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Abstract

Teacher evaluation is an important but often neglected component of the education system. It exists, but it has often been seen and used as a supervisory tool rather than an opportunity for supported teacher development. As such, both teachers and administrators have dismissed teacher evaluation as a meaningless process when it has the potential to be used to improve teacher expertise and practice, and ultimately, student achievement. Following a qualitative case study approach, this study explored teacher perspectives of evaluation at three different school districts in the Northeast. Teacher experiences indicate that there is merit to standards-based and peer evaluation models, particularly when the evaluation tool focuses on providing relevant and practical feedback for improvement. The study also revealed the importance of school culture for the effectiveness and acceptance of teacher evaluation. Finally, the findings suggest that teachers should be involved in the process of developing and implementing an evaluation system to encourage acceptance and use of the model.

Keywords: Teacher evaluation, feedback, collective case study, change theory, job satisfaction
Dedication

To my parents, Joe and Anne,
who have supported me from the beginning
and will inspire me to the end.

To my sons, Sawyer and Camden,
who inspire me with their curiosity
and have been my very best teachers.

And to my husband, Jason,
whose love and support make the impossible
possible.

I love you.
# Table of Contents

Abstract ................................................................................................................................. 2

Dedication ............................................................................................................................... 3

Chapter One .......................................................................................................................... 8

Problem of Practice ............................................................................................................... 8

Summary of Existing Literature ........................................................................................ 9

Statement of Significance .................................................................................................... 10

Positionality Statement ....................................................................................................... 12

Personal Background and Biases ....................................................................................... 12

Relation to Others ................................................................................................................ 14

Research Questions ............................................................................................................ 15

Theoretical Frameworks ...................................................................................................... 16

Hackman and Oldham’s Theory of Job Satisfaction ......................................................... 17

Fullan’s Theory of Educational/Organizational Change .................................................... 18

Conclusion ........................................................................................................................... 19

Chapter Two ........................................................................................................................ 21

History of Teacher Evaluation ........................................................................................... 23

The Purposes of Teacher Evaluation ................................................................................ 24

Models of Teacher Evaluation .......................................................................................... 26

Value-Added Models ........................................................................................................... 26

Standards-Based Models .................................................................................................... 28

Peer Assistance and Review .............................................................................................. 31

Teachers’ Role in Evaluation Design and Implementation ............................................... 35
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Studies on Teacher Perceptions of Evaluation</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Three</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Tradition</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Access</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Storage and Management</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Human Subjects</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Four</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Findings</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case #1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Model</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Analysis of Participants</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case #2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Model</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Analysis of Participants</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter One: Introduction

With the adoption of the Common Core, the emphasis on accountability through No Child Left Behind, and proposals and pilot programs for teacher merit pay in various cities and districts, several states are beginning to reexamine their teacher evaluation systems. Unfortunately, research and personal experience have demonstrated that many educators hold a negative view of teacher evaluation systems, finding them highly subjective, inconsistent, and often punitive (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Holland, 2005; Kauchak, Peterson, & Driscoll, 1985; Merrill & Rodriguez, 2011; Lee, 2012). Without an understanding of what educators find useful in a teacher evaluation system, any new evaluation process will lack teacher buy-in and become merely another “test” to pass.

Problem of Practice

There are concerns about both existing and newly proposed evaluation systems. Educators have balked at new teacher evaluation procedures that use student scores as a measure of teacher effectiveness (Smith, 2012; Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012; Di Carlo, 2012; Goodwin & Miller, 2012; Lee, 2012; Abrams, Pedulla, & Madaus, 2003). Many existing evaluation systems are highly subjective or based on vague criteria unrelated to relevant standards (Soar, Medley, & Coker, 1983; Darling-Hammond et al.). Underlying concerns of both new and old evaluation systems is a sense among educators that they have little input regarding teacher evaluation (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990). Without a say, many educators disengage from the process, viewing teacher evaluation as a tool of supervision rather than an opportunity for supported improvement (Holland, 2005; Johnson, 1997; Mielke & Frontier, 2012; Papay, 2012; Rothberg & Fenner, 1991; Atkins, 1996; Lee, 2012, Denver New Millennium Initiative, 2010).
Minimal formal research has been done in recent years regarding how teachers perceive teacher evaluation systems, including what they view as advantages and disadvantages of various evaluation models (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Johnson, 1997; Heneman & Milanowski, 2003; Lee, 2012; Kauchak, et al., 1985; Merrill & Rodrigues, 2011). A research base does exist on the correlation between teacher quality and student test scores and other measures of student achievement (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1999). It is clear that teachers play an integral role in student achievement, but it is less clear how teachers should be evaluated so that the process is fair and constructive (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012; Holtzap, 2003; Milanowski, 2004; Wright, et al.). Any successful evaluation system should include teacher input to ensure not only that the process is meaningful and fair, but also that it becomes an accepted tool (Mielke & Frontier, 2012; Johnson, 1997; Papay, 2012); thus, this study examined teacher perceptions of effective evaluation systems in several public school districts in the Northeast.

**Summary of Existing Literature**

Teacher evaluation, and thus the relevant existing literature, is varied. Because teacher evaluation dates back several centuries, it has witnessed many changes in format and philosophy (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003; Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). A handful of studies have examined the two primary and divergent philosophies behind evaluation: Evaluation can be seen and used as a tool for supervision and elimination, or its purpose can be to support professional growth (Marzano, 2012; Holland, 2005; Papay, 2012). Over the years, various models have been developed—administrator observation, peer review, standards-based models, and more recently, value-added models; the literature and research on each model suggests that all styles have both merits and inadequacies. More limited literature exists on teacher perceptions of teacher
evaluation, and many of these studies focus on teacher perspectives of a single model (Lee, 2012; Merrill & Rodriguez, 2011; Kauchak, Peterson, & Driscoll, 1985; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990). More research thus needs to be conducted to gain a clearer and broader picture of what evaluation features teachers find useful and ineffective so as to inform the creation of new and valuable evaluation models and tools.

**Statement of Significance**

A study that examines teacher perspectives of teacher evaluation systems has significance for researchers, practitioners, and policy-makers. Beginning in the 1980s, there has been an emphasis on teacher accountability for student achievement, and thus these three decades have seen the expansion of literature on teacher evaluation (Danielson, 2001; Ellett & Teddlie, 2003). With the emphasis on accountability through “criterion-referenced, state-mandated minimum competency testing programs for students” (Ellett & Teddlie, p. 106), most of the research examined the relationship between teacher quality and student achievement rather than examining teacher evaluation systems and teachers’ perceptions of them. This study provided a largely unexplored perspective: advantages and disadvantages of various evaluation systems as experienced by actual teachers.

The information gleaned from this study has practical, applicable implications for both practice and policy. Many teachers and administrators view current evaluation processes as meaningless formalities rather than as an opportunity for improvement and collaboration (Holland, 2005; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Kauchak, et al., 1985; Lee, 2012). With the continued implementation of No Child Left Behind accountability standards and the new adoption of the Common Core State Standards, states and districts are beginning to reassess their teacher evaluation systems. Having teacher perspectives of and input into the evaluation process
can help states and districts develop meaningful evaluation systems that are viewed positively by teachers and administrators alike.

A teacher evaluation system that provides meaningful feedback is an important element in developing teacher expertise; constructive feedback with specific improvement goals can guide teachers in their professional development and lead to concrete results in the classroom (Holland, 2005; Holtzapple, 2003; Taylor & Tyler, 2011). When teachers receive meaningful feedback and support from their evaluators, a level of trust develops that encourages greater collaboration between administrators and teachers; there is a sense that both evaluator and teacher are working toward a common goal: the success of the teacher for the ultimate success of the students (Holland; Papay, 2012; Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002).

As with many organizational changes, having teachers provide input into the development and implementation of an evaluation system promotes their acceptance of and commitment to a system (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Holland, 2005; Mielke & Frontier, 2012; Papay, 2012). Teachers also offer a unique perspective, including elements of teaching and learning that may be overlooked or seen as insignificant by those not in the classroom (Johnson, 1997).

By using a qualitative approach to gain insight into teacher perspectives on various teacher evaluation systems, I obtained a better understanding of the elements that teachers find useful. This, in turn, will help states and districts develop new teacher evaluation systems that are accepted and beneficial tools for continued teacher improvement. Additionally, more meaningful and accepted teacher evaluation systems can have a positive impact on student achievement, school culture, and workplace morale (Holland, 2005; Ellett & Teddlie, 2003).
Positionality Statement

As this study examined teachers’ perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of teacher evaluation systems, it was important to understand my own biases and perceptions as the researcher. Understanding my own attitudes and influences as they relate to myself, my relation to others, and the larger system of education, helped to minimize influences that could damage the reliability and validity of my proposed study (Briscoe, 2005).

Personal background and biases. I have never viewed my own background—whether race, ethnicity, class, or gender—as something to hold me back or allow me to disengage; indeed, my family has encouraged me to use my talents, passions, and privileges to help others. The value that my parents and extended family placed on education and service to others influenced my decision to enter the field of education. I served as a high school social studies teacher for six years before becoming an administrator, and whether in the classroom or the central office, I am motivated to constantly search for ways to improve the school experience, for students, colleagues, community members, and myself.

My positions as both a classroom teacher and administrator have provided me with the opportunity to experience our existing teacher evaluation protocol from both perspectives, thereby allowing me greater insight into the evaluation system—and its benefits and flaws—as a whole. I have personally experienced and thus understand teachers’ frustrations in feeling that the evaluation system is a punitive tool which they have no part in creating. I was observed infrequently during my years as a new teacher, and never had an observation and evaluation after my tenure year. Although I valued the underlying philosophy of evaluation, the tool that we used measured my ability as a teacher by whether I dressed “with professional flair” and kept my room “creatively decorated.” While there may have been value in how I presented myself and
created an inviting classroom environment, the evaluation rubric we used did not allow for constructive feedback on my actual instructional and assessment practices. Thus, like many of my colleagues, I found evaluations to be an ineffective use of my time.

When I became an administrator at the school where I had taught, I experienced new frustrations. Although I made sure to annually observe and evaluate every staff member who was assigned to me, I was limited in their formal evaluations by having to use the official rubric; additionally, although I did weekly walkthroughs, the information I gleaned during these informal observations could not be included in the formal evaluation. Consequently, there were underperforming teachers who would teach a perfect lesson for the formal observation, but if I mentioned concerns that were not directly observed during that one class, the evaluation was grieved by the union and I had to remove any comments that were not specifically observed. It was frustrating to feel like I was wasting my time as an administrator writing an evaluation that was based on a contrived and abnormal classroom experience, especially when I knew otherwise.

Another frustration I experienced as an administrator was my lack of content knowledge in certain subjects. For example, when I observed foreign language teachers, I could assess classroom management and culture, but I could not evaluate the teachers’ mastery of their content. It was difficult for me to provide useful feedback or suggestions on issues specific to content or the application of content.

As both a teacher and an administrator, I was dissatisfied with the evaluation tool and overall process. In both roles, I understood the value of constructive feedback, as well as the value of time. To go through an evaluation process that was both frustrating and ineffective was a waste of time and effort, and ultimately, I do not think it led to benefits or improvements for our students. In informal conversations, my teaching colleagues had several suggestions for how
the evaluation model could be improved, but there was no forum for them to propose actual changes, and upon further investigation, I learned that they had not been allowed to provide input on the existing model, which was developed by two former administrators. Because most teachers viewed the evaluation tool and process as a top-down model, it reinforced their reluctance to accept the evaluation as a credible, professional assessment and an opportunity for growth. I realized, and the leadership literature suggests, that stakeholders need to be involved in the creation and decision process around any initiative or change for it to be successful and sustaining (Burke, 2011; Fullan, 1982, 1993). Without teacher involvement, any changes I made as an administrator would likely be viewed as another “top-down” push and would likely meet with the same resistance. If I desired a valuable and valued evaluation model, I would need to include teachers—the very individuals being evaluated—in the process, and it is from this personal interest and desire for positive change that my study developed. In my research on teachers’ perceptions of teacher evaluation, I provide an opportunity for educator voice and input in order to help in developing a more meaningful and beneficial teacher evaluation system.

**Relation to others.** The participants in the study were teachers and administrator evaluators. Like me, their personal and professional backgrounds likely influenced how they view the system of education, and more specifically, teacher evaluation. Some teacher participants were more progressive in their educational philosophies and open to change; others were more resistant. Regardless of how much their professional attitudes and philosophies align with my own, I remained unbiased in conducting qualitative interviews and interpreting the data.

I was also aware of how teacher participants viewed my role as an administrator. My position as an administrator, to teachers within my current district and teachers in other districts, may have unintentionally created an “othering” effect (Briscoe, 2005) in which participating
teachers found themselves feeling inferior. There was the potential for teachers to feel intimidated by my position of power. Thus, in conducting my interviews, I focused on emphasizing my role as a scholar rather than as an administrator.

Finally, there is a perception that teacher evaluation is a tool used by administrators to penalize teachers (Holland, 2005; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990). Many educators—and administrators—approach evaluation with this preconceived bias (Holland, 2005). This is a more systemic issue or bias that must be addressed within my proposed study and in the larger scope of evaluation reform. The intent of this study was to gather teacher input into the evaluation process for the purpose of developing a system of teacher evaluation that is viewed as a positive tool for professional improvement and teacher-administrator collaboration.

Clearly, I faced many potential influences, both personal and professional, as a researcher. These influences served to motivate me in my research and possible push for reform, but they could also skew the accuracy and thus validity of the study. Identifying and addressing such biases was important in creating and conducting a credible study so that the findings may be used to improve teacher evaluation, whether at the local, state, or national levels.

**Research Questions**

The goal of teacher evaluation should be to provide constructive feedback for the purpose of teacher improvement; however, the structure and process of many existing teacher evaluation systems contribute to a view of teacher evaluation as a punitive administrative tool (Holland, 2005; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Rothberg & Fenner, 1991). As states and districts begin to re-examine evaluation systems in light of new student and teacher accountability standards, soliciting educator input can promote a positive mentality and teacher commitment toward the evaluation process (Mielke & Frontier, 2012; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Danielson, 2001).
This study sought to answer the following question: How do high school teachers at multiple public school districts in New Hampshire perceive existing teacher evaluation systems? The following sub-questions provided focus and direction for the researcher and participants.

- What do teachers view as the primary purpose(s) of teacher evaluation?
- What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do teachers perceive as most effective in achieving this purpose?
- What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do teachers view as unhelpful in achieving this purpose or only punitive in nature?
- What do teachers see as advantages and disadvantages of value-added, standards-based, and peer assistance and review models of teacher evaluation?
- What role, if any, do teachers believe teachers should play in designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems?

Theoretical Frameworks

This study was grounded in two theoretical frameworks: Hackman and Oldham’s theory of job satisfaction (1980) and Fullan’s theory of educational/organizational change (1982). In considering the initial and ultimate objectives of the research study, namely, gaining teacher perspectives of effective teacher evaluation practices and using this teacher input to develop meaningful and effective evaluation models, these two theories aligned with each other and with the study. Hackman and Oldham’s job satisfaction theory explains what factors must be in place for a job or activity—in this case, teacher evaluation—to be rewarding and thus accepted as valid and meaningful. Fullan’s educational/organizational change theory provides a lens through which to view and guide the process of developing a teacher evaluation model that adheres to
Hackman and Oldham’s theory. Thus, these two theories frame both the content and process of the research study.

**Hackman and Oldham’s theory of job satisfaction.** Building on need and motivation theories, Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) theory of job satisfaction posits that there are three primary psychological states that affect employee satisfaction (see Figure 1):

1. Knowledge of results, or performance feedback
2. Experienced responsibility for the work and its outcomes
3. Experienced meaningfulness of the work itself

Hackman and Oldham’s theory has its roots in Herzberg’s theory of satisfaction and motivation, which states that there are five main factors of job satisfaction, or motivators: “achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 73). Hackman and Oldham extend Herzberg’s theory by arguing that the job or activity should be designed to include these motivators. Thus, the focus is “on work and job design, that is, designing jobs and roles for organizational members that enhance these three psychological states and, in doing so, increasing motivation and perhaps performance as well” (Burke, 2011, p. 172).

![Figure 1. Hackman and Oldham's theory of job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 73)](image-url)
Looking more closely at Hackman and Oldham’s three psychological states, it is clear that they are interrelated. First, a person must have knowledge of the results of his or her work; such performance feedback provides a basis for positive motivation in doing well or negative motivation in doing poorly. Secondly, the person must experience responsibility for the results of the work; without this sense of personal accountability, knowing the results of the work means little as “there is no reason to feel personally proud when one does well or sad when one doesn’t” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, p. 72). Finally, the person must experience the work as meaningful. If the work has no meaning, then there is little motivation or satisfaction in doing it and it becomes a trivial performance of “going through the motions” regardless of personal accountability and feedback. It is in the combination of all three psychological states that job satisfaction is at its highest, and from this satisfaction, the potential for superior job performance.

In understanding the basic ideas of Hackman and Oldham’s theory of job satisfaction and Fullan’s theory of educational/organizational change, how then do these frameworks guide the research in answering, “How do teachers perceive teacher evaluation systems?” Applying Hackman and Oldham’s theoretical lens to this study, teachers must view teacher evaluation as meaningful if it is to be accepted and useful. Gaining teachers’ perspectives on effective and ineffective features of teacher evaluation models can help in creating a teacher evaluation system that meets the three psychological needs stated above. The features identified by teachers as valuable align with the psychological states that promote job satisfaction and internal motivation.

**Fullan’s theory of educational/organizational change.** The second theoretical framework is educational/organizational change theory, as developed by Fullan (1982). Fullan outlines four phases of change: initiation, implementation, continuation, and outcome. He argues that all stakeholders, including teachers, are change agents and should participate in each stage of
the change process. This inclusion encourages greater commitment and the potential for meaningful, sustained change: “It is only by individuals taking action to alter their own environments that there is any chance for deep change” (Fullan, 1993, p. 40).

In thinking about and handling the complexity of the change process, Fullan includes several recommendations in his educational change theory. Notable among these is the importance of remembering that “you can’t mandate what matters” (p. 22); essentially, those who create the policies, such as teacher evaluation policies, cannot always expect these policies to be accepted as meaningful and valid, particularly if certain change agents were not included in the change process. You cannot make people change, and any change attempted on that premise is doomed to failure.

In approaching the development of a teacher evaluation model as a change process, teachers must be part of the process in developing evaluation tools and protocols. As evaluations focus on teacher improvement, teachers must thus provide input into what features of evaluations are useful and not. Teacher participation in the change or development process will help to ensure the creation of a meaningful and accepted evaluation model that actually facilitates teacher improvement.

Conclusion

Teacher evaluation is an important but often neglected component of the education system. It exists, but it has long been seen and used as a supervisory tool rather than an opportunity for supported teacher development. As such, both teachers and administrators have dismissed teacher evaluation as a meaningless process when it has the potential to be used to improve teacher expertise, and ultimately, student achievement.
With the continued emphasis on stricter educator accountability tied more directly to student growth and the rise of the Common Core standards, we have the opportunity to revisit teacher evaluation and develop new systems that are both effective and accepted. Promoting teacher input is an essential step in this process. Ideally, the result is the use of teacher evaluation systems that promote the professionalism of teaching, develop teacher effectiveness, and improve the system of education for teachers, administrators, and students.
Chapter Two: A Review of the Literature

In her first two years as a teacher at a small rural high school in New England, Ms. Gilles received two formal observations and evaluations. Per school policy, each evaluation included a pre-conference to discuss the intended lesson and a post-conference and review the final evaluation summary. The evaluation form included various but vague descriptors, such as “organized classroom appearance” and “good questioning skills,” as well as levels of performance for each category ranging from “Does not meet” to “Exceeds expectations.” On each of her two evaluations, Ms. Gilles received a score in either the “Meets expectations” or “Exceeds expectations” levels for each indicator. Aside from these checked boxes, the evaluations included a summary of her lesson and a list of commendations. Despite being new to both the building and the profession, Ms. Gilles received no constructive feedback. Indeed, during her third—and tenure—year and in the three years following, Ms. Gilles never received another evaluation. Her supervisor told her, “I’m really not worried about you” when she inquired about an observation. Thus, in her six years in the classroom, Ms. Gilles had two total evaluations, each with limited and unconstructive feedback for improvement.

Unfortunately, many teachers could share similar stories. Although the past two decades have seen a renewed emphasis on student and teacher accountability, this has not always translated into meaningful or effective models to assess and develop teacher expertise.

In the wake of No Child Left Behind’s emphasis on accountability standards and the rise of pay-for-performance proposals in many states and districts (Adams, Heywood, & Rothstein, 2009), it is imperative that teacher evaluation systems be viewed as fair and reliable measures of teacher effectiveness. There are several teacher evaluation models in use today. Primary among these are standards-based competency systems, value-added approaches, and peer assistance and
review models. There is research to both support and oppose claims that each evaluation system is beneficial. Similar to the idea that there is no “one right way” to teach, there is no “one right way” to measure exemplary teaching (Gabriel & Allington, 2012). A district must adopt a model and adapt it to fit the local context, making changes as needed before and throughout the design and implementation process to ensure evaluation accuracy and acceptance (Papay, 2012).

Regardless of what evaluation system a district utilizes, one thing is certain: Teacher acceptance of any evaluation model, particularly a high-stakes model linked to employment status or monetary compensation, is critical (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Johnson, 1997; Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002). “If the evaluation process does not have credibility, if teachers don’t value what they learn from it, or if they perceive it as unfair, it will fail” (Simon, 2012, p. 61). The focus of this study was on gathering teachers’ perspectives of the effective and ineffective features of various evaluation models so as to provide direction in evaluation design and implementation.

Having served as both a teacher and administrator, I have personally experienced the frustration of following a teacher evaluation system that provides little substantive feedback and vague standards of performance. Colleagues have shared similar concerns regarding both the design and process of the evaluation tool. Their position in the classroom—at the heart of teaching and learning—and their experience with existing teacher evaluation models makes teachers an important resource in developing and revising new evaluation systems. There is considerable literature regarding the benefits and drawbacks of various evaluation models, but relatively limited research on how teachers themselves perceive evaluation as a whole and as specific models. Such research will be beneficial as states and districts continue to develop and implement new evaluation tools and processes; teacher acceptance is essential for any evaluation
system’s last success, and ultimately, effective evaluation systems lead to better teachers, which in turn promote greater student achievement. Thus, this study sought to answer the question: How do high school teachers at multiple public school districts in New Hampshire perceive existing teacher evaluation systems?

Before we can attempt to answer that question, a better understanding of teacher evaluation is needed. Thus, this chapter will begin with a brief review of the history of teacher evaluation, highlighting the changing focus from the first evaluation systems to the present. It will then examine the varying purposes of evaluation and the implications for evaluation tools, followed by a review of three current evaluation models: value-added approaches, standards-based models, and peer assistance and review systems. The chapter will conclude with a review of existing studies on teacher perceptions of evaluation, as well as what the literature says about the significance of teacher involvement in the design and implementation processes.

**History of Teacher Evaluation**

Teacher evaluation is not a new phenomenon; indeed, it dates back to the 1700s, when supervision was highly informal and varied (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). The focus of and emphasis on evaluation, however, has changed throughout the years. Most of the earliest documented and formal teacher evaluations in America date back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. With the influx of immigrants, the Common School movement in education emphasized uniformity and the development of good American citizens (Mondale & Patton, 2001). Teacher evaluations reflected these values. During this period, teachers were evaluated more on personal characteristics than on student achievement or teaching practices (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003; Marzano et al.). A “good” teacher was a moral and ethical individual who followed the rules of society and thus served as a positive role model. Additionally, good
teachers had to possess basic reading skills, although their ability to teach such skills to students was not always measured in their evaluation (Ellett & Teddlie).

With the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 came a “renewed call for educational reforms” (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003, p. 105; Danielson, 2001). The emphasis was on accountability through high standards and testing for students. In holding students accountable, accountability for teachers—and thus teacher evaluation—came under the magnifying lens. New research studies on teacher effects and effectiveness contributed to a growing knowledge base on teacher quality (Ellett & Teddlie). The passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 reiterated the importance of having high-quality teachers to ensure student learning and achievement. The emphasis on outcomes has thus given rise to new teacher evaluation systems that seek to directly connect evaluation to teaching and learning.

**The Purposes of Teacher Evaluation**

The two primary purposes of teacher evaluation are to *measure* teacher competence and to *develop* teacher expertise (Marzano, 2012; Danielson, 2001; Papay, 2012). Traditionally, teacher evaluation has been used as a measurement tool of supervision and selection, which has contributed to the negative mindset of evaluations’ being something “done to” teachers by administrators (Holland, 2005). When evaluations are considered tools for “supervision” and are attached to high-stakes outcomes such as dismissal or compensation, teacher view evaluation as punitive judgments rather than opportunities for supported professional growth (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Mielke & Frontier, 2012).

Despite the negative connotation often associated with such summative evaluation purposes, evaluations used for measurement do have value. Such evaluation tools ideally improve teacher instruction—and thereby student learning and achievement—by “providing
incentives for teachers to work hard and by removing the least effective teachers from the
district” (Papay, 2012, p. 128). Indeed, in an unofficial survey of over 3,000 educators, Marzano
(2012) found that teachers believe that evaluations should be used to measure teacher
competence; however, the survey results also indicated that evaluations should also be used for
teacher development, and that this second purpose was the more important objective.

Teacher evaluation tools that stress and support professional growth encourage
widespread change among all teachers, not just those identified as ineffective (Papay, 2012). This, in turn, has larger implications for improved student achievement. Mielke and Frontier
(2012) argue that teachers should be constantly striving to improve their practice and develop
expertise; “needs improvement” should not be a label to avoid. Teacher evaluation systems
should reflect this formative purpose by providing ongoing feedback from multiple sources and
including teachers in the learning and improvement process. In a recent survey titled The Widget
Effect (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009), 73% of 15,000 teachers across 12
districts and four states said their most recent evaluation did not identify any areas for
improvement; of those who were given suggested areas of development, over half reported
receiving no support to actually improve in those areas. While not all teachers would agree that
constant individual improvement is necessary, several studies have shown that teachers tend to
prefer and accept as valid teacher evaluation models that focus on identifying and supporting

In re-examining teacher evaluation systems, districts must determine what the purpose of
evaluation will be. Knowing the purpose—teacher measurement or development, or both—will help the district in designing an appropriate evaluation model. Three primary evaluation models
being implemented are value-added models, standards-based systems, and peer assistance and
review programs. Each model has advantages and limitations, both as measurement tools and as professional growth tools.

**Models of Teacher Evaluation**

**Value-added models.** Value-added models are essentially student growth models. Value-added evaluation tools assess measure student test score gains from one year to the next to show direct evidence of teacher effects on learning (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012). New technologies and opportunities for long-range data collection and analysis have encouraged many districts to develop and implement value-added models (Papay, 2012). By tracking student scores on standardized state or district tests and statistically controlling for other classroom factors, value-added measures provide districts and each teacher with data on individual teacher effectiveness.

Supporters of value-added evaluation models promote this approach as providing an objective view of teacher effectiveness, unbiased by evaluator opinion or interpretation (Papay, 2012; Di Carlo, 2012). Additionally, in an era of test-based accountability, a value-added approach “explicitly focuses on educational outputs rather than inputs” (Papay, p. 126) and connects teacher evaluation to student achievement as measured by test scores. If the goal of teacher evaluation is to assess a teacher’s effectiveness in the classroom—ultimately, facilitating student progress toward national, state, or district standards—then value-added models provide an easy and inexpensive measurement tool.

Despite the desire to directly equate student achievement—or lack thereof—with individual teacher quality or effectiveness, research has shown that there are many areas of concern in following a value-added model. Such models may not or often cannot control for non-teacher factors, such as a student’s home environment, prior knowledge, or level of
motivation (Goodwin & Miller, 2012; Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). Any educator understands that there are many factors that affect student learning, including other school-related contributors and contexts. Research by Sanders and Horn (1998) showed “little evidence that subsequent effective teachers can offset the effects of ineffective ones” (p. 247). Thus, a teacher’s value-added performance rating may suffer from this “halo or pitchfork effect” of students’ previous teachers (Goodwin & Miller, p. 81).

Researchers have also demonstrated flaws associated with the rating variability across different years, tests, statistical methods, and student populations (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, & Ravitch, 2010; Di Carlo, 2012; Papay, 2012; Soar, Medley, & Coker, 1983). In a study conducted in Chicago high schools utilizing value-added models, researchers tracked teacher scores over two years and found considerable variability: 16% of top-performing teachers in the first year scored in the bottom two quartiles the following year, and 8% of teachers with the lowest value-added performance scores jumped to the top between the first and second year (Aaronson, Barrow, & Sander, 2003). Similarly, using different tests affected teachers’ scores. Papay (2011) found that 30% of the teachers who were rated as below average using one student achievement test scored in the top 25% using a different assessment. Such substantial year-to-year or test-to-test variation challenges the reliability of value-added measures.

Despite these flaws, it is unlikely that value-added models will be completely abandoned. Researchers have identified steps that district leaders and policymakers can take to improve the reliability and validity of value-added measures. Collecting multiple years of data can address concerns of year-to-year variability (Di Carlo, 2012; Papay, 2012). Value-added evaluation tools can also be used in conjunction with other measurement components, such as classroom
observation, and fair weights should be assigned to each component so that potential inaccuracies or variations do not overly misrepresent a teacher’s level of performance or effectiveness (Di Carlo).

Because of their emphasis on student achievement through focusing on student test scores, value-added models tend to be used for summative evaluation purposes. Value-added scores show that a teacher has or has not been effective in facilitating student learning, but these ratings do not specify areas where teachers can improve. Teachers must analyze the data to determine areas of weakness, and most teachers are unwilling or unable to conduct such data analysis (Papay, 2012). Thus, for districts looking to implement a teacher evaluation system focused on promoting and supporting professional growth, many researchers recommend developing a standards-based model (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Heneman & Milanowski, 2003; Marzano, 2012; Papay; Gallagher, 2004).

**Standards-based models.** Standards-based evaluation systems, such as those developed by Danielson (2007) and Marzano (2007), are based on a comprehensive and clear set of professional and instructional standards or competencies. For each standard, there are clearly defined levels of performance within a detailed rubric; through classroom observations and other evaluation tools such as professional portfolios and self-reflections, teachers gain an understanding of how they are performing and what they can do to improve (Danielson, 2007; Danielson, 2012; Marzano; Papay, 2012; Milanowski & Heneman, 2001).

Standards-based models provide teachers and administrators with clear and research-based indicators of effective instructional practices; thus, even if used as a summative evaluation for purposes of pay or dismissal, standards-based evaluations give teachers an opportunity and target for improvement (Marzano, 2012; Papay, 2012). Key to this opportunity for professional
growth is the inclusion of constructive feedback, which research shows can and does lead to teacher improvement (Taylor & Tyler, 2011). In a 2009 survey of teachers in 23 countries, 79% of teachers agreed that feedback helped develop their skills as a teacher (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009). In a multi-year study of a standards-based system implemented in the Cincinnati Public Schools, Heneman & Milanowski (2001; 2003) found that teachers consistently highlighted the importance of substantive feedback in assessing the advantages of the new system. Unfortunately, providing timely and constructive feedback was challenging for many time-strapped administrators, so subsequent modifications to the model included peer evaluators and deadlines for follow-up feedback conferences.

Other challenges districts have faced in implementing a comprehensive standards-based model include the increased workload for evaluators and teachers. Research suggests basing evaluations on multiple sources of data in order to provide a fuller and more accurate assessment of a teacher’s effectiveness (Holland, 2005; Milanowski & Heneman, 2001; Gallagher, 2004; Papay, 2012). This translates into multiple observations (six per year for each evaluated teacher in Cincinnati Public Schools) and professional portfolios in which teachers assemble lesson plans, students achievement scores, and other pieces of evidence that demonstrate competency in the performance standards. Administrators and teachers have expressed concern about the additional time and energy required to complete these tasks effectively (Heneman & Milanowski, 2003).

Another concern is the need for trained observers. Whether evaluators are administrators or peers, it is important that they are trained so that observations and resulting evaluations are objective and tied to evidence of the standards (Danielson, 2012; Milanowski & Heneman, 2001). In some districts, evaluator training encompasses not only a review of what the standards
are and how to measure these standards using evidence, but also “calibration sessions” to help validate the objectivity of an evaluator (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Heneman & Milanowski, 2003; Danielson). Taking these steps helps to ensure that standards-based evaluations are unbiased and reliable assessments of teacher competence.

Recent studies have further supported the validity of standards-based evaluation models by connecting teacher evaluation ratings to student achievement scores. Both Milanowski (2004) and Holtzapple (2003) concluded that students who scored low in the Teaching for Learning Domain of a standards-based evaluation modeled on Danielson’s Framework performed lower than predicted, while students whose teachers scored high performed higher than predicted. These studies validated the standards-based evaluation system by showing connections to student achievement; such validity supports the use of a rigorous standards-based evaluation tool for high-stakes decisions such as pay-for-performance and teacher dismissal, as well as promoting teacher acceptance of the evaluation as a credible tool. Additionally, this research prompted districts such as those in Cincinnati to organize professional development activities for their teachers that aligned with the evaluation standards (Holtzapple). In this way, standards-based evaluation becomes a vehicle for professional growth. Connecting standards-based evaluation to teachers’ professional development and school improvement goals further encourages teachers to “understand their work within the larger contexts of which it is a part…and supports a school culture of continuous organizational learning” (Holland, 2005, p. 73). Individual and school-wide improvement in turn contributes to improvements in student learning and overall achievement.

For districts looking to use teacher evaluation as a tool to develop teacher expertise, a standards-based model offers clear targets of teacher competence and the opportunity for growth.
While challenges of design and implementation remain, the research suggests that a standards-based model can be a credible tool for both formative and summative evaluation purposes (Papay, 2012; Marzano, 2012).

**Peer assistance and review.** The earliest peer assistance and review (PAR) program was the “Toledo Plan,” developed in 1981 (Goldstein, 2007). Under the Toledo Plan, consulting teachers left the classroom for three years to mentor new teachers and struggling veteran teachers. Review and assistance went on throughout the academic year, at the close of which each consulting teacher drafted a final report and presented their conclusions to the school’s PAR Panel, comprised of teachers, a union representative, and administrators. The Toledo model has served as the basis for most existing PAR programs (Heneman & Milanowski, 2003) and continues to gain teacher acceptance in comparison to the traditional administrator-evaluator model (Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990).

Peer assistance and review models offer several benefits. Unlike a more top-down evaluation approach, PAR encourages the “professionalization of teaching” as teachers take collective responsibility for creating and maintaining professional standards and engage in collaborative improvement for individuals and the education profession as a whole (Goldstein, 2007). Because teachers are taking control of their own and their colleagues’ evaluation and improvement, it reduces demands on administrators’ time. Rather than participating in a single, often hurried evaluation, teachers get more consistent and thorough feedback based on ongoing observations (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Goldstein). Administrators still take part in sitting on the PAR Panel and conduct evaluations as necessary, but they no longer must devote significant amounts of time to the observation and evaluation process. Indeed, many can take on the role of instructional leader rather than supervisor.
Any truly comprehensive evaluation model cannot ignore a teacher’s grasp of content knowledge. Unlike a principal evaluator, who may or may not have content-area expertise, peer evaluators can be and often are matched to teachers in the same or similar subject areas. Sharing a content knowledge base makes these peer evaluators’ feedback more valid and meaningful because evaluators understand the content and can fairly comment on the teacher’s understanding of the content (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012).

PAR models also help in establishing constructive relationships built on greater trust between the evaluated teacher and the peer evaluator. With increased trust, there is a better opportunity for accepted and sustained teacher improvement, and thus, a greater potential for change that positively affects students. In a study of seven districts’ PAR programs, Johnson and Fiarman (2012) concluded that teachers trusted consulting teachers more than administrator evaluators because they viewed them as peers rather than supervisors; the relationship could be truly mentoring because it was not based on a “power over” mentality. The ongoing collaboration further encouraged a healthy relationship in which teachers felt themselves an active part in the evaluation and improvement process (Goldstein, 2007).

Studies have also shown that PAR has a positive impact on teacher retention, particularly of new teachers (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002). The mentoring relationship inherent in PAR promotes a supportive working environment, especially important for teachers new to the profession or district. PAR’s emphasis on collaboration contributes to a sense of community and belonging, which further helps in retaining new teachers. Conversely, PAR also facilitates the removal of incompetent teachers (Johnson & Fiarman; Goldstein, 2007). The structure of ongoing observations and feedback, as well as supported improvement goals and plans, allows for ample opportunity for teacher development; if a teacher continues to fail to
meet professional standards, due process has been followed and schools can be confident in their decision to non-renew (Goldstein). Because of the thorough process, schools that have chosen to dismiss teachers after following PAR protocols have faced no legal challenges, and thus, no costly legal fees or drawn-out cases (Johnson & Fiarman).

Finally, a peer assistance and review model promotes the teacher evaluation process as having a formative purpose. Although PAR is also used for summative purposes of teacher renewal or dismissal, the year-long mentoring component allows for ongoing and supported improvement. The importance of a formative evaluation model was validated in Peterson and Comeaux’s study (1990) of teacher preferences of four evaluation systems, including a peer review model. Teachers reported that the ideal purpose of evaluation should be in promoting professional development and encouraging reflection; a PAR model, unlike many traditional models, does just that, and teachers expressed their preference for a PAR-style approach.

Despite peer assistance and review’s many benefits, there are legitimate issues of concern. Most notable among these is the quality of consulting teachers or peer evaluators. Heneman and Milowski’s (2001; 2003) multi-year study of the new teacher evaluation system in Cincinnati highlighted a sincere concern among teachers about the credibility of peer evaluators. If consulting teachers are not carefully selected and thoroughly trained, they may not provide objective and reliable evaluations, thereby diminishing the validity and acceptance of a PAR system. Johnson and Fiarman (2012) suggest establishing a rigorous selection process and providing extensive training in not only the teaching standards (what the standards mean and how to objectively assess teachers on those standards) but also in how to provide teachers with constructive feedback and professional support toward identified improvement goals. Studies of successful PAR programs further highlight the need for consulting teachers to undergo
“calibration training” and potential certification workshops to ensure consistent and objective assessments of teacher practices based on evidence of the standards (Johnson & Fiarman; Heneman & Milanowski; Goldstein, 2007).

Funding presents another challenge for districts looking to implement or sustain a PAR program. Consulting teachers continue to be paid a salary for their PAR work, but districts must also pay for long-term substitute teachers who will replace consulting teachers during their mentorship (Goldstein, 2007; Johnson & Fiarman, 2012). Johnson and Fiarman argue that the financial costs of replacing consulting teachers may possibly be offset by the savings accrued through retention of new teachers; if fewer teachers leave the district, less money must go toward rehiring and retraining costs. Additionally, because the PAR process ensures due process, dismissal cases do not bring with them pricy lawsuits, estimated at about $100,000 per dismissed teacher in non-PAR districts (Johnson & Fiarman).

Finally, peer assistance and review represents a shift from the way evaluations have always been done—namely, by principals or other administrators (Goldstein, 2007). Teachers and unions who oppose PAR express concerns about peers or supposed equals acting in any supervisory capacity; administrators have reservations about giving up control over a realm they have long governed (Goldstein). PAR has the potential to improve teacher quality and teacher professionalism in a meaningful way, but, as with any new initiative or system, it must overcome the concerns of the “unfamiliar.”

Where teachers have been involved in the design and implementation, and when existing concerns such as evaluator training have been addressed, peer assistance and review has a high rate of teacher acceptance. 85% of Salt Lake City teachers and 77% of Florida teachers in PAR districts accept PAR as a valid and meaningful evaluation system, and more districts are
considering PAR in light of recent calls for teacher evaluation reform (Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002).

**Teachers’ Role in Evaluation Design and Implementation**

Although there has been extensive research detailing the various evaluation models and the benefits and limitations of each approach, there is relatively little literature on how teachers perceive these systems, both in their design and implementation. There is agreement among researchers (Danielson, 2001; Holland, 2005) that teacher evaluation has long carried negative connotations: a “dog-and-pony show” or “hoop to jump through.” These nicknames highlight the fact that teachers see evaluations as largely meaningless, instances of unfair or inaccurate measurement rather than opportunities for supported professional improvement.

Some of the literature does stress the need for teacher involvement in the design and implementation of teacher evaluation systems; it is widely recognized that collaboration between teachers and administrators encourages greater acceptance of and commitment to an evaluation tool and process (Papay, 2012; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Mielke & Frontier, 2012; Simon, 2012). Indeed, a teacher evaluation system centers on the teacher, whether in measuring or developing their expertise and effectiveness. Teacher input is therefore important in developing a system they find reliable and valuable, and teachers provide a perspective of teaching that others outside of the daily classroom experience may overlook as insignificant.

Johnson (1997) examined perceptions of effective teaching among teachers, principals, and school board members; he found competing views among various stakeholder groups. The greatest within-role consensus and focus on the teaching process occurred at the teacher level, with weak consensus and more emphasis on teacher personality and teaching outcomes at the principal and school board levels. Johnson concluded that teachers and those closest to the core
of teaching must be involved in developing teacher evaluation systems for evaluations to be seen as meaningful and accurate reflections of effective teaching.

Including teacher input also has implications for motivation. “Actively involving and empowering [teachers] as leaders” in developing and using teacher evaluation systems motivated them to adhere to a model and improve for no incentive aside from professional growth (Mielke & Frontier, 2012, p. 11). This has the potential to have a positive influence beyond the acceptance and use of the evaluation model. Motivation research shows that “when workers—teachers included—sense they’re making steady, measurable progress, their workplace satisfaction soars and their performance greatly improves” (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012, p. 30; Amabile & Kramer, 2011). This is the ultimate goal of teacher evaluation: effective teachers contributing to student learning and achievement.

Existing Studies on Teacher Perceptions of Evaluation

A handful of studies have been conducted to learn teacher perspectives of evaluation, including what teachers view as the overall purpose of evaluation, as well as their thoughts on the merits and drawbacks of various models. Of those studies that surveyed teachers on their views of the purpose of evaluation, almost all concluded that evaluation should be a tool for professional growth, rather than a supervisory tool used to make decisions regarding dismissals, promotions, and merit pay (Rothberg & Fenner, 1991; Merrill & Rodriguez, 2011; Denver New Millennium Initiative, 2010; Atkins, 1996; Lee, 2012). In only one study did teachers want an evaluation instrument that “includes consequences to address ineffective performance, and rewards exemplary teachers” (Byrd & Rasberry, 2011, p. 11).

Many studies focused on teacher perceptions of administrator evaluation, which has been a prevalent method for decades. Kauchak, Peterson, and Driscoll (1985) interviewed 60 teachers
of varying backgrounds and surveyed an additional 168 teachers, soliciting their views on the validity and usefulness of principal visits. The majority of teachers viewed administrator observations as “being perfunctory with little or no impact on actual teaching practice” (p. 33). They cited the infrequent and short nature of administrative visits, as well as administrators’ lack of content knowledge and follow-through, as primary reasons for the ineffectiveness of this evaluation method.

Such sentiments were echoed in studies by Merrill and Rodriguez (2011) and Lee (2012). Merrill and Rodriguez interviewed 15 award-winning teachers from New Mexico; their findings highlighted principals as being unqualified due to a lack of content knowledge, especially at the secondary level, as well as being unable to find enough time to devote to multiple, thorough observations and adequate follow-up sessions for feedback and guided growth. Lee (2012), who conducted extensive surveys, interviews, and focus groups, also found that teachers do not value administrators as ideal evaluators. Because teachers felt that evaluations should be opportunities for growth, the lack of administrative follow-through and non-constructive feedback lent administrator evaluation a “notion of inauthenticity” (p. 215). Other teachers expressed concerns over favoritism and bias, further tarnishing the administrative evaluation method.

Given the concern regarding an evaluator’s lack of content knowledge, a few studies have examined teacher perceptions of peer evaluation. Of the 302 teachers they surveyed, Lombard and Bunting (1989) found that 60% supported peer review, viewing it as a model that emphasizes practitioner involvement and regards teachers as valued professionals. The 21 public school teachers of the Denver New Millennium Initiative, sponsored by the Center for Teaching Quality, published a 2010 paper on teacher perspectives of various evaluation instruments and models. In general, the teachers interviewed supported peer evaluation, but under the conditions
that peer evaluators be trained in effective evaluation practices and undergo regular auditing to maintain evaluation consistency. Kauchak et al. (1985) discovered greater reservations among teachers regarding peer evaluation. Teachers expressed concerns about the strain that peer review might place on professional or collegial relationships, as well as an overall hesitancy to accept the responsibility of observing others. Among existing studies, peer evaluation has met with the most mixed reviews.

More recent studies have explored the use of value-added methods in teacher evaluation; consistently, teachers hold a negative view of using student achievement tests or other value-added models to assess teacher effectiveness. Lee (2012) found in her research that teachers often did not agree with their value-added score, even those who were rated “highly effective.” Their lack of trust in the validity of their scores translated to an overall lack of faith in a value-added evaluation system. Additionally, teachers recognize that there are numerous factors beyond a single teacher that can influence a student’s score on a test, and a single test does not capture the full range of abilities or knowledge that a student possesses, and thus cannot accurately portray a teacher’s impact or effectiveness.

The teachers of the Denver New Millennium Initiative (2010) likewise found that the typical value-added model misidentified over 25% of teachers as effective or ineffective, thereby making the tool an unreliable method for teacher evaluation, especially in schools or districts where evaluation is tied to bonus pay, promotions, and dismissal. In a study of teachers from 28 states, Abrams, Pedulla, and Madaus (2003) found that teachers are overwhelmingly opposed to using test scores for teacher accountability: 82% of teachers from high-stakes states and 90% of teachers from low-stakes states disagreed with a value-added model. Rather than a tool for
professional growth, they viewed value-added models as destructive to teacher morale and ineffective in inspiring teacher improvement.

Beyond their perspectives of specific evaluation tools or models, teachers in the majority of studies agreed on the need for multiple methods of evaluation. From their focus group sessions with 65 National Board Certified Teachers in North Carolina, Byrd and Rasberry (2011) concluded that teachers desired evaluations that encompassed diverse perspectives of teacher effectiveness, including both local and state measures of student growth, teacher portfolios that allow for self-reflection and individual goal-setting, and observations by and follow-up feedback from multiple reviewers. Atkins (1996), Lee (2012), and the Denver New Millennium Initiative (2010) echoed these findings in their studies, citing an array of evidence that should be used in teacher evaluation, from ongoing observations by peers, administrators, and outside observers, to professional portfolios and self-evaluations. Perhaps, however, Merrill and Rodriguez (2011) capture teacher sentiment best: “Just as effective teachers rely on multiple measures of student learning, so should multiple measures be used to evaluate effective teaching” (p. 10).

Conclusion

There is research-based evidence supporting and opposing value-added, standards-based, and peer review models of teacher evaluation (Papay, 2012; Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Heneman & Milanowski, 2003). Although in the current era of quantifiable accountability measures, many states and districts are examining value-added evaluation models based on student test scores, researchers warn of the risks of reducing the complex art of good teaching to mere numbers (Goodwin & Miller, 2012; Darling-Hammond et al.; Di Carlo, 2012). Much of the literature suggests the greater effectiveness of standards-based evaluation systems (Darling-Hammond et al.; Danielson, 2007; Heneman & Milanowski;
Holtzapple, 2003; Gallagher, 2004), but only a few studies have been conducted on teacher perspectives of such effectiveness. A standards-based model may be deemed effective based on how accurately it assesses teacher skill, but if teachers do not accept the purpose of the evaluation system or gain meaningful feedback, they will likely reject it.

As more districts begin to explore new models of teacher evaluation, there is an opportunity to add to the limited literature on teacher perspectives of evaluation, including their perceptions of the purposes of evaluation, the perceived and experienced benefits and drawbacks of various models, and the design and implementation process. Thus, the intent of this study was to gather teacher insight into teacher evaluation to extend the knowledge base on the subject and to inform evaluation reform at my school and others. Bringing this important stakeholder group into the discussion can help shift the mindset from teacher evaluation as punitive and superficial to being meaningful and valid, thus facilitating the acceptance and success of the evaluation system.
Chapter Three: Methodology

This study sought to answer the following question: How do high school teachers at multiple public school districts in New Hampshire perceive existing teacher evaluation systems? Creswell (2013) maintains that qualitative research is appropriate when researchers want to “empower individuals to share their stories, hear their voices, and minimize the power relationships that often exist between a researcher and the participants” (p. 48). As the purpose of this study was to gain teachers’ personal/professional perspectives of evaluation tools and models, including the positive and negative features of existing evaluation systems, a qualitative research model best aligned with the study focus.

I worked within the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, as described by Ponterotto (2005): “Reality is constructed in the mind of the individual, rather than it being an externally singular entity” (p. 129). The research objective was to understand how the research participants—teachers—interpreted the purpose and process of teacher evaluation; in essence, I explored how they construct and interpret the reality of teacher evaluation. I expected teachers to hold varying views of teacher evaluation models; true to the constructivist paradigm, I was not looking to prove or disprove a single theory but rather to gather and analyze multiple truths or realities.

In line with the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, the role of the researcher was as a co-creator, uncovering teachers’ perspectives—or realities—through interactive dialogue and reflection. Just as the participants’ backgrounds shapes their interpretation of reality, so too does my background as a teacher and administrator shape my perspective of teacher evaluation. Thus, while taking an active role in discovering teacher participants’ perspectives, I “bracketed” (Ponterotto, 2005, p.131) or “positioned [myself] in the research to acknowledge how [my]
interpretation flows from [my] own personal, cultural, and historical experiences” (Creswell, 2013, p. 25).

**Research Tradition**

As defined by Merriam (1988), a qualitative case study is “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit” (p. 21). The deep focus of a case study approach provided the structure needed for me to examine and understand teacher evaluation in its real-life context (Yin, 1981, 2009). This becomes especially important in the study of teacher evaluation because a teachers’ perception of evaluation is tied to their specific experience with certain models; their firsthand knowledge provided me with concrete details that were helpful in understanding what teachers viewed as beneficial in teacher evaluation. Additionally, a case study helped to “explain the complexities of real-life situations which may not be captured through experimental or survey research” (Zainal, 2007, p. 4), thereby allowing me to arrive at a fuller and more distinct understanding of the phenomenon of teacher evaluation.

For this study, I used a collective approach, examining varying models of teacher evaluation, or cases, thereby allowing me to gather and analyze different perspectives of the issue of teacher evaluation. I selected three different research locations within the state of New Hampshire for this collective case study. Collective case studies present an issue through multiple cases (Stake, 1995; Creswell, 2013). Through the use of multiple cases, collective case studies, as Zainal (2007) suggests, “may allow for the generalization of findings to a bigger population” (p. 4).

Because teacher evaluation models can differ significantly in procedure, content, frequency, and even purpose, it was important for me to examine several different cases to
determine commonalities across varying experiences and models. The intense focus of a case study is essential to understanding how teachers perceive something as complex as an evaluation model, but my objective was in understanding the phenomenon of teacher perceptions of evaluation as a whole, not simply a single model. Thus, a collective case study in which I examined and analyzed different cases was most appropriate. More specifically, this was a descriptive collective case study. A descriptive case study presents a detailed account, often in narrative form, of the phenomenon being studied (Yin, 2009). Unlike the general exploration common to an exploratory case study or the focus on causality inherent in an explanatory case study, a descriptive case study fully illuminates the intricacies of an experience (Yin, 2009; Stake, 1995).

Descriptive cases require a descriptive theory to be developed at the outset of the study; this descriptive theory articulates existing knowledge of the phenomenon and helps to specify the depth and scope—or boundaries—of the case (Tellis, 1997). Such cases are often used to answer questions based on theoretical constructs (Yin, 2009); the descriptions of the purposes and procedures of teacher evaluation developed throughout my research process helped to define the theoretical constructs under which teachers and districts operate. Additionally, the detailed qualitative accounts common to descriptive case studies helped to illuminate the complexities of teacher evaluation with the hope that such knowledge can be used to develop more effective and accepted models (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009).

**Participants**

I selected three schools in different districts for this research study. Because I serve in an administrative role in my current position, I selected districts—and thus participants—in communities where I neither work nor live. To select possible research sites, I reviewed the
teacher evaluation models used at all New Hampshire public high schools in order to identify districts that represent a variety of evaluation protocols. I targeted districts that follow a traditional model, as well as districts that include more progressive or controversial procedures, such as peer evaluation and the incorporation of student assessment data. From these categories, I then attempted to select schools of different sizes, including a small school (0-500 students), a mid-sized school (500-1000 students), and a large school (1000 or more students). From these criteria, I selected the following three research sites. Although the student population numbers and evaluation models differed, all three schools were high-achieving schools and had free and reduced percentages below the state average.

The first research site was a rural high school in central New Hampshire. The school serves approximately 540 students in grades 9 through 12, with a teaching staff of 45. The evaluation model in this district is traditional: all teachers are evaluated annually with a single announced observation (new teachers are evaluated two to three times a year), following a rubric loosely based on the Danielson framework (Danielson, 2007). There is no self- or peer-assessment component, nor are student local or standardized test results included in the teacher’s evaluation.

The second research site was a rural high school in western New Hampshire. The district includes a single middle high school serving 240 students in grades 6 through 12; approximately 145 of these students are in grades 9 through 12. The school has 16 faculty members, nine of whom exclusively teach at the high school levels. The district’s evaluation model uses a variation of the Kim Marshall rubric (Marshall, 2013) and includes multiple observations of all teachers once a year (new teachers are evaluated two to three times a year), a teacher self-assessment and reflection, and student standardized test results for applicable subjects.
The third research site was a suburban high school in southeastern New Hampshire. The largest of the three research sites, this district serves 1135 students in grades 9 through 12, with a teaching staff of approximately 105. An administrator observes and evaluates new teachers two times a year following a rubric; veteran teachers are only evaluated every 3 years by an administrator. In addition to an administrator assessment, the district is one of the few districts in the state to include a peer evaluation component. Whereas the first two research sites connect teacher evaluation to both individual professional development plans and contract renewal/non-renewal, the third district keeps teacher evaluation separate from professional development and contract renewal, with the exception of contract renewal for beginning teachers.

I used purposeful sampling to recruit three to four teachers from each of the three districts, which represented three different evaluation models for a total of 10 teacher participants. For each research site, I recruited at least one veteran teacher and one new teacher; for the purpose of this study, a “new” teacher was an educator with 3 or fewer years in the classroom. Because many districts have different evaluation protocols for veteran and non-veteran (new to teaching and new to district) teachers, I felt it was beneficial to interview those teachers to hear their perspectives on the value and possible inequalities of these protocols.

The three research sites represent a range of faculty sizes (16 to 105 teachers); thus, I strove to include participants who represented different departments or subject areas. This range was important because an evaluator’s content knowledge and familiarity with a subject can impact his or her evaluation of a teacher (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Kauchak, Peterson, & Driscoll, 1985; Merrill & Rodriguez, 2011). Having participants from multiple disciplines ensured that I would gather data from teachers whose evaluators had shared content knowledge, as well as from those whose evaluators did not have a background in the participant’s subject.
Additionally, I interviewed the principal, or assistant principal, if applicable, at two of the three research sites so as to gain their perspective on the evaluation model used in their district. Although the primary focus of my research is teacher perspectives of evaluation, administrators offer valuable insight regarding their role that teachers may likely not experience or understand. The administrator interviews also provided me with the principal’s or assistant principal’s perceptions on how teachers value and use the district’s evaluation model.

**Recruitment and Access**

To recruit participants, I first sent letters to the superintendents (Appendix A) and principals (Appendix B) of potential participating school districts. This letter highlighted the purpose and scope of the study, as well as possible risks and benefits. Through this initial letter and a follow-up telephone call, I sought permission to access teachers in the district. I used the principal as a gatekeeper in directing me to teachers who were willing to participate in the interviews.

Following approval of the research proposal by Northeastern University’s Institutional Review Board, I began recruiting participants. Once the gatekeeper provided access to possible participants, I made initial contact via email and/or written letter (Appendix C) to review the purpose of the study, emphasize possible risks and benefits, and remind them of the voluntary nature of their participation throughout the study. For those who wished to participate, I acquired their signature of informed consent (Appendix D) before conducting any research.

**Data Collection**

For this study, data was collected in the forms of semi-structured interviews and relevant documents.
**Interviews.** The majority of data came from one semi-structured interview with each participant. Every interview took place at the participant’s school. One teacher chose to hold the interview in a conference room, which allowed for greater privacy and a quiet environment; however, all other participants felt more comfortable answering questions in their own classrooms. Interviews occurred at the close of the school day, after students had been dismissed, or during a teacher’s prep period; each participant chose the time that was most convenient for him or her. The interviews lasted between 45 and 60 minutes.

The interviews followed a protocol (Appendices E and F), with open-ended questions I designed. In addition to questions specific to the research topic of teacher evaluation, the interview included demographic questions, such as the participant’s age, years of total teaching experience, years at current school, and highest level of education. The interview protocol was approved by Northeastern University's IRB board prior to any contact with possible participants.

Before conducting interviews, I familiarized myself with the evaluation tool and procedure in use by the participant, allowing both the participant and me to reference actual evaluation terminology and processes with less confusion (Appendices G-L). Additionally, before each interview began, I reviewed the purpose of the study, risks and benefits, and the intended plans for using the results; participants signed an informed consent form before continuing (Appendix D).

All interviews were audio-recorded; I also took notes during the interview. Interviews took place in a setting that was both private and convenient for the participant. The participants were reminded at the outset that they could stop the interview and withdraw from the study at any point.
Documents. The documents collected for this study included any used as part of the schools’ or districts’ evaluation protocol. This included but was not limited to district policy documents related to teacher evaluation, evaluation rubrics or checklists, observation forms, and any formative and summative evaluation documents. Participants were invited to share completed evaluation forms with me, but it was neither mandatory nor expected. Only two teachers shared completed evaluations with me during the interview, but did not allow me to retain a copy.

Data Storage and Management

To ensure confidentiality throughout the data collection and analysis stages, participants were given a pseudonym to mask their identity. An identity key was securely stored separate from the transcript files and audio recordings. Names and other identifying markers were erased from any photocopied documents, and all documents and transcribed interviews were labeled with corresponding pseudonyms.

Following each interview, I transcribed the audio recording. Audiotapes or audio files were destroyed or permanently deleted immediately after being transcribed. Physical artifacts, such as audiotapes, signed consent forms, written interview notes, and evaluation documents, were kept at my home in a locked file cabinet, accessible only by me. Electronic files, such as the coded transcripts and any back-up computer files, were stored on a password-protected computer.

Data Analysis

The transcribed interviews and notes from the document analysis were analyzed using Stake’s (1995) approach of direct interpretation and categorical aggregation: Researchers “reach new meanings about cases through direct interpretation of the individual instance and through
aggregation of instances until something can be said about them as a class” (p. 74). This approach is appropriate in instrumental and collective case studies where the focus is on understanding phenomena or relationships within it (p. 77).

Upon collection of the data, I read through each interview in its entirety, “immersing [myself] in the details, trying to get a sense of [each] interview as a whole” (Agar, 1980, p. 103). Coding was done using MAXQDA, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), to allow for easy organization and manipulation of the coded data (Yin, 2009). The data were coded using a combination of initial and in vivo coding methods during first-cycle coding. Initial or open codes facilitated the interpretation of the interview data through a wide lens; in vivo coding allowed me to capture the essence of what the participants felt and experienced by “prioritiz[ing] and honor[ing] the participant’s voice” (Saldaña, 2013, p. 91). During second-cycle coding, axial coding was utilized to develop major categories and themes (Saldaña, 2013; Yin, 2009); this cycle of coding “reduce[d] the number of Initial Codes while sorting and relabeling them into conceptual categories” (Saldaña, p. 218).

From the second-cycle axial coding, themes and relationships were identified and further explored. To analyze across the three cases, I conducted a third cycle of coding and analysis. I looked at the primary themes and categories that emerged within the data of each individual site, and then determined similarities and differences. Code mapping was used to highlight and refine the cross-case themes and conclusions (Saldaña, 2013). Finally, the data were presented as an in-depth look of the cases through narrative and tables (Creswell, 2013).

**Trustworthiness**

Because of its frequently subjective nature, qualitative research is often criticized for its failure to utilize traditional validation or verification methods. There are, however, numerous
validation strategies qualitative researchers can use to assess the accuracy of their findings and to ensure that their studies are credible and rigorous (Creswell, 2013). This study used member checking, peer review and debriefing, triangulation, and clarification of researcher bias.

As this study relied largely on participant interviews, the researcher utilized member checking so that participants could “judge the accuracy and credibility of the account” (Creswell, 2013, p. 252). After each interview had been transcribed, the participant was given the opportunity to read the transcript and make clarifications. These notes of clarification were attached to the transcript and referenced during analysis.

The various forms of data collected in this study (interviews, documents, etc.) were triangulated to corroborate evidence and support the findings (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell, 2012). Additionally, peer review and debriefing was used during all stages of the study process to ensure validity. The advisor was familiar with qualitative data analysis and provided guidance and feedback throughout the research and analysis stages.

The researcher also took steps to minimize potential threats to internal validity. Participants were selected from districts outside of where I work and live. At the outset of each interview, I stated the purpose of the study, emphasizing the non-judgmental, information-seeking nature of the study. Additionally, I included a section in the first chapter where I clarified my experiences with and potential biases toward teacher evaluation.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

All of the participants were treated in accordance with ethical research principles and the guidelines of the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Prior to any interview, I reviewed the study’s purpose, scope, and potential risks and benefits with each participant and acquired his or her informed consent. The informed consent form included a
written description of the study, a clear and detailed account of potential risks and benefits, contact information should participants have questions or concerns, and an opt-out statement (Appendix D). Participation in the study was voluntary and participants had the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time.

Although there were no identifiable risks for participating in this study, I adhered to practices to maintain participant confidentiality. Participants were selected from districts outside of where I work and live. All participant identities were kept confidential through the use of pseudonyms, and the data were reported collectively.

All data collected were securely stored in a password-protected computer account and any physical copies or artifacts were kept in a locked file cabinet; upon completion of the study, all data will be appropriately destroyed. During all stages of the research design process, I adhered to ethical guidelines and incorporated procedures to minimize risks and discomforts to the participants.
Chapter Four: Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation systems, including evaluation purposes, processes, and tools. More specifically, this study explored teachers’ perceptions of the purposes of teacher evaluation; the features of existing systems that are most and least effective in achieving those purposes; the advantages and disadvantages of value-added, standards-based, and peer review evaluation models; and teachers’ role in designing and implementing evaluation systems.

Presentation of Findings

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with teacher and, if possible, administrator participants from three high schools. Additionally, the researcher conducted a document analysis of the three schools’ evaluation forms, including rubrics, forms, and documents outlining the evaluation process. As such, the findings will be presented organized by case, with an analysis of the context and themes that emerged at each site. Following the individual case findings, the researcher will present the cross-case findings and answer the study’s research questions.

Case #1. The first research site was a rural high school in central New Hampshire. The school population at the time of the study was 500 students in grades nine through twelve, 46 teachers, and two administrators who conduct evaluations.

Evaluation model. The school follows a traditional evaluation model: All teachers are evaluated annually with a single announced observation; new teachers, including both those new to the profession and experienced teachers new to the school, are evaluated two times a year with an announced observation. All evaluations are conducted by the principal and assistant principal; each is responsible for observing and evaluating half of the teaching staff. There is no
self- or peer-assessment component, nor are student local or standardized test results included in the teacher’s evaluation.

**Evaluation tool.** The observation and evaluation tool is a rubric loosely based on the Danielson framework (Danielson, 2007) (see Appendix G). Teachers are assessed on indicators in six domains: Teaching Techniques (eleven indicators), Attitude (four indicators), Classroom Climate (four indicators), Professional Responsibilities (seven indicators), Professional Qualifications (nine indicators), and School-Wide Initiatives (five indicators). For each indicator, there are four levels of achievement: Unsatisfactory, Growth Needed, Meets Expectations, and Consistently Exceeds Expectations. Additionally, an evaluator can select “No Basis To Rate” for any indicator if appropriate.

**Evaluation process.** The evaluation process includes a pre-observation document, the actual observation, a post-observation document, and the evaluator’s written evaluation and follow-up meeting (see Appendix H). Prior to any observation, a teacher’s assigned evaluator contacts the teacher to set up a day and time to observe a class period. This initial contact is done in person or through email, and the evaluator typically gives a range of one or two weeks and allows the teacher to select the specific day and class period within that range for the observation. Once the observation date has been determined, the teacher completes the Pre-Observation Conference Form and submits it to the evaluator. On this ten-question form, the teacher outlines the observed lesson, including the learning objectives, the instructional strategies and activities he or she intends to use, and the methods of formative and summative assessment the teacher will use to assess student achievement of the learning objectives. The form also includes a section for the teacher to describe the demographics of and special needs within the particular class, as well as specific areas in which the teacher is looking for administrative
feedback. If the evaluator needs additional information beyond what the teacher includes on the Pre-Observation Conference Form, they arrange a meeting to discuss and clarify any points; if no further clarification is needed, no meeting takes place until after the observation.

On the date of the observation, the evaluator attends the class in full. While it is not dictated by policy, evaluators tend to sit in the back of the classroom so as to observe not only what the teacher is doing, but also how all students are behaving or engaging during the lesson. The evaluator has a copy of the evaluation rubric and the teacher’s Pre-Observation Conference Form and refers to both while taking notes throughout the observation. The evaluator may interact with students or the teacher during the lesson, such as by asking questions.

Within the week following the observation, the teacher completes the Post-Observation Reflection and submits it to the evaluator. The five reflection questions center on what the teacher believed was effective and not effective in the observed lesson, as well as what evidence the teacher has to support whether students achieved the lesson objectives. If necessary, the evaluator can seek further clarification on anything the teacher has written in the reflection through a follow-up meeting or email conversation.

The evaluator then uses the Pre- and Post-Observation documents, the rubric, and his or her notes from the observation to complete the Evaluation Form. This entails giving the teacher a score for each indicator on the rubric, writing an evaluative summary of the observation, and listing commendations and recommendations. The summary includes an overview of the lesson, what the evaluator observed, and feedback based on how the teacher scored against the rubric. For any Unsatisfactory or Growth Needed designation, the evaluator must provide an explanation in the summary.
Once the evaluation has been written, the teacher and evaluator meet to review the evaluation. There is no timeline for how long after the observation this meeting is to occur, but practice is for the follow-up meeting to happen within two weeks of the observation. The meeting takes place in either the evaluator’s office or the teacher’s room. During the meeting, the teacher reads the summary and asks questions if needed. There is an opportunity for discussion, as well. The teacher and evaluator then sign the formal evaluation, at which point it is placed in the teacher’s personnel file. If a teacher contests some or all of the evaluation, he or she may write additional comments that will be attached to the evaluation before being added to the personnel file.

Demographic analysis of participants. There were four teacher participants from this school. Three were considered veteran teachers; their tenure at that particular school ranged from nine to 11 years, while their total teaching experience ranged from 11 to 35 years. One teacher was in her first year of teaching, although she had served in a non-teaching role at the school prior to becoming a classroom teacher. Two of the teacher participants were male; two were female. Two taught English/Language Arts; two were Social Studies teachers. In addition to the teacher participants, the researcher interviewed an administrator who conducts evaluations. He has served in an administrative role in the school for 3 years and taught high school English for nine years prior to that.

Themes. In this particular case study, three dominant themes emerged from the interview and document data analysis: accountability and reassurance, the evaluation environment, and the human component.

Accountability and reassurance. All but one of the teachers at this school perceived the primary purpose of evaluation was accountability as it was practiced at that school.
Accountability is being held accountable to a certain standard or standards; essentially, the teacher evaluation tool measures what a teacher is (or is not) doing in comparison to what a teacher should be doing (Saphier, 1993). As one teacher bluntly stated, “it [the evaluation] was making sure that people are doing what they’re supposed to do.” Another teacher explained that because educators work with impressionable human beings, it is important for administrators to hold teachers accountable for providing a quality education: “If you’re not doing it, you got to be called on it, particularly in this field where you could be impacting people in a very negative way.”

Done in the absence of a system of supported improvement, teacher evaluations done for the purpose of accountability often end up feeling punitive to teachers. One teacher shared: “If you get evaluated more, you can tell that you’re being watched…the trend in education seems to be accountability with everything, on everything except for the kid.” Holding teachers accountable through the evaluation felt less about pointing out and providing support for areas in need of improvement and more about using the evaluation to document a teacher’s shortcomings as evidence for implementing an Improvement Plan or even recommending nonrenewal or termination. One teacher shared: “I don’t see a lot of heads-up given to people. Instead it’s a ‘gotcha.’ I’ve seen that happen a number of times.”

Interestingly, however, there was a disconnect between what the majority of teachers interviewed at this school perceived the purpose of evaluation was as it was practiced and what they philosophically believed the purpose should be. Although all teachers mentioned that evaluation should be for improvement, they expressed a more common philosophy of purpose: reassurance. One veteran teacher stated that evaluation “ought to be to recognize good practices as well. It seems like the evaluation is always based on ‘improve here, improve here, improve
here,’ rather than ‘this is great.’” “Praise goes a long way,” shared another teacher. Others echoed these sentiments, sharing that the power of a compliment or affirmation of a job well done does more to motivate teachers to improve than a checklist or rubric of a teacher’s weaknesses: “It’s just awesome what that [reassurance] does for the teacher. It bolsters their confidence. When they’re confident, they’ll risk more, like, ‘Hey, I’ll try this, because you know what, they have faith in me here.’” With an evaluation system based on accountability in practice, teachers felt vulnerable in opening themselves up to criticism; they were less willing to showcase new lessons or take other instructional risks for fear that their mistakes would be the focus on the evaluation. Overwhelmingly among the teachers, the perception was that accountability is the purpose of evaluation at that school, but reassurance should be the primary purpose.

Contrasting administrator perspective. Conversely, the administrator’s perception of the primary purpose of evaluation at this school was accountability through supported improvement, or “continuous growth.” He shared that both he and the other administrator evaluator are “really looking to help them [teachers], and explaining that to the teachers, that ‘I’m here to help you and work with you and try to help you improve,’ and not in a negative tone.”

He viewed accountability as important, but not exclusive to evaluation. It is the administrators’ job, he explained, to hold teachers accountable regardless of the specific evaluation process or tool, and holding teachers accountable is a continuous process, not confined to a single observation or evaluation. His belief is that the evaluation process and tool, however, can and should be used to help teachers improve.

We [administrators] are responsible for what’s going on in the school in general, whether that’s instruction or discipline, so we have to make sure that what’s going
on is the best thing for our kids. Me hammering a teacher in the evaluation for not doing something isn’t going to make things better, though….The evaluation has to help teachers reflect. I think that sometimes teachers don’t take that step and they can’t see it because they’ve always done something a certain way, like how they teach a particular lesson or assess something. My goal is to approach the evaluation that way, to help them reflect and grow as a teacher.

In using the evaluation to help teachers improve, this administrator felt that he was indirectly helping teachers stay accountable to their students.

**Evaluation environment.** Another theme that emerged during the interviews was the significance of the evaluation environment in influencing whether teachers perceived the evaluation process and instrument positively or negatively. Specifically, teachers and the administrator spoke of the importance of an evaluation culture built on trust and the evaluator’s experience.

**Trust.** Trust for one’s evaluator, or the lack thereof, directly impacted whether teachers valued the evaluation. “Trust” encompassed mutual respect between the teacher and evaluator, as well as the teacher’s sense that the evaluator was approaching the evaluation with a positive, supportive mindset. One teacher, speaking about a previous evaluator who had fostered a collaborative dynamic around evaluations, shared that that evaluation process “gave you faith in yourself, because you’re treated like a professional, treated like an equal.” He valued the feedback he received through the evaluation, and thus he was motivated to improve. Conversely, his current evaluator approached the evaluation process in a more negative mindset, which consequently undermined the teacher’s respect for the evaluator and evaluation. This, in turn, deterred him from using the evaluation feedback to improve:
[The evaluator] doesn’t reinforce what you do right but only emphasizes what you’re doing wrong. Walking out of an evaluation when it’s only about what you did wrong, how are you feeling at that point? I feel the purpose of the evaluation is to ‘little boy’ me, you know what I mean? And it totally shot my confidence. If you get crapped on in the evaluation, it takes away your faith in the entire system, and you’re not going to take risks, you’re not going to do those extra things to get better. Ultimately, you have to have respect for the person that’s evaluating you.

Ultimately, the evaluation experience was negative and demeaning for this teacher; he lost faith in his evaluator and thus lost faith in the evaluation system. Indeed, the experience was so devaluing that he even questioned whether to remain in the field of education.

Another teacher, although not personally suffering from a lack of trust in her evaluator, acknowledged the same:

No one is going to do a good job when you feel like they’re hostile, and that’s when you shut down yourself….The emotional investment is too great, and this slapping down, it’s too great if it’s just another fail. I know what it feels like to fail, and I don’t need to feel it again.

For both of these teachers, trust in one’s evaluator had a direct impact on how they viewed or valued the evaluation. In experiences where there is no trust, specifically, the evaluation serves no positive purpose and many teachers disregard it in order to preserve a sense of self-worth. Unfortunately, a tool that could motivate teachers to improve instead fosters mistrust and indifference.
Evaluator’s classroom and evaluation experience. The other essential component of a positive environment was the evaluator’s classroom and evaluation experience. An evaluator who lacked significant experience in either was viewed as less qualified to conduct evaluations, and teachers often viewed their feedback with indifference. Speaking of the importance of classroom experience, one teacher shared, “When my evaluator, who had taught in a sixth grade classroom, was talking to me about something that I did with my seniors, it didn’t carry as much weight for me.” She went on to clarify that not only was classroom experience important for an evaluator to have, but specifically, recent and relevant classroom experience, which both of her current evaluators had:

It…depends on how long your supervisors have been removed from the classroom….I think they still remember what it’s like to be "in the trenches" as opposed to an evaluator who it's been 25 years since they taught and the whole system of education was different 25 years ago than it is now.

In other words, teachers need to feel that their evaluator can directly relate to the teaching experience.

Other teachers echoed the importance of classroom experience in an evaluator. One veteran teacher said, “I think after you stop teaching for a while, you lose touch with what was important in what you do.” Another stated that one of the reasons she felt her evaluator was qualified to evaluate her was because he “has been a teacher in the classroom.” The administrator echoed her statement when he shared that one of the reasons he felt qualified to evaluate teachers was because of his experience as a teacher: “I spent 8 years in the classroom and I spent 3 of those years working with other teachers on how we can improve our curriculum, and reading professional texts on what’s best practice and having discussions with my peers
about what’s not working.” Another veteran teacher added that evaluators should have spent at least 3 years in the classroom to have significant classroom experience to evaluate others: “I want classroom experience to really come through because that’s what we’re evaluating…you can’t have somebody evaluating you that’s taught for like 3 years. I didn’t know what I was doing within the first 3 years.”

**Administrative experience.** In addition to classroom experience, teachers also spoke about administrative experience, particularly in regard to conducting evaluations. One teacher stated, “When you reach the level of administration, you have philosophies of education that make you qualified to evaluate a teacher.” She elaborated by talking about how administrators see many instructional styles and strategies in their role as evaluators, and in so doing, gain a wider sense of what engages students and what does not. Others agreed that an evaluator’s administrative experience is important in establishing credibility because it is the administrative experience that offers what the administrator called “the big picture view” that should not be discounted when conducting evaluations. Indeed, all those interviewed at this school were against outside evaluators for this reason: Outside evaluators would not fully understand the larger context and culture of a building or classroom, thereby making their evaluation feedback less credible in the eyes of these teachers. Ultimately, teachers and the administrator agreed that a sense of trust in one evaluator, and embedded in that, an evaluator’s classroom and administrative experience, were essential in creating a positive evaluation environment and overall evaluation experience.

**Human component.** The final theme that surfaced was that there is a very significant “human component” to education. Teaching is not a “black and white” endeavor but rather a profound and complex profession centered on the interactions between a teacher and his or her
students. Education and teaching is not an objective field: by its very nature, a teacher’s assessment of a student, or an administrator’s evaluation of a teacher carries an element of subjectivity. How, then, do we reconcile inherent subjectivity—the “human component”—with a fair and balanced evaluation?

_Human component in the classroom._ A teacher’s “product,” unlike those in manufacturing or entrepreneurship, is an educated human, and this creates unique challenges that educators must face. One challenge is the many human factors beyond a teacher’s control that may impede his or her ability to successfully educate students. Teachers spoke to such factors as personal motivation, family support or lack thereof, and socioeconomic status:

I have several kids in the general class that are just really unmotivated students. No matter if I was doing cartwheels and said, ‘Let me teach you how to juggle,’ there would be some resistance there. You can’t always change their work ethic, especially if there’s no support at home.

Students are human beings with the free will to choose to do as they wish, including not following a teacher’s directions, completing an assignment or activity, or participating in class. As this teacher highlights, some students simply are not passionate about a given subject area or lesson, and thus they may not be motivated to participate in the lessons that are, for other students, engaging and successful. She cannot force a student to be motivated to achieve, or even participate minimally, in her class. Another teacher echoed her point about not being able to control student motivation, adding that a student’s family dynamics can also impact a student’s engagement in class:

We take everybody that society brings to the door and we’re supposed to move them all from point A to point B, regardless of what they come in with, regardless
of their socioeconomics or family life, even regardless of whether they actually want to get to point B.

Both teachers are speaking of the human component within the classroom, or the fact that students are humans who come to school with various values, interests, motivations, and backgrounds, some of which are adverse to what a teacher is attempting to achieve: learning.

Because of this, teachers struggle with evaluations that are so objective that they do not allow for inevitable—and uncontrollable—human factors. A teacher may not be able to reach every student, but that does not make him or her ineffective; thus, evaluators must find a balance between an objective evaluation measuring teachers against clear criteria and a subjective evaluation that recognizes the human factors beyond a teacher’s control, thereby fairly evaluating the softer skills required in teaching.

A second challenge regarding the human component of education is that teachers play many roles in regard to students, and often the official curriculum is of less importance than meeting a student’s basic human emotional needs. One teacher shared, “You are so much to these kids. You’re their uncle. You’re their father, in some cases. You’re their role model, and I’m not even talking about educating them yet.” Another echoed this sentiment in describing a different view of student success: “You’re more of a social worker than you are a teacher in many instances, and for you, having the kid earn a 70 [grade] is so much more valuable than you getting an Honors-level kid earning a 100.” Another teacher alluded to the importance of the “hidden curriculum,” skills such as empathy, collaboration, and social norms, among others, that are not often tested on standardized tests or documented in a teacher’s evaluation but that are equally essential: “We have standards, yes, but there has to be the human side, there has to be. The kids have to be getting something out of their education more than the ability to do multiple
choice testing or write a five paragraph essay.” Again, teachers recognize the human component within the classroom; an evaluator or evaluation tool that does not accept and allow for this human component will be quickly discredited by teachers.

*Human component between evaluators and teachers.* The challenges of the human component between teachers and students extend to the evaluator and the teacher being evaluated. Indeed, teachers saw evaluation as even more complicated by the human component. First, evaluators have to evaluate teachers’ ability to effectively teach students despite the challenges already voiced regarding the variables of working with adolescent humans. One teacher commented:

My [teaching] style, my philosophies, my approach might be effective for six out of seven of the kids in this group, but one of the kids might do much better with somebody else. It’s all the human thing. How can you evaluate me on factors that might be beyond my control? If I’m doing my best for every kid but there are some who I just don’t mesh with, and there are always some, does that make me an ineffective teacher? Should I be knocked on my evaluation for that? I don’t think so, but it can happen. It does happen. Again, it’s the human thing.

This teacher recognized the importance of differentiating in her classroom, and while that was something that could be evaluated objectively, having a differentiated classroom still did not ensure that a student would be successful in that class or with that teacher. Another teacher elaborated on this, adding that just as one test does not fit all students or assess all skills, so, too, does a single evaluation tool fail to fit all teachers or measure all elements of effective teaching: “Again, whether you’re talking about students getting tested or teachers getting evaluated, you’re dealing with human beings, and this is really hard to quantify, it's hard to put a number on it.”
The second complicating factor regarding the human component between teachers and their evaluators is the fact that teachers are themselves human, subject to bad days, “and even bad years,” as one teacher mentioned; evaluators must take that into account, as well. In all of the interviews, teachers recognized this fact and felt that effective evaluators must know those whom they are evaluating well enough to appropriately identify these situations and handle them accordingly. For those teachers simply having an atypical day, all four teachers interviewed agreed that an evaluator should not use that day’s observation as the basis for a teacher’s evaluation: “If I’m having an off day, find another time to do my observation. I’m expected to do the same for my students, and I do, because it’s the right thing to do. I would hope my administrator would do likewise.” Similarly, the idea of an outside evaluator was met with resistance not only because such an evaluator would not know the context of the school, but also because he or she would not know the context of the individual teacher. An outside evaluator might provide a very objective view, but his or her feedback may be incomplete or inaccurate without the full context surrounding that teacher.

For teachers in need of improvement, two of the teachers and the administrator all spoke to the importance of making sure that the evaluation was used to identify areas of weakness and provide support in strengthening those areas. One teacher commented on evaluation: “Teachers are human. Things change. They may slip a little, and if they slip a little, then they need to be called on it.” She added, however, that given this human component, evaluators should approach evaluations with an attitude of supportive collaboration toward teacher improvement: “This [evaluation] is personal, this is human, and I want the people who evaluate me to be like, ‘We want to see you succeed here, and if you’re not, we want to tell you how you can succeed here.’” Another stated that even though an evaluation should highlight areas for improvement, it should
also be used to celebrate what a teacher does well, as teachers, like any humans, need positive acknowledgement:

  Praise goes a long way. I think that in education, we have certain expectations and certain standards and most of us do exceed them regularly, but we don’t always hear, ‘Your hard work is paying off, that was really great.’ That goes a long way. We all need to hear that at some point.

  This theme of the human component of education and evaluation was evident throughout all five interviews at this site, and it emerged when participants spoke to the other themes of evaluation environment and purpose. Teachers describe effective evaluators as those who create an evaluation environment that is supportive and founded on mutual trust. They acknowledge that a teacher’s job is to educate other humans and they understand the unique challenges that entails. In essence, the human component, so evident in the interaction between a teacher and her students, must also be present and respected in the evaluation tool and evaluator-teacher dynamic.

**Case #2**

  The second research site was a small rural high school in western New Hampshire. The school population at the time of the study was 138 students in grades 9 through 12, 15 teachers, and one administrator who conducts evaluations.

  **Evaluation model.** The teacher evaluation model at this school is based on the work of Kim Marshall, which emphasizes frequent classroom visits and clearly defined evaluative criteria. Although teachers may request a formal evaluation following the traditional model (a single announced observation of a full class), the practice at this school is to evaluate teachers through short and frequent classroom visits. All teachers are evaluated annually by a single
administrator. Additionally, teachers complete a self-evaluation, which gets factored into the overall evaluation summary. Peer assessment is not a component of this school’s model. At the time of this study, the school was in its first year of using student achievement data, as measured by local or standardized test scores, as a measure of teacher effectiveness and a component of a teacher’s overall evaluation.

**Evaluation tool.** The evaluation tool is largely based on the teacher evaluation rubrics developed by Kim Marshall, with some minor changes to reflect the needs and philosophy of this school (see Appendix I). Teachers are assessed on indicators in six domains covering all aspects of a teacher’s job performance: Planning and Preparation for Learning (nine indicators); Classroom Management (six indicators); Delivery of Instruction (ten indicators); Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-Up (eight indicators); Family and Community Outreach (seven indicators); and Professional Responsibilities (nine indicators). For each indicator, there are four levels of achievement: Expert, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Does Not Meet Standards.

**Evaluation process.** Each year, teachers develop three to five professional goals, using the evaluation rubrics to self-assess where they fall within each domain and making goals specific to the rubric criteria. Teachers are encouraged to concentrate on areas of interest that encourage personal professional growth while at the same time pursuing goals that enhance the school’s mission. At least one of these goals must be tied to increasing student achievement, as measured through either the state-mandated assessment or valid district-level standardized tests. Goals are set collaboratively with the teacher and administrator before or within the first month of school. Teachers complete the Annual Goals Form (see Appendix J), which outlines their goals, the steps they intend to take to achieve those goals, and how they will measure achievement of those goals.
The principal observes all teachers throughout the school year through several mini-observations, nicknamed “drive-bys.” These mini-observations last a minimum of five minutes and have no maximum time limit. They occur at least twice per quarter, for a total of eight or more mini-observations per teacher per year. During or immediately after each observation, the principal completes a Mini-Observation Form (see Appendix J). This form includes questions related to all of the rubric domains except Family and Community Outreach. Although there are several areas and guiding questions included in the form, it is expected that the principal observe and comment upon only one or two areas. The principal’s focus is guided not only by what he witnesses during the class, but also the goals that the teacher has outlined for the year during the annual goal setting session.

Within two days of the observation, the principal must share the completed Mini-Observation Form with the teacher, either as a hard copy or electronically. If either the teacher or principal desire further discussion, either party must formally request a meeting; teachers must request a meeting via email within two days of receiving the Mini-Observation Form, whereas administrators must request a meeting directly on the form before giving it to the teacher.

In addition to these mini-observations, teachers may request a formal observation. This observation follows a more traditional approach: Teachers complete a Pre-Observation Form, the principal observes a predetermined class for the entire period and completes an Observation Record, and both meet for the Post Observation Conference within 5 days of the observation (see Appendix J). The Pre-Observation Form describes the lesson topic, the teacher’s learning goals for that lesson, the context of that lesson (its place within a larger unit), and relevant information about the students being observed. The Observation Record, completed by the evaluator, includes a description of the witnessed lesson and general commendations and recommendations
for improvement. Although there is no direct reference to the rubric on the form, it is practice that the commendations and recommendations align with the rubric domains.

All of the mini-observations and any formal observations are taken into account when the administrator prepares the end-of-year summary. Both the teacher and principal complete the rubrics for teacher evaluation prior to a meeting, typically scheduled for June. In the meeting, each shares a completed rubric; additionally, the teachers review their Annual Goals Form and discuss how they have accomplished or are progressing toward meeting each goal. Specific attention is given to the goal tied to student achievement, and the teacher shares quantitative data on student performance and the specific steps or strategies he or she has used to promote academic achievement.

Following this meeting, the administrator completes the Teacher Evaluation Summary (see Appendix J), which provides an overall rating for each of the six domains. Again, each overall domain score is determined based on the observations throughout the year, the teacher’s self-assessment, and the principal’s assessment. The Teacher Evaluation Summary also includes specific commendations, recommendations for improvement, and overall comments. The principal must complete this form and provide the teacher with a copy within 5 days of the meeting. The Teacher Evaluation Summary and a final version of the rubrics completed by the administrator are then placed in the teacher’s personnel file. Student achievement levels are shared with the community, but neither individual student growth or teacher correlations and evaluations are publicized.

**Demographic analysis of participants.** There were three teacher participants from this school. Two were considered veteran teachers; their tenure at that particular school ranged from five to 10 years, while their total teaching experience ranged from five to 26 years. The third
teacher had 11 total years of teaching experience, but as he was in his second year of teaching at that school, he was considered a new teacher. Two of the participants were male; one was female. Each taught a separate discipline: Social Studies, English, and Physical Education.

**Themes.** At this particular research site, three dominant themes emerged from the interview and document data analysis: feedback for improvement, relevance, and the snapshot approach.

**Feedback for improvement.** All three teachers who were interviewed felt the primary purpose of teacher evaluation was to provide feedback in order to help teachers improve their practice. As one teacher shared, evaluation is “to help make the teacher a better teacher,” a phrase he repeated three times throughout the interview. He added that ultimately, an evaluation that helps a teacher improve will have a wider and more important impact; namely, “a greater student experience and better student achievement.” Both of his colleagues echoed him in perceiving the evaluation as a tool to “give relevant feedback to teachers, to help them reflect on their practices, and to provide guidance according to the best practices of the day.”

All three also shared the sentiment that such feedback was presented in a constructive way, and as such, teachers welcomed the evaluation. For example, one teacher emphasized that the school’s principal, who conducted all evaluations, did not focus feedback solely on a teacher’s weaknesses; the evaluation was “to also make [teachers] aware of their strengths” so that they could use those lessons as exemplars when planning instruction. In this way, teachers felt the principal was encouraging improvement through positive feedback and celebration of a teacher’s strengths.

Of course, the evaluation did not ignore areas where a teacher needed improvement; feedback on a teacher’s weaknesses was described as “clear” and “goal-oriented,” which
teachers saw as “useful and motivating”: “[Evaluation feedback] gives me something to focus on during the course of the year. It gives me the target to get to, and it makes me feel like I can get there.” Another teacher mentioned that the school has cultivated “a supporting culture so teachers see that it’s not a ‘we’re here to get you’ mentality.” One of the newer teachers stated simply, “I don’t have to worry about the evaluation model here. It’s to help me get better as a teacher, not to ding me.”

Language connotations: coach vs. evaluator. Interestingly, all three teachers repeatedly referred to the evaluator as a “coach” or used coaching analogies when describing the school’s evaluation model: “Under this model, what I like is it’s more ‘Hey, you did this well, but did you think of trying this?’ He feels more like my coach than my principal or my evaluator.” Another teacher described the principal similarly:

He’s coaching me. He’s making me aware of where I didn’t do well in the game, so to speak, and giving me strategies to improve, and because we do the drive-by’s [multiple mini-observations] here, he’s giving me chances to practice and show him that I’ve improved. He’s not using the observations to bench me, or fire me, but to make me a better teacher.

Clearly, teachers perceived the evaluation model and evaluator positively, so much so that the language they used carries positive connotations. In total, the words “coach” or “coaching” were used 14 times throughout these three interviews. In comparison, the word “evaluator” was used only twice. The teachers’ very word choice reflects the philosophy and purpose of using an evaluation for feedback toward improvement.

Relevance. Another theme that emerged during the interviews was the importance of relevance, specifically in having a relevant evaluation tool or rubric. Having a relevant
evaluation tool allows teachers to receive relevant and useful feedback, which in turn promotes teacher motivation and acceptance of the evaluation model.

All three teachers saw the primary purpose of the evaluation as providing feedback for improvement; all three also emphasized that to achieve this purpose, the evaluation tool or rubric needed to be relevant for any given teacher, regardless of tenure or discipline. As one teacher noted, “You need to be able to actually use the feedback you get. If it’s not relevant to what you do, then you’re just going to ignore it.”

There were certain characteristics that the teachers felt were indicative of an effective teacher and that were relevant to any teacher. Among the most commonly noted characteristics were the ability to engage students and building a positive rapport with students. An effective teacher, according to one teacher, “should obviously have empathy, and be able to connect positively with the students in some way.” Another teacher associated a teacher’s connections with students to the larger goal of student achievement: “You’ve got to get to know the students on a personal level, find their interests, make connections with them, show them you care. If you can’t do that, you’re not going to get anywhere with them academically.”

All three teachers also noted that engaging students was essential for their effectiveness as a teacher. One teacher shared, “You have to engage students, you have to. If you’re not engaging them, I don’t think you have a chance then to teach them. They’ll tune out.” Both of the other teachers echoed this sentiment, adding that a teacher’s ability to engage students was fairly easy—and important—for a principal to assess:

Our rubric includes a section on engagement, and [the principal] really focuses on this area because he can pretty much tell you within a few minutes of being in your class whether you’re engaging the kids or not. And typically, if you’re
struggling with engaging the students, you’re struggling in other parts of the rubric, too.

Despite their different subject areas, all three teachers believed that engaging students and building positive relationships was critical to their success, and thus felt that any useful evaluation tool should evaluate student engagement and positive teacher-student relationships.

Although there were some indicators that were relevant for all teachers, there was also a common opinion among the three teachers that an evaluation tool or rubric needed to be differentiated to accommodate different disciplines. The physical education teacher stated:

It can’t just be an evaluation set up based on someone teaching a core discipline.

For example, the subject I teach looks really different than something like English or math, and so my classroom looks different, and my instruction looks different, and my classroom management looks different. Even my appearance looks different because I’m not wearing a shirt and tie like the other guys who teach here. Technically, I’d score low on the part of the rubric that talks about dressing professionally.

Because of the different nature of his discipline, this teacher felt that the evaluation rubric did not always capture what he did do, or worse, could penalize him for areas not relevant or appropriate to his subject.

Even the core teachers who were interviewed recognized this potential flaw of a one-size-fits-all evaluation tool. The English teacher noted, “I feel like often things like music and art and Special Ed [Special Education] are looked at on the periphery, and the evaluation has nothing to do with what they do in their classroom every day. So what good is it to them?” Another core teacher commented that “Some subjects are more knowledge-based and some subjects are more
skill-based and so those classes are going to look different, and that has to be reflected in the evaluation to be fair.” He suggested that evaluation tools should include two components: “a generic evaluation for all teachers, and then a part that’s more specific to your subject area.” Ultimately, each teacher came to the same conclusion: the evaluation tool had to be differentiated to be truly relevant and useful.

**The Snapshot approach.** The final theme that emerged at this site was the concerns of using an evaluation model based on a single observation, or snapshot. Teachers saw the snapshot approach as disadvantageous to both the teacher being observed and the evaluator. They also shared suggestions of how to avoid the dangers of such an evaluation model.

**Dangers of a snapshot model.** Although this school’s evaluation was not based on a single observation, all three teachers had experienced such a model in previous districts or prior to evaluation changes at this school. Each teacher expressed concerns that having teachers evaluated on a single observation, whether announced or unannounced, was useful neither to the teacher nor the evaluator.

Teachers felt that the common snapshot model, in which a teacher has one observed observation, provided an incomplete and thus inaccurate reflection of their teaching. In some instances, teachers who know they are being evaluated provide that inaccurate reflection by preparing and teaching a lesson that is not typical of their class; as one teacher commented, “It’s fake. Anybody can put together a great lesson once a year if they know they’re being observed.” Another teacher added that “When a teacher puts on a dog-and-pony show, it wastes everyone’s time. The principal is giving feedback on something that normally doesn’t happen, and the teacher will disregard the feedback anyway because it’s not relevant to what they typically do.”
Two of the three teachers also expressed concerns with a single unannounced observation. Both worried that observers risk “making judgments without knowing any context for what’s going on.” One teacher, speaking from personal experience, shared how frustrating an observation done without context could be:

I prefer unannounced observations because you get a glimpse of what really goes on in the classroom. But it gets frustrating sometimes when, for example, I’ve had comments like, ‘Well, Johnny wasn’t doing what the rest of the class was doing’ in a negative way, but I told Johnny to do that, they just didn’t hear me tell Johnny to do that, or there was a reason Johnny wasn’t doing what everyone else was doing but they assumed there was no reason and that I wasn’t doing my job.

While this teacher felt unannounced observations were more authentic, observing a teacher only once still provides an incomplete picture.

*Multiple snapshots.* Essentially, the teachers interviewed saw the danger of the snapshot approach being related to frequency and the announced status. At this school, the evaluation model is based on the evaluator’s conducting several mini-observations throughout the year. Teachers supported this model, noting that having more than one observation provided a more accurate representation of a teacher. One teacher stated, “I personally like the pop-in model. It’s a more accurate reflection of your teaching because the principal gets several different perspectives of your classroom and you as a teacher.” Another teacher echoed this statement, adding that there was a lack of pressure or anxiety when multiple observations were done: “The frequency of pop-ins is important, too. It doesn’t have to be adversarial, like this is my one chance this year to show him who I am as a teacher.” The third teacher also highlighted the importance of having multiple observations contribute to the final evaluation:
Sometimes the drive-bys happen when the kids are all sitting, doing work quietly, and then he’s [the evaluator] not really seeing me do anything. But then he’ll come in at other times and see me leading an activity or helping kids with a project, so it balances out. I’ve found that the end-of-year summary he writes is a lot more well-rounded because he’s seen me more times doing different things.

She, like the other teachers, saw merit in having multiple observations throughout the year; teachers felt less anxiety over the prospect of being evaluated on a single poor observation, and the final evaluation provided a more accurate reflection of a teacher’s strengths areas for improvement.

All three teachers supported multiple observations, but they were divided on whether observations should be announced or unannounced. No teacher felt that all observations should be announced due to the possibility that teachers misrepresent what they do in class. One teacher felt that all observations should be unannounced so that every snapshot was a “truer version of a teacher.” The other two teachers, however, believed a mix of unannounced and announced observations was more beneficial. They agreed with their colleague that unannounced observations would avoid teachers putting on the “dog-and-pony show,” but they also expressed that having announced observations would allow them to ask for feedback specific to a class or lesson: “The unannounced drive-bys will show me in the raw as I normally am, but I wish there were also one or two announced so I could ask him [the evaluator] to watch for certain things or to give me specific feedback on something I’m planning to do in the lesson.” For these teachers, multiple observations that were not all announced were essential to overcoming the dangers of the snapshot approach and creating a full and accurate portrait of a teacher.
Case #3

The third research site was a suburban high school in southeastern New Hampshire. The school population at the time of the study was 1083 students in grades 9 through 12, 99 teachers, and three administrators who conduct evaluations.

**Evaluation Model.** The evaluation model at this school includes both administrative and peer observations; all observations and resulting evaluations are based on Charlotte Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching* (2013). Untenured teachers are evaluated three times each year, twice by an administrator and once by a peer within their content area. Tenured teachers receive a walkthrough evaluation once a year by a peer and a formal observation every third year by an administrator. All formal observations are announced; walkthrough observations can be either announced or unannounced. Standardized assessment scores or other quantitative measures of student achievement are not included in a teacher’s evaluation.

**Evaluation tool.** The evaluation tool is the evaluation instrument developed by Charlotte Danielson (see Appendix K). Teachers are assessed on indicators within four domains: Planning and Preparation (six indicators); Classroom Environment (five indicators); Instruction (five indicators); and Professional Responsibilities (six indicators). For each indicator, there are four levels of achievement: Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished.

**Evaluation process.** Untenured teachers receive three formal observations every year. Two of these observations happen during the first half of the school year; the third typically occurs between January and April and is one of the observations conducted by an administrator. Although it is not policy, common practice is for the first and third evaluation to be administrator observations and the second observation to be conducted by a peer within one’s discipline. Most
often the peer is the department chair for the subject area, but other veteran teachers from the
discipline may also observe an untenured teacher.

Prior to a formal observation, the teacher and evaluator determine a date and time (class)
for the observation; the evaluator may recommend a certain class, or it may be left completely to
the teacher’s preference. The teacher then shares his or her lesson plan with the evaluator,
whether that is an administrator or a peer, and answers any questions that the evaluator may have
regarding the lesson. During the scheduled observation, the evaluator has a copy of the teacher’s
planned lesson and the evaluation rubric; the observation lasts the full length of the class, with
the evaluator typically observing and taking notes without directly engaging in the lesson.

Following the observation, the evaluator indicates the teacher’s proficiency in each of the
rubric areas using an observation form (see Appendix L). The evaluator rates the teacher on
each of the rubric indicators; additionally, the evaluator writes a short summary for each of the
four domains. Here is where the evaluator highlights a teacher’s strengths and makes
suggestions for improvements within that domain. Within one to two weeks after the
observation, the teacher and evaluator then meet again to review the evaluator’s report and to
discuss the lesson more fully. If necessary, the evaluator may revise the teacher’s evaluation
summary based on clarification from the meeting; likewise, teachers may include their own
written comments on the evaluator’s summary. The document is then placed in the teacher’s
personnel file. For untenured teachers, this same process happens three times each year until
they are tenured.

Tenured teachers follow a slightly less formalized observation and evaluation process.
Every third year, aligning with their recertification cycle, tenured teachers follow the formal
evaluation process highlighted above. Rather than three observations within the year, however,
tenured teachers receive one formal observation conducted by an administrator. During the other two years, tenured teachers receive a single walkthrough evaluation, conducted by a peer, or, if requested, an administrator. As with untenured teachers, the department chair for a given content area is typically the peer evaluator; department chairs themselves receive a walkthrough evaluation from another veteran teacher within their department.

Walkthroughs can be announced or unannounced; announced walkthroughs require no prior meeting or discussion of the intended lesson. During the walkthrough, the evaluator quietly observes 5 to 15 minutes of a class. He or she completes a brief checklist based on simplified indicators from Danielson’s “Classroom Environment” and “Instruction” domains (see Appendix L). Following the walkthrough, the evaluator adds any ideas, questions, or comments based on the observation, and within a week, the teacher and evaluator meet to review the walkthrough observation form. The completed and signed form is then added to the teacher’s personnel file. As with the formal evaluation, a teacher may attach written comments if he or she feels that the walkthrough evaluation is not accurate. Additionally, the teacher may also request that an administrator rather than a colleague conduct the walkthrough.

**Demographic analysis of participants.** There were three teacher participants from this school. One was considered a veteran teacher, having taught at that school for seven years. The remaining two teachers were both in their first year of teaching at this school, and thus were considered new teachers, although one had taught for many years at two previous districts. Their total teaching experience ranged from one to 20 years. Two of the teacher participants were female; one was male. Each taught a different discipline: English, Social Studies, and Science. In addition to the teacher participants, the researcher interviewed an administrator who conducts evaluations. He has served in an administrative role in the school for 10 years; he served as an
administrator in two other schools and taught high school Physical Education prior to this position.

Themes. In this particular case study, three principal themes emerged from the interview and document data analysis: feedback for improvement, practicality, and multiple perspectives.

Feedback for improvement. All three teachers and the administrator who were interviewed felt personally that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation should be to provide feedback for the sake of improvement. All four also believed that the school adhered to the same philosophy of conducting evaluations for improvement. Notably, despite their different roles in the evaluation process, both teacher and administrator participants felt that the school’s philosophy aligned with how evaluation was actually implemented or practiced.

Personal philosophies of evaluation. Veteran and new teachers alike held a personal belief that evaluation should be used to provide feedback for the purpose of helping teachers improve their professional practice. One teacher shared, “I don’t want to get complacent. An evaluation should give me an objective view of where I am in my teaching, an outside view that I can’t really see sometimes, and also give me a picture of where I want to be.” Another teacher added, “Don’t we promote ‘lifelong learning’ to our students? So we should model it, and that applies to the evaluation, too. It should be for further development and improvement, no matter if you’ve been teaching one year or 31 years.” The third teacher, one with several years of experience, agreed:

To be evaluated is to have somebody take a look at how you’re doing and tell you where you’re doing well and tell you where you use some improvement. It’s having somebody else to help you to really reflect, and everybody needs to take
time to reflect, no matter how long you’ve been at it [teaching]. I think it helps
to keep us all kind of thinking, ‘How can I do better?’

Regardless of tenure, these teachers believed that improving one’s professional practice is a
lifelong journey, and evaluations can serve as a roadmap toward improvement.

The administrator interviewed also believed that the purpose of evaluation should be feedback from improvement: “I see teacher evaluation as a way to help teachers get better. It
doesn’t matter if you’ve been teaching for 30 years, there’s always something you can work on.”
It was a philosophy he ascribed to as a classroom teacher and continued to adhere to as an administrator with evaluation responsibilities.

School’s philosophy and practice of evaluation. This school district’s philosophy regarding teacher evaluation, as outlined in the district’s Professional Development Master Plan, is founded on a guiding principle that the purpose of evaluation is improvement: “Appraisal of performance is positive in nature and intent. It recognizes strengths and provides a means for support and improvement. [It] is designed to foster excellence in teaching and learning by encouraging best practices.” All three teachers expressed that this philosophy is demonstrated not only through the written statement of purpose, but more importantly, through the actual implementation of the evaluation tool and process.

Both the full evaluation rubric and abridged walkthrough form were described as tools that “provide constructive feedback.” One teacher elaborated by explaining that the rubric’s indicators are “directly connected to practice and ways of improving practice and student skills.” Another teacher stated of the rubric: “It’s a positive set of diagnostic criteria. It tells you, ‘You’re doing this, here’s where you are in this area, and then here is the next step where you need to go.’ It’s kind of incentivizing success because it sets you up with a path of how to get
This teacher, like both of the others interviewed, felt that the evaluation tool itself provided clear feedback for improvement.

All three teachers also emphasized that the school’s administrators approached the evaluation in a manner that echoed the purpose of improvement. One of the newer teachers said, “He [an administrator evaluator] approaches things from the standpoint of practice, instead of a standpoint of these ‘policy level goals’ that you need out of a teacher.” While the teacher could not speak to whether her evaluator had any formal training in conducting evaluations, she believed that his long tenure in the district had provided him with experience in the collaborative and supportive philosophy on which the evaluation and other school practices were founded. Her experience at this school was in stark contrast to her previous district, where the evaluation was conducted “to make sure that teachers were effectively doing their job.” The evaluative culture at her current school was focused on improving a teacher’s practice, and her evaluator made her feel supported toward that goal rather than measuring her against an irrelevant policy or standard. As such, she concluded that she felt “like I am supported to take a little risk to try new things in my teaching, and it’s encouraging. This support, it’s really motivating.”

Another teacher with previous evaluation experience outside of this district compared the two approaches. At his previous school, the purpose of evaluation was to hold teachers accountable, with administrators specifically focusing on a teacher’s shortcomings. Additionally, student achievement as measured through high-stakes standardized assessments factored heavily into a teacher’s evaluation, contributing further to what he described as “a culture of combat.” He explained, “The mentality was that administrators were out to destroy you through the evaluation, and they didn’t do much to dispel that mentality. We [the teachers]
were fighting to survive, not improve.” Conversely, he described the practice of evaluation at his current school as supportive and guided by the goal of improvement:

It’s a very nice tone the administration sets. They make it clear that they’re here to help you and that the evaluation isn’t like having to swallow a pill you have to take. They want you to improve as a teacher, not because you’re necessarily deficient, but because you can always learn something new, and what’s really key is that they coach you along the way.

It was evident throughout the interviews that teachers believed their administrators translated the school’s philosophy of evaluation for the purpose of improvement into practice.

The three teachers’ perceptions were directly echoed in how the administrator participant described his approach to conducting evaluations. His personal evaluation philosophy aligned with that of the school, and his practice stemmed from his beliefs. His approach was not about faulting teachers or making them feel anxious or upset, but rather encouraging them to reflect and to incorporate best practices into their professional repertoire. Regarding the goal of improvement, he stated, “There’s no pressure and teachers won’t get dinged if their students don’t do well during a certain lesson.” He recognized that not all lessons are equally effective, nor will all students perform equally well; to evaluate and judge a teacher on a single bad instance was unfair and not in line with the purpose of improvement.

Additionally, he stressed that providing feedback for improvement did not mean simply pointing out a teacher’s weaknesses: “I try to emphasize, at least when I do an observation, something the teacher does really well, so that they can continue it or apply it in other ways, and then look at something that they might need to improve.” For him, improving encompasses expanding one’s strengths to other areas, even areas that are not considered weaknesses. In
boosting a teacher’s confidence, this approach has the potential to motivate teachers to improve, thereby validating the purpose of evaluation as practiced at this school.

**Practicality.** A second theme that emerged at this site was the importance of using a practical tool that provides useful feedback. Specifically, those interviewed spoke to practicality in terms of the length of the evaluation rubric and in receiving feedback that is relevant to their grade level, content area, and actual classroom practice.

**Length.** There is no doubt that teachers are busy people. As such, all three teachers at this school valued an evaluation rubric that was not overwhelmingly long; as one teacher bluntly stated, “Having a very long and involved rubric can be a waste of time.” Another echoed these sentiments when she shared that “Teachers just start tuning out or getting lost when you’re wading through pages upon pages of a rubric. If it’s too long, you’ve lost me.” Both of these teachers highlighted a point that providing feedback on too many areas or with too much detail can overwhelm teachers, causing them to ignore or overlook any feedback for improvement, or disregard the evaluation tool as a whole.

Teachers were clear that it did not matter whether the feedback was positive or negative; any feedback provided in a lengthy rubric was equally discounted: “I might get a glowing evaluation, but if it’s too long, I’m not going to read it all.” Another added, “If I have to dig for where I did well and where I need to improve, chances are I’m not going to [dig].” The clear implication is that if the evaluation rubric is too long due to the number of indicators or the amount of detail, teachers do not invest the time or effort to find or use the feedback to work toward improving their practice.

As unanimous as they were in disapproving of an evaluation rubric that was too long, teachers were split on what qualified as overly lengthy. One teacher described the school’s
current rubric, which was four full pages, as long, but not so long as to be impractical: “It is a long rubric, which is definitely one of the pitfalls of the one we use, but it’s thorough. I wouldn’t go longer, though.” Another teacher shared, “If it’s to the point where it’s six pages, that’s too extensive.” The third teacher, drawing on experience from a previous district, stated:

Where I was before, the rubric was one page. One page with, like, 12 areas, but not much detail regarding what each level in each area looked like, so it really didn’t tell me anything. The rubric here is so damn long. It’s definitely better than the one at my old school, but to be honest, I don’t read it all. It’s too much to digest, so I focus on a few key areas and skip the rest.

Having experienced an evaluation rubric that was too short, this teacher believed that this school’s rubric was too long; the former provided no practical feedback, while the latter provided too much. As such, this teacher disregarded some of the feedback provided, choosing instead to focus on those areas she saw as most relevant to her practice.

Relevance. The previous quote speaks not only to the importance of a practical length for an evaluation rubric, but also using a tool that is directly relevant to a teacher’s everyday practice. All three teachers, as well as the administrator, emphasized that practical feedback was specific to a teacher’s grade level and discipline and was focused on areas where the teacher had a direct impact on students. One teacher spoke extensively about grade level distinctions: “An evaluator in an elementary school is going to be seeing different things than somebody in a high school. Teaching five-year-olds is different than teaching fifteen-year-olds. How do you apply a one-size-fits-all rubric in this situation and expect to provide decent feedback?” Concerned that a generalized rubric would be either too vague to provide meaningful feedback or skewed unfairly toward a particular grade range, this teacher recommended having “an elementary,
middle, and high school version of the rubric, with teachers from those grade levels actually helping to develop each version.”

She and the other two teachers all also spoke to the practicality of receiving feedback specific to one’s content area. One of the benefits of peer evaluation at this school was that the peer evaluator taught within the same discipline and thus could provide discipline-specific feedback. One teacher shared, “A major benefit to having the peer evaluation is that he [her peer evaluator] is familiar with if not well knowledgeable in my subject area, and he can give me specific strategies to try based on the content I’m covering.” Another teacher added, “I value what [the administrator] has for suggestions, but he just can’t give me ideas for delivering specific material because he doesn’t have the background in it.” Teachers saw the peer evaluation as especially valuable for the content-specific feedback it provided.

More than one teacher suggested using a differentiated evaluation tool to accommodate differences in grade level and content area. One teacher recommended “different sets of metrics for each discipline so teachers can get very concrete feedback.” Another teacher stated that “A rubric specific to each subject area would be useful. That would take some of the pressure off of the evaluator in trying to narrow down a broad category to fit different teachers.” Even the administrator agreed that a practical evaluation rubric might “look slightly different depending on the type of teacher, or even grade level. I’d love to see a differentiated tool that helps me give better feedback in areas where I’m not as familiar with the content.” In seeing the purpose of the evaluation as providing feedback for improvement, these teachers and the administrator believed that a more tailored—or differentiated—rubric would allow for more practical feedback.

Lastly, there was a common feeling that a practical evaluation tool should focus on areas directly related to the classroom. One teacher shared, “Some of the things they evaluate in the
rubric aren’t really central, in my mind at least, to actual teaching.” Another teacher echoed these sentiments:

I don’t see every area being evaluated as the same in importance, like ‘arrives to work on time’ and things like that. I mean, those things are important, and I guess when you think about job performance, that’s all part of it, but it just makes for a long rubric and sometimes I think it takes away from more important parts, like ‘engaging the kids’ or ‘differentiating the material.’

Both teachers gave less weight to certain areas when using the rubric feedback for improvement because they felt that the most practical information for their own professional practice was related to their impact on student learning.

Interestingly, the administrator expressed the same concerns about rubrics that focused on areas outside of instructing and assessing: “Sometimes teachers focus in on that [indicators not directly tied to the classroom experience] rather than focusing in on feedback about what’s happening in the classroom, with the kids. That’s really what matters.” His concern was that teachers would concentrate on improving areas that were not directly connected to improving student learning. Although his view was slightly different than the concern expressed by the teachers, all three were speaking to the importance of using an evaluation tool that provides practical feedback.

**Multiple perspectives.** The final theme that arose at this school was the value of having multiple perspectives of a teacher throughout the evaluation. Teachers and the administrator believed that having multiple perspectives offers a more well-rounded view of the teacher as a professional and provides more thorough and practical feedback that he or she can use to improve. This was the only site that used peer evaluation, and teachers appreciated the
perspective that a colleague could bring to the evaluation process, specifically surrounding content knowledge and classroom-level knowledge of students. Participants also valued the “big picture” perspective that an administrator brought to the evaluation.

*Peer perspective.* None of the teachers interviewed felt threatened in being evaluated by a peer, in large part due to the belief that a colleague’s evaluation provided a different lens through which to view and improve one’s practice. One of the most common comments was that the peer perspective offered concrete —and welcomed —feedback on a teacher’s specific content area or curriculum. Both veteran and new staff members were evaluated by peers; most often the peer evaluator was the department chair, and veteran teachers did not dismiss the peer feedback even when the evaluator had fewer years of teaching experience. One veteran teacher noted that “My colleagues are the ones who can give me the most useful and detailed feedback on my content.” Another teacher emphasized that while her administrator could provide suggestions for classroom management,

> It’s in my peer evaluation where I can get into good discussion about my curriculum because they know the material; sometimes they’re even teaching the same course. My administrator didn’t teach [subject], and even though he might be familiar with the topics, that doesn’t mean he really knows it inside and out, and even still there’s a difference between knowing the content and being able to teach the content. I just find [peer evaluator] gives me better suggestions about my content.

For this teacher and others, a valuable evaluation offered content-specific feedback, and peers provided more such feedback given their background in the discipline. Additionally, colleagues
with experience teaching the same subject could suggest explicit instructional suggestions that were connected to actual curriculum topics.

Teachers also appreciated that their peers were not removed from actual classroom experience, as most administrators are. As such, peers could empathize with the current demands on a classroom teacher and take these pressures into account on the peer evaluation. One teacher shared, “I don’t think [administrator evaluator] intends it, but sometimes he gives me feedback that is great in theory but useless in reality.” Another echoed this feeling: “I think administrators sometimes forget what it’s like to be in the classroom every day, dealing with 20 or 30 teenagers. [The peer evaluator] gets that because he’s dealing with the same things I am in his own classroom.”

Additionally, because a peer evaluator is still teaching, he or she may have direct experience with the students in the observed teacher’s class and can thus provide feedback specific to those learners: “My department chair [peer evaluator] can give me great feedback on classroom management because he knows these kids. He might know exactly what I can do to motivate Johnny because he had Johnny in class, too.” For these teachers, a peer’s current classroom experience offered a unique and practical perspective in the teacher’s evaluation.

**Administrator perspective.** Teachers valued the peer perspective for the feedback through a teacher lens, but they also saw the importance of the administrator’s perspective. Specifically, they spoke to the administrator’s range of experience and “big picture” view.

Teachers recognized that, unlike the peer evaluators, administrators observed teachers of different disciplines and grade levels; this “breadth of experience” was beneficial in providing administrators with what one teacher described as “a bank of suggestions from all classes.” Another teacher shared a similar sentiment: “I think the administrators have a different
perspective on classroom management because they see all different styles of teaching, and they have the advantage of seeing my students in other teachers’ classes.” She appreciated that her administrator’s observation experiences could provide her with new strategies to try with individual students or her class as a whole.

The administrator also emphasized that his ability to observe many teachers was helpful in providing feedback: “I’ve been doing it for a while, so I’ve seen a lot and know a lot about different strategies and things that work and things that don’t work. Experience is a good teacher, so I try to bring that experience when I’m doing an evaluation.” His observations of different classrooms and teachers provided him with what he called “a toolbox of strategies” that he could suggest to other teachers; he believed that the variety of strategies that he had seen over the years allowed him to make more tailored suggestions that “matched a teacher’s [instructional] style or personality.”

In addition to experience, the administrator’s perspective provided what was frequently referred to as the “big picture” view, which encompassed the school’s vision, goals, and culture. One teacher stated of her administrator: “I get busy with planning and grading and focus more on the day-to-day in my classroom, but he has the school’s vision and mission front and center in his mind. He helps me reflect back on those in the evaluation.” One of her colleagues agreed, sharing, “[The administrator] knows where the school is going, what its goals are, where we are on that path. He gives me feedback that helps me get or stay on that same path.” Both teachers believed that because of his position, the administrator was able to provide more global feedback that would help a teacher stay aligned to the school’s culture, vision, and goals. Essentially, teachers believed such feedback stretched them beyond their individual classroom and helped them improve as a member of a larger organization, namely, the school community.
The administrator also used the phrase “big picture” to describe how he approached evaluations. His perception of what the “big picture” perspective entailed mirrored what the teachers shared:

I can come into an evaluation with the big picture in mind. I see things from a larger viewpoint, in terms of the larger culture of the school, and our goals as a school or district. So I can bring that outlook into an evaluation and offer feedback or suggestions on how a teacher is contributing to that big picture or how they can improve in those areas.

He emphasized that while teachers work within their own classroom community, they are ultimately part of the larger school community, or a “bigger picture.” Thus, part of his feedback—and the perspective that he can share—is how to help teachers be a positive part of the overall school community.

Ultimately, all three teachers and the administrator highlighted the importance of having an evaluation comprised of multiple perspectives. The varying perspectives—through the teacher (peer) lens and the administrator lens—offers the teacher being evaluated with different types of feedback. Additionally, this varied approach provides the teacher with a collaborative network or team of support as he or she works to improve his or her professional practice.

**Conclusion**

Teachers welcomed the opportunity to share their perspectives of teacher evaluation. Despite the common thread of a standards-based evaluation component, each school presented some varying themes. While teachers at the second and third sites highlighted feedback for improvement as the primary purpose of evaluation, the first site spoke to the disconnect between accountability as practiced and reassurance as teachers felt it should be. Teachers at the first
school also spoke to the importance of the evaluation environment and the challenges of fairly assessing teachers despite uncontrollable human factors between teachers and students and teachers and evaluators. At the second school, teachers emphasized a need for a relevant tool, as well as the importance of having multiple views of a teacher’s practice so as to avoid the potential pitfalls of basing an evaluation on a single observation. These themes were echoed at the third site, where teachers spoke to needing a practical evaluation model and multiple perspectives—peer and administrator—to gain a more complete picture of a teacher’s effectiveness. Just as the three schools shared some evaluation features but differed on others, so too did their themes both overlap and at times diverge.
Chapter Five: Conclusions

Many districts have put greater emphasis on teacher evaluation in an era of accountability in public education; some have even tied rewards and punishments, such as merit pay and non-renewal, to evaluation results. Unfortunately, many teachers view existing evaluations as either something to be feared or as simply another “hoop to jump through.” Either perspective limits the effectiveness of evaluations as an accepted and useful tool.

Having a better understanding of how teachers perceive evaluation can inform districts in developing a more meaningful evaluation model. As such, the purpose of this study was to examine how teachers perceived teacher evaluation, focusing specifically on five research questions:

1. What do teachers view as the primary purpose(s) of teacher evaluation?
2. What features of teacher evaluation systems do teachers perceive as most effective in achieving this purpose?
3. What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do teachers view as unhelpful in achieving this purpose or only punitive in nature?
4. What do teachers see as advantages and disadvantages of value-added, standards-based, and peer assistance and review models of teacher evaluation?
5. What role, if any, do teachers believe teachers should play in designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems?

To answer these questions, the researcher reviewed evaluation documents and interviewed high school teachers and administrators at three school districts in New Hampshire. From these interviews and document analyses, several themes emerged within and across the research sites.
Cross-Case Analysis

All three research sites followed a standards-based model of teacher evaluation; indeed, the first and third sites both used rubrics that were based on the Danielson (2007, 2013) framework. At the second and third sites, the evaluation also included a value-added measure and a peer evaluation component, respectively. Despite some of these shared evaluation features, there were distinct differences among the three sites (See Table 1).

Although the rubrics on which teachers were evaluated were both Danielson-based at the first and third sites, the first site had a more negative culture or school climate, which became evident in the themes that emerged. The school’s purpose for evaluation, as interpreted and experienced by teachers, was to hold teachers accountable to given standards of effectiveness; essentially, teachers viewed the rubric as a measuring stick of their practice, highlighting where they were meeting the standard and where they were falling short. Teachers believed that they were measured without support for improvement, and this contributed to an environment of negativity and distrust: Teachers felt disrespected and at times targeted by their evaluators and thereby discredited the evaluation. Unlike the teachers at the second two schools, their overall perspective of teacher evaluation at this site was largely negative, in large part due to a school culture that lacked respect and trust for the school’s practices and the personnel who carried them out.

The second site combined a standards-based and value-added model; it was the only site to use student achievement as measured by standardized assessment scores, and as such, the issue of relevance and the importance of multiple views of a teacher emerged as primary themes. Because teachers were being evaluated in part based on student test scores, teachers at this school desired an evaluation tool that was relevant to their subject area and offered more than
one glimpse of a teacher’s practice. Teachers expressed concern that a single standardized test score may not accurately or fully capture what a student knows; likewise, a single observation may not accurately or fully capture what a teacher does. Thus, the use of a value-added component to the teacher evaluation model at this site led to a desire for a relevant evaluation tool used multiple times.

The third site, although similar to the previous two schools in that it used a rubric to assess teacher effectiveness, was different in that both a peer and an administrator evaluated teachers. The culture at this school, as described by the teacher participants, was supportive and collaborative. Unlike the first site, this school’s climate was founded on trust and respect, and thus, teachers valued not only their administrator’s feedback, but also the suggestions of their peers. The “wrap-around” support that teachers felt during the evaluation process was inherent in the school’s purpose for and philosophy of teacher evaluation: to provide feedback and support for teacher improvement. Additionally, it was very clear at this site that teachers’ personal philosophy regarding evaluation aligned with the school’s philosophy and actual practice around evaluation, thereby adding further credibility to and teacher support of the evaluation tool and process.

Despite these differences, there were three common themes that emerged from the three sites. First, although not always the practice, the primary purpose of teacher evaluation should be to provide feedback for improvement. Second, teachers saw value in an evaluation tool that was both relevant and practical, specifically in regard to content area, grade level, and length. Finally, all teachers stressed the importance of a positive evaluation environment, one built on trust, respect, and collaborative support. See Table 1 below for similarities and differences across the cases.
Table 1
A Comparison of the Three Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Site #1</th>
<th>Site #2</th>
<th>Site #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation model</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>Standards-based Value-added measure</td>
<td>Standards-based Peer evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation purpose, as practiced</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation purpose, teachers’ beliefs</td>
<td>Improvement Reassurance</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of school</td>
<td>Negative (lacking respect and trust)</td>
<td>Positive (respect and trust)</td>
<td>Positive (respect, trust, collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful features noted</td>
<td>Relevance Objective/subjective balance</td>
<td>Relevance (evaluation criteria and subject area)</td>
<td>Relevance (evaluation criteria, subject area, and grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation models supported</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
<td>Standards-based Peer evaluation</td>
<td>Standards-based Peer evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connections to Theory

This study examined teacher perspectives of teacher evaluation through two theoretical frameworks: Hackman and Oldham’s theory of job satisfaction (1980) and Fullan’s theory of educational/organizational change (1982).

Hackman and Oldham’s theory of job satisfaction. The theory of job satisfaction, as developed by Hackman and Oldham (1980), suggests that there are three primary psychological states that affect employee satisfaction:

4. Knowledge of results, or performance feedback
5. Experienced responsibility for the work and its outcomes
6. Experienced meaningfulness of the work itself.
Teachers will be more satisfied with their jobs and with the teacher evaluation model if these three psychological states are met.

**Site #1.** This school did not directly attend to the three principles affecting employee satisfaction. While the evaluation rubric did provide teachers with performance feedback, most teachers found the feedback irrelevant and even biased. In focusing on too many criteria and on areas not directly related to classroom practice, the evaluation tool did not provide useful feedback to teachers, thus giving them no clear and concise knowledge of their effectiveness. Teachers turned instead to other measures of effectiveness, such as student engagement and the number of students who passed their course.

Likewise, although teachers felt responsible for their work within their classroom, they did not experience a sense of responsibility for the evaluation results. Indeed, the climate of the building, wrought with distrust and a lack of respect between teachers and their administrative evaluators, made teachers view the evaluation results with suspicion. With no sense of ownership for the results of the evaluation, three of the four teachers interviewed dismissed the tool and the process as a formality to be endured instead of an opportunity for growth to be embraced.

Finally, three of the four interviewed teachers did not see the evaluation as meaningful in any way. They viewed the feedback it provided as primarily useless and they felt that the evaluation, conducted within a negative environment, was not done for a meaningful purpose. Indeed, several teachers felt that the evaluation was often conducted so as to provide documentation of the need for a formal Improvement Plan, which could potentially lead to non-renewal. Because this school did not meet any of Hackman and Oldham’s three states in regard
to teacher evaluation, it is not surprising that teachers here expressed great dissatisfaction with both the tool and the process.

**Site #2.** This school’s evaluation model was the only one to include a value-added component in addition to the standards-based model. The standardized assessments did provide feedback to teachers, but not all teachers found the feedback relevant to their practice. For example, teachers who taught disciplines other than English/language arts and math did not feel that student scores in these areas on state assessments could be directly tied to their instruction. Another concern was that factors beyond a teacher’s control could influence standardized test scores, thereby providing inaccurate feedback on a teacher’s overall performance.

Despite these concerns, teachers at this school did feel that the standards-based evaluations provided clear feedback of their effectiveness. Teachers received several short observations, and evaluators shared their feedback within 24 hours. This immediate feedback, in addition to the end-of-year evaluation summary, offered teachers knowledge of results, thereby meeting the first tenet of Hackman and Oldham’s theory.

Because teachers develop annual professional development goals based on the results of their evaluation, they experience clear responsibility for the outcomes of the evaluation. There is the opportunity to have pride when a goal has been met; conversely, teachers might experience a sense of guilt for not working toward an outlined goal and having that area addressed again in the following year’s evaluation.

Lastly, because the evaluation is done in the spirit of continuous improvement, and because teachers are supported in developing and achieving goals based on the evaluation, teachers at this school experience the tool and the process as meaningful. The exception is the value-added component, which all but one teacher felt was not a meaningful piece of the
evaluation. They agreed, however, that if local assessments that were directly connected to each discipline could be used, the feedback would be fairer, and thus more meaningful.

**Site #3.** Of the three research sites, this school followed Hackman and Oldham’s principles most fully. This school’s evaluation system was a combination of a standards-based and peer review approach. Teachers felt that they received useful performance feedback from both their administrator and peer evaluators. Although some found the evaluation rubric lengthy, all teachers agreed that the descriptors provided a clear indication of their current level of effectiveness; additionally, all teachers felt that their evaluators gave them concrete suggestions and support for improvement.

Teachers at this school also assumed responsibility for the outcomes of the evaluation. Because they believed that the evaluation model provided useful feedback for improvement, as well as support in achieving those improvement goals, teachers accepted and assumed responsibility for the evaluation results. None of the teachers interviewed feared the evaluation; most welcomed it as an opportunity to collaborate with administrators and colleagues toward a common goal of improving teacher effectiveness for the ultimate objective of student success.

Finally, teachers viewed the evaluation model as a meaningful practice. They respected the process for encouraging collaboration and professional growth; they valued the feedback as relevant and meaningful. Additionally, teachers had served on the committee to develop the new evaluation process, specifically the walkthrough component; this ownership of the process likely further contributed to a sense of meaningfulness of the evaluation process and results.

In following the three tenets—knowledge of results, responsibility for work, and meaningfulness—the teachers at this school demonstrated the greatest satisfaction with the teacher evaluation system than at either of the other two schools. Teachers at the first site, where
the first principle was followed to only a limited extent and the second and third principles were not adhered to at all, had the least amount of job satisfaction in regard to the evaluation. Thus, the results of this study, as evidenced in the different sites, support Hackman and Oldham’s theory that employee satisfaction is affected by how well those three psychological states are met.

**Fullan’s theory of educational/organizational change.** The second theoretical framework is Fullan’s educational/organizational change theory (1982). Fullan argues that all stakeholders in a change process should participate in each of four stages of the change process: initiation, implementation, continuation, and outcome. Doing so promotes greater commitment to the change and a greater likelihood that the change will be sustained.

**Site #1.** This school’s evaluation system has been in place since the school opened nearly fifteen years ago. Only two of the teachers who were interviewed were employed with the school at that time, and neither recalled teachers having input into the development and implementation of the evaluation. Their understanding was that the former principal and Director of Special Education implemented a system that followed a traditional observation process and used a rubric cobbled together from past experiences at other districts.

In the time since, the only change was in how frequently evaluations were conducted: the new administration increased the evaluations to annual observations. Although yearly evaluations was the required frequency as outlined in the original teacher evaluation master plan, past practice had been to conduct an evaluation of a teacher every 3 years. The administration did not include teachers in discussions of why the process was being changed (initiation stage), nor did they provide any explanations after the change of the reasons for the increased frequency of evaluations; thus, teachers were left to make assumptions for the change in practice.
Unfortunately, the majority of teachers interviewed assumed that the increase in frequency was an attempt for the administration to increase accountability and have the necessary documentation for dismissals and non-renewals. Without any voice in or knowledge of this first phase of change, teachers were angry with the new evaluation frequency that administrators implemented.

Not including teachers in the early stages of the evaluation change process led to teacher distrust of the administrators and the evaluation as a whole. Teachers were also excluded from participating in the continuation stage: despite their misgivings about the change, they were not involved in the decision to continue with the new practice; the change was upheld because it had School Board and administrator support. Thus, the outcome of this change process is an evaluation that many teachers will dismiss as a meaningless practice and will follow only because it is required for their recertification. Because teachers were not included throughout the change process, this school has an evaluation model that, were it not a Board-approved policy, would likely not be sustained.

Site #2. The teacher evaluation model at this school was in its first year of implementation. In response to an upcoming state requirement that teacher evaluation models include a component measuring student learning, the superintendent had a few years earlier organized a committee to develop an evaluation system that would meet the state mandate. In addition to the superintendent, the committee included two building administrators, the district’s Director of Special Education, and two classroom teachers. Although none of the teachers interviewed in this study served on the committee, those who worked in the district during the committee’s tenure believed that the teachers chosen communicated information with the full faculty and fairly represented teacher insights.
All teachers interviewed agreed that during this first implementation year, the administrator evaluator was open to feedback. While there was no formal process in place for soliciting teacher suggestions, teachers shared that they felt comfortable speaking to their principal about both their personal evaluation and the new system as a whole. Indeed, one teacher had already shared with the principal her opinion about the announced/unannounced status of observations, and she felt that he was receptive to her feedback. Because this is only the first year using the new model, the school is still in this second stage of the change process. If the pattern continues, however, it is likely that teachers will continue to be and feel included in the final stages of Fullan’s change process, thereby resulting in an evaluation model that is both accepted and lasting.

Site #3. As with the second site, this school had a committee to revise the teacher evaluation model to meet new state educator accountability requirements to include measures of student learning in some capacity. The committee included one district administrator; four building administrators, including at least one principal from the elementary, middle, and high school levels; and 12 teachers who represented various grade levels, schools, and disciplines. Those who were interviewed who worked in the district during that time recalled that each teacher representative gave a monthly update at each school’s faculty meeting; all teachers were invited to offer their suggestions and insights during these meetings. In addition, the district’s teachers’ union discussed and voted on the evaluation model before it was approved for implementation. Those interviewed felt strongly that teachers had been given ample opportunity to participate both directly and indirectly in the design of a new evaluation system.

Teachers also agreed that they were active participants during the implementation process. The committee continued to meet and collect feedback from both teachers and
administrators on the usefulness of the evaluation tool and process. All of the teachers who were interviewed also felt that they could go to their administrator evaluator at any time to voice concerns and offer suggestions. Thus, teacher input during this critical stage was both sought out and welcomed.

At the time of the study, this school was in the continuation and outcome stages of the change process. Having implemented the change during the two previous years, the committee was making final revisions based on teacher feedback and preparing to update district policies to align with the new model. None of the teachers in the study felt misrepresented in the decision to move in this direction. Given that teachers played a significant role throughout the change process, it is not surprising that they accepted and valued the evaluation model, thereby resulting in a positive change outcome.

As the situations and outcomes at these three sites demonstrate, having stakeholders—in this case, teachers—involved in the change process determines the success of the change. In the school where teachers were not included, the change was forced and viewed negatively by teachers. In the schools where teachers were active change agents, the changes to the evaluation were supported and sustained. Districts contemplating making changes to their evaluation model could benefit from adhering to Fullan’s theory of change.

Connections to Literature

The results of this study support existing literature in regard to what teachers perceive as the purpose of evaluation and the benefits and drawbacks of various evaluation models and features.

The purpose of evaluation. Earlier researchers categorize evaluation as fulfilling two different purposes: measuring teacher competence (accountability and potential elimination) and
developing teacher expertise (Marzano, 2012; Danielson, 2001; Papay, 2012). Previous studies revealed that although teachers acknowledge that there is some value in using evaluations as a measurement tool, they see the second purpose as more important (Rothberg & Fenner, 1991; Merrill & Rodriguez, 2011; Atkins, 1996; Marzano). The teachers interviewed in this study echo this belief: An evaluation’s primary purpose should be to support professional growth by providing relevant feedback and concrete suggestions toward clear improvement targets. Indeed, evaluations done only to hold teachers accountable were negatively viewed and at times ignored, while those conducted to support teacher improvement or for the dual purpose of accountability and improvement were accepted as more meaningful and valid tools (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Holland, 2005; Gallagher, 2004).

Interestingly, this study also found that some teachers see an additional purpose for evaluation: to celebrate or reassure teachers in what they are doing well. While this purpose was often spoken to as being connected with that of using evaluation to support teacher improvement, it is distinct and has not been explored in existing literature. Furthermore, those teachers who mentioned celebration or reassurance as a purpose for evaluation believed that it was still secondary to providing teachers with feedback and support for improving practice.

**Evaluation models and features.** All three schools in this study followed a standards-based evaluation model; one school also incorporated value-added measures and another school included a peer evaluation component. Regardless of their school’s model, however, teachers offered their perspectives on the three approaches and the useful and non-useful features of evaluation. Overall, these results echo the positives and negatives highlighted in previous studies of each model and its related features.
**Value-Added models.** Mirroring existing literature, the general perception of value-added models among interviewed teachers was negative (Lee, 2012; Denver New Millennium Initiative, 2010; Abrams, Pedulla, & Madaus, 2003). A notable concern was that there are many factors that can impact a student’s performance on a standardized assessment; many of these factors, such as a student’s home environment and level of motivation, are beyond a teacher’s control (Lee; Goodwin & Miller, 2012). Indeed, this was a concern that spanned evaluation approaches; even those using a standards-based model felt that uncontrollable factors could contribute to a negative observation and evaluation.

Another common concern regarding value-added evaluation measures was that standardized tests do not always align with the given curriculum or assess every discipline (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012; Papay, 2011). Teachers believed it was unfair to be assessed using a test that was not necessarily aligned in either scope or sequence to the curriculum in their classroom. Additionally, as the state standardized assessment addresses only math and reading, teachers of all disciplines felt a sense of inequality. To use a value-added approach for math and English teachers was seen as discriminatory, and to use different value-added measures for teachers of other disciplines opened up concerns about whether all value-added assessments had the same level of rigor (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Baker et al., 2010). Ultimately, the underlying issue, prevalent in both existing literature and this study, was a perception that value-added models provide an unfair evaluation.

**Standards-based models.** The results from this study support most findings in previous studies regarding standards-based systems of evaluation. Teachers appreciate the clear expectations outlined in a standards-based rubric; not only does it provide clear and usually detailed feedback on their current level of practice, but such a model also gives them a target of
the next level of professional practice (Danielson, 2007; Papay, 2012; Marzano, 2012). Particularly because teachers believed the primary purpose of evaluation should be to provide feedback for improvement, this model with clear indicators and descriptions of achievement was the most positively viewed. Likewise, of the three evaluation approaches explored in the literature, standards-based models had the fewest teacher concerns (Atkins, 1996; Heneman & Milanowski, 2003; Papay).

One drawback highlighted in the literature was the concern that standards-based observations demand a significant amount of an administrator’s time (Heneman & Milanowski, 2003; Merrill & Rodriguez, 2011). Teachers voiced the same problem in their discussions of standards-based models, noting that at schools where evaluators conducted shorter but more frequent observations, the drain on an evaluator’s time was less concerning. Interestingly, although previous studies revealed teachers’ desire for evaluator training (Milanowski & Heneman, 2001; Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Marzano, 2012; Denver New Millennium Initiative, 2010), only one teacher in this study suggested a formal training for administrator evaluators. More important than training was trust and respect between an administrator and the teacher, as without trust and respect, the evaluation process and any feedback that came of it was discredited. This finding diverged with existing literature but was present in all three schools.

**Peer assistance and review.** As with the previous two models, this study’s findings primarily echo existing literature. Teachers here and in earlier studies cited a reduced demand on administrator evaluation time and a more collaborative approach to evaluation as benefits of a peer evaluation model (Goldstein, 2007; Johnson & Fiarman, 2012). The most common and significant benefit mentioned, however, is a peer’s ability to provide content-specific feedback. Every teacher interviewed valued such feedback and recognized that while an administrator
might not have the subject area expertise to provide meaningful feedback, a colleague could offer suggestions connected specifically to content (Johnson & Fiarman; Lombard & Bunting, 1989).

This study found that the evaluative relationship between peers was less of a concern than earlier studies have found (Kauchak, Peterson, & Driscoll, 1985; Goldstein, 2007); in fact, the only two teachers to express disapproval of a peer evaluation model both taught at the school where the underlying climate was based on distrust and a lack of respect for teacher professionalism. Because of the supervisory dynamic between a peer evaluator and teacher, existing literature demonstrated more mixed perceptions of peer evaluation (Kauchak, et al., 1985; Goldstein, 2007; Heneman & Milanowski, 2001, 2003); at the three sites in this study, however, teachers tended to be more supportive of the concept of peer evaluation, especially if it was or would be conducted in the presence of clear expectations and indicators of teacher effectiveness.

Overall, this study supports earlier findings regarding what teachers view as the purpose of evaluation and useful and concerning features of each of the three evaluation models. These conclusions add to the limited research that looks at teacher perceptions of evaluation models by looking at evaluation as a whole (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990; Soar, Medley, & Coker, 1983; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012), rather than focusing on a single model; because the conclusions are not specific to one type of evaluation system, they can thus be applied more broadly at any school, district, or educational organization looking to develop or revise teacher evaluation policies, procedures, and tools.
Research Questions, Revisited

This study set out to explore how teachers at three high schools in three different New Hampshire school districts perceived teacher evaluation. As such, teachers shared their beliefs around five research questions. An amalgamation of teacher’s thoughts, ideas, and suggestions from the three research sites follows.

What do teachers view as the primary purpose(s) of teacher evaluation? Teachers at all three schools felt strongly that evaluation should be conducted for the primary purpose of providing feedback for improvement. Secondary to this, teachers at one site believed that evaluation should celebrate or reassure teachers of where they doing well in their practice. The celebratory purpose emphasized at this single school can likely be attributed to the negative climate; the purpose of the evaluation as practiced was for accountability, and observations were conducted in a culture lacking respect and trust, making teachers feel threatened and penalized rather than supported. As such, teachers at this school, in looking for ways to promote a sense of professional competence and confidence, believed the evaluation should not only encourage improvement, but also reassure teachers of their ability.

Least supported was the philosophy of using evaluation for accountability, or to simply measure a teacher’s effectiveness without providing suggestions for improvement. Teachers across the three schools were in agreement that evaluations conducted solely for the purpose of accountability risked becoming a tool for punishing teachers. Indeed, the majority of teachers interviewed at the first school felt strongly that this purpose only served to penalize and demoralize teachers; their perception was likely influenced by their negative experience with teacher evaluation as practiced at that school. Conversely, teachers at the other two schools felt
accountability was not in and of itself a bad thing, but that holding teachers accountable could be done less threateningly by providing feedback for improvement.

**What features of teacher evaluation systems do teachers perceive as most effective in achieving this purpose?** At the first site, where teachers believed that feedback for improvement and reassurance should be the primary objectives of teacher evaluation, they cited multiple observations and discussion as effective features. Observing a teacher multiple times would allow an evaluator to see the teacher interacting with different students and teaching various lessons. This, teachers believed, would provide a more accurate picture of the teacher’s strategies and effectiveness, thereby allowing the evaluator to provide more specific feedback and concrete suggestions for improvement.

Similarly, teachers at this school believed an effective evaluation model would allow for collaborative discussion between the evaluator and the teacher. Such dialogue would provide the evaluator with the teacher’s insights about the observed lessons, as well as the context of that lesson within a larger unit of study. Many teachers also viewed a discussion as less one-sided and threatening as a summative meeting during which the evaluator simply shared the evaluation results. A discussion, in these teachers’ minds, allowed for mutual brainstorming, respectful dialogue, and collaboration toward one or more goals for improvement. In a school where teachers tended to view the evaluation as unfair and threatening, these two features would not only promote a purpose of improvement, but do so in a way that was fair and non-intimidating.

Despite experiencing slightly different evaluation models and more positive cultures, teachers at the other two schools highlighted the same features as being effective in providing feedback for improvement. Teachers at both schools felt that the collaboration and ideas that came from a post-observation discussion was most beneficial in supporting teachers toward
improvement. Such dialogue promoted a feeling of team: Teachers and evaluators—whether administrator or peer evaluators—were working together and supporting one another toward a common goal of greater teacher effectiveness and student learning.

Likewise, teachers at the second and third sites cited multiple observations as being effective. These teachers spoke from experience: The second school followed an evaluation process where the administrator observed teachers four or more times each year; the third school included two administrator evaluations and a peer evaluation. In both cases, teachers believed that multiple observations provided a wider and more accurate perspective of a teacher’s strengths and weaknesses.

Teachers at the last two sites agreed that having clear evaluation criteria was beneficial in assessing current levels of teacher effectiveness and outlining targets for improvement. Both of these schools included multiple perspectives in their evaluation model: The second school used multiple perspectives across time (a single evaluator observing multiple times throughout the year) and the third school incorporated multiple perspectives across time and evaluator (multiple evaluators, each observing one to two times every year). It is perhaps because of these diverse approaches that teachers at these two schools believed clear criteria was so important; indeed, clear expectations of effectiveness would provide a consistent measuring tool across multiple evaluators and observations.

Finally, my findings tend to support the development of evaluation systems that fit within the local context of a given school or district, rather than a one-size-fits-all model. Although teachers highlighted useful features that might be applicable across most contexts, such as the need for teacher input and the importance of having a relevant tool, how these components look or to what extent they are included will be influenced by the needs and goals of each district.
What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do teachers view as unhelpful in achieving this purpose or only punitive in nature? Teachers at all three schools cited the snapshot approach as an ineffective feature of evaluation models. Most of the teachers interviewed at the first school believed that the snapshot model resulted in “gotcha” evaluations, where the administrator focused exclusively on one poor lesson or one disengaged student without acknowledging the larger context. Teachers at the latter two schools believed the single observation approach led to meaningless “dog and pony show” lessons. While the first site was the only one to still follow this frustrating practice, teachers at the second and third schools agreed that a single observation provided an incomplete and sometimes inaccurate picture of a teacher’s effectiveness.

Based on their experience at their current school, teachers from Site #1 also mentioned the lack of constructive feedback and an emphasis on teacher weaknesses as ineffective evaluation features. Both features did little to boost teacher morale or encourage improvement; both of which were in short supply given the negative state of the school climate. Teachers here yearned for a tool and process that would provide concrete suggestions and support for improvement, as well as highlight positive pieces of a teacher’s practice; as such, direct experience informed these teachers’ ideas regarding harmful evaluation features.

Likewise, the experience with value-added evaluation measures at the second school influenced these teachers’ responses. All three teachers at this school viewed value-added features as ineffective; they spoke to unfairness, inconsistency, and the influence of uncontrollable external factors as reasons for their dislike of value-added measures. The teachers at the third site emphasized a lack of clear criteria and an unclear process as harmful features. This can probably be attributed to their experience with peer evaluation; without a clear process
and tool, peer evaluation had the potential to cause an inferior/superior dynamic and deep divisions among colleagues. Although the common feature across the three sites was the snapshot approach, teachers’ additional responses emerged from the specific model in place at each school.

What do teachers see as advantages and disadvantages of value-added, standards-based, and peer assistance and review models of teacher evaluation? Although there were some similarities among the three research sites, teachers at different schools saw varying advantages and disadvantages to value-added, standards-based, and peer assistance and review evaluation models.

Value-added models. At the first school, teachers saw no clear advantages to value-added measures. Rather, they cited three distinct disadvantages: the model’s inability to account for non-teacher-controlled factors, such as student motivation, text anxiety, and family/socioeconomic influences; the misalignment between the robust assessments in class (discussions, research papers, projects) and the format of most standardized tests; and the inequity of comparing different groups of students each year to determine a teacher’s effectiveness.

Teachers at the third school also noted that external factors influenced student achievement; to devalue a teacher’s effort and effectiveness because of factors beyond his or her control was seen as unfair. Teachers at this school also saw as a disadvantage the fact that there was no single test that could be applied to all disciplines, nor were tests for different subject areas necessarily comparable in terms of alignment to the curriculum and level of rigor. The only advantage mentioned was the potential of using value-added measures to inform instruction;
both teachers who spoke to this, however, added that the standardized measure being used need to be valid and aligned to the curriculum for it to be useful for guiding instruction.

Those at the second school highlighted two of the same disadvantages: outside variables impacting student performance and the inconsistency of evaluating teachers of different disciplines with different assessments, or not at all. Teachers here, however, saw more advantages to value-added evaluation models than at either of the other two schools. Teachers felt that a standardized assessment helped to align teachers of the same subject in what they taught. Although there was a curriculum in place, teachers were honest in sharing that unless all students were taking a common assessment aligned to that curriculum, the reality was that there would be teachers who veered from the curriculum. As at the third site, teachers here also felt that value-added measures could inform instruction. Finally, one teacher at this school found that having her evaluation tied to value-added measures motivated her to improve.

The more positive response to value-added models at the second school can likely be attributed to the fact that the school’s evaluation model included a standardized assessment component. As such, teachers could speak from experience regarding advantages to this model.

**Standards-based models.** All three schools included a standards-based element in their evaluation system, which allowed teachers to speak directly to what they viewed as advantages and disadvantages of this model. Teachers at the second and third schools were nearly identical in their responses. Teachers at both schools saw a standards-based model as providing clear criteria or indicators; this was doubly useful as teachers knew in advance on what they were being assessed, and evaluators could more consistently—and hopefully objectively—measure teachers against those standards. Teachers also noted that a standards-based model could be used multiple times or by more than one evaluator throughout the year; both of these schools
incorporated multiple views of a teacher within an evaluation cycle, and so these teachers appreciated the consistency across time and individuals that a standards-based rubric would provide. The only disadvantage that teachers at the second and third sites noted was that standards-based models typically demand a great deal of an administrator’s already limited time.

At the first school, teachers saw one advantage; namely, that teachers knew of the standards against which they would be measured. They cited two disadvantages. First, they felt that a standards-based rubric had the potential to include irrelevant criteria, which would in turn provide meaningless feedback to teachers. Irrelevant criteria encompassed standards not directly related to teaching and learning, as well as softer skills that did impact learning but might not be measurable in a standards-based model. Second, they believed that a negative school climate had the power to undermine the validity and usefulness of an evaluation. Because a standards-based evaluation depended on a human evaluator, who could potentially abuse his or her supervisory power, there was a danger to using this approach. Notably, the disadvantages the teachers here spoke of were issues that they were currently experiencing with their evaluation model; what they viewed as disadvantages were certainly real disadvantages in their situation, but they were only potential disadvantages for others. It is quite probable that their experience impacted their perceptions of the benefits of and drawbacks to a standards-based approach.

Peer assistance and review models. The teachers from all three schools shared the same perceptions of the advantages of peer evaluation. All saw peer review as a positive opportunity for teachers to learn from each other and to collaborate on lessons and instructional strategies. Most teachers viewed veteran peer review more favorably due to a veteran teacher’s classroom experience and understanding of the school context, but a handful of teachers also commented that more novice peer evaluators can offer a fresh perspective or suggestions around more
current best practices. Additionally, peer review models were perceived as advantageous in providing teachers with a different perspective, particularly one that allowed for content-specific feedback.

The teachers diverged more in what they saw as disadvantages to peer evaluation approaches. At the third school, which practiced peer evaluation, teachers highlighted the potential for unhealthy peer relationships and unfair evaluations in the absence of a trusting and respectful climate. These teachers were quick to add that they were not experiencing these disadvantages, but they recognized the possibility of this drawback. Teachers at the second school mentioned the difficulty of having to find and/or train qualified peer evaluators; either option required time and expense. As with the third school, these teachers also noted the risk of creating an unhealthy dynamic among colleagues as a disadvantage. Finally, those at the first site saw strained peer relationships and inaccurate evaluations (in that peer evaluators may be either overly critical or overly kind in assessing others) as concerns.

**What role, if any, do teachers believe teachers should play in designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems?** All but two teachers believed that teachers should be directly involved with designing the evaluation system, especially in establishing a tool and indicators against which they will be measured. The two teachers who disagreed believed that teachers should have input by serving more in an advisory role than as active members of a design team: in their opinions, teachers would provide initial suggestions regarding the evaluation design and later offer feedback on the model that was put forward. Interestingly, both of these teachers had previous careers in the private sector; both commented that, in their business world experience, employees did not have input into how they were evaluated. Neither felt that completely dismissing teacher input was appropriate, but they also believed such input
was best incorporated through a more limited or indirect role. Regardless of their opinions about the appropriate degree of teacher input, all who were interviewed agreed that teacher input in the process would lead to not only the development of a more relevant and practical tool, but also more teacher acceptance of and commitment to that tool.

Teachers were also, as a group, not averse to having teachers participate in the implementation of evaluation systems, but there were disparities and at times uncertainties about what exactly that role would be or entail. One common response, not specific to any particular school, was that the role that teachers played in the implementation process would depend on the evaluation model being used. As an example, one teacher shared that in a peer evaluation model, she saw teachers as playing a very active role in implementation, serving not only as peer reviewers, but helping to explain the process and benefits of peer evaluation to other teachers and School Board members.

Two of the three teachers interviewed at the third school believed that teachers should also be afforded opportunities to provide ongoing feedback during the implementation process. Such “on-the-ground” input was important in refining an evaluation tool and process so that teachers continued to feel committed to the model. This district had a committee that included teachers during previous changes to their evaluation model, and one of the committee’s tasks was to gather teacher feedback during the first two years of implementation; it is not surprising, then, that the teachers at this school recommended such an implementation role for teachers.

Conclusions

There are five major conclusions that can be drawn from the results of this investigation into teacher perceptions of evaluation.
1. The primary purpose of teacher evaluation should be to provide feedback for improvement. Evaluation models founded on this philosophy were seen as more credible and meaningful (Marzano, 2012; Papay, 2012; Rothberg & Fenner, 1991).

2. The evaluation tool must be relevant and practical for teachers to see it as valuable and actually use it for improvement. A relevant and practical tool would be one of manageable length, focused on criteria directly related to teaching, and able to accommodate differences in content area and grade level (Byrd & Raspberry, 2011; Lee, 2012; Denver New Millennium Initiative, 2010).

3. The school culture or climate in which evaluations are conducted must be based on trust and respect, as well as a spirit of collaborative support. This culture must be present regardless of what type of evaluation model is in place. (Danielson, 2001; Amabile & Kramer, 2011)

4. An evaluation model should include a process that allows for multiple views of a teacher. A single “snapshot” approach is viewed as unfair as it portrays an incomplete and potentially inaccurate view of a teacher’s effectiveness (Holland, 2005; Merrill & Rodriguez, 2011; Peterson & Comeaux, 1990).

5. Teachers should be involved in the design, implementation, and continuation of any teacher evaluation system. Giving teachers such voice and ownership encourages the development and acceptance of a meaningful evaluation tool and process (Mielke & Frontier, 2012; Fullan, 1982; Johnson, 1997).

If a school or district intends to find or develop an evaluation model that is seen as effective and accepted by teachers as meaningful, they must take into account the above conclusions regarding purpose, relevance, culture, and process. The extent to which a district incorporates the above
conclusions will vary based on their local context, which cannot be discounted. There is, thus, no one-size-fits-all evaluation model, but a successful model will likely meld local context and most or all of the above conclusions in some capacity.

**Implications for Practice**

There are several implications for practice. Based on teacher dissatisfaction when the evaluation purpose did not align with the evaluation as practiced, a school should first determine what the purpose of evaluation will be when designing or revising an evaluation system. The purpose will dictate how the tool looks and how the process happens. Some evaluation models are more conducive to a certain purpose; for example, value-added evaluation models are more aligned with purposes of accountability than improvement, and have potentially more significant ramifications in low-performing versus high-performing schools. Thus, knowing what the primary purpose will be will help a school choose and refine an evaluation model. Furthermore, given that nearly every teacher in this study believed that providing feedback for improvement should be the goal of evaluation, schools and districts looking for teacher acceptance of a tool should consider developing an evaluation that is based on this purpose.

Second, based on feedback from nearly every teacher at every school regarding the importance of a tool that accommodates different disciplines and grade levels, districts should consider a differentiated evaluation tool that allows these accommodations. The findings suggest that teachers value relevance and practicality in an evaluation tool and the feedback it provides; a differentiated tool can provide more concrete and useable feedback specific to a teacher’s subject area and grade level. In the same way that effective teachers are encouraged—perhaps even expected—to differentiate for the students in their class, an effective evaluation tool and process should acknowledge differences among teachers, as well.
In addition to the evaluation tool and process, a school or district should also examine the culture that is in place to ensure that it aligns with the philosophy behind the evaluation model. Based on the experiences of the teachers at the first study site, it is clear that without a climate founded on respect and trust, it is likely that any evaluation model will likely face resistance. These two elements are essential regardless of the evaluation system in place. There is also evidence from the second two research sites that a culture that embodies a spirit of collaboration supports all models of evaluation, but especially those based on standards-based or peer review approaches. Thus, districts should not only examine but work to cultivate a positive culture built on respect, trust, and collaboration.

The role of the principal or building leader is especially important, as they play a critical role in shaping and maintaining a school’s culture. Administrators must learn the different skill sets of managing one’s staff and leading them toward a common vision or goal. These two elements of leadership are required of a good administrator, and yet they required different skills and objectives. A good administrator knows the distinction between and how and when to carry out each role; in this way, teachers feel both inspired and supported.

Finally, how the teachers at various sites reacted to the evaluation when they were or were not involved in the change process has significant implications for practice. At the first site, teachers were not involved in any stage of the change process, leading to several teachers’ expressing frustration and outright dismissal of the evaluation tool. Conversely, at the third school, where teachers were included as important stakeholders at each stage, teachers valued and accepted the evaluation as a meaningful tool. These findings suggest that schools or districts that intend to overhaul or revise their evaluation model should involve teachers in the process, from the early stages of initiation to the final stages of continuation and outcome. Doing so
encourages a greater opportunity for teachers to take ownership of the evaluation tool and accept it as a valuable, and lasting, model.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

More research needs to be done to extend these conclusions. The sample size of this study was small and limited to high school teachers in a single state. Further studies should examine the perspectives of elementary or middle school teachers, teachers in even larger districts, teachers in low-performing districts, or teachers in other states, to determine whether this study’s findings hold true across other populations of teachers.

Additionally, as more districts begin to connect teacher evaluation directly to student achievement scores, more research is warranted on how this can be done in a manner that is both fair and accepted. The one site in this study that used value-added measures in their evaluation model had less than a year’s experience with that approach; the novelty of the model may have contributed to teacher perceptions that were either overly positive or negative. Thus, further research should investigate not only districts with more experience using value-added models, but also the features and process of value-added systems in districts where such models have been successful.

Finally, more research needs to be done around peer evaluation. The results of this study suggest that teachers are more accepting of peer evaluation than earlier studies have found (Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002; Milanowski & Heneman, 2001; Goldstein, 2007). One of this study’s limitations is that no peer evaluators were interviewed; their perspective might lead to different findings regarding the usefulness of peer review. Additionally, only teachers at the third site could speak to peer evaluation based on actual experience; further studies might explore teachers’ experiences with various models of peer review, as well as their perceptions of
the features they find meaningful and those they do not. Ultimately, further research is needed to both confirm and extend this study’s conclusions.

**Scholar-Practitioner Reflection**

As a former teacher, I approached this study with experience in a single district, and therefore, experience with only one model of teacher evaluation, namely, a standards-based evaluation system. Thus, my perceptions of peer evaluation and value-added measures, as well as the wider range of standards-based models, were informed by my own limited assumptions and opinions, as well as those of my teacher colleagues. I recognized, however, first as a teacher and then as an administrator, that too many teachers disengaged from the evaluation process, viewing it as a waste of valuable time. Given the very personal nature of evaluation, it was clear that teachers had much to share about their experiences with and ideas about teacher evaluation, and it was my hope that in digging into their perceptions, I could come to some conclusions about what teachers viewed as an effective evaluation model.

What I did not realize at the outset was how important a school’s culture was in the evaluation process. While a review of the existing literature highlighted data-supported benefits and drawbacks of value-added, standards-based, and peer evaluation models, this study demonstrated that a negative school climate could undermine potential benefits and a positive climate could overcome drawbacks. Indeed, an evaluation’s success was certainly due in part to the inclusion of useful features, such as relevant criteria and a manageable length, but also in part to the culture in place at the given school. Although I had not anticipated this finding, it makes sense that any change, policy, or practice within a school, whether related to evaluation or not, will be affected—positively or negatively—by the culture.
I also learned that knowing what teachers find effective in an evaluation system is not necessarily enough. Teachers are change agents, as described by Michael Fullan (1982), and they must be part of the development and implementation of an evaluation system. It is participation in the process of change that promotes ownership of the evaluation model, and it is ownership that leads to a meaningful and lasting tool. Each of the three sites in this study exemplified this idea. The first school excluded teachers from any part of the evaluation change process; that, in addition to the negative climate, contributed to a negative teacher perception toward the evaluation model. Despite the fact that their evaluation system included several features deemed effective by previous studies, such as clear indicators and the opportunity for post-observation discussion, teachers’ overall impressions of the evaluation were largely negative. The second and third schools involved teachers throughout the change process, or as much of a process as had occurred yet at the second school; as such, teachers had a more positive and accepting view of the evaluation model. Indeed, in “owning” the evaluation, teachers at these two sites not only saw it as a meaningful practice, but also felt comfortable sharing further feedback with their administrators.

Although the data validated my expectations regarding how teachers perceive value-added evaluation models, I was surprised by the overall acceptance of a peer review approach. I expected teachers to show more concern and even outright resistance to such a model. In reflecting on this, I believe that the culture in the school where I once taught shaped my assumptions of how teachers perceive peer evaluation. The school climate where I taught lacked respect and trust between administration and teachers; even worse, there was a lack of trust among teachers, even within the same department. The majority of my colleagues viewed teaching as a practice done only between a teacher and his or her students; teachers saw
collaboration as a threat to their autonomy, and perhaps even their self-confidence in their teaching ability. Thus, they actively resisted collaboration of any kind. Peer evaluation is not only collaborative, but there is the potential for an unequal dynamic to develop in the relationship because one teacher is evaluating another. The general attitude of my colleagues toward peer evaluation during my teaching tenure was thus negative, and this likely clouded my thoughts on how peer review would be perceived.

In conducting this study, I learned that interviewing individuals about a topic as personal as evaluation invites great emotion. My objective was to better understand teacher perceptions of evaluation, but understanding their perceptions was more complicated than simply knowing what they thought. I learned very quickly in the interview process that understanding teachers’ perceptions required digging into the possible causes of and influences on their beliefs. I came to hear their responses in a more diverse way and learned to identify seemingly insignificant statements as clues that provided greater context to their beliefs. This lesson is one that can be applied in other areas of my practice as an educator, whether as a teacher or as an administrator; indeed, it is a lesson that all educators would benefit from learning.

I intend to share my findings with the teachers, administrators, and superintendents of the participating sites. I hope that they are able to use the information to improve or build upon their existing models. I also intend to share my conclusions with my own district to inform their work on the teacher evaluation tool and process, particularly in light of possible changes to accountability requirements at the state and national levels. More specifically, I think the ideas of having multiple perspectives of a teacher, creating a relevant and practical tool, and finding authentic ways to include teachers in the evaluation development and review process will be helpful for my district. Indeed, I plan to serve on my district’s Professional Development
committee so as to not only share my findings, but also play a part in developing any revisions to our current evaluation model.

Lastly, I intend to explore opportunities to share my findings with wider audiences, such as at state and regional conferences, publications in educational journals, and with committees at local or state levels. My conclusions can be applied to many different evaluation models, and I would like to be able to help educators in my state and beyond develop an evaluation tool that is truly meaningful. This is what inspired me to conduct this research—to gain knowledge that I and others can actually put into practice.
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Appendix A

Letter of Intent to Superintendents
Dear Superintendent ____________ ,

I am a graduate student in Northeastern University’s Doctor of Education program, and I am currently in the early stages of my dissertation work. As a former teacher and current administrator for the Governor Wentworth Regional School District, I have experienced teacher evaluation through different roles and perspectives; my interest in finding a valuable evaluation model has led to the focus of my dissertation. Specifically, I am examining how teachers perceive various models and evaluation features. I intend to interview teachers from various high schools in New Hampshire to gather their perspectives on their current district’s evaluation model, as well as other evaluation methods, such as peer review and value-added measures. Additionally, I intend to interview the principal at each of the selected schools to gain an administrator’s perspective of the evaluation model.

I have identified your district as a potential research site because your district’s evaluation model includes many common features. I am looking for your permission to contact the high school principals and teachers to be possible participants. I would like to conduct the interview at your district’s high school. I would like to contact principals to inform them of the study after receiving your permission, and I would contact teachers via a letter and/or email, depending on what the principal feels is the best method of communication. Interviews would take place in the early fall and would be conducted at a time and place most convenient to each participant. The interviews will in no way disrupt the education of students. I plan to share the results of the study with the teachers and principal, as well as the superintendent.

If you have questions or concerns regarding my study, please contact me at hills.k@husky.neu.edu. If you are willing for teachers in your district to participate in my study, please indicate by signing below or you can write a letter of support for me. For your convenience, you may email a scanned copy to the email address above, or you may send a hard copy to: Kaitlyn Hills
Governor Wentworth Regional School District
P.O. Box 190
Wolfeboro Falls, NH 03896-0190

Sincerely,

Kaitlyn Hills

I give my permission for Kaitlyn Hills to conduct interviews with the high school principal and teachers in my district for the purpose of her study on teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation.

_________________________________________  ______________________
Signature                          Date
Appendix B

Letter of Intent to Principals
Dear Principal ________________,

I am a graduate student in Northeastern University’s Doctor of Education program, and I am currently in the early stages of my dissertation work. As a former teacher and current administrator for the Governor Wentworth Regional School District, I have experienced teacher evaluation through different roles and perspectives; my interest in finding a valuable evaluation model has led to the focus of my dissertation. Specifically, I am examining how teachers perceive various models and evaluation features. I intend to interview teachers from various high schools in New Hampshire to gather their perspectives on their current district’s evaluation model, as well as other evaluation methods, such as peer review and value-added measures. Additionally, I intend to interview the principal at each of the selected schools to gain an administrator’s perspective of the evaluation model.

I have identified your school as a research site because your district’s evaluation model includes many common features. I have received permission from your Superintendent to interview teachers in your school and I am looking to contact teachers to be possible participants. With your permission, I will contact teachers via a letter and/or email, depending on what you feel is the best method of communication. Interviews would take place in the early fall and would be conducted at a time and place most convenient to each participant. The interviews will in no way disrupt the education of students. I plan to share the results of the study with the teachers and principal, as well as the superintendent.

I will follow up with you via a telephone call in the next two weeks to discuss further how best to contact possible teacher participants. In the interim, if you have questions or concerns regarding my study, please contact me at hills.k@husky.neu.edu.

Sincerely,

Kaitlyn Hills
Appendix C

Letter of Intent to Potential Participants
Dear Potential Participant,

I am a graduate student in Northeastern University’s Doctor of Education program, and I am currently working on my dissertation on how teachers perceive various teacher evaluation models and features. My goal is to arrive at a better understanding of what evaluation features teachers find valuable so as to inform districts and policymakers in the development of useful teacher evaluation models.

I have identified your school as a research site because your district’s evaluation model includes many common features. I would like to invite you to participate in this study.

If you choose to participate, we will meet for approximately an hour to talk about your experiences with your district’s teacher evaluation model. The interview will be audio-recorded and will take place in the early fall at a time and place most convenient to you. The interview will in no way disrupt the education of students at your school. Your confidentiality will be maintained at all times; I will assign each participant a pseudonym and all interviews and documents will be referenced using only this pseudonym.

I intend to interview three to four teachers from each school, with teachers representing a range of years of experience and departments; as such, I am asking that interested potential participants please complete the attached demographic sheet and email it to me at hills.k@husky.neu.edu; you may also mail a hard copy to

Kaitlyn Hills
Governor Wentworth Regional School District
P.O. Box 190
Wolfeboro Falls, NH 03896-0190

If you are selected to participate, I will follow up with you to discuss in greater depth the study, have you sign an informed consent form, and schedule a time for our interview. You may withdraw from the study at any time. If you have any questions or concerns regarding my study, please contact me at hills.k@husky.neu.edu.

Sincerely,

Kaitlyn Hills
Demographic Record Sheet

If you are interested in participating, please complete the following form and email to hills.k@husky.neu.edu or mail to Kaitlyn Hills, Governor Wentworth Regional School District, P.O. Box 190, Wolfeboro Falls, NH 03896-0190. By submitting this form, you are expressing interest in participating in the study, but you are not obligated to participate should you be selected.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Name ____________________________________________________

School __________________________________________________________________________

Male _____   Female _____

Total years of teaching experience _________

Total years at current school _________

Department/Subject Area ____________________________________________

Grade levels you primarily teach (circle at that apply):  9   10   11   12
Appendix D

Informed Consent Form
Dear _______________________.

Thank you for your interest in my research study on teacher perspectives of teacher evaluation. You have been selected to participate. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not you would like to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.

Research Study: Teacher Perspectives of Teacher Evaluation

Purpose of the Study: This study will examine teacher perceptions of evaluation systems in several public school districts in order to deepen understanding of what evaluation features teachers find effective and ineffective.

Process: You will be asked to participate in an interview which will take approximately one hour. The interview will be conducted in early fall of 2014 at a time and place most convenient to you. In no way will the interview disrupt the education of students at your school or your professional responsibilities. The interview will be audio-recorded. During this interview, you will be asked a series of questions designed to allow you to share your experiences with the evaluation model in your district. If there are completed evaluation forms that you wish to share with the researcher, you will be invited to do so; you are not, however, obligated to share any of your professional evaluation documents. If you choose to share these documents, they will be photocopied and any identifiable information will be deleted. The original documents will be returned to you.

Risks and Benefits: There are no known risks associated with this research. The information gleaned from this study has practical, applicable implications for both practice and policy. I hope to obtain a better understanding of the evaluation elements that teachers find useful. This, in turn, will help states and districts develop new teacher evaluation systems that are accepted and beneficial tools for continued teacher improvement. Additionally, more meaningful and accepted teacher evaluation systems can have a positive impact on student achievement, school culture, and workplace morale.

Confidentiality: Your confidentiality will be maintained at all times. You will be assigned a pseudonym and all interviews and documents will be referenced using only this pseudonym. Physical artifacts, such as audiotapes, signed consent forms, written interview notes, and evaluation documents, will be kept at the researcher’s home in a locked file cabinet, accessible only by the researcher. Electronic files, such as the coded transcripts and any back-up computer files, will be stored on a password-protected computer.

Freedom to Withdraw: You are free to decide not to enroll in this study or to withdraw at any time.
I have discussed with ______________________ the above procedures and explained how the interview will work. I have asked whether any questions remain and have answered these questions to the best of my ability.

______________________________________________  ______________________
Signature of Researcher  Date

I understand the process and purposes of this project. I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any time.

______________________________________________  ______________________
Signature of Participant  Date
Appendix E

Teacher Interview Protocol
Teacher Interview Protocol

Before we begin, I need your consent to participate in the study. Here is the consent form. Please take a moment to read it over again. Do you have any questions?

In this interview, we will discuss your beliefs about and experiences with teacher evaluation. Do I have your permission to record this interview?

1. What do you teach? What grade or grades do you teach?
2. How long have you been teaching?
3. Why did you choose to teach at this particular school?
4. How long have you been teaching at this school?

I will now ask you some questions about your school’s specific evaluation process and your experiences.

5. Describe your school’s evaluation process.
6. Who conducts your evaluation? What are the benefits and drawbacks/limitations that you have experienced with this type of evaluator?
7. Do you feel that your evaluator is qualified to evaluate you? Why or why not?
8. Do you feel that you receive useful feedback? Why or why not?
9. How often are you observed? Are these observations announced? How do you feel about the frequency of observations and the [announced/unannounced] status?
10. Is the teacher evaluation process different depending on how long a teacher has been teaching, or teaching in this school? If so, please describe the different tracks.
11. Regardless of this school’s evaluation process, do you feel that teachers with less experience should be observed and evaluated more frequently, or that veteran teachers should be observed and evaluated less frequently, or not at all?
12. Are you aware of the standards against which you are evaluated? Do you think these standards – both the criteria and levels of achievement – are appropriate? Please elaborate.
13. Does your school practice any type of formal or informal peer evaluation? What do you see as the benefits and drawbacks of peer evaluation?
14. Does your school’s evaluation model attach weight to student achievement, as measured through standardized test scores or by other means? What do you see as the benefits and drawbacks of this model?

I am now going to shift to some more philosophical and more general questions regarding teacher evaluation. Feel free to draw on your experiences with evaluation in other schools in which you have taught.

15. What do you view as the primary purpose or purposes of teacher evaluation?
16. What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do you perceive as most effective in achieving this purpose?
17. What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do you view as unhelpful in achieving this purpose?
18. Are there any features of existing teacher evaluation models that you see as being only punitive in nature? Is so, what are they?

19. What role, if any, do you believe teachers should play in designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems?

20. Are there any other observations, comments, or questions that you have?

Thank you for your participation today and for being willing to answer my questions. I will be reviewing our interview in the coming weeks and if I have any follow-up questions or need clarification, I will be in touch. Likewise, if any questions or concerns arise after our meeting today, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Again, thank you for your participation.
Appendix F

Administrator (Evaluator) Interview Protocol
Administrator (Evaluator) Interview Protocol

Before we begin, I need your consent to participate in the study. Here is the consent form. Please take a moment to read it over again. Do you have any questions?

In this interview, we will discuss your beliefs about and experiences with teacher evaluation. Do I have your permission to record this interview?

1. What is your administrative role at this school?
2. How long have you served in that role here?
3. Have you served in this or other administrative roles at other schools? If so, for how long?

I will now ask you some questions about your school’s specific evaluation process and your experiences.

4. Describe your school’s evaluation process.
5. Do you conduct evaluations? Whom do you evaluate [teachers, specialists, guidance counselors, etc.]? How many people do you evaluate, and how frequently?
6. What are the benefits and drawbacks/limitations that you have experienced with being an evaluator?
7. Do you feel that you are qualified to evaluate teachers? Why or why not?
8. Did you receive any formal or informal training in teacher evaluation? If so, describe what you were taught. If not, do you think training would be beneficial, and what would you see as being addressed in such training?
9. How often do you conduct observations? Are these observations announced? How do you feel about the frequency of observations and the [announced/unannounced] status?
10. Is the teacher evaluation process different depending on how long a teacher has been teaching, or teaching in this school? If so, please describe the different tracks.
11. Regardless of this school’s evaluation process, do you feel that teachers with less experience should be observed and evaluated more frequently, or that veteran teachers should be observed and evaluated less frequently, or not at all?
12. Do you believe teachers are aware of the standards against which you evaluate them? Do you think these standards – both the criteria and levels of achievement – are appropriate? Please elaborate.
13. Does your school practice any type of formal or informal peer evaluation? What do you see as the benefits and drawbacks of peer evaluation?
14. Does your school’s evaluation model attach weight to student achievement, as measured through standardized test scores or by other means? What do you see as the benefits and drawbacks of this model?

I am now going to shift to some more philosophical and more general questions regarding teacher evaluation. Feel free to draw on your experiences with evaluation in other schools in which you have worked.

15. What do you view as the primary purpose or purposes of teacher evaluation?
16. What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do you perceive as most effective in achieving this purpose?
17. What features of existing teacher evaluation systems do you view as unhelpful in achieving this purpose?
18. Are there any features of existing teacher evaluation models that you see as being only punitive in nature? Is so, what are they?
19. What role, if any, do you believe teachers should play in designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems?
20. What role, if any, do you believe administrators should play in designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems?
21. Are there any other observations, comments, or questions that you have?

Thank you for your participation today and for being willing to answer my questions. I will be reviewing our interview in the coming weeks and if I have any follow-up questions or need clarification, I will be in touch. Likewise, if any questions or concerns arise after our meeting today, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Again, thank you for your participation.
Appendix G

Site #1 Evaluation Rubric
### I. Teaching Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>GROWTH NEEDED</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>CONSISTENTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATION OF LESSON PLAN</strong></td>
<td>No identifiable goals/objectives, not tied to state frameworks/bench marks, no means of assessments.</td>
<td>Objectives are not clearly stated or recognized/assessment is not measuring goals taught.</td>
<td>Goals/objectives are presented, lesson has a clear direction and an assessment tool is used to see if goals were met.</td>
<td>Lesson plan has clear goals and objectives that are in line with state frameworks/bench marks and also in line with the curriculum, assessment tools are used to ensure goals are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTATION OF LESSON PLAN</strong></td>
<td>Lesson does not flow; student’s involvement is minimal. Activities lacking creativity.</td>
<td>Lesson is weak in instruction, needs more student involvement, jumping from task to task.</td>
<td>Lesson keeps students involved and interested, allows for some flexibility, teacher is confident in presentation of lesson.</td>
<td>Smooth flow in lessons and activities, student involvement is high, teacher has alternative activities in place; evidence of student learning has taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIETY OF TEACHING METHODS</strong></td>
<td>Teacher uses only one teaching method (lecture)</td>
<td>Methods are inappropriate to the lesson being taught.</td>
<td>Teaching methods are effective.</td>
<td>Teacher uses a variety of methods so that all students are able to understand lesson and materials presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER</strong></td>
<td>Weak in subject matter, teacher is unsure on materials.</td>
<td>Teacher is not current with subject matter, updated materials needed.</td>
<td>Subject matter is current. Shows a good understanding of materials taught.</td>
<td>Has new and innovative materials/knowledge and is used in the lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUESTIONING SKILLS</strong></td>
<td>Questions are not used.</td>
<td>Questions are general; do not assess student learning or understanding.</td>
<td>Questioning techniques are appropriate.</td>
<td>Questions are used to allow students to process and retain information, used questions for learning tools, and assessment tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CREATIVITY WITH EDUCATIONAL TOOLS</strong></td>
<td>No resources were utilized.</td>
<td>Limited resources were used not allowing for all to learn.</td>
<td>Appropriate resources were used.</td>
<td>Multiple tools were used to help all students in class understand the concepts being taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILIZATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS</td>
<td>Materials used were outdated and ineffective, no materials were used to support lesson.</td>
<td>Materials used were inconsistent with the lesson.</td>
<td>Appropriate and meaningful materials were provided and assisted in the learning process.</td>
<td>Materials presented allowed for high level thinking throughout the lesson, student unitized materials to support lesson, materials added dimension to the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL RESPONSE AND PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>Students were not engaged in lesson.</td>
<td>Student participation was minimal, limited time for student response.</td>
<td>Students had opportunities to be involved in lesson both in question and participation.</td>
<td>Students were fully engaged in lesson; student involvement was encouraged and valued for the success of lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACTION TO PUPIL RESPONSE AND PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>Teacher does not encourage or recognize student involvement or responds negatively.</td>
<td>Teacher responded minimally to student participation.</td>
<td>Teacher acknowledges student participation and is encouraged.</td>
<td>Teacher recognized and praised students who participated; teacher allows opportunity for response, attempting to engage most students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLOWS PROPER SAFETY PROCEDURES</td>
<td>Does not follow proper safety processes.</td>
<td>Has not reviewed processes with students.</td>
<td>Students are aware of processes, teacher follows appropriate procedures.</td>
<td>Teacher has practiced all procedures and information is clearly posted in classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>GROWTH NEEDED</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>CONSISTENTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUPIL RAPPORT</strong></td>
<td>Evidence of positive rapport with students is not visible; personal identification with students is not evidenced; never compliments positive student effort.</td>
<td>Evidence of positive rapport seldom visible; personal identification with students is lacking; positive student compliments given inconsistently.</td>
<td>Evidence of positive rapport is often visible; personal identification is usually practiced; often gives positive student compliments.</td>
<td>Teacher and students are relaxed and comfortable in the classroom; teacher addresses students’ by name; teacher compliments students appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUNCTUALLY</strong></td>
<td>Is frequently late; often attempts to leave early; is absent excessively.</td>
<td>Devotes minimum time necessary to the workday; does not exceed minimum leave time but is often absent; reluctantly devotes extra time.</td>
<td>Arrives at work on time and willingly completes a full day’s work; is seldom absent.</td>
<td>Arrives to work early; rarely absent; volunteers extra time if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERVISOR COOPERATION</strong></td>
<td>Unwilling to accept constructive criticism; always needs to be directed and motivated; shows little self-motivation.</td>
<td>Sometimes shows resentment of constructive criticism; does what is directed to do; very seldom initiates a project or task.</td>
<td>Takes criticism fairly well; begins some tasks independently; sometimes develops improved procedures on own.</td>
<td>Readily accepts criticism and acts upon recommendations; is self-reliant; understands many tasks innately; always seeks better ways of doing things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSIGNED DUTIES (NON-TEACHING)</strong></td>
<td>Failure to perform assigned duties.</td>
<td>Carries out assigned duties in a routine but adequate manner; cooperates because he/she has to; is reluctant to perform additional or difficult duties.</td>
<td>Gives assistance when asked; if required will perform additional and/or difficult duties; exhibits more than basic energy and vitality required for completing duties.</td>
<td>Carries out duties with considerable vigor and enjoyment; consistently offers to help others; readily accepts unusual and difficult assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Classroom Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM CLIMATE</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>GROWTH NEEDED</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>CONSISTENTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL APPEARANCE</td>
<td>Classroom disorganized and not conducive to student learning.</td>
<td>Classroom disorganized.</td>
<td>Classroom is usually neat and organized.</td>
<td>Classroom is always neat and organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>Unprepared for class; disorganization with time on tasks; no evidence of general classroom expectations.</td>
<td>Inconsistently prepared; time on tasks ineffectively arranged; classroom expectations not clearly defined.</td>
<td>Usually prepared; time on tasks generally planned and sequenced; classroom expectations are evident.</td>
<td>Always prepared; time on tasks is appropriate; flexible; plans ahead; clear classroom expectations are evidenced in absence of teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR/DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>Displays frequent loss of self-control; inappropriately applies classroom discipline procedures; makes sarcastic remarks; panics in an emergency.</td>
<td>Occasionally displays loss of self-control; inconsistently applies classroom discipline procedures; unsure of self in emergency situations.</td>
<td>Usually exhibits self-control; usually follows classroom discipline procedures; does not panic in emergencies.</td>
<td>Has complete self-control; follows classroom discipline procedures accurately; takes charge in emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE MOTIVATION</td>
<td>Lacks ability to motivate students.</td>
<td>Attempts to motivate students.</td>
<td>Uses a variety of motivational techniques.</td>
<td>Successfully motivates students utilizing a variety of techniques and personal relationship building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV. Professional Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>GROWTH NEEDED</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>CONSISTENTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATION WITH FACULTY</td>
<td>Is unable to maintain collegial relationships with faculty.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some limited cooperation with faculty.</td>
<td>Cooperates with faculty members. Is able to come to a consensus over imperative issues.</td>
<td>Demonstrates excellent cooperation skills. Offers support and assistance to new faculty. Easily comes to consensus and provides leadership for others to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY WITH PARENTS</td>
<td>Has difficulty communicating with parents or demonstrates avoidance around parental communication.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some limited ability to communicate with parents.</td>
<td>Communicates openly with parents both in writing and orally.</td>
<td>Communicates effectively with parents. Welcomes meeting with parents as needed. Welcomes parental involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT OF SCHOOL POLICIES</td>
<td>Has difficulty supporting school policies.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some limited support of school policies.</td>
<td>Recognizes the importance of supporting school policies and demonstrates support.</td>
<td>Openly supports school policies and demonstrates leadership around implementation of such policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Does not have or has an ineffective professional development plan.</td>
<td>Has a staff development plan which does not address professional weaknesses or district initiatives.</td>
<td>Has an active staff development plan which addresses professional growth and district initiatives.</td>
<td>Has an innovative staff development plan which addresses school initiatives as well as state-of-the-art practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORD KEEPING</td>
<td>Has difficulty keeping or does not keep accurate records which include attendance, grades, parental communications, and committee assignments.</td>
<td>Keeps records on a limited or inaccurate fashion.</td>
<td>Keeps good records.</td>
<td>Maintains accurate records, reports results as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADING PROCEDURES</td>
<td>Grading practices are subjective, changeable, or inaccurate.</td>
<td>Grading practices are not clearly delineated.</td>
<td>Grading practices are clearly delineated in writing, fair and understood by parents and students.</td>
<td>Demonstrates clearly delineated grading practices which include rubrics which allow for student assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSITIVE TO STUDENT NEEDS/REFERRALS</td>
<td>Is insensitive to student needs; does not make needed referrals for services.</td>
<td>Recognizes some student needs; makes some limited referrals.</td>
<td>Is sensitive to student needs; makes referrals as appropriate.</td>
<td>Recognizes student needs; is proactive regarding services to students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Professional Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>GROWTH NEEDED</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>CONSISTENTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATE ATTIRE</td>
<td>Does not follow the Faculty Dress Code</td>
<td>Some areas of Faculty Dress Code are not being adhered to (i.e. needs to be reminded to wear a tie, wears sleeveless shirts/blouses.)</td>
<td>Follows the requirements set forth in Faculty Dress Code.</td>
<td>Follows requirements set forth in Faculty Dress Code and dresses with a professional flare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATENESS OF LANGUAGE</td>
<td>Uses language which is not conducive to the learning environment of the class and school.</td>
<td>Uses language which is conducive to the learning environment and school in most situations.</td>
<td>Uses language which enhances understanding of the subject matter and is suitable for an educational environment.</td>
<td>Uses language which enhances and reinforces understanding of the subject matter and which stimulates the minds of others in an educational environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABILITY TO WORK WITH OTHERS</td>
<td>Does not show any willingness to collaborate with professional staff and has minimal/negative involvement with administrative and/or paraprofessional staff.</td>
<td>Collaborates on a limited basis with professional, administrative and paraprofessional staff.</td>
<td>Works well with professional, administrative and paraprofessional staff.</td>
<td>Works well with professional, administrative and paraprofessional staff and shows a commitment to cooperative strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDANCE RECORD</td>
<td>Person does not follow the Attendance Policy set forth in the Master Agreement.</td>
<td>Person works to meet the Attendance Policy set forth in the Master Agreement but has difficulty meeting its standards.</td>
<td>Person meets the standards set forth in the Master Agreement for Attendance.</td>
<td>Person meets standards of the Attendance Policy set forth in the Master Agreement and is seen at many other school functions at which attendance is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POISE AND SELF-CONTROL</td>
<td>Shows little composure and self-control in most situations.</td>
<td>Is able to make reasonable decisions and use diplomacy in some situations.</td>
<td>Shows composure and self-control on a regular basis.</td>
<td>Shows composure and self-control even when being involved in difficult situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGMENT AND TACT</td>
<td>Is unable to make reasonable decisions and use diplomacy in most situations.</td>
<td>Is able to make reasonable decisions and use diplomacy in some situations.</td>
<td>Is able to make reasonable decisions and use diplomacy in most situations.</td>
<td>Is able to make reasonable decisions and use diplomacy even in the most difficult situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPENDABILITY</td>
<td>Is unreliable, is not a person that can be used for support or assistance.</td>
<td>Can be used for support or aid in some situations.</td>
<td>Person is reliable and can be used for support and aid in most situations.</td>
<td>Person is eager to provide support and aid and is very reliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION SKILLS</td>
<td>Person has difficulty sharing thoughts and ideas with others in an appropriate manner and has difficulty listening to the ideas and thoughts of others.</td>
<td>Person works to share ideas and thoughts in an appropriate manner on a limited basis. Has some difficulty listening to the ideas and thoughts of others.</td>
<td>Person shares ideas and thoughts and listens to the ideas and thoughts of others.</td>
<td>Person actively shares thoughts and ideas with others in a manner which is constructive. Actively seeks the ideas and thoughts of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL ENTHUSIASM</td>
<td>Person shows little or no enthusiasm or eagerness during class lessons and other professional activities within the school.</td>
<td>Person shows limited amounts of enthusiasm and/or eagerness during class lessons and/or other professional activities in the school.</td>
<td>Person shows enthusiasm and eagerness during class lessons and other professional activities at the school.</td>
<td>Personal actively involves others in their enthusiasm and eagerness during class lessons and other professional activities associated with the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Site #1 Evaluation Forms
**PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE FORM**

Date: ___________   
Educator: ____________________   
School: ____________________   
Grade: ________   

*In preparation for your classroom observation, please fully complete the following form before your pre-observation meeting. Give the original to the evaluator and keep a copy for yourself. At your pre-observation conference you will have the opportunity to review your lesson plan and make any necessary adjustments to this form.*

1. What is the title/topic of your lesson?  
2. Is this lesson the start of a new topic or a continuation of a topic or area of study?  
3. What are the demographics of your class?  
4. Identify the specific needs and accommodations that you will put in place to address the multiple learning needs of your class.  

**LESSON PLAN**

What are your learning objectives for this lesson? Why have you chosen these?

What teaching methods do you plan to use?

What learning activities (including methods of participation) will your students engage in?

How will you assess student learning and at what point(s) in the lesson?

What evidence will you use to determine achievement of the lesson objectives?

What specific aspect of your instruction would you like feedback on that may help improve your classroom teaching?

Other comments.

_______________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________

Educator ____________________   Date ___________   
Evaluator ____________________   Date ___________
POST-OBSERVATION REFLECTION

Date: _______ Educator: ____________________ School: ______________________ Grade: _________

Please submit to the evaluator within three school days after the observation.

1. As I reflect on my lesson, to what extent were students productively engaged and interested in the lesson? What aspects of my lesson were most effective in meeting my students’ needs? What were not?
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Did the students learn what I intended? Were my instructional goals met? What specific indicators do I have to confirm learning? Describe the characteristics that indicate the learning goals were met?
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

3. How did I adjust my lesson for those students not meeting the learning goal? Why did I have to adjust my lesson?
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

4. If I had the opportunity to teach this lesson again to this same group of students, what would I do differently, and why?
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

5. How will I build on what I learned as a teacher?
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

To be signed at the post-observation conference indicating receipt and review of this form.

_________________________________________ ______________________  ____________________________
Educator Date Evaluator Date
Evaluation Form for Teachers

| CODE: NBR – NO BASIS TO RATE  ME – MEETS EXPECTATIONS  U – UNSATISFACTORY  GN – GROWTH NEEDED  CE – CONSISTENTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS |

*Explanation must be given on the Evaluative Summary if U/GN is used.

### I. TEACHING TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Check (✓)</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>GN</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Organization of unit/lesson plan (Curriculum is updated and current )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Implementation of unit/lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Variety of teaching methods, Personalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Questioning skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Demonstration of creativity with educational tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Utilization of instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Students actively engaged, “Who’s doing the work”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Reaction to pupil response and participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Follows proper safety procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Rubrics are being use for assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. ATTITUDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Check (✓)</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>GN</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Pupil rapport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Cooperates with the supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Performance of assigned duties other than teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. CLASSROOM CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Check (✓)</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>GN</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Physical appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Effective organization &amp; layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Appropriate behavior/discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Positive motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Check (✓)</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>GN</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Cooperation with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Communicates effectively with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Support of school policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Record keeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Grading procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Sensitive to student needs/referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check (✓)</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>GN</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Appropriate attire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Appropriateness of language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ability to work with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Attendance record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Poise and self-control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Judgment and tact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Communications skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Professional enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. SCHOOL WIDE INITIATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check (✓)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Learning goals displayed and/or discussed with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Participation in curriculum revision using the UbD framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Use of technology, i.e., Google Classroom, OneDrive, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Web2School is updated on a weekly basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:**

**Commendations:**

**Recommendations:**

Evaluator’s Signature: ________________________________ Date: ______________

Teacher’s Signature: ________________________________ Date: ______________

Teacher’s signature indicates that the teacher has received and read this evaluation. The teacher has the right to attach written comments to his/her evaluation.
Appendix I

Site #2 Evaluation Rubric
## A. Planning and Preparation for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher:</th>
<th>4 Expert</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>2 Needs Improvement</th>
<th>1 Does Not Meet Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Is expert in the subject area and has significant knowledge of child development and how students learn.</td>
<td>Knows the subject matter well and has knowledge of child development and how students learn.</td>
<td>Is somewhat familiar with the subject and has a few ideas of ways students develop and learn.</td>
<td>Has little familiarity with the subject matter and few ideas on how to teach it and how students learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Has curriculum maps updated and plans the year so students will meet state standards and be ready for external assessments.</td>
<td>Has curriculum maps updated for the year that are aligned with state standards and assessments.</td>
<td>Has done some thinking about how to cover standards and test requirements this year. Curriculum maps are mostly current</td>
<td>Plans lesson by lesson and has little familiarity with state standards and tests. Curriculum maps are largely incomplete or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Alignment</strong></td>
<td>Plans units backwards, aligned with high standards, state assessments, and all of Bloom's levels, with particular attention to higher-order thinking skills. Also responds to timely teachable moments of significance.</td>
<td>Plans most curriculum units backwards with standards, state tests, and some of Bloom's levels in mind, with particular attention to higher-order thinking skills.</td>
<td>Plans lessons with some thought to larger goals and objectives and higher-order thinking skills.</td>
<td>Teaches on an ad hoc basis with little or no consideration for long-range curriculum goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Assessments</strong></td>
<td>Prepares diagnostic, formative, interim, and summative assessments to monitor student learning.</td>
<td>Plans formative and summative assessments to measure student learning.</td>
<td>Drafts unit tests as instruction proceeds.</td>
<td>Writes final tests shortly before they are given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Anticipation</strong></td>
<td>Anticipates misconceptions that students are likely to have and plans how to overcome them.</td>
<td>Anticipates misconceptions and confusions that students might have.</td>
<td>Has thought about one or two ways that students might become confused with the content.</td>
<td>Proceeds without considering misconceptions students might have about the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. Lessons</strong></td>
<td>Designs lessons with clear, measurable goals closely aligned with standards and unit outcomes.</td>
<td>Designs lessons focused on measurable outcomes aligned with unit goals and state standards.</td>
<td>Plans lessons with unit goals in mind.</td>
<td>Plans lessons aimed primarily at entertaining students or covering textbook chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g. Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Designs highly relevant lessons that motivates students and engage them in active learning.</td>
<td>Designs lessons that are relevant, motivating, and likely to engage students in active learning.</td>
<td>Plans lessons that will engage some students and perhaps get a discussion going.</td>
<td>Plans lessons with very little likelihood of motivating or involving students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Differentiation</td>
<td>Designs lessons that break down complex tasks and address learning needs, styles, and interests.</td>
<td>Designs lessons that target diverse learning needs, styles, and interests.</td>
<td>Plans lessons with some thought as to how to accommodate special needs students.</td>
<td>Plans lessons aimed at the &quot;middle&quot; of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Environment</td>
<td>Artfully uses room arrangement, materials, and displays to maximize student learning. The room reflects student ownership of the space.</td>
<td>Organizes classroom furniture, materials, and displays to support unit and lesson goals.</td>
<td>Organizes furniture and materials to support the lesson, with only a few decorative displays.</td>
<td>Has a conventional furniture arrangement, hard-to-access materials, and few wall displays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Classroom Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher:</th>
<th>4 Expert</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>2 Needs Improvement</th>
<th>1 Does Not Meet Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Expectations</strong></td>
<td>Is direct, specific, consistent, and tenacious in communicating and enforcing very high expectations.</td>
<td>Clearly communicates and consistently enforces high standards for student behavior.</td>
<td>Announces and posts classroom rules and punishments.</td>
<td>Comes up with <em>ad hoc</em> rules and punishments as events unfold during the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Shows caring, respect, and fairness for students and builds strong relationships.</td>
<td>Is fair and respectful toward students and builds positive relationships.</td>
<td>Is fair and respectful toward most students and builds positive relationships with some.</td>
<td>Is sometimes unfair and disrespectful to the class; humiliates students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Respect</strong></td>
<td>Creates a climate of mutual respect which in turn fosters a climate which minimizes the disruption of learning.</td>
<td>Fosters respect and places a high priority on minimizing disruption.</td>
<td>Gains the respect of some students but there are regular disruptions in the classroom.</td>
<td>Is not respected by students and the classroom is frequently chaotic and sometimes dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Routines</strong></td>
<td>Collaboratively develops and successfully implements class routines so that students maintain them throughout the year, even in the teacher’s absence.</td>
<td>Teaches routines and has students maintain them all year.</td>
<td>Tries to train students in class routines but many of the routines are not maintained.</td>
<td>Does not teach routines and is constantly nagging, threatening, and punishing students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Repertoire</strong></td>
<td>Has a highly effective repertoire of management strategies and can capture and hold students’ attention.</td>
<td>Has a repertoire of management strategies and can capture and maintain students’ attention.</td>
<td>Has a limited repertoire of management strategies and students are frequently not paying attention.</td>
<td>Has few management strategies “moves” and constantly struggles to get students’ attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Uses coherence, lesson momentum, and seamless transitions to get the most out of every minute.</td>
<td>Maximizes academic learning through coherence, lesson momentum, and smooth transitions.</td>
<td>Sometimes loses teaching time due to a lack of clarity, interruptions, and inefficient transitions.</td>
<td>Loses a great deal of instructional time because of confusion, interruptions, and ragged transitions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C. Delivery of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher:</th>
<th>4 Expert</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>2 Needs Improvement</th>
<th>1 Does Not Meet Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Expectations</strong></td>
<td>Consistently sets high academic expectations which are reflected in students’ commitment and performance.</td>
<td>Consistently sets high academic expectations.</td>
<td>Tells students that the subject matter is important and they need to work hard.</td>
<td>Does not establish high expectations for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Effort-Based</strong></td>
<td>Teaches students to be risk takers, learn from mistakes, and encourages students to master the material.</td>
<td>Encourages students to learn from mistakes, and believe that through effective effort, they will be more successful. Conveys to students: This is important, and you can do it, and I’m not going to give up on you.</td>
<td>Tells students that making mistakes doesn’t mean they’re stupid; they can learn from errors.</td>
<td>Teacher embarrasses students when they make mistakes. Gives up on some students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Goals</strong></td>
<td>Shows students exactly what’s expected by posting essential questions, goals, rubrics, and exemplars.</td>
<td>Gives students a clear sense of purpose by posting the unit’s essential questions and the lesson’s goals.</td>
<td>Tells students the main learning objectives of each lesson.</td>
<td>Begins lessons without giving students a sense of where instruction is headed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Connections</strong></td>
<td>Routinely activates students’ interest and makes connections to prior knowledge, experience, and reading.</td>
<td>Activates students’ prior knowledge and hooks their interest in each unit and lesson.</td>
<td>Tries to make the subject interesting and relate it to things students already know.</td>
<td>Rarely hooks students’ interest or makes connections to their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Clarity</strong></td>
<td>Presents material clearly and explicitly, with well-chosen examples and vivid and appropriate language.</td>
<td>Uses clear explanations, appropriate language, and examples to present material.</td>
<td>Sometimes uses language and explanations that are fuzzy, confusing, or inappropriate.</td>
<td>Often presents material in a confusing way, using language that is inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. Repertoire</strong></td>
<td>Orchestrates highly effective strategies, materials, and groupings to involve and motivate all students.</td>
<td>Orchestrates effective strategies, materials, and classroom groupings to foster student learning.</td>
<td>Uses a limited range of classroom strategies, materials, and groupings with mixed success.</td>
<td>Uses only one or two teaching strategies and types of materials and fails to reach most students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Engagement</td>
<td>Gets students highly involved in focused work in which they are critical thinkers, active learners, and problem-solvers.</td>
<td>Has students actively think about, discuss, and use the ideas and skills being taught.</td>
<td>Attempts to get students actively involved but some students are disengaged.</td>
<td>Mostly lectures to passive students or has them plod through textbooks and worksheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Differentiation</td>
<td>Successfully meets the learning needs and styles of students by differentiating and scaffolding.</td>
<td>Differentiates and scaffolds instruction to accommodate most students’ learning needs.</td>
<td>Attempts to accommodate students with special needs, with mixed success.</td>
<td>Fails to provide for differentiated instruction for students with special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Adaptability</td>
<td>Deftly identifies and adapts lessons and units to take advantage of teachable moments and correct misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Is flexible about modifying lessons to take advantage of teachable moments.</td>
<td>Is focused on implementing lesson plans and sometimes misses teachable moments.</td>
<td>Is rigid and inflexible with lesson plans and rarely takes advantage of teachable moments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Application</td>
<td>Consistently has students summarize and internalize what they learn and apply it in a different context and/or to real-life situations.</td>
<td>Asks students to make real-life applications for what they are studying.</td>
<td>Has students sum up what they have learned and apply it in a similar context.</td>
<td>Moves on at the end of each lesson and unit without having students apply their knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher:</th>
<th>4 Expert</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>2 Needs Improvement</th>
<th>1 Does Not Meet Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Shares and reviews the criteria for proficient work, including rubrics and exemplars, and students use them to improve their learning.</td>
<td>Shares clear criteria for proficiency, including rubrics and exemplars of student work.</td>
<td>Shows students some of the qualities that their finished work should exhibit.</td>
<td>Expects students to know (or figure out) what it takes to get good grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Diagnosis</strong></td>
<td>Gives students a well-constructed diagnostic assessment up front, and uses the information to fine-tune instruction.</td>
<td>Diagnoses students' knowledge and skills up front and makes small adjustments based on the data.</td>
<td>Does a quick K-W-L (Know, Want to Know, Learned) exercise before beginning a unit.</td>
<td>Begins instruction without diagnosing students' skills and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Checking for Understanding</strong></td>
<td>Uses a variety of effective methods to check for understanding; immediately unscrambles confusion and clarifies.</td>
<td>Frequently checks for understanding and gives students helpful information if they seem confused.</td>
<td>Uses moderately effective methods (e.g., thumbs up, thumbs down) to check for understanding during instruction.</td>
<td>Uses ineffective methods (&quot;Is everyone with me?&quot;) to check for understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Self-Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Has students set ambitious goals, continuously self-assess, and take responsibility for improving performance.</td>
<td>Has students set goals, self-assess, and know where they stand academically.</td>
<td>Urges students to look over their work, see where they had trouble, and aim to improve those areas.</td>
<td>Allows students to move on without assessing and improving problems in their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Detailed qualitative and quantitative feedback is provided frequently and in a timely fashion. Feedback is used to motivate and direct effort as well as clear up misconceptions.</td>
<td>Detailed feedback is provided frequently and in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>Limited feedback is provided by not necessarily frequently enough or in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>Provides little to no feedback to assist students in their learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. Data Use</strong></td>
<td>Works with colleagues to use formative and summative assessment data to fine-tune teaching, re-teach, and help students.</td>
<td>Uses data from assessments to adjust teaching, re-teach, and follow up with students.</td>
<td>Looks over students' test to see if there is anything that needs to be retaught.</td>
<td>Gives tests and moves on without analyzing them and following up with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Tenacity</td>
<td>Consistently follows up with struggling students with personal attention to help them reach proficiency. Makes sure students who need support receive appropriate assistance.</td>
<td>Shares responsibility with students who are not succeeding and helps them improve. Makes sure students who need support receive appropriate assistance.</td>
<td>Fails to recognize when students need extra support and makes little to no effort to provide assistance to struggling students.</td>
<td>Does not make efforts to help students who are struggling or locate extra support for students who need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Reflection</td>
<td>Works with colleagues to reflect on what worked and what didn't and continuously improve instruction.</td>
<td>Reflects on the effectiveness of lessons and units and continuously works to improve them.</td>
<td>At the end of a teaching unit or semester, thinks about what might have been done better.</td>
<td>Does not draw lessons for the future when teaching is unsuccessful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# E. Family and Community Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher:</th>
<th>4 Expert</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>2 Needs Improvement</th>
<th>1 Does Not Meet Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Respect</td>
<td>Shows great sensitivity and respect for family and community culture, values, and beliefs.</td>
<td>Communicates respectfully with parents and is sensitive to different families’ culture and values.</td>
<td>Does not recognize that there are varying cultures and beliefs among families of students.</td>
<td>Communicates respectfully with parents and is sensitive to different families’ culture and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Expectations</td>
<td>Provides parents clear, user-friendly learning and behavior expectations, i.e. exemplars, rubrics, and/or work samples.</td>
<td>Gives parents clear, succinct expectations for student learning and behavior for the year.</td>
<td>Only shares a list of classroom rules and the syllabus/curriculum for the year.</td>
<td>Does not inform parents about learning and behavior expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Communication</td>
<td>Makes sure parents hear positive news about their children first, and immediately flags any problems.</td>
<td>Promptly informs parents of behavior and learning problems, and also updates parents on good news.</td>
<td>Lets parents know about problems their children are having but rarely mentions positive news.</td>
<td>Seldom informs parents of concerns or positive news about their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Homework</td>
<td>Assigns highly engaging homework, gets close to a 100% return, and provides rich and timely feedback.</td>
<td>Assigns appropriate homework, holds students accountable for turning it in, and gives feedback.</td>
<td>Assigns homework, keeps track of compliance, but rarely follows up.</td>
<td>Assigns homework but is resigned to the fact that many students won’t turn it in, and doesn’t follow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Responsiveness</td>
<td>Deals immediately and successfully with parent concerns and makes parents feel welcome.</td>
<td>Responds promptly to parent concerns and makes parents feel welcome in the school.</td>
<td>Is slow to respond to some parent concerns and is unapproachable.</td>
<td>Does not respond to parent concerns and makes parents feel unwelcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Middle/High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Middle/High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Reporting</td>
<td>In conferences, report cards, and informal talks, gives parents detailed and helpful feedback on children’s progress.</td>
<td>Regularly updates PowerSchool. In conferences, progress reports, report cards, and informal talks, gives parents detailed and helpful feedback on children’s progress.</td>
<td>Uses conferences and report cards to give parents feedback on their children’s progress and tell parents areas in which their child can improve.</td>
<td>Regularly updates PowerSchool. Uses conferences, progress reports, and report cards to give parents feedback on their children’s progress and tell parents areas in which their child can improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Outreach</td>
<td>Is successful in contacting and working with parents, including those who are hard to reach, utilizing a variety of methods.</td>
<td>Tries to contact parents and is tenacious in contacting hard-to-reach parents.</td>
<td>Makes little to no effort to contact parents.</td>
<td>Makes no effort to contact parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F. Professional Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher:</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Expert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### a. Reliability
- Carries out assignments conscientiously and punctually, keeps meticulous records, and is never late.
- Is punctual and reliable with paperwork, duties, and assignments; keeps accurate records.
- Occasionally skips assignments, is late, makes errors in records, and/or misses paperwork deadlines.
- Frequently skips assignments, is late, makes errors in records, and/or misses paperwork deadlines.

### b. Professionalism
- Presents as a consummate professional and always observes appropriate boundaries.
- Demonstrates professional demeanor and maintains appropriate boundaries.
- Occasionally acts and/or dresses in an unprofessional manner and/or violates boundaries.
- Frequently acts and/or dresses in an unprofessional manner and violates boundaries.

### c. Judgment
- Is invariably ethical, honest, and forthright, uses impeccable judgment, and respects confidentiality.
- Is ethical and above-board, uses good judgment, and maintains confidentiality with student records.
- Sometimes uses questionable judgment, is less than completely honest, and/or discloses student information.
- Acts in an ethically questionable manner, uses poor judgment, and/or discloses sensitive student information.

### d. Teamwork
- Is an positively contributing member of teacher teams and committees and frequently attends school activities.
- Shares responsibility for grade-level and schoolwide activities and volunteers to serve on committees.
- When asked, will serve on a committee and attend a school activity.
- Declines invitations to serve on committees and attend school activities. Serves as a negative influence on the school team.

### e. Contributions
- Frequently contributes valuable ideas and expertise that further the school’s mission.
- Is a positive team player and contributes ideas, expertise, and time to the overall mission of the school.
- Occasionally suggests an idea aimed at improving the school.
- Rarely if ever contributes ideas that might help improve the school. Is often negative regarding other people’s contributions.

### f. Communication
- Informs the administration of any concerns and reaches out for help and suggestions when needed.
- Keeps the administration informed about concerns and asks for help when it’s needed.
- Does not share concerns with the administration or ask for help.
- Constantly complains, and is not open to help.

### g. Collaboration
- Meets often with colleagues to plan units, share ideas, and analyze assessments.
- Regularly collaborates with colleagues to plan units, share teaching ideas, and look at student work.
- Meets occasionally with colleagues to share ideas about teaching and students.
- Meets infrequently with colleagues, and conversations lack educational substance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h. Self-Improvement</th>
<th>Continually evaluates best practices considering new professional sources of info.</th>
<th>Continues best practices and seeks out effective teaching ideas from supervisors, colleagues, workshops, and other sources.</th>
<th>Will consider ideas for improving teaching and learning that are provided for them.</th>
<th>Is not open to ideas for improving teaching and learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Regulations and District Protocol</td>
<td>Is engaged and invested in student support processes. Fully understands and implements plans established.</td>
<td>Fully understands and implements plans established.</td>
<td>Does not completely implement all portions of student plans.</td>
<td>Is unfamiliar with students’ IEPs and 504s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Site #2 Evaluation Forms
Annual Goals Form

Teacher: __________________
Grade/Subject: _____________________
School: _____________________

Goal:
#1.
#2.
#3.
#4.

Plan of Action:
#1.
#2.
#3.
#4.

Assessment Criteria:
#1.
#2.
#3.
#4.

Teacher: ___________________________ Date: ______
Administrator: ________________________ Date: ______

Teacher signature indicates review of, not necessarily agreement with, the content of the report.
Mini-Observation Form

Teacher: ______________________________

Date and Time of Observation: ________________ Class Observed: ________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evidence/Comments/Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Planning and Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the lesson have clear, measurable goals closely aligned with standards and unit outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an environment created to maximize student learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Classroom Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are expectations communicated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students familiar with routines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is class time used effectively?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Delivery of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students actively engaged in learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is material presented with clarity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are varied instructional strategies being employed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the lesson address differentiated learning needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students engaged in higher order thinking?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-Up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is learning being assessed by the teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is this being used to refine instruction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the teacher’s conduct professional?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Follow up requested by administrator

Teacher: ______________________________ Date: ____________
Administrator: __________________________ Date: ____________

Teacher signature indicates review of, not necessarily agreement with, the content of the report.

Reminder to teachers: An email to the observing administrator should be sent within 2 school days of receipt of this form if you desire a follow up meeting.
Pre-Observation Form

Teacher: _________________________
Grade/Subject: _______________________
School: _______________________

Description of lesson being taught

Goal(s) of lesson

Context of lesson, including preceding lessons and those to follow

Information about students being observed

Other relevant information

Teacher: _____________________________ Date: __________
Administrator: __________________________ Date: __________

Teacher signature indicates review of, not necessarily agreement with, the content of the report.
Observation Record

Teacher: _________________________
Grade/Subject: _______________________
School: _______________________

Date and Time of Observation: _________________________________

Description of Activity:

Commendations and Recommendations:

Additional Remarks:

Teacher: _________________________     Date: ___________
Administrator: _________________________    Date: ___________

Teacher signature indicates review of, not necessarily agreement with, the content of the report.
Summary Report of Observations

Teacher: _________________________
Grade/Subject: _______________________
School: _________________________

Teacher: ___________________________  Date: __________
Administrator: ________________________  Date: __________

Teacher signature indicates review of, not necessarily agreement with, the content of the report.
# Teacher Evaluation Summary

Teacher’s Name: ___________________________  
School Year: ___________________________

School: _________________________________  
Subject Area/Grade: __________________ 

Evaluator: _______________________________  
Date of Summary Meeting: __________ 

## Rubric Ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Areas</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Does not Meet Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Preparation for Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor, Assessment and Follow Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific Commendations:

Specific Recommendations for Improvement:

Overall Comments by Principal:

Overall Comments by Teacher:

Teacher Signature: _______________________________  
Date: ___________

Administrator Signature: __________________________  
Date: ___________

Teacher signature indicates review of, not necessarily agreement with, the content of the report.
Appendix K

Site #3 Evaluation Rubric
## Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</td>
<td>In planning and practice, the teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students. The teacher displays little understanding of prerequisite knowledge important to student learning of the content.</td>
<td>The teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays a lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another. The teacher indicates some awareness of prerequisite learning, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete. The teacher’s plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.</td>
<td>The teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines. The teacher demonstrates understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics. The teacher’s plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the subject.</td>
<td>The teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines. The teacher demonstrates understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and understands the link to necessary cognitive structures that ensure student understanding. The teacher’s plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline and the ability to anticipate student misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</td>
<td>The teacher displays minimal understanding of how students learn—and little knowledge of their varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages—and does not indicate that such knowledge is valuable.</td>
<td>The teacher displays generally accurate knowledge of how students learn and of their varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages.</td>
<td>The teacher understands the active nature of student learning and attains information about levels of development for groups of students. The teacher also systematically acquires knowledge from several sources about individual students’ varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages.</td>
<td>The teacher understands the active nature of student learning and acquires information about levels of development for individual students. The teacher also systematically acquires knowledge from several sources about individual students’ varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes</td>
<td>The outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor. Not all of these outcomes reflect important learning in the discipline. They are stated as student activities, rather than as outcomes for learning. Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand and are suitable for only some students.</td>
<td>Outcomes represent moderately high expectations and rigor. Some reflect important learning in the discipline and consist of a combination of outcomes and activities. Outcomes reflect several types of learning, but teacher has made no effort at coordination or integration. Outcomes, based on global assessments of student learning, are suitable for most of the students in the class.</td>
<td>Most outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline and are clear, are written in the form of specific student learning, and suggest viable methods of assessment. Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for coordination, and they are differentiated, in whatever way is needed, for different groups of students.</td>
<td>All outcomes represent high-level learning in the discipline. They are clear, are written in the form of specific student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment. Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and, where appropriate, represent both coordination and integration. Outcomes are differentiated, in whatever way is needed, for individual students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</td>
<td>The teacher is unaware of resources to assist student learning beyond materials provided by the school or district, nor is the teacher aware of resources for expanding one’s own professional skill.</td>
<td>The teacher displays some awareness of resources beyond those provided by the school or district that are available for classroom use and for extending one’s professional skill but does not seek to expand this knowledge.</td>
<td>The teacher displays awareness of resources beyond those provided by the school or district, including those available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the internet.</td>
<td>The teacher’s knowledge of resources for classroom use and for extending one’s professional skill is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e: Designing Coherent Instruction</td>
<td>Learning activities are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, do not follow an organized progression, are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity, and have arbitrary time allocations. Instructional groups are not suitable to the activities and offer no variety.</td>
<td>Some of the learning activities and materials are aligned with the instructional outcomes, and represent moderate cognitive challenge, but with no differentiation for different students. Instructional groups partially support the activities, with some variety. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure, but the progression of activities is uneven, with only some reasonable time allocations.</td>
<td>Most of the learning activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and follow an organized progression suitable to groups of students. The learning activities have reasonable time allocations; they represent significant cognitive challenge with some differentiation for different groups of students and varied use of instructional groups.</td>
<td>The sequence of learning activities follows a coherent sequence, is aligned to instructional goals, and is designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity. These are appropriately differentiated for individual learners. Instructional groups are varied appropriately, with some opportunity for student choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f: Designing Student Assessments</td>
<td>Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes and lack criteria by which student performance will be assessed. The teacher has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit.</td>
<td>Assessment procedures are partially congruent with instructional outcomes. Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear. The teacher’s approach to using formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes.</td>
<td>All the instructional outcomes may be assessed by the proposed assessment plan, assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students. Assessment criteria and standards are clear. The teacher has a well-developed strategy for using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used.</td>
<td>All the instructional outcomes may be assessed by the proposed assessment plan, with clear criteria for assessing student work. The plan contains evidence of student contribution to its development. Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students as the need has arisen. The approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as teacher use of the assessment information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</td>
<td>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between teacher and students, and among students are generally negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Student interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict. The teacher does not deal with disrespectful behavior.</td>
<td>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between teacher and students, and among students, are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and developmental levels. Students rarely demonstrate disrespect for one another. The teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior, with uneven results. The net result of the interactions is neutral, conveying neither warmth nor conflict.</td>
<td>Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the ages, cultures, and developmental levels of the students. Interactions among students are generally polite and respectful, and students exhibit respect for the teacher. The teacher responds successfully to disrespectful behavior among students. The net result of the interactions is positive, respectful, and business-like, though students may be somewhat cautious about taking intellectual risks.</td>
<td>Classroom interactions between teacher and students and among students are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth, caring, and sensitivity to students as individuals. Students exhibit respect for the teacher and contribute to high levels of civility among all members of the class. The net result is an environment where all students feel valued and are comfortable taking intellectual risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</td>
<td>The classroom culture is characterized by a lack of teacher or student commitment to learning, and/or little or no investment of student energy in the task at hand. Hard work and the precise use of language are not expected or valued. Students are too well disciplined to learn. Expectations for student achievement are the norm, with high expectations for learning reserved for only one or two students.</td>
<td>The classroom culture is characterized by little commitment to learning by the teacher or students. The teacher appears to be only &quot;going through the motions,&quot; and students indicate that they are interested in the completion of a task rather than the quality of the work. The teacher conveys to students that success is the result of natural ability rather than hard work, and refers only in passing to the precise use of language. High expectations for learning are reserved for those students thought to have a natural aptitude for the subject.</td>
<td>The classroom culture is a place where learning is valued by all. High expectations for both learning and hard work are the norm for most students. Students understand their role as learners and consistently expend effort to learn. Classroom interactions support learning, hard work, and the precise use of language.</td>
<td>The classroom culture is a cognitively busy place, characterized by a shared belief in the importance of learning. The teacher conveys high expectations for learning for all students and insists on hard work. Students assume responsibility for high quality by initiating improvements, making revisions, adding detail, and/or assisting peers in their precise use of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c: Managing Classroom Procedures</td>
<td>Much instructional time is lost due to inefficient classroom routines and procedures. There is little evidence that the teacher manages instructional groups and transitions and/or handling of materials and supplies effectively.</td>
<td>Some instructional time is lost due to partially effective classroom routines and procedures. The teacher manages instructional groups and transitions, or handling of materials and supplies, or both, are inconsistent, leading to some disruption of learning. With regular guidance and prompting, students follow established routines and volunteers and paraprofessionals perform their duties.</td>
<td>There is little loss of instructional time due to effective classroom routines and procedures. The teacher’s management of instructional groups and transitions, or handling of materials and supplies, or both, are consistently successful. With minimal guidance and prompting, students follow established classroom routines and volunteers and paraprofessionals perform their duties.</td>
<td>Instructional time is maximized due to efficient and seamless classroom routines and procedures. Students take initiative in the management of instructional groups and transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies. Routines are well understood and may be initiated by students. Volunteers and paraprofessionals make an independent contribution to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d: Managing Student Behavior</td>
<td>There appear to be no established standards of conduct, or students challenge them. There is little or no teacher monitoring of student behavior, and response to students' misbehavior is not representative or disrespectful of student dignity.</td>
<td>Standards of conduct appear to have been established, but their implementation is inconsistent. The teacher monitors, with uneven results, to monitor student behavior and respond to student misbehavior.</td>
<td>Student behavior is generally appropriate. The teacher monitors student behavior against established standards of conduct. Teacher response to student misbehavior is consistent, proportional, and respectful to students and is effective.</td>
<td>Student behavior is entirely appropriate. Students take an active role in monitoring their own behavior and that of other students against standards of conduct. Teacher monitoring of student behavior is active and preventive. The teacher's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students' dignity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e: Organizing Physical Space</td>
<td>The classroom environment is unusual, or learning is not accessible to many. There is poor alignment between the arrangement of furniture and resources, including computer technology, and the learning activities.</td>
<td>The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students. The teacher makes modest use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher attempts to adjust the classroom furniture for a lesson or, if necessary, to adjust the lesson to the furniture, but with limited effectiveness.</td>
<td>The classroom is safe, and students have equal access to learning activities, the teacher ensures that the furniture arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities and uses physical resources, including computer technology, effectively.</td>
<td>The classroom environment is safe, and learning is accessible to all students, including those with special needs. The teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to enhance learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Domain 3: Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Communicating with Students</td>
<td>The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to students, and the directions and procedures are confusing. The teacher's explanation of the context contains major errors and does not include any explanation of strategies students might use. The teacher's spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax. The teacher's academic vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.</td>
<td>The teacher's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success. The teacher's directions and procedures are not fully clarified. The teacher's explanation of the context may be missing some aspects or details. The teacher's spoken language is correct but uses vocabulary that is either limited or not fully appropriate to the students' ages and backgrounds. The teacher readily takes opportunities to explain academic language.</td>
<td>The instructional purpose of the lesson is clearly communicated to students. The teacher clearly identifies the contexts and their relevance to the lesson. The teacher explains their approach to the lesson in a clear and coherent manner. The teacher's use of academic language is precise and serves to extend students' understanding.</td>
<td>The teacher links the instructional purpose of the lesson to the larger curriculum. The directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstanding. The teacher clearly explains the context and its relevance to the lesson. The teacher's explanations of context are scaffolded, clear, and accurate. The teacher extends students' knowledge and experience by explaining the context. The teacher uses appropriate language that is clear and correct and is suitable to students' ages and interests. The teacher uses academic language precisely and serves to extend students' understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</td>
<td>The teacher's questions are of low cognitive challenge, with single correct responses, and are asked in rapid succession. Interaction between the teacher and students is predominantly teacher-student style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers. The teacher assumes all contributions without asking students to explain their reasoning. Only a few students participate in the discussion.</td>
<td>The teacher's questions lead students through a single path of inquiry with answers seemingly determined in advance. Alternatively, the teacher attempts to ask some questions designed to engage students in thinking, but only a few students are involved. The teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion, to encourage them to respond to one another, and to explain their thinking, with uneven results.</td>
<td>While the teacher may use some low-level questions, he poses questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding. The teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when doing so is appropriate. The teacher challenges students to justify their thinking and successfully engages most students in the discussion, employing a range of strategies to ensure that most students are heard.</td>
<td>The teacher uses a variety of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high-level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition. Students formulate many questions with depth, challenge one another's thinking, and make unsolicited contributions. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Engaging Students in Learning</td>
<td>The learning tasks/activities, materials and resources are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or require only rote responses, with only one approach possible. The groupings of students are unstable to the activities. The lesson has a clearly defined structure, or the pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed.</td>
<td>The learning tasks and activities are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students and little opportunity for them to explain their thinking, allowing most students to be passive or only compliant. The groupings of students are moderately suitable to the activities. The lesson has a recognizable structure, however, the pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged or may be so slow that many students have an accumulative amount of “down time.”</td>
<td>The learning tasks and activities are fully aligned with the instructional outcomes and are designed to challenge student thinking, inviting students to make their thinking visible. This technique results in active intellectual engagement by most students with important and challenging content and with teacher scaffolding to support that engagement. The groupings of students are suitable to the activities. The lesson has a clearly defined structure, and the pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.</td>
<td>Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content through well-designed learning tasks and activities that require complex thinking by students. The teacher provides suitable scaffolding and challenges students to explain their thinking. There is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry and student contributions to the exploration of important content. Students may serve as resources for one another. The lesson has a clearly defined structure, and the pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed not only to be intellectually engaged with and reflect upon their learning but also to communicate their understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Using Assessment in Instruction</td>
<td>Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria, and there is little or no monitoring of student learning feedback is absent or of poor quality. Students do not engage in self- or peer assessment.</td>
<td>Students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria, and the teacher monitors student learning for the class as a whole. Questions and assessments are rarely used to diagnose evidence of learning. Feedback to students is general, and few students assess their own work.</td>
<td>Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria, and the teacher monitors student learning for groups of students. Questions and assessments are regularly used to diagnose evidence of learning. Teacher feedback is related to groups of students to identify specific and specific. Students engage in self-assessment.</td>
<td>Assessment is fully integrated into instruction, through extensive use of informative assessment. Students appear to be aware of, and have some evidence that they have contributed to, the assessment criteria. Questions and assessments are used regularly to diagnose evidence of learning by individual students. A variety of forms of feedback, both teacher and peer, is accurate and specific and advances learning. Students self-assess and monitor their own progress. The teacher successfully differentiates instruction to address individual students' misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</td>
<td>The teacher ignores students’ questions when students have difficulty learning, the teacher blames them or their home environment for their lack of success. The teacher makes no attempt to adjust the lesson even when students don't understand the content.</td>
<td>The teacher accepts responsibility for the success of all students but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to use. Adjustment of the lesson in response to assessment is minimal or ineffective.</td>
<td>The teacher successfully accommodates students’ questions and interests. Drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies, the teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning. If improved measures are needed, the teacher makes a minor adjustment to the lesson and does so smoothly.</td>
<td>The teacher sets an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or students' interests, and successfully adapts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings. Using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school or community, the teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a: Reflecting on Teaching</td>
<td>The teacher does not keep a record of a lesson, does not make usual efforts or achieves increased instructional outcomes, or the teacher only makes recommendations on a few topics. Teaching is not the best of it. The teacher has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved.</td>
<td>The teacher can accurately reproduce a lesson’s effectiveness and the degree to which instructional outcomes were met. The teacher is confident about the effectiveness of their teaching and can cite examples of how a lesson could be improved.</td>
<td>The teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment. The teacher makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught.</td>
<td>The teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes. The teacher can cite specific examples of how a lesson could be improved. Students contribute their knowledge and participate in maintaining the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</td>
<td>The teacher’s system for maintaining information on student performance or assignments and student progress is not effective or its effectiveness is questionable. The teacher’s records show non-reflective activities in disarray, the test being error and confusion.</td>
<td>The teacher’s system for maintaining information on student performance or assignments and student progress is effective. The records are unambiguous and only partially effective. The teacher’s system for non-instructional activities are adequate but inefficient and, unless given frequent oversight by the teacher, prone to errors.</td>
<td>The teacher’s system for maintaining information on student performance or assignments, student progress in learning, and student progress in learning are fully effective. The teacher’s system for non-instructional activities are fully effective. Students contribute their knowledge and participate in maintaining the records.</td>
<td>The teacher’s system for maintaining information on student performance or assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional activities is fully effective. Students contribute their knowledge and participate in maintaining the records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c: Communicating with Families</td>
<td>The teacher provides little information about the instructional program to families; the teacher’s communication about students’ progress is minimal. The teacher does not respond or respond insufficiently to parental concerns.</td>
<td>The teacher provides frequent and appropriate information about the instructional program and conveys information about students’ progress in a culturally sensitive manner. The teacher makes some attempts to engage families in the instructional program.</td>
<td>The teacher communicates frequently with families in a culturally sensitive manner, with students contributing to the communication. The teacher responds to family concerns about students’ progress and cultural sensitivity. The teacher’s efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.</td>
<td>The teacher communicates frequently with families in a culturally sensitive manner, with students contributing to the communication. The teacher responds to family concerns about students’ progress and cultural sensitivity. The teacher’s efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d: Participating in the Professional Community</td>
<td>The teacher’s relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving. The teacher avoids participation in a professional culture of inquiry, meeting opportunities to become involved. The teacher avoids becoming involved in school events or school district projects.</td>
<td>The teacher maintains cordial relationships with colleagues in full duties that the school or district requires. The teacher participates in the school’s culture of professional inquiry when invited to do so. The teacher participates in school events and school district projects, making a substantial contribution.</td>
<td>The teacher’s relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation; the teacher actively participates in a culture of professional inquiry. The teacher volunteers to participate in school events and school district projects, making a substantial contribution.</td>
<td>The teacher’s relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation; the teacher actively participates in a culture of professional inquiry. The teacher volunteers to participate in school events and school district projects, making a substantial contribution and assuming leadership role in at least one aspect of school or district life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
<td>The teacher engages in no professional development activities to enhance their knowledge or skill. The teacher seeks feedback on teaching performance from either supervisors or more experienced colleagues. The teacher’s knowledge about the teacher is limited. The teacher’s knowledge about professional development opportunities is limited.</td>
<td>The teacher participates in a limited extent in professional development opportunities that are relevant to the teacher’s needs and knowledge, or to assume professional responsibilities.</td>
<td>The teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance their knowledge and professional development. The teacher actively engages with colleagues and supervisors in professional conversations about practice, including feedback on teaching performance. The teacher finds professional development opportunities to assist other teachers and contribute to the profession.</td>
<td>The teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance their knowledge and professional development. The teacher actively engages with colleagues and supervisors in professional conversations about practice, including feedback on teaching performance. The teacher finds professional development opportunities to assist other teachers and contribute to the profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f: Showing Professionalism</td>
<td>The teacher displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. The teacher is not alert to students’ needs and contributes to the school’s lack of ability to serve the school. The teacher makes decisions that are based on self-serving interests. The teacher does not comply with school and district regulations.</td>
<td>The teacher is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. The teacher’s attempts to serve the teacher are consistent, and the teacher is willing to adjust to the needs of the teacher. The teacher is willing to adjust to the needs of the teacher. The teacher complies with school and district regulations.</td>
<td>The teacher displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. The teacher is active in serving students, working to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed. The teacher maintains an open mind in team or departmental discussions. The teacher complies with school and district regulations.</td>
<td>The teacher can be counted on to hold the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality and to take a leadership role with colleagues. The teacher is highly proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed. The teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes and behaviors that are not in the best interests of students, particularly those that traditionally underprivileged, are honored in the school. The teacher takes a leadership role in teams or departmental decision making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional standards. The teacher complies fully with school and district regulations, taking a leadership role with colleagues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt from The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument, 2013 Edition. Copyright © 2013 The Danielson Group. All rights reserved.
Appendix L

Site #3 Evaluation Forms
### Teacher Observation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator Name:</th>
<th>School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>Subject:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer:</td>
<td>Date of Observation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This form should be used in conjunction with Danielson’s Rubrics for Enhancing Professional Practice (2nd ed.). Please use the following indicators:

- D = Distinguished
- P = Proficient
- B = Basic
- U = Unsatisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c: Selecting Instructional Goals</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e: Designing Coherent Instruction</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f: Designing Student Assessments</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c: Managing Classroom Procedure</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d: Managing Student Behavior</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e: Organizing Physical Space</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 3: Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a: Communicating with Students</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c: Engaging Students in Learning</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d: Using Assessments in Instruction</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a: Reflecting on Teaching</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c: Communicating with Families</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d: Participating in the Professional Community</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f: Showing Professionalism</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENDATIONS:**

**Domain 1: Planning and Preparation:**

**Domain 2: Environment:**

**Domain 3: Instruction/Delivery of Service:**

**Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities:**

__________________________________________________________

Signature of Peer or Administrator Observer                Date

__________________________________________________________

Signature of Teacher                                        Date

*Teacher’s signature indicates that he/she has read the above evaluation.*
Classroom Walkthrough Observation

Educator: ___________________________  Grade/Subject: ______________________
School: _____________________________  Date: ______________________
Observer: ___________________________

Classroom Environment

_____ Creates an environment of respect and rapport conducive to learning

_____ Manages classroom procedures and student behavior

_____ Organizes physical space in a way that promotes learning

Instruction

_____ Communicates with students in a respectful and appropriate way

_____ Uses questioning and discussion techniques

_____ Demonstrates flexibility and the ability to differentiate to meet student needs

_____ Engages students in learning

SUGGESTIONS AND QUESTIONS

___________________________________________________________

Signature of Peer or Administrator Observer

_________________________  Date

___________________________________________________________

Signature of Teacher

_________________________  Date