluators
- Measures of student achievement and growth on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments, district benchmark assessments, levels tests, and/or common classroom assessments.

The expectations for student performance are designed to take into account the varying demographics of schools within the district. Principals can cite either the percentage of students at grade level *or* the percentage of students who demonstrate year-to-year growth, with the ranges for expected “growth” reflecting student baseline scores. For a *distinguished* rating on a criterion, 80 percent of students have to be at grade level or demonstrating growth, 70 percent of students for a *satisfactory* rating, and so forth. Student performance data are weighted heavily in the overall summative score. The district created a ninth criterion called “significant impact on student learning,” which pulls out scores on specific subcriteria that the district believed were critical to effective leadership, in effect counting those scores twice. One of the chosen subcriteria scores is on student performance.

Three respondents agreed that the district takes into account the challenges that new principals or principals who change grade levels might face when incorporating measures into the principal’s evaluation; one respondent replied that the district does not account for these factors.

The district has developed or revised several tools to address the goals of the new principal-evaluation system, including the following:

- The rubric itself
- Self-reflection and goal-setting forms
- The “significant impact on student learning” worksheet
- The principal professional growth plan
- The summative evaluation report

The monthly one-on-one meetings are the only aspect of the new evaluation system that existed in previous years.

The summative evaluation scoring process utilizes the “ranges and conditions” method of calculating a summative score, similar to the one in the teacher-evaluation system. The scores of each of the subcriteria, which are between 1 and 4, are added together, and the sum is assigned a rating of 1, 2, 3, or 4 for the corresponding criterion, based on established numerical ranges for each of the performance levels. The same process is employed to assign the sum of the criteria scores an overall summative rating of 1 to 4. However, principals are not scored according to different rating schemes during the pilot like the teachers are.

All four of the interviewees believe that the principal rubric differentiates between different levels of effectiveness relatively well. One respondent stated that the distinctions between the performance levels were “crystal clear.” Another interviewee cautioned that the district is still in the process of tweaking the rubric but expressed confidence that the rubric would be able to effectively differentiate among the different levels by the end of the year. In terms of the characteristics of the rubric that were most helpful for differentiating among different levels of effectiveness, one respondent mentioned its specificity and clarity, and another respondent cited the fact that there was no superfluous language. However, one respondent pondered whether the language describing the *distinguished* rating in the principal rubric was actually achievable.

Each principal respondent mentioned a different measure or tool that he or she believed would provide the most useful feedback to help improve professional practice. One respondent identified the detailed rubric, “hands down,” because its specific descriptors and clear expectations help inform the self-assessment and goal-setting process. Another principal thought that the goal-setting sheet itself would be the most helpful tool for improving practice because it most closely mirrored the existing continuous improvement plans. A third principal emphasized the utility of the ongoing conversations throughout the school year in the one-on-one and group monthly meetings. The resulting feedback was timely, focused on specific criteria, and referred to best practices from elsewhere in the district.

## **Professional Development**

### **Aligning Evaluation Results**

Two principal interviewees agreed that the evaluation system has informed their professional development plans, describing how the monthly one-on-one meetings require principals to examine their goals on a specific criterion and share progress up to that point. In addition, the group meetings provide principals with examples of best practices and additional resources to consult. The third principal respondent mentioned that in the future, the district will probably allow principals to choose which leadership conferences to attend, based on their areas of weakness.

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

All three interviewees reported having received training to help them understand how they will be evaluated. Before the beginning of the school year in August 2011, the district conducted a required two-hour formal training session that provided 40 principals and their evaluators with an overview of the new evaluation system, the rubric language, the summative scoring process, and examples of artifacts to demonstrate proficiency. In September 2011, the district also hosted a required two-hour formal training session for 30 principals and their evaluators that provided an in-depth overview of Criterion 1 and its associated evidence and measures, as well as the goal-setting and self-assessment process. The principals also were required to participate in the three-hour monthly group meetings, during which their supervisors reviewed the definition of each criterion and possible forms of evidence. Approximately 12 principals attend these monthly meetings. Principal interviewees estimate that they have received between 15 to 40 hours of training on the principal-evaluation system so far this year. Wenatchee School District estimates that it has spent approximately \$6,410 on all costs associated with training principals on the new evaluation system.

All three principal interviewees believe that the training has been very helpful. One respondent highlighted the sharing of best practices as particularly enlightening, noting that principals have learned very useful strategies and practices from each other. Another respondent thought that the specific focus on what effective leadership looks like and the training to increase principals' capacity to evaluate themselves has been critical, but that the staff development aligned with areas for growth has been "the most important part." The three principal interviewees each had different suggestions for future training sessions as follows:

- One interviewee thought that it was important to continue to focus on the "verbiage within the rubric" and tweaking the language so that it was applicable to all buildings.
- Another interviewee thought it beneficial to continue examining each criterion in depth, as well as review Criteria 1 and 3, which the district tweaked in response to principal feedback.
- The final interviewee requested training sessions that were more differentiated to account for differences in the professional development needs of a new versus a more experienced principal.

All three principals agreed that continued monthly meetings were the best format for professional development sessions moving forward.

The evaluators of principals have attended all of the same training sessions on the new principal-evaluation system (listed earlier) as the principals themselves. Therefore, there have been no additional costs associated with training the evaluators of principals in Wenatchee School District. The district administrator interviewee estimates that he has attended approximately 15 hours of professional development related to evaluating principals in the new evaluation system. The respondent thought that the most helpful training had been the monthly meetings that discussed the intention and meaning of each criterion in detail.

### **Support and Stakeholder Engagement**

All four interviewees believe that the professional development has positively impacted principals' perception of the new evaluation system, although one respondent clarified that the new evaluation system never really held a negative connotation among principals. In general, principals were enthusiastic about the opportunity to make the evaluation process more systematic and consistent. Two respondents explained that the trainings sessions helped to quell anxieties by increasing understanding of the new system and rubrics, but one respondent qualified that principals are still concerned about the amount of time they will be required to invest in both the teacher- and principal-evaluation systems simultaneously.

### **Communication Strategies**

In addition to the district training sessions, respondents indicated that they received information about the new principal-evaluation system through e-mails, electronic newsletters from the leadership team, the district website devoted to the pilot, and through constant ongoing, informal conversations. Interviewees stated that there were constant opportunities for two-way feedback in the frequent small group meetings, and one respondent noted that the design team had actually revised two of the criteria in the rubric to reflect feedback from the principals. Two interviewees

related that the face-to-face communications with their evaluators, which allowed principals to ask questions and seek clarification, were the most helpful form of communication, with one respondent elaborating, “I enjoy that opportunity to share ideas and concerns with [him or her].”

Three interviewees claim that the district’s core message about the principal evaluation system is that it is a growth model. One of these respondents added that an additional emphasized goal is that the finalized evaluation system is manageable, so that principals are collecting only relevant information and are not heavily burdened with gathering superfluous pieces of evidence. The final respondent identified the core message as setting high expectations for effective leadership in the district. Three respondents did not believe that there were any existing misunderstandings in communication between the principals and the district. One respondent stated that in the past few years, the district has implemented several different methods of encouraging principal professional growth, so there is still some skepticism about whether this evaluation system will continue to be used in coming years. There is also a lingering concern about how time-intensive the principal and teacher evaluation processes will be for principals in the district.

Two respondents had no suggestions for how the district might improve communication around the goals and requirements of the evaluation system. One respondent suggested that providing concrete examples—e.g., sharing a completed goal sheet—could be very illustrative. Another interviewee requested that the district simply continue on course, clarifying the processes and language of the rubric. The district administrator respondent mentioned that there were plans to have principals complete an online survey to solicit additional feedback about which specific descriptions or phrases in the rubric language were still “fuzzy.”

All principals in the district are participating in TPEP. However, assistant principals are not being evaluated in the new evaluation system this school year. Respondents indicate that most of the assistant principals are choosing to attend the training sessions voluntarily, so that they become familiar with the expectations for how they will be evaluated in the future. For assistant principals who are not attending trainings, overviews of the new evaluation system were presented at administrative meetings at the beginning of the school year, and the assistant principals also receive the same newsletters as the pilot principals.

## **Time and Resources**

The three principal respondents’ estimates for the total amount of time they have spent on their own evaluation activities so far this year range from seven to 20 hours, rather than the one to three hours under the former evaluation system. The time estimates for the evaluation activities conducted so far this year include approximately two hours of preparation for goal-setting in advance of the corresponding hour-long meetings with their evaluator, as well as the monthly one-hour one-on-one meetings, which require about an hour of preparation.

The principal evaluator estimated that under the new system, he or she spends approximately four to 4½ hours per month to evaluate one principal, whereas in the old evaluation system the estimate would have been closer to two or three hours. The time estimates for the evaluation activities conducted so far this year include the following:

- One hour formulating questions in advance of each upcoming one-on-one meeting
- The one- to 1½-hour, one-on-one meeting

- Thirty to 45 minutes editing notes from the meeting.

The district administrator estimates that these activities and the other activities related to implementing and supporting the principal-evaluation system have comprised approximately 30 percent of full-time job responsibilities, rather than the 15 percent to 20 percent of full-time job responsibilities in previous years. The administrator does expect the time commitment to decrease once the process and rubrics become more defined and familiar.

Wenatchee School District used grant money to cover any additional costs of evaluation activities outside of individuals' time.

## **Culture Shifts**

All four respondents agree that pilot principals generally see the new principal-evaluation system as helping enhance their craft and improve student learning. One principal specified that the sheer fact that he is being evaluated is a major improvement. Two principal respondents identified the specificity and clarity of the rubrics, expectations, and evidence as helping principals hone in on areas for improvement. One of these respondents also noted that the framework is comprehensive, research-based, and tied to opportunities for professional development, which helps motivate principals to be more successful. Finally, the district administrator respondent cautioned that it might still be a little early to tell but noted that the hopes-and-worries survey at the beginning of the year seemed to indicate that feelings among principals were relatively positive about the new evaluation system, and there was little that might have occurred since then to alter those feelings.

## Summary and Conclusions

When asked to reflect on the greatest strengths of the new teacher-evaluation system, five of seven respondents in Wenatchee School District believed that the framework itself, aligned with the specific and detailed rubric, would play a key role in helping motivate teachers to improve instructional practice. The clear vision of what high-quality instruction looks like, partnered with the precise descriptions of the various levels of performance, enables teachers to reflect on their practice in a more thoughtful goal-setting process, pinpoint areas of weakness, and follow a continuum of improvement to more effective teaching. One interviewee added that the framework, founded on the Marzano method, is research-based and comprehensive; all teachers, regardless of experience, can find areas for growth. Another respondent added that because the district itself worked to develop the framework, that process also helps foster a sense of ownership in the new evaluation system. Two respondents highlighted the extensive professional development offerings and the expectation that administrators increase their focus on instructional leadership as additional strengths of the system. One respondent also mentioned that a strength of the new evaluation system is that it increases accountability.

When discussing aspects of the evaluation system that still need improvement, five of eight Wenatchee School District respondents cited time as their biggest concern, particularly for evaluators, because the new system requires more one-on-one time with each of the teachers. Although the tool is relatively user friendly, evaluating every teacher in the building once the system goes to scale would be a huge undertaking, if not actually impossible for one administrator. One respondent suggested that perhaps the district could further tweak some of the tools such as the walk-through form or the pre- and postconference forms to make the process more manageable for both the teacher and principal. All three principal respondents mentioned that the summative tool was still not finalized, particularly the ranges for the rating scale. Similarly, the district administrator interviewee added that some of the language and measures still needed to be tweaked to compensate for the fact that the Marzano model does not align perfectly with the eight criteria provided by the state. Finally, one teacher respondent believed that the process of collecting evidence and artifacts to effectively demonstrate proficiency on each of the eight criteria required more clarity and guidance.

The responses from Wenatchee School District interviewees regarding the biggest challenges for implementing and sustaining the new teacher-evaluation system also focused on the issue of time, with five of eight respondents expressing concerns that the process of providing feedback and support to 30 or more teachers in one building using the new evaluation tool would be extremely labor intensive. Several respondents suggested that an administrator would only be able to effectively evaluate six to eight teachers at one time using the new evaluation tool, which would be similar to the current “long form” evaluation process. Another three respondents highlighted the cost of providing timely and effective professional development as a challenge for sustaining the system at scale, given limited available funding. In order to provide effective, research-based professional development, Wenatchee School District would have to either pay for external expertise or develop expertise within the district. One respondent reiterated the challenge of ensuring consistency in evaluations across evaluators and schools. Finally, one teacher interviewee emphasized as a potential hurdle the cultural shift required for teachers to adjust from receiving consistent ratings of *satisfactory* to perhaps being rated as *basic* in some

criteria. Some teachers would struggle to view a *basic* rating as an opportunity for professional growth.

In terms of the principal-evaluation system, respondents echoed similar sentiments as those comments about the teacher-evaluation system: All four interviewees emphasized that the clear and detailed expectations for an effective administrator outlined in the rubric allowed for more robust and thoughtful self-assessment and goal-setting processes. Two respondents added that the evaluation system carved out time for principals to work one-on-one with their evaluators to examine their skills and identify areas for growth, with the rubric providing a clear map to help improve professional practice. Another respondent mentioned that these characteristics of the new evaluation system also held principals more accountable for their practice.

However, respondents still had concerns about aspects of the evaluation system that needed further improvement and that posed challenges for long-term implementation and sustainability. All four respondents mentioned time as a continuing challenge, particularly for administrators who must simultaneously commit to both the teacher- and principal-evaluation systems. Respondents worried that principals would have no time to fulfill the other responsibilities of the job, such as responding to disciplinary issues, communicating with parents, and overseeing programmatic and logistical activities within the building. Three of the respondents mentioned that some of the language in the rubric still needed tweaking in order to clarify the meaning of specific phrases, making it applicable to all buildings regardless of demographics or level, and adapting it to the assistant principal job. Two respondents mentioned that the district had yet to finalize ranges for the summative scores and provide an overview of the entire summative rating process. One respondent added that the district had not yet settled on an effective method of determine measures of student performance that held principals accountable for student achievement but was also fair and reasonable.

In Wenatchee School District, both teacher- and principal-evaluation systems are focused on partnering thoughtful and robust self-reflective and goal-setting processes with extensive individualized opportunities for professional support, based on identified areas of weakness. The summative evaluation score in both systems utilizes a “ranges and conditions” numerical calculation, although the district is experimenting with four various levels of strictness in the rating of teachers. The extensive work that the district has devoted to designing the rubrics and conducting communication and training activities in both the teacher- and principal-evaluation systems has garnered buy-in among pilot participants. As a result, participants report that they are enthusiastic about the new evaluation systems, if hesitant about specific hurdles to implementation, particularly the burden of time placed on administrators. One teacher responding to the survey stated, “I’m actually enjoying [being evaluated in the new teacher-evaluation system] because it’s challenging me. It’s not like the status quo of the past. I enjoy that. I want to see how I can be better at my profession.” Similarly, a principal interviewee stated that the evaluation system “gives me an excellent picture as an administrator. It allows me to look at my skills. It allows me to judge my abilities. It allows me to work one-on-one with my evaluator to identify specific areas that I need to grow in, and then it creates a map for me to get there.”

Although Wenatchee School District is still in the midst of implementing the pilot, and there remain areas of both the teacher- and principal-evaluation systems that interviewees and survey respondents identify as requiring more tweaking, the district is making timely progress toward its goals for the pilot process.

## 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=23)	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.	100.0% (n=23)	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.	100.0% (n=23)	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.	87.0% (n=23)	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.	91.3% (n=23)	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.	73.9% (n=23)	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.	39.1% (n=23)		

\*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?***	95.5% (n=22)	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.	90.5% (n=21)	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.	59.1% (n=22)	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.	72.7% (n=22)	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.	81.0% (n=21)	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.	81.0% (n=21)	The measures being used to evaluate teachers are fair.	—
The measures used to evaluate my teaching incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.	85.7% (n=21)	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.	86.4% (n=22)	The measures used by my district’s new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to help teachers improve instructional practice.	—
Have you been observed for the purpose of evaluation under the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?***	100.0% (n=22)	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.	90.5% (n=21)	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.	90.5% (n=21)	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=21)	Have you received any formal training on conducting evaluations for the new teacher-evaluation system?***	—
The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.	100.0% (n=21)	The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.	—
I understand my responsibilities under the new evaluation system.	100.0% (n=21)	I understand my responsibilities as an evaluator under the new teacher-evaluation system.	—
The evaluation training I received provided helpful information about differences in the evaluation process for teachers of specific content areas or student populations.	42.9% (n=21)	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.	85.7% (n=21)	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.)**	100.0% (n=21)	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?***	—
To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?***	100.0% (n=21)	To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be conducting evaluations?***	—
To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?***	95.2% (n=21)	To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new teacher-evaluation system?***	—

<b>Teachers</b>	<b>%/n</b>	<b>Principals</b>	<b>%/n</b>
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>	90.5% (n=21)	I am well prepared to evaluate teacher performance this year <i>using the tools and processes associated with the new evaluation system.</i>	—
		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?***	52.4% (n=21)	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?***	23.8% (n=21)	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.	81.0% (n=21)	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.	90.5% (n=21)	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 percentage 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.	100.0% (n=20)		—
My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>nonpilot teachers</i> .	42.9% (n=21)		—
My district either has solicited or plans to solicit feedback concerning the new teacher-evaluation system from teachers participating in the pilot.	90.5% (n=21)		—
I understand what criteria are included in my district’s new teacher-evaluation system.	95.2% (n=21)	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.	95.2% (n=21)	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.	100.0% (n=21)		—

\* 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	%/ <i>n</i>	Principals	%/ <i>n</i>
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:	66.7% ( <i>n</i> =21)	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.	61.9% (n=21)	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.	61.9% (n=21)	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.	85.7% (n=21)	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.	90.5% (n=21)	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.	71.4% (n=21)	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.	66.7% (n=21)	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.	95.2% (n=21)	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.	85.7% (n=21)	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.	61.9% (n=21)	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.

## *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=14)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective leadership.	100.0% (n=14)
My district’s leadership framework, which is outlined in the evaluation rubric, provides clear guidance about what effective school administration should look like.	92.9% (n=14)
Under the district’s new principal-evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district’s leadership framework.	78.6% (n=14)
I understand the design of my district’s leadership framework.	78.6% (n=14)
Do you consult your district’s leadership framework on a regular basis when making decisions about professional practice?***	42.9% (n=14)
District administrators regularly reference the district’s leadership framework.	35.7% (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.

\*\*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?***	92.9% (n=14)
My district’s new principal-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between different levels of principal practice.	84.6% (n=13)
My district is using data from multiple measures to evaluate principals.	92.9% (n=14)
The measures (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) being used to evaluate principals will provide a comprehensive picture of principal performance.	100.0% (n=14)
The measures being used to evaluate my performance are fair.	85.7% (n=14)
The measures being used to evaluate my performance incorporate the most important aspects of principal performance.	92.9% (n=14)
The measures used by my district’s new principal-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve my practice as a school leader.	92.9% (n=14)
The new process being implemented this year to evaluate principal performance is clear to me.	100.0% (n=14)
The new process being implemented this year to evaluate principal performance is fair.	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.

\*\*\*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?***	92.9% (n=14)
The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.	100.0% (n=13)
I understand my responsibilities under the new principal-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=14)
My district provided helpful training on how I could use data generated by the new principal-evaluation system to improve my practice.	85.7% (n=14)
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.**	92.9% (n=14)
To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?***	100.0% (n=11)
To what extent did the training materials help you understand your responsibilities under the new evaluation system?***	100.0% (n=12)
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>	85.7% (n=14)
District administrators in my district are being held accountable for implementing the new principal-evaluation system.**	85.7% (n=14)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system feeds into districtwide professional development planning.	92.9% (n=14)
My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.	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.

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

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

## 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.	100.0% (n=14)
My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to <i>nonpilot principals</i> .	71.4% (n=14)
My district either has solicited or has plans to solicit feedback concerning the new principal-evaluation system from principals participating in the pilot.	85.7% (n=14)
I understand what criteria are included in my district’s new principal-evaluation system.	100.0% (n=14)
I understand what measures are used by my district’s new principal-evaluation system to measure principal performance.	92.9% (n=14)
I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new principal-evaluation system.	78.6% (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 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:	50.0% (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.

## 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.	85.7% ( <i>n</i> =14)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system is more objective than the previous principal-evaluation system.	64.3% ( <i>n</i> =14)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system identifies specific areas in which a principal needs to improve.	92.9% ( <i>n</i> =14)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in a principal’s performance.	100.0% ( <i>n</i> =13)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system provides clear steps that a principal can take to improve areas of weakness.	78.6% ( <i>n</i> =14)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of principal performance.	76.9% ( <i>n</i> =13)
My district’s new principal-evaluation system encourages better school administration.	85.7% ( <i>n</i> =14)
The use of multiple measures of student growth is an integral part of a comprehensive principal-evaluation system.	71.4% ( <i>n</i> =14)
I have more productive conversations with district administrators because of my district’s new principal-evaluation system.	92.9% ( <i>n</i> =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.

## 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 fewer than three people responded are not presented.

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

	Frequency	%
<b>I am a:<sup>a</sup></b>		
General education teacher	10	43.48%
Core content teacher (e.g., math, science, reading)	6	26.09%
Noncore content teacher (e.g., physical education, music)	6	26.09%
English language teacher	1	4.35%
Special education teacher	2	8.70%
Support provider (e.g., school psychologists, occupational therapists, guidance counselors)	0	0.00%
Mentor, coach, or other instructional leader (e.g., reading specialists)	0	0.00%
Nonteaching staff (e.g., administrative assistants, custodians)	0	0.00%
Other	1	4.35%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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.

<b>I am a:</b>		
Continuing contract teacher	23	100.00%
Provisional status teacher	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand the goals of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	18	78.26%
Agree somewhat	5	21.74%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system offers a clear definition of effective teaching.</b>		
Agree strongly	13	56.52%
Agree somewhat	10	43.48%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	14	60.87%
Agree somewhat	9	39.13%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Under the district's new evaluation system, I am evaluated against practices that are embedded in my district's instructional framework.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	43.48%
Agree somewhat	10	43.48%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	3	13.04%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand the design of my district’s instructional framework.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	43.48%
Agree somewhat	11	47.83%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	23	100.00%
<b>I consult my district’s instructional framework on a regular basis to inform my professional practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	6	26.09%
Agree somewhat	11	47.83%
Disagree somewhat	5	21.74%
Disagree strongly	1	4.35%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	23	100.00%
<b>Other <i>pilot teachers in my school</i> have begun to reference the district’s instructional framework.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	8.70%
Agree somewhat	7	30.43%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	12	52.17%
Missing	0	0.00%
Total	23	100.00%
<b>Have you reviewed your district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric, which provides descriptions of teacher practice across four levels of effectiveness?</b>		
Yes	21	91.30%
No	1	4.35%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	1	4.35%
Total	23	100.00%
<b>My district’s new teacher-evaluation rubric clearly differentiates between levels of teacher practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	13	56.52%
Agree somewhat	6	26.09%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	100.00%

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation process collects information to account for the unique aspects of my teaching position.</b>		
Agree strongly	6	26.09%
Agree somewhat	7	30.43%
Disagree somewhat	4	17.39%
Disagree strongly	1	4.35%
Uncertain	4	17.39%
Missing	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district is using data from more than classroom observations to evaluate my teaching.</b>		
Agree strongly	11	47.83%
Agree somewhat	5	21.74%
Disagree somewhat	1	4.35%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	5	21.74%
Missing	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The measures used to evaluate my teaching (e.g., observations, portfolios, student data) will provide a comprehensive picture of my performance as a teacher.</b>		
Agree strongly	8	34.78%
Agree somewhat	9	39.13%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	2	8.70%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The measures used to evaluate my teaching are fair.</b>		
Agree strongly	7	30.43%
Agree somewhat	10	43.48%
Disagree somewhat	3	13.04%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>The measures used to evaluate my teaching incorporate the most important aspects of teaching performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	43.48%
Agree somewhat	8	34.78%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The measures used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system provide useful feedback to improve instructional practice.</b>		
Agree strongly	10	43.48%
Agree somewhat	9	39.13%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	3	13.04%
Missing	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Have you been observed for the purpose of evaluation under the new teacher-evaluation system this academic year?</b>		
Yes	22	95.65%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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)	22	95.65%
Walk-through	15	65.22%
Informal (i.e., not included in your overall summative evaluation rating)	7	30.43%
Announced (i.e., you knew about the observation ahead of time)	15	65.22%
Unannounced (i.e., you did not know beforehand that the observation would occur)	11	47.83%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
I have not been observed under the new teacher-evaluation system.	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Missing	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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.

	Frequency	%
<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	1	4.35%
30–60 minutes	21	91.30%
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	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>How many times have you been formally observed this semester?</b>		
One time	20	86.96%
Two times	2	8.70%
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	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>How many times have you participated in walk-through observations this semester?</b>		
One time	5	21.74%
Two times	4	17.39%
Three or more times	7	30.43%
Uncertain	2	8.70%
I have not participated in any walk-through observations under the new teacher-evaluation system	4	17.39%
Missing	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	5	21.74%
5–10 minutes	10	43.48%
11–20 minutes	2	8.70%
21–30 minutes	1	4.35%
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	4	17.39%
Missing	1	4.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Who observed your instruction during these observations?</b>		
Principal	9	39.13%
Vice principal	9	39.13%
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	1	4.35%
Other	2	8.70%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Were the observation results discussed with you?</b>		
Yes	16	69.57%
No	4	17.39%
Uncertain	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Have you incorporated feedback from the observation results into your practice?</b>		
Yes	18	78.26%
No	2	8.70%
Uncertain	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is clear to me.</b>		
Agree strongly	9	39.13%
Agree somewhat	10	43.48%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The new process implemented this year to evaluate my performance is fair.</b>		
Agree strongly	11	47.83%
Agree somewhat	8	34.78%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>Have you received any formal training to understand the new teacher-evaluation system and how you will be evaluated?</b>		
Yes	21	91.30%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Training for teachers regarding the new evaluation system has been offered.</b>		
One time	1	4.35%
A couple of times	3	13.04%
On an ongoing basis	17	73.91%
Not at all	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>The training I received helped me understand the new evaluation processes and procedures.</b>		
Agree strongly	6	26.09%
Agree somewhat	15	65.22%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>I understand my responsibilities under the new evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	5	21.74%
Agree somewhat	16	69.57%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	2	8.70%
Agree somewhat	7	30.43%
Disagree somewhat	5	21.74%
Disagree strongly	3	13.04%
Uncertain	4	17.39%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<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	3	13.04%
Agree somewhat	15	65.22%
Disagree somewhat	3	13.04%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	21	91.30%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>To what extent did the training materials help you understand how you will be evaluated?</b>		
Very helpful	11	47.83%
Somewhat helpful	10	43.48%
Not very helpful	0	0.00%
Not helpful at all	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	7	30.43%
Somewhat helpful	13	56.52%
Not very helpful	1	4.35%
Not helpful at all	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<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	5	21.74%
Agree somewhat	14	60.87%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Are principals in your district being held accountable for implementing the new evaluation system?</b>		
Yes	11	47.83%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	10	43.48%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>Will principals in your district be evaluated on how effective they are at evaluating teacher performance?</b>		
Yes	5	21.74%
No	0	0.00%
Uncertain	16	69.57%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system feeds into schoolwide or districtwide professional development planning.</b>		
Agree strongly	8	34.78%
Agree somewhat	9	39.13%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	4	17.39%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My evaluation results will be helpful in informing decisions regarding my professional development needs and selection.</b>		
Agree strongly	13	56.52%
Agree somewhat	6	26.09%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	2	8.70%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
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>		
Memoranda and newsletters	18	78.26%
Faculty meetings	5	21.74%
Q&A documents	2	8.70%
Q&A meetings	7	30.43%
Webcasts or other online meetings	1	4.35%
Training sessions for pilot participants	21	91.30%
Detailed information posted on district website	11	47.83%
Focus groups	2	8.70%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Other	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	

<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 <i>teachers</i> been informed of the district's new evaluation system and ongoing pilot? <sup>d</sup>		
Memoranda and newsletters	10	43.48%
Faculty meetings	8	34.78%
Q&A documents	0	0.00%
Q&A meetings	0	0.00%
Webcasts or other online meetings	1	4.35%
Training sessions for pilot participants	3	13.04%
Detailed information posted on district website	8	34.78%
Focus groups	0	0.00%
All teachers in my district are participating in the pilot	0	0.00%
Uncertain	4	17.39%
Other	3	13.04%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	

<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	18	78.26%
Agree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	3	13.04%
Total	23	100.00%

	Frequency	%
<b>My district has effectively communicated information about the evaluation pilot to nonpilot teachers.</b>		
Agree strongly	2	8.70%
Agree somewhat	7	30.43%
Disagree somewhat	3	13.04%
Disagree strongly	4	17.39%
Uncertain	5	21.74%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	100.00%

<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	14	60.87%
Agree somewhat	5	21.74%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	1	4.35%
Uncertain	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	100.00%

<b>I understand what criteria are included in my district's new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	12	52.17%
Agree somewhat	8	34.78%
Disagree somewhat	1	4.35%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	100.00%

<b>I understand what measures are used by my district's new teacher-evaluation system to measure my performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	9	39.13%
Agree somewhat	11	47.83%
Disagree somewhat	1	4.35%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	100.00%

	Frequency	%
<b>I understand what I need to do to obtain a high rating under the new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	7	30.43%
Agree somewhat	14	60.87%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	0	0.00%
1–2 hours	3	13.04%
3–4 hours	10	43.48%
5–6 hours	2	8.70%
7–8 hours	1	4.35%
More than 8 hours	5	21.74%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	14	60.87%
Slightly greater	4	17.39%
About the same	1	4.35%
Slightly less	0	0.00%
Much less	2	8.70%
Uncertain	0	0.00%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<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	9	39.13%
Agree somewhat	4	17.39%
They are about the same	2	8.70%
Disagree somewhat	1	4.35%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	5	21.74%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system is more objective than the previous teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	8	34.78%
Agree somewhat	5	21.74%
They are about the same	3	13.04%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	3	13.04%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	11	47.83%
Agree somewhat	7	30.43%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	3	13.04%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system identifies specific areas of strength in my performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	13	56.52%
Agree somewhat	6	26.09%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	2	8.70%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides clear steps that I can take to improve areas of weakness.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	17.39%
Agree somewhat	11	47.83%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	4	17.39%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

	Frequency	%
<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system provides a mechanism to make meaningful distinctions among levels of teacher performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	6	26.09%
Agree somewhat	8	34.78%
Disagree somewhat	2	8.70%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	5	21.74%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>My district's new teacher-evaluation system encourages better teaching performance.</b>		
Agree strongly	14	60.87%
Agree somewhat	6	26.09%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</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	12	52.17%
Agree somewhat	6	26.09%
Disagree somewhat	0	0.00%
Disagree strongly	0	0.00%
It is still too early to know	3	13.04%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>I have more productive conversations with colleagues because of my district's new teacher-evaluation system.</b>		
Agree strongly	4	17.39%
Agree somewhat	9	39.13%
Disagree somewhat	6	26.09%
Disagree strongly	2	8.70%
Missing	2	8.70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

<b>What are the strengths of your district's new teacher-evaluation system?</b>
---

- Clear and organized. Incredibly inviting for tech savvy employees. Allows opportunity for ongoing thought and the uploading of proof on how to achieve your goals for the year. I love that we will be able to go into our system and see video or link to information that can help me.
- Criteria in which to set goals
- Good training classes, opportunity to talk with others in the pilot program.
- Great information provided to pilot participants.
- I am hopeful this system will provide a clearer understanding of what the district wants from teachers as well as a clearer methods for teachers in need. There seems to be no support for teachers who need help with relationships, effective teacher methods of teaching and discipline.
- I like that the pilot is a growth model. I hope that it helps me improve weak areas of my practice.
- I really like the specific rubric elements that I can look to for guidance in improving my teaching and becoming more effective.
- I really liked the self-assessment worksheet.
- I think the strength is that it is research based and that teacher's played an important role in designing the system.
- More clarity to expectations and levels of performance
- More specific targets to demonstrate proficiency in.
- New system allows self-reflection; choice of areas for personal improvements. 8 criterion areas, with expectation to choose 3 as areas for personal improvement. The evaluation is not merely an evaluator coming in to observe a lesson; evaluator has met with the teacher, and they have identified specific criterion for school year focus (areas of personal improvement) self-assessment piece is a major, giving the teacher an opportunity to “identify and focus” on personal objectives for improving their teaching. I feel it would be helpful if a copy of the teacher’s self-assessment was made part of the pre/post observation forms. The self-assessment seems vital in this new evaluation process, for the emphasis appears to be changing from merely observing a lesson, to observing how a teacher can personally “improve” by “formulating their professional growth areas, ” and focusing on “chosen” criterion targets.
- The evaluation system focuses on the fundamental aspects of teaching. Teachers are expected to focus on these aspects to improve their ability to teach students a at wide range of academic levels. It also allows for teachers to define clear goals for improving instruction.
- The Marzano information and professional development are very helpful.
- There are times throughout the year to reflect on how we are doing on meeting the criteria on the new teacher-evaluation rubric and how we are coming along on accomplishing the goals we set for ourselves at the beginning of the year.
- They have provided us with workshops of our choice- best practices....they are more involved with the teachers and instruction. I've seen them out of their offices and in classrooms more this year than in the past.

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

- The evaluation document is really big... The skills are broken down so far or so detailed, that it is overwhelming... I get lost in the details!!
- Administrator work load-- particularly in elementary setting with just one administrator. The position entails so much more than evaluating staff, but I can foresee this new system (once it is building-wide rather than just three teachers) will engulf their time.
- At times, the comprehensiveness of the evaluation is overwhelming.
- I believe our evaluation rubric needs more clarity on the difference between the levels such as the difference between distinguished and the next level down.
- I still feel like a lot of it is vague. Even though it is very similar to the old one, I don't feel like my first evaluation was as productive as it has been in previous years. It might be that I am being evaluated this year by a different principal, and so he has a different way of doing things. But, I also teach [*a noncore class*], and I'm not sure that he has ever had the chance to evaluate a class like that before.
- I work at an alternative school with a non-traditional approach to instruction, and I am confused at times how I am supposed to evaluate myself with regard to some of the rubric elements.
- It is not user friendly.
- It is very early and I have not been through the post evaluation conference yet...
- Language is weak at times; hard to know where you fit on the rubric, re: self assessment
- Old evals focused on a lesson and how: the teacher presented the material; it was aligned to state standards; one would “know” if the students learned the lesson or not: -evidence of “what students have learned;” -info/data use; -how a “lesson” aligned/or not with the teacher’s professional goals; - how the lesson aligned with GLEs;-collecting observation data. Suggestion: need new form to reflect: 1-“what criterion are you choosing as your focus? What are your 3 personal goals? 2-what objectives under the 3 criterion headings am I focusing on? 3-what evidence (teaching strategies) demonstrate progress on my personal goals and objectives? 4-as my evaluator observes my teaching, what indicators will be noticeable as proof that I am aligned to my chosen criterion professional goals and objectives? 5-based on my personal self-assessment, how does my lesson focus on personal improvement in my 3 chosen criterion of focus, and my targeted indicators?
- Seems like there are great time demands on evaluators.
- Still subjective and vague in some rubric scales
- Strong technology process will be difficult for some. Teachers outside of the process do not have a strong understanding of what is to come.
- The eval technology is not working as well as we need it to. Information is being lost. Not sure if this is because of a program glitch or that we were not using the software correctly. There are not any instructions.
- There is a lot of information that teachers/administration are responsible for. I feel that it’s potentially overwhelming.
- Very time consuming.

	Frequency	%
<b>What grade levels do you teach?°</b>		
Early childhood	0	0.00%
Elementary (K–5)	10	43.48%
Middle (6–8)	5	21.74%
High school	6	26.09%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	

°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 is your gender?</b>		
Male	4	17.39%
Female	17	73.91%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	100.00%

<b>What is your current teacher certification status?</b>		
Provisional status	0	0.00%
Continuing contract	20	86.96%
Other	1	4.35%
Missing	2	8.70%
Total	23	100.00%

<b>In total, how many years have you worked as a certified teacher?</b>		
Less than 5 years	1	4.35%
5–10 years	8	34.78%
11–20 years	6	26.09%
More than 20 years	5	21.74%
Missing	3	13.04%
Total	23	100.00%

## **Appendix C. Principal Survey Frequencies**

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



**AIR**<sup>®</sup>

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH<sup>®</sup>

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*