Marshall University
Marshall Digital Scholar

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

2016

Principal Perceptions of Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia

Brent Douglas Griffith
brentgriffith328@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, and the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF STANDARDS-BASED TEACHER EVALUATION IN WEST VIRGINIA

SIGNATURE PAGE

I hereby affirm that the following project meets the high academic standards for original

scholarship and creative work established by my discipline, college, and the Graduate College of

Marshall University. With my signature, I approve the manuscript for publication.

Project Title: Principal Perceptions of Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia

Student's Name: Brent Griffith

Department: Leadership Studies

College: Marshall University

Committee Chairperson

Date 4-26-15

iii

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my father, Melvin Griffith, the hardest working man I've ever known. My work is different from his, but I hope my effort matches his example.

And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ.

Colossians 3:23-24

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Elizabeth Campbell, Dr. Lisa Beck, Dr. Barbara Nicholson, and committee chair, Dr. Louis Watts. Also, I would like to thank Dr. Michael Cunningham for the benefit of his expertise throughout my graduate education. Each of you has provided guidance throughout my coursework, research, and writing has been integral to my growth as a student and as a professional.

Thank you to my wife, Brittany Griffith, for her patience and encouragement during this long process. I promise, honey, I am finished. It is your turn now. You were always a better student than me anyway. Thank you to my parents, Melvin and Kathy Griffith, and my brother, Marty Griffith. I was blessed with the best family for which a person could have hoped. You have been endlessly supportive and I could not have done this without your love. Thank you to my in-laws, Calvin and Norma Brogan, for your help and encouragement.

While I pursued my doctoral degree, God blessed me with two beautiful children, Beckett Douglas Griffith and Brinley Danielle Griffith. I love you both so much. There were times when your laughter and your kisses were the only things that kept me going. Please, remember that nothing is out of your reach if you are willing to work for it.

Many thanks go to the congregation of McCorkle Free Will Baptist Church of Sod, WV. The love and support you have shown my family over the years has been overwhelming.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my God for his mercy and faithfulness. It was through much prayer by myself and others that this was accomplished. Truly, I can do all things through Christ, who strengthens me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Standards-based teacher evaluations have become the norm in many states due to an increased focus on student achievement and teacher effectiveness. These evaluations have become integral to the improvement of classroom instruction efforts and the planning of specific professional development for teachers. West Virginia deployed a new standards-based teacher evaluation system in 2014, using the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards as a basis for measuring teacher performance and growth in certain areas. The new evaluation system also included teacher self-reflection and goal-setting portions. The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of school principals as to the effectiveness of the new standards-based West Virginia teacher evaluation system and its self-reflection and goal-setting portions. A researcher-created survey was administered electronically through Survey Monkey to 695 West Virginia principals. The survey was completed by 281 principals for a response rate of 40%. The study's findings suggested that while principals have an overall positive perception of the new system, they did not tend to regard it as extremely effective in enabling them to assess teacher performance. Ancillary findings suggested an ambivalence from principals regarding the degree to which the evaluation process and the evaluation instrument allowed them to effectively evaluate teachers. It is suggested that this study be replicated with the population expanded to include West Virginia teachers who have participated in the new evaluation system.

Keywords: principal, teacher, evaluation, standards-based, self-reflection, goal setting

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance evaluation has become a topic of much discussion in recent years and has undergone some significant changes (Overland, 2014). The importance of evaluations has been demonstrated in the emphasis placed on it in today's education environment. In fact, the federal Race-to-the-Top program encouraged more rigorous teacher evaluations as a means of school reform (Popham & DeSander, 2014). Overland (2014) stated that there are two broad categories into which teacher evaluations fall: student centered measures and teacher-centered measures. The former includes student growth data such as standardized test scores, and the later focuses on the actions of the teacher through means such as observations and self-reflections. These procedures have been widely known and used, but the importance of the principal's role in the process has seldom been stressed (Derrington, 2011).

West Virginia, in its new performance-based teacher evaluation system (WVBOE Policy 5310), evaluates teachers using several criteria. West Virginia principals rate teachers on seven standards: curriculum and planning, the learner and the learning environment, teaching, professional responsibilities for self-renewal, professional responsibilities for school and community, student growth, and professional conduct. The policy also requires teachers to complete a self-reflection and to create two student learning goals to allow an overall rating and to address the continued development of teachers' professional practice. In addition, a standardized school growth score is included which is incorporated into the teacher's summative evaluation. Similar systems are used in other states, but limited research exists as to their effectiveness in enhancing teachers' professional practice.

This study attempted to measure the perceptions of school principals about the effectiveness of the new West Virginia performance-based teacher evaluation system in measuring teacher professional growth. The perceptions of principals, because of their close involvement in the evaluation process, provided data useful to practitioners and policy makers as to the evaluation system's ability to measure and affect teacher professional growth and development.

BACKGROUND

Teacher evaluation in America began long before the foundation of the United States. From colonial times to the industrial revolution, educators were supervised by the leaders of their respective communities. Most often, these supervisors were local businessmen and members of the clergy who ensured teachers would uphold the societal mores of the people of the region (Tracy, 1995).

In the 1800s, control of schools began to shift from community leaders to organized local school districts. Within these new structures, the roles of superintendent and head teacher first emerged because education was becoming too complex for nonprofessionals (Tracy, 1995). Due to the population growth and economic development during the industrial revolution, schools began to focus on producing a large labor force to support the needs of industry (Jacobson & Battaglia, 2001). With this shift came the focus on scientific management which was prevalent in manufacturing.

Between World War I and World War II, schools began to focus less on scientific management and more on human development. However, this trend reversed dramatically with the Soviet launch of the Sputnik satellite and the beginning of the space race. Math and science

then become the primary focus of schooling. Likewise, the focus of teacher appraisal now shifted for the first time to research based strategies (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

In this century, the focus has shifted from supervision to evaluation and from teacher behavior to student achievement (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). With this new focus in mind, the purpose of teacher evaluations is now twofold: to ensure high-quality teaching and to promote professional development (Danielson, 2010).

Previous Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia

Before the new version of the West Virginia Performance Evaluation of School Personnel Policy (5310) was implemented on June 14, 2013, the state used a teacher evaluation system comprised mainly of teacher observations and summative teacher evaluations. In this system, principals rated teachers on seven standards: programs of study, classroom climate, instructional management system, student progress, communication, professional work habits, and technology standards. Principals rated teachers on each of these standards using the following scale (WVBOE Policy 5310):

- Exemplary – Performance is consistently exceptional in meeting performance criteria demonstrated by providing extraordinary opportunities for student success through instructional strategies that confirm the teacher's expertise and the ability to reach all students.

- Exceeds Standards – Performance is consistently above average in meeting performance criteria demonstrated by going beyond the established standards and instructional practices in reaching all students.

- Meets Standards – Performance is consistently adequate in meeting performance criteria.

3

- Unsatisfactory – Performance is not consistently acceptable in meeting performance criteria.

The teacher's role in this process was mostly passive. Principals completed observations throughout the year and then conferenced with teachers at the end of the school year to discuss the ratings the teacher had received. Teachers had the opportunity to add an addendum to their evaluation, but otherwise took no part in the evaluation process.

Performance-based Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia

West Virginia Performance Evaluation of School Personnel Policy (5310) went into effect statewide for the 2013-2014 school year. As a performance-based system, teacher evaluations included school-wide student learning growth, as measured by standardized test scores. In addition, teachers were assigned a more active role in their own evaluations. The major purposes of WVBOE Policy 5310 are:

1. To promote professional growth and development that advances student learning in West Virginia schools;

2. To define and promote high standards for professional personnel and their performance;

3. To provide data that indicate the effectiveness of professional personnel as one basis for sound personnel decisions;

4. To provide data for educator preparation programs to identify areas of need and guide program improvement; and

5. To establish county and school evaluation data that serve as a basis for professional development that specifically targets the area(s) identified for professional growth (p. 1).

Two out of the five major purposes focus on the professional growth and development of the employee being evaluated. In the first case, this policy stresses that evaluations should be

opportunities for teachers to reflect on their performance and make adjustments that advance student learning. In the second case, the policy stresses that evaluation data should be used by schools and districts to guide professional development in specific identified deficiency areas.

For five of the seven standards in the evaluation, teachers receive a rating of:

- Distinguished – Performance which is consistently exceptional.

- Accomplished – Performance which demonstrates mastery of the standard.

- Emerging – Performance which meets the basic standard and has an opportunity for professional growth.

- Unsatisfactory – Performance which does not meet the basic standard. (WVBOE Policy 5310, p. 5).

For Standard 6 (Student Growth), teachers are rated based on demonstration of their students' success through multiple measures such as student learning goals or school-wide summative assessment performance. For Standard 7 (Professional Conduct), teachers are rated as meeting the standard, being below the standard, or being unsatisfactory.

Professional Growth

Professional growth is a primary objective of the West Virginia evaluation system. The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) defines professional growth as "change that occurs in a person through the course of her or his academic career or personal life that allows her or him to bring new and diverse knowledge, skills, values, and professional orientations to her or his work ("A Framework for Faculty Growth," 2008, p. 24)." Furthermore, individuals drive their own professional development as a process of continually combining their own wants and the specific needs of the socio-cultural, institutional, and personal context in which they work (O'Meara & Terosky, 2010, p. 45).

Professional growth, then, describes the incremental changes that happen in an individual when the professional and cultural needs of the individual's work is used to inform and direct adjustments in performance. This process becomes more meaningful when individuals, especially educators, work cooperatively. O'Meara & Terosky (2010) identified professional relationships as one of the key aspects of professional growth and Morel (2014) stated that teachers' ability to reflect, collaborate, and create their own professional growth creates greater job satisfaction. Brinko (1993) agreed that self-generated feedback combined with feedback from others is more effective than feedback from others alone, but that one generally finds one's own opinion more valuable and more credible than the feedback of others.

Self-reflection

One of the new elements in the teacher evaluation process intended to promote professional development is self-reflection. Teachers reflect through comprehending and learning from their teaching experiences and assigning significance to their teaching practices (Zhao, 2012). Ballard & McBride (2010) states that teachers should consider reflection as an integral part of their everyday lives and should use it to become more thoughtful decision makers and more efficient teachers. Reflection is more than just thinking; it is an intellectual process that involves continuously evaluating one's actions and how thinking about those actions can affect our future experiences (Cornish & Jenkins, 2012).

Goal-setting

Another of the new elements in the teacher evaluation process intended to promote professional development is goal-setting. Sinnema and Robinson (2012) reported that research has established a relationship between specific challenging goals and task performance (p. 141).

In West Virginia, teachers will develop rigorous, measureable goals to improve student learning yearly. These goals may span a school year, semester, or quarter. However, the goals must be complete before the teacher's summative evaluation. Fifteen percent of the teacher's evaluation will be based on student growth as measured by the goals set by the teacher.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The combination of Race-to-the-Top requirements to document student growth and research that shows the importance of teacher effectiveness on student learning has led to performance-based teacher evaluation systems across the country (Church, 2012). A review of the literature shows that many standards-based teacher evaluation programs which were designed to hold teachers accountable for student learning while also helping them improve their professional practice simply do not accomplish that goal. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2011) and Derrington (2011) found that teacher evaluations are many times viewed by principals and teachers as a perfunctory obligation, just another piece of paperwork to be completed.

Sheppard (2013) states that few studies exist that examine administrator perceptions of teacher evaluation systems that could be used to determine if said evaluation systems were effective. Thomson (2013), Breedlove (2011), and Bogart (2013) recommend that the perceptions of principals should be surveyed along with the perceptions of teachers. And, Towe (2012) recommends further study of the aspects of the evaluation process, such as self-evaluation.

West Virginia Performance Evaluation of School Personnel Policy (5310) explains that one of the purposes of the policy is to "encourage continuous growth and improvement through

personal reflection and goal setting" (2013, p. 10). No data exist, however, as to the effectiveness of said system to achieve this goal.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Principals and teachers should use the teacher evaluation process as a tool to guide the development of professional skills, but little research exists as to the perceptions of teachers and administrators of evaluation systems' ability to affect professional practice (Sheppard, 2013). The goal of these systems, according to Church (2012), should be to document teacher effectiveness and to guide professional growth.

The purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of principals of the effectiveness of the new standards-based teacher evaluation system in West Virginia in measuring teacher performance and growth. This study asked principals to rate the effectiveness of the evaluation system overall, then to rate the effectiveness of two specific elements of the new system (i.e., self-reflection and goal-setting) in measuring teacher performance and growth. The focus on self-reflection and goal-setting was based on the emphasis given to these two elements in the new evaluation system.

It is important to note that this study did not examine the standardized school growth score portion of the evaluation. The focus of this study is on the evaluation system as a whole and, specifically, the teacher self-reflection and goal-setting portions. At the time of writing this study, teachers were not yet held accountable for student growth scores as this portion of the evaluation has not yet been fully implemented.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent do principals perceive the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

2. To what extent do principals perceive the self-reflection process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

3. To what extent do principals perceive the goal-setting process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The main goal of the teacher evaluation process should be to help teachers grow professionally (Fisicaro, 2010). The data collected from this study could be used to inform teachers, principals and policy-makers as to the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation system's ability to influence teacher professional growth and development. While it is possible that these data could be used to address the evaluation system's processes at the state level, they are more likely to be useful to building- and district-level administrators who wish to train teachers and evaluators alike as to the proper use of and purpose of the evaluation process.

While data exist as to the overall perceptions of various evaluation systems, little is available as to the effectiveness of the various aspects of the evaluation process or the effect these processes had on professional practice. Many educators stated, generally, that they felt the evaluation process had little or no influence on their professional development or growth. Considering that a positive effect on professional practice is a major goal of most standards-

based evaluation systems, it seems that many are not effectively accomplishing the tasks for which they were designed.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study surveyed principals regarding their perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the new teacher evaluation system and the effectiveness of the self-reflection and goal-setting portions of the West Virginia teacher evaluation process. Participants completed a quantitative survey. The first seven questions were demographic. Questions eight through 10 prompted respondents to share their perceptions by using a Likert-type scale. The last question was qualitative and asked respondents to share any additional comments they might have thought were relevant. The survey was accessed through Surveymonkey.com and submitted through the same. Analysis was conducted using appropriate statistical methods via SPSS.

SAMPLE

The sample for this study was 281 of 695 West Virginia school principals. This included all 695 principals who worked in grades kindergarten through twelfth-grade, including vocational centers. These principals represented all levels from Pre-k through high school and vocational schools.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

This study used a quantitative survey instrument with an open-ended qualitative question developed by the researcher. The data collected through this survey helped to answer the research questions posed in this study through the evaluation and comparison of principal perceptions. The first portion of the survey instrument was demographic and asked respondents to share data concerning their professional careers and work places. The second portion of the

survey consisted of three quantitative questions that prompted respondents to record their perceptions on a Likert-type scale. The last portion of the survey was a qualitative question that gave respondents an opportunity to share any other information that they deemed appropriate.

LIMITATIONS

This study may not apply broadly to certain districts and states due to differences in evaluation processes. Participants from different districts may have received different training which affected their experiences and, therefore, their perceptions. Furthermore, responses may have been affected by respondents' concerns with portraying their schools or districts in a negative light.

The findings are limited to the perceptions of specific principals who responded to the survey rather than being generalizable to the larger population of principals; principals who responded may have done so out of a particular bias, either positive or negative/receptive or non-receptive toward the teacher evaluation instrument or teacher evaluation in general; and while the researcher's own professional experience as a principal can constitute a source of empathy and provide an experiential background to be effective in eliciting and understanding respondents' perceptions, it can also be viewed as a limitation in that it is a potential source of bias.

DEFINITIONS

The following operational definitions were used to examine the research questions of this study:

1. "Principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system" is defined as the ratings given to question 9 of the survey.

2. "Principals' perception of the effectiveness of the self-reflection portion of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system" is defined as the ratings given to question 10 of the survey.

3. "Principals' perception of the effectiveness of the goal-setting portion of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system" is defined as the ratings given to question 11 of the survey.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter One of this research study includes the problem, research questions, purpose, significance of this study, research method, limitations, and definitions. Chapter Two includes a review of the literature relevant to the study, while Chapter Three introduces the methods and procedures used in this study to collect data. Chapter Four outlines the findings of the study, and Chapter Five discusses the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Teacher evaluation is a topic of great significance in this era of accountability. Few educational areas have received more attention in recent times due in part to the national accountability and testing movement (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2014). Evaluation procedures have, indeed, become ubiquitous in the lives of teachers and principals (Edwards, 2001). However, evaluation procedures vary greatly from state to state and no two approaches are identical. Cardno (2001) stated that teacher appraisal has the potential to be constructive, destructive, or merely procedural with no real potential to affect practice. The protocols within teacher evaluation systems shift the focuses and, therefore, the outcomes of teacher appraisal.

Many states and districts are developing new evaluation protocols for the purpose of improving teacher practice. Marzano (2012) stated that evaluations can effectively measure teacher performance and simultaneously affect teacher development, but to be successful the model must specifically focus on the teacher's growth in various instructional strategies. Likewise, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2011) found that measures of teacher effectiveness should support the development of a teacher's skills based on specific strengths and weaknesses.

Research has shown that students' academic progress is greatly affected by the skills of the teacher in their classroom (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2011). Robert Marzano stated that the most significant factor for student learning is the classroom teacher (Quinn, 2014). Furthermore, Porter-Magee (2004) claimed that teacher quality imparts a lasting impact on student achievement, either positive or negative depending on the respective teacher's ability. However, this impact not only affects achievement; it also affects student motivation,

specifically enjoyment of the subject being taught. Enthusiastic teachers provide better learning support and classroom management to their students (Kunter et al., 2013). Therefore, the twofold purpose of teacher evaluation is to assure quality in teaching and promote professional learning (Danielson, 2010). Teacher evaluation is nothing new, but the processes and purposes of evaluation have evolved to reflect the changing demands of the educational system.

History of Teacher Evaluation

The Massachusetts School Law of 1647 was the first law of its kind to require townships to establish schools for the education of students and to monitor the students' achievement in reading and biblical knowledge (Tracy, 1995). During this time, local businessmen and members of the clergy were responsible for hiring teachers and subsequently visiting schools to ensure that proper instruction was taking place. Tracy (1995) explained that these visiting committees would evaluate the school to determine the appropriateness of student progress, the content being taught, and the methods being used by the teacher. This included the secular and religious instruction of students as both were requirements of the instructor.

After the beginning of the Industrial Revolution during the latter part of the 1700s, urban areas began to see the creation of much larger school districts than had previously existed. This called for a more structured approach to teacher supervision. This shift from community accountability to organizational management brought professionalization to teacher evaluation as lay persons were no longer qualified to assess the complexities of school systems (Tracy, 1995).

By the mid-eighteen hundreds, the first principal teacher positions were created in response to the new organization of urban schools into age-specific grades (Rousmaniere, 2007). Each school building would have one principal teacher who was responsible for administrative duties. The role of principal teacher eventually became the building principal (Marzano, 2011).

The rapid population growth and economic development of the nineteenth century led to the need for schools to produce a large labor force to support the needs of industry (Jacobson & Battaglia, 2001). Schools then began to be operated from a scientific management perspective that viewed teachers as workers turning out students as efficient and cost-effective products. Teacher assessment under this system often consisted of nothing more than checklists of observable behaviors (Jacobson & Battaglia, 2001).

The first true school principalship positions appeared in the 1920s and were mainly concerned with ensuring positive home-to-school relations and upholding family values (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). The focus of schooling began to shift from a scientific to a human relations perspective through the 1950s (Tracy, 1995). This trend ended abruptly with the Soviet Union's launch of the Sputnik satellite in 1957 and the beginning of the cold war. Schools then became more focused on academic excellence, especially in math and science, and principals for the first time relied on research based strategies for teacher appraisal (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

By the end of the twentieth-century the role of principal had shifted again, this time to that of instructional leader (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). The focus of teacher evaluations became teacher behaviors that were likely to directly influence student performance. This is represented in Madeline Hunter's *Essential Elements of Instruction* (1982), which offered principals guidelines for teacher appraisal that were based on research-based instructional behaviors (Jacobson & Battaglia, 2001). The lesson planning guide for teachers included topic introduction, skill demonstration and modeling, guided practice, checking for understanding, and closure. Hunter (1985) described her evaluation model as "designed to guide behavior, predict outcomes, and stimulate research" (p. 57). As currently conceptualized, the role of principal is balanced between concern for the teacher's professional needs and concern for the productivity

15

of the organization (Tracy, 1995). Ingvarson (2001) described the more recent twofold purpose of teacher appraisal this way:

> Two main purposes for teacher evaluation can be distinguished. The first is to safeguard the educational interests and welfare of students and ensure that their teachers are able to fulfill their contractual duties. This purpose is based on the undeniable requirement that teachers be publicly accountable. Standards for this purpose are mainly generic and common to all teachers. The second purpose emphasizes the complementary need to ensure that teachers continually review and improve their practices in the light of contemporary research and profession-defined standards. (p. 164)

Contemporary views of teacher evaluation suggest that not only do all students deserve quality instruction and high levels of learning, but that the standing of our democracy in the global economy hinges on their receiving a high quality education (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). In fact, Middlewood and Cardno (2001) found that a nation's education system and its economic prosperity are inseparably linked because of the importance of an educated workforce.

Previous Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia

Prior to the new evaluation system instituted in the 2013-2014 school year, West Virginia used a teacher evaluation process comprised mainly of teacher observations and evaluations conducted by principals as established by the West Virginia Board of Education (WVBOE). For teachers, this was primarily a passive process of being observed, having a conference about what was observed, and then receiving a summative evaluation.

During observations and evaluations, principals collected data in a checklist and rated teachers on seven performance standards. This assessment resulted in the teacher being assigned one of four ratings: (1) Exemplary, (2) Exceeds Standards, (3) Meets Standards, (4)

Unsatisfactory (WVBOE Policy 5310). Teachers had the opportunity to add an addendum to their evaluation, but otherwise had no active role in the evaluation process.

Performance-based Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia

On June 14, 2013, the state of West Virginia instituted the new Performance Evaluation of School Personnel Policy (WVBOE Policy 5310). Teacher evaluations were expanded to include school-wide student learning growth, as measured by standardized test scores. Another significant change in the policy provided for teachers to take a more active role in their own evaluation process. The major purposes of this revised policy are (WVBOE Policy 5310):

1. To promote professional growth and development that advances student learning in West Virginia schools;

2. To define and promote high standards for professional personnel and their performance;

3. To provide data that indicate the effectiveness of professional personnel as one basis for sound personnel decisions;

4. To provide data for educator preparation programs to identify areas of need and guide program improvement; and

5. To establish county and school evaluation data that serve as a basis for professional development that specifically targets the area(s) identified for professional growth.

According to these major purposes, this new policy stresses a focus on professional growth and development in addition to teacher quality assurance. Evaluations should now be opportunities for teachers to reflect on their performance and make adjustments that advance student learning. Furthermore, data should now be used by schools and districts to guide professional development in specific identified deficiency areas.

Performance Standards. There are seven standards on which teacher performance is evaluated. Five of the seven standards, constituting 80% of the evaluation total, are appraised based on the teacher's ability to meet the established professional standards and elements listed below (WVBOE Policy 5310):

1. Curriculum and Planning:

    a. Element 1.1: The teacher demonstrates a deep and extensive knowledge of the subject matter.

    b. Element 1.2: The teacher designs standards-driven instruction using state-approved curricula.

    c. Element 1.3: The teacher uses a balanced assessment approach to guide student learning.

2. The Learner and the Learning Environment:

    a. Element 2.1: The teacher understands and responds to the unique characteristics of learners.

    b. Element 2.2: The teacher establishes and maintains a safe and appropriate learning environment.

    c. Element 2.3: The teacher establishes and maintains a learner-centered culture.

3. Teaching:

    a. Element 3.1: The teacher utilizes a variety of research-based instructional strategies.

    b. Element 3.2: The teacher motivates and engages students in learning, problem solving and collaboration.

c. Element 3.3: The teacher adjusts instruction based on a variety of assessments and student responses.

4. Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal:

   a. Element 4.1: The teacher engages in professional development for self-renewal that guides continuous examination and improvement of professional practices.

   b. Element 4.2: The teacher actively engages in collaborative learning opportunities for self-renewal with colleagues.

5. Professional Responsibilities for School and Community:

   a. Element 5.1: The teacher participates in school-wide collaborative efforts to support the success of all students.

   b. Elements 5.2: The teacher works with parents, guardians, families, and community entities to support student learning and well-being.

   c. Element 5.3: The teacher promotes practices and policies that improve school environment and student learning (p. 11).

Standard 6 (Student Growth) is measured based on demonstration of student success. Five percent of the Student Growth standard is based on student growth as measured by the school-wide score on the state summative assessment. The other 15% of the student growth standard is based on student growth as measured by the student learning goals crafted by each respective teacher and measured by the scores of students on the Smarter Balanced standardized tests given each year.

Standard 7 (Professional Conduct) is measured based on the competencies and habits of mind that quality teaching require. These include: adhering to policy and procedure, professional attendance, adhering to schedule, and respect. In this area, teachers are rated as meeting the

standard, being below the standard, or being unsatisfactory. If a teacher is rated as unsatisfactory in any of these areas, he will be evaluated as being unsatisfactory in this standard.

Teacher Ratings. For standards 1 through 5, teachers receive a rating of:

- Distinguished – Performance which is consistently exceptional.

- Accomplished – Performance which demonstrates mastery of the standard.

- Emerging – Performance which meets the basic standard and has an opportunity for professional growth.

- Unsatisfactory – Performance which does not meet the basic standard (WVBOE Policy 5310).

Progression. WV Policy 5310 outlines three progression classifications for teachers. These progressions are based on years of experience and dictate the number and frequency of observations required. Teachers in their first, second, or third year are in the Initial Progression level and will be observed a minimum of four times. Teachers in their fourth or fifth year are in the Intermediate Progression level and will be observed a minimum of two times. Teachers in their sixth year of experience and beyond will be in the Advanced Progression level in which there is no set minimum number of observations. However, teachers in the Advanced Progression can be observed at any time the principal deems necessary or any time the teacher requests an observation from administration.

Teacher Observations. Observations for teachers, occurring at the time and frequency required by each teacher's progression level, are conducted by an evaluator, usually the principal. These observations are intended to run the length of the particular lesson being observed, but cannot be less than thirty minutes. At the conclusion of the observation, the evaluator submits the form electronically to teachers. The evaluator must then conduct a

conference with the teacher within ten days. At this time, the teachers may submit evidence

relative to the current observation (WVBOE Policy 5310).

Self-reflection. In addition to the performance standards on which teachers are rated,

teachers must complete an annual self-reflection on or before October 1 based on the teacher

performance standards. Teachers rate themselves as Distinguished, Accomplished, Emerging, or

Unsatisfactory for each of the elements of the performance standards. Self-reflections are

submitted electronically and, once submitted, are reviewed by the evaluator. If a teacher is rated

as Distinguished, the evaluation must be accompanied by relevant evidence that supports the

determination. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, student standardized test scores,

student growth data, personal projects completed, and lesson plans (WVBOE Policy 5310).

Goal-setting. Another part of the new evaluation system involves goal-setting. Teachers

must develop rigorous, measureable goals to improve student learning. These goals may span a

school year, semester, or quarter. However, the goals must be complete before the teacher's

summative evaluation. Fifteen percent of the teacher's evaluation is based on student growth as

measured by the goals set by the teacher and as assessed by the principal (WVBOE Policy 5310).

Summative Teacher Evaluations. Evaluations are to be completed for teachers yearly

by July 1. This includes all teachers, regardless of progression level. The purposes of these

evaluations are to ensure that all teachers meet the performance standards and to encourage

continuous growth and improvement through personal reflection and goal setting (WVBOE

Policy 5310).

Focused Support Plans. A focused support plan may be used when an area of concern

has been documented by an evaluator based on one of the performance standards. This is an

improvement process between the teachers and the principal. These plans must last a minimum of nine weeks and may be repeated once per plan.

Focused support plans commence only after an evaluator has documented evidence indicating an area of concern based on one or more of the performance standards. The plan must include the following components: (1) identified area of concern, (2) expectations for change, (3) a nine week timeline for implementation, and (4) resources for support. Supports for improvement may include professional development, coaching support, mentoring, peer observation, programs of study, or other appropriate resources. If evidence supports that the standard has been met at the end of the nine week period, the plan is successfully completed. If evidence supports that adequate progress has been made, but the standards have not yet been met, the plan will continue for another nine weeks. If inadequate progress is made, an evaluation will be completed for the teacher and a Corrective Action Plan will be developed to address the area of concern (WVBOE Policy 5310).

Corrective Action Plans. Corrective action plans are used whenever a teacher completes a focused support plan and shows inadequate progress in correcting the deficiency previously identified. This plan spans eighteen weeks and may not be repeated. If the educator does not show adequate progress at the end of this time period, he or she will be terminated for unsatisfactory performance.

Corrective Action Plans must include the same essential components as the Focused Support Plan listed above. If adequate progress is made by the teacher in his standard of concern at the end of 18 weeks, the Corrective Action Plan will be completed. If adequate progress is not made by the teacher before the conclusion of the 18 week period, termination for unsatisfactory performance shall ensue (WVBOE Policy 5310).

Professional Growth

Professional growth is one of the main purposes of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system (WVBOE Policy 5310). This study will measure principal perceptions of how effective the system is in contributing to teacher performance and professional growth as it was designed to do. Professional growth is the change in a person, both personally and academically, that allows one to add new knowledge, skills, and values to his work (A Framework for Faculty Growth, 2008). For teachers, professional growth must have purpose and be connected directly to his or her classroom and personal needs (Slepkov, 2008). Kalule and Bouchamma (2013) found that teachers make positive changes in their instruction as a result of being supervised. These changes were both internal (self-esteem, motivation) and external (knowledge, methods).

Professional development is defined as the process in which teachers improve their decision making about students, learning content, and teaching (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2014). It is often a means to the professional growth of teachers. This approach is valuable only if it brings about changes in teacher behavior that increase student learning (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). It is therefore the responsibility of schools and districts which desire to improve student learning to plan and implement thoughtful professional development opportunities that address school-wide and individual teacher needs (Middlewood & Cardno, 2001).

O'Meara and Terosky (2010) identified four aspects of teacher professional growth: (1) learning, (2) agency, (3) professional relationships, and (4) commitments. Likewise, Looney (2011) stated that all successful teacher evaluation systems should include a cooperative element to foster mutual support and professional learning.

Self-reflection

One of the features of the new West Virginia standards-based teacher evaluation system is self-reflection. A teacher self-reflection portion has been added to the evaluation protocol as a means to give teachers a more active role in their own evaluation. According to Brookfield (1995), "Reflective practice has its roots in the Enlightenment idea that we can stand outside of ourselves and come to a clearer understanding of what we do and who we are by freeing ourselves of distorted ways of reasoning and acting" (p. 214). Indeed, if teachers are to be critically reflective, they must learn to view their practice objectively in terms of how their actions affect student achievement (Brookfield, 1995). Furthermore, Danielson (2010) stated that self-assessment and reflection are critical if teacher evaluation is to be a meaningful learning experience for teachers.

Van Manen (1977) stated that there are three levels of reflection: (1) technical, (2) practical, and (3) critical. Zhao (2012) explains that on the technical level teachers focus on seeking economical and efficient ways to reach goals. Cornish & Jenkins (2012) stated that the practical level consists of considering the context of learning and how context affects the way reflection informs practice. The critical level, Cornish & Jenkins (2012) stated, is shaped by experience. Here past and present teaching experiences merge with one's personal history and assumptions about teaching to form one's future goals. Ballard & McBride (2010) pointed out that each stage of Van Manen's model is sequential and teachers must address the needs of each level before progressing to the next.

Reflection is an integral part of a teacher's professional growth process. As stakeholders in the evaluation process, teachers' perceptions must be considered alongside the considerations of the evaluator (Kalule & Bouchamma, 2013). However, although critical reflection begins with

the teacher evaluating himself, it only becomes truly effective in changing professional practice when the process is shared with another. For teachers, this is the evaluator (Brookfield, 1995). In fact, Brookfield (1995) goes on to state that research shows that teachers only learn to be truly critically reflective when they see this behavior modeled by the principal.

Goal-setting

A second addition to the new West Virginia standards-based teacher evaluation system is goal-setting. Teachers must set rigorous, measureable goals to improve student performance (WVBOE Policy 5310). Goal-setting is a benchmark for what a person wishes to accomplish and helps bridge the gap between current performance and desired future performance (Hoy & Hoy, 2006). Sinnema & Robinson (2012) stated that evaluation procedures that include goal setting are more effective than those that do not. Furthermore, Hoy and Hoy (2006) stated that "teachers are more likely to work toward goals that are clear, specific, reasonable, moderately challenging, and attainable within a relatively short period of time" (p. 134). Thus, goal setting for classroom teachers is imperative to effective evaluation, but the goals must be developed properly.

Hoy and Hoy (2006) elaborate that goal setting improves performance in four distinct ways: (1) they direct our attention to the task at hand, (2) they mobilize effort in proportion to the difficulty of the task, (3) they increase persistence, and (4) they promote the development of new strategies when old strategies are no longer adequate.

Goals are the difference between who one is now and who one wants to be or what one wants to accomplish in the future (Sinnema & Robinson, 2012). However, Sinnema and Robinson (2012) also stated that goal setting is only able to increase performance by motivating those teachers who already have the skills and ability required to teach effectively. When these

skills and abilities are not present, teachers should strive to master the basics before using goal setting to increase professional practice.

SUMMARY

The Unites States is changing at an increasingly rapid pace. These demographic, cultural, environmental, technological, and economic changes make apparent the fact that educational reform is more important than ever if our schools hope to prepare citizens with the adequate skills necessary to keep pace with the world around them (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2014). To ensure this, school principals must view teachers as adult learners who should be actively engaged in their improvement process, rather than being passive recipients (Derrington, 2011).

Danielson (2010) stated there is abundant evidence that a thoughtful approach to teacher evaluation that engages teachers in reflection and self-assessment will create the opportunities needed for teacher growth and development that will, in turn, lead to improved classroom performance.

For the 2013-2014 school year, West Virginia adopted a new standards-based teacher evaluation system with the purpose of ensuring teacher quality and providing meaningful teacher professional growth. This system is the first in the state's history to include student performance as an evaluation indicator. It is also the first to offer the teacher a truly active role in the evaluation process. Additions to the evaluation process in this system include teacher self-reflection and goal setting. These elements were included to engage teachers in the process of their own evaluation and to act as a means of professional development.

This study was designed to measure the perceptions of school principals as to the evaluation system's ability to measure teacher effectiveness. This study also measured principal perceptions of the teacher self-reflection and goal setting elements' ability to do the same.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

In recent years, states across the nation have been working to reform their teacher evaluation systems. This evaluation reform was inspired, in part, by federal Race to the Top funds, which required teacher evaluation to include student performance (DeNisco, 2014). Similar to the actions of other states, in 2013 West Virginia adopted a new performance-based teacher evaluation system outlined in the Performance Evaluation of School Personnel Policy (WVBOE Policy 5310). This system was purposed to promote the professional growth of teachers and to provide administration with the appropriate data to make meaningful decisions concerning the planning of professional development and to provide data to inform personnel decisions (WVBOE Policy 5310).

Teacher quality is a central focus of this evaluation system. As the 1966 Coleman report "Equality of Educational Opportunity" found, variance in student achievement is caused by teacher quality more than any other factor (Coleman et al., 1966). Porter-Magee (2004) agreed, saying that the lasting negative impact poor teachers have on students is, along with environmental factors, responsible for the achievement gap observed in relation to poor and minority students. The opposite, however, is also true as strong, enthusiastic teachers have a lasting positive impact on student achievement (Kunter et al., 2013).

Danielson (2010) stated that if teacher evaluation systems are to be effective they must be rigorous and reliable, but also engage teachers as active participants through self-assessment, reflection on practice, and professional conversation. West Virginia agreed when it included self-reflection and goal setting elements in its new evaluation system.

The purpose of this study was to examine principal perceptions of the current performance-based teacher evaluation used in West Virginia as to its effectiveness in measuring teacher professional performance and growth. Special attention was paid to the self-reflection and goal setting portions of the evaluation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent do principals perceive the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

2. To what extent do principals perceive the self-reflection process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

3. To what extent do principals perceive the goal-setting process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design was primarily a quantitative study. Using Surveymonkey.com, principals responded to a survey designed to measure their perceptions of the West Virginia teacher evaluation system's effectiveness in measuring teacher performance and growth. The survey instrument consisted of three sections: demographics, perceptions, and comments. The comments section of the survey was qualitative.

The first section of the survey instrument, consisting of seven questions, was demographic and asked respondents to share data concerning their professional careers and work places. The second section, consisting of three questions, contained three quantitative questions

that prompted respondents to record their perceptions on a Likert scale. The third section, consisting of only one question, was qualitative and gave respondents an opportunity to share any other information that they feel is pertinent to the study.

SAMPLE

The sample for this research study was 281 principals of West Virginia's 695 at all schools levels, kindergarten through twelfth-grade and vocational centers. The names of participants were not published and their responses were kept confidential. All data were reported in aggregate form.

DATA COLLECTION

This study used a researcher-developed quantitative survey instrument with qualitative elements included. The survey consisted of three sections: demographics, perceptions, and comments. The first section of the survey was designed to collect basic demographic information about the respondents such as gender, professional experience, and school grade level. The second section was designed to collect the perceptions of respondents on the research topic through specific Likert-type questions. The third section of the survey was open-ended and offered respondents the opportunity to share any other information they felt was pertinent to the topic. The data collected through this survey helped to answer the research questions posed in this study through the evaluation of principal perceptions.

VALIDATION

The survey instrument was validated through a pilot study of West Virginia principals and higher education principal-preparation faculty members. These respondents were tasked

with completing the survey and providing feedback on its wording and clarity. Feedback collected through this process was used to make appropriate changes to the survey.

DATA ANALYSIS

An email request to participate in the study was sent to the entire population of West Virginia school principals in mid-September 2015. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS software to perform a stepwise multiple regression.

LIMITATIONS

This study may not reflect broadly to certain districts and states due to differences in evaluation processes. Participants from different districts may have received different training which affected their experiences and, therefore, their perceptions. Furthermore, responses may be affected by respondents' concerns with portraying their school or district in a negative light.

The findings are limited to the perceptions of specific principals who responded to the survey rather than being generalizable to the larger population of principals; principals who responded may have done so out of a particular bias, either positive or negative/receptive or non-receptive toward the teacher evaluation instrument or teacher evaluation in general; and while the researcher's own professional experience as a principal can constitute a source of empathy and provide an experiential background to be effective in eliciting and understanding respondents' perceptions, it can also be viewed as a limitation in that it is a potential source of bias.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In 2013 a new teacher evaluation system was instituted in West Virginia public schools to measure teacher performance and professional growth. The new system involved five performance standards, which are divided in 14 total performance elements. The new system also added some additional elements to aid in evaluation: (a) teacher self-reflection, (b) teacher goal-setting, and (c) the use of school student performance data.

This study examined the effectiveness of this new standards-based teacher evaluation system in West Virginia in measuring teacher performance and growth as perceived by practicing principals.

DATA COLLECTION AND PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

The sample of this study was 281 of the 695 principals of West Virginia's kindergarten through twelfth-grade schools, including vocational centers. While all 695 were asked to participate, the actual number who responded was 281.

As approved by Marshall University's Institutional Review Board (IRB), each principal was invited by e-mail to complete an online survey created through Surveymonkey.com. Of this population of 695 principals, 281 responded to the survey resulting in a response rate of approximately 40%.

The Griffith Principal Survey (GPS) was used to collect data from principals in the sample. This survey was created from statements found in West Virginia Board of Education Policy 5310 and was piloted with nine assistant principals at various educational levels. The GPS also collected demographic data from respondents. Information was collected detailing

respondents' sex, years of experience as an educator, years of experience as a principal, education level obtained, daily workplace, student population of school site, and region of the state in which each worked.

Sex

The sample of principals consisted of 434 females (62.45%) and 261 males (37.55%). Of the 281 principals who completed the survey, 177 (62.99%) were female, while 102 (36.30%) were male. Two respondents (0.71%) declined to answer this question.

Years as Educators

The majority of respondents (65%) had 20 or more years of experience in teaching and administration; only 6% had fewer than 10 years' experience. The largest single grouping of principals reported having 20 to 29 years of experience (37%). Principals with 10 to 19 years of experience were 29% of the respondents. Twenty-eight percent of respondents reported 30 or more years as educators. One respondent (0.36%) declined to answer this question. The mean years of experience of respondents was 23 years as educators.

Years as Principals

The majority of respondents (174) had fewer than 10 years of experience in principal positions; only 38 had more than 15 years. The largest single grouping of respondents reported having between five and nine years of experience as principals. Twenty-eight percent of respondents had zero to four years of experience as principals, and 24% reported 10 to 14 years of experience as principals. Respondents with 15 or more years of experience were 14% of those surveyed. Two respondents (0.71%) declined to answer this question. The mean experience of respondents was eight years as a principal.

Education Level

The majority of respondents, 230 (81.85%), reported an educational level of Master's degree. Twenty-five (8.90%) respondents designated "Other" on the survey and wrote in a specific degree level. Each of these was a variation of master's degree plus graduate hours, so these cases were considered on the master's degree level. When combined, these two respondent groups made up a master's degree grouping of 255 (90.75%). Of the remaining respondents, 13 (4.63%) reported having a doctoral degree and 12 (4.27%) reported having an education specialist degree. None of the principals responded as having a bachelor's degree. One respondent (0.36%) declined to answer this question.

Daily Work Place

According to the *State of West Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook* (West Virginia Department of Education, 2010), schools are to be defined in three categories: elementary schools (includes grades 1 through 4, but does not include grade 8); middle level schools (includes grade 8, but does not include grade 12); high schools (includes grade 12); and vocational centers (CTE) (p. 4).

These categories were used in the survey to define each respondent's daily workplace. The majority of principals, 170 (61%), reported that they worked at the elementary level. Fifty-nine (21%) reported that they worked at the middle school level, and 43 (15%) of the respondents worked at the high school level. Nine (3%) respondents surveyed worked at a vocational center. Some respondents used the "comments" section on this question to give further information about their schools' student grade levels. These comments were used by the researcher to categorize each respondent's answer according to the three categories provided by West Virginia.

Student Population of School

Respondents were asked to give an approximate student population for the schools in which they worked. The greatest number of principals (39.5%) reported working at a school with a student population of 300 to 599. Principals working at schools serving zero to 299 students were 38.79% of those surveyed. Principals working at schools with 600 to 899 students were 14.59%, and principals working at schools with 900 or more students were 4.98%. Six respondents (2.14%) declined to answer this question.

RESA Location

West Virginia's schools are organized into eight multi-county regional education service agencies (RESAs) to provide educational supports and services to the state's students, schools, and school systems. Each respondent was asked to identify in which RESA he or she worked. RESA 7 was the region with the highest number of survey responses with 19.29%. RESAs 2 and 8 were next with 15.66% of surveys submitted. RESA 5 principals were 13.17% of respondents and RESA 3 had 12.46% of respondents. RESA 1 comprised 9.96% of surveys returned, and principals from RESAs 4 and 6 each represented 6.76% of the respondents. One respondent (0.36%) declined to answer this question.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The Griffith Principal Survey (GPS) asked respondents to share their perceptions of various aspects of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system. Those perceptions were reported using a 4-point Likert-type scale on which 1 represented the lowest score and 4 the highest.

Research Question 1: To what extent do principals perceive the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

Question 8 of the survey asked principals to rate the effectiveness of the West Virginia teacher evaluation system in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth. Respondents did this by rating the individual evaluation items, which are based on the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards by which teachers' performance and growth are measured. Two respondents (0.71%) declined to answer this question. Complete response data can be found in Table 1.

The mean ratings varied from a low of 2.54 on the question of the system's effectiveness in evaluating how a teacher works with parents, guardians, families and communities to support student learning and well-being to a high of 2.90 on its effectiveness in evaluating a teacher's performance in establishing a safe and appropriate learning environment. No single item received a mean rating of 3 or greater, although the greater percentage of respondents rated all of the performance standards as 3 or 4 on the Likert-type scale, indicating they find them effective. The highest percentage for a rating of 4 was found for the evaluation instrument's effectiveness in enabling the principal to assess the teacher's performance in establishing and maintaining a safe and appropriate learning environment (22.38%), while the greatest percentage assigned the lowest rating (i.e., 1) to being able to evaluate whether a teacher was successful in working with parents, guardians, families, and community entities to support student learning and well-being (9.45%).

Table 1

Percentages and Mean Ratings of Principal Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the West Virginia Teacher Evaluation System Standards in Measuring Teachers' Professional Performance and Growth.

Standards	1	2	3	4	Mean
Establishing and maintaining a safe and appropriate learning environment.	6.50%	19.86%	51.26%	22.38%	2.90
Establishing and maintaining a learner-centered culture.	8.30%	26.35%	50.18%	15.16%	2.72
Designing standards-driven instruction using state-approved curricula.	6.50%	30.32%	49.10%	14.08%	2.71
Participating in school-wide collaborative efforts to support the success of all students.	7.58%	30.32%	46.93%	15.16%	2.70
Motivating and engaging students in learning, problem solving and collaboration.	7.97%	30.07%	47.46%	14.49%	2.68
Utilizing a variety of research-based instructional strategies.	8.66%	32.13%	44.77%	14.44%	2.65
Demonstrating a deep and extensive knowledge of the subject matter.	7.61%	32.25%	49.28%	10.87%	2.63
Adjusting instruction based on a variety of assessments and student responses.	7.94%	32.85%	48.01%	11.19%	2.62
Actively engaging in collaborative learning opportunities for self-renewal with colleagues.	9.03%	33.21%	44.77%	13.00%	2.62

Engaging in professional development for self-renewal that guides continuous examination and improvement of professional practice.	7.58%	35.38%	44.04%	13.00%	2.62
Promoting practices and policies that improve school environment and student learning.	7.58%	37.18%	45.49%	9.75%	2.57
Working with parents, guardians, families, and community entities to support student learning and well-being.	9.45%	37.45%	42.55%	10.55%	2.54
Your overall perception of the effectiveness of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system.	8.70%	32.25%	49.28%	9.78%	2.60

Research Question 2: To what extent do principals perceive the self-reflection process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

Question 9 of the survey asked principals to give their perceptions of the effectiveness of the self-reflection process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system in measuring teacher professional performance and growth. Respondents were not evenly divided on the subject of the new system's effectiveness in allowing them to assess teachers' capacity for self-reflection. Forty-four percent of respondents chose 3 on the 4-point Likert-type scale to describe the system's effectiveness in assessing self-reflection, while 12% selected 4, for a combined 56% who approve of the evaluation instrument as a tool for that purpose. The remainder selected 1 (12%) or 2 (32%), for a total of 44%.

Research Question 3: To what extent do principals perceive the goal-setting process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

Question 10 of the survey asked principals to give their perceptions of the effectiveness of the goal-setting process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system in measuring teacher professional performance and growth. Respondents were not fairly evenly divided on the subject of the new system's effectiveness in allowing them to assess teachers' capacity for goal-setting. Forty-two percent of respondents chose 3 on the 4-point Likert-type scale to describe the system's effectiveness in assessing goal-setting, while 18% selected 4, for a combined 60% who approve of the evaluation instrument as a tool for that purpose. The remainder selected 1 (7%) or 2 (31%), for a total of 38%.

ANCILLARY FINDINGS

Though not included in the three research questions for the study, the researcher gathered selected demographic data and also asked the respondents to add comments about their perceptions of the West Virginia Performance Evaluation System. This section will provide the ancillary data which were collected.

Demographic Data Findings

A bivariate correlation was conducted on the relationship of the respondent's sex to each of the survey questions. A weak negative correlation (-.129) was found between the principal's sex and perception of the evaluation system's effectiveness in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth in the area of working with stakeholders. Respondents who identified as female (62.99%) perceived the evaluation system as more effective in this category than did

their male counterparts. A linear returned an R^2 of 0.13, however, suggesting that sex accounts for only 13% of the difference between males' and females' responses on this issue. (see Table 2).

Table 2

Bivariate Correlation of Sex and Principal Perception of Evaluation System's Effectiveness in Measuring Teachers' Professional Performance and Growth in the Area of Working with Stakeholders.

	Sex	System Effectiveness in Measuring Performance & Growth with Stakeholders
Sex	_____	-.129*
System Effectiveness in Measuring Performance and Growth in Working with Stakeholders	-.129*	_____

*Correlation is significant at the $p <= 0.05$ level (two-tailed).

A weak positive correlation (.119) was found between the principal's perceptions of the self-reflection portion of the teacher evaluation system and the education level of respondents. Respondents who identified themselves as perceiving the self-reflection portion of the teacher evaluation system to be most effective tended to be the most educated. A linear regression returned an R^2 of .119, however, suggesting that education level accounts for only 11% of the difference between responses on this issue (Table 3).

Table 3

Bivariate Correlation of Education Level and Principal Perception of Self-reflection Portion of the Evaluation System's Effectiveness in Measuring Teachers' Professional Performance and Growth.

	Education Level	Self-reflection
Education Level	_____	.119*
Self-reflection	.119*	_____

*Correlation is significant at the $p < = 0.05$ level (two-tailed).

     A third correlation (-.155) was found between the principal's perceptions of the goal-setting portion of the teacher evaluation system and the daily workplace of respondents. Principals who reported working at the elementary level tended to perceive the goal-setting portion of the evaluation system to be most effective. A linear regression returned R^2 of 0.20, however, suggesting that daily workplace account for only 20% of the difference between responses on this issue. (Table 4).

Table 4

Bivariate Correlation of Daily Workplace and Principal Perception of the Goal-setting Portion of the Evaluation System's Effectiveness in Measuring Teachers' Professional Performance and Growth.

	Daily Workplace	Self-reflection
Daily Workplace	_____	-.155*
Self-Reflection	-.155*	_____

*Correlation is significant at the $p < = 0.05$ level (two-tailed).

Qualitative Findings

On Question 11 of the survey, respondents were given an opportunity to provide additional comments concerning their personal reactions and views of the new teacher evaluation system being used in West Virginia. A total of 114 respondents (40.5% of the sample) chose to submit comments.

The responses were examined as to the topics mentioned specifically. The most common topics addressed (as categorized by the researcher) in order of their observed frequencies are presented below in Table 5. These categories were assigned based on the key words and topics observed in the respondent comments. This method is referred to in the literature as inductive content analysis (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007). Cavanagh (1997) described the basis for content analysis:

The purpose of creating and defining categories is to provide a means of describing the phenomenon under investigation, to increase understanding, and to generate knowledge.

Essentially, data is placed into groups of categories on which analysis (numerical or otherwise) can be performed. (p. 8)

The comments in each category were further categorized as either favorable (or positive) regarding the new system or specific elements of the system or as unfavorable (or negative). Table 5 includes the percentage of comments classified as favorable in each of the seven key topic areas.

Table 5

Comments by Principals Categorized by Key Topics.

Key Word	Number of Comments	Percent Favorable
Goal-setting	30	53%
Self-reflection	24	54%
Subjectivity	20	0%
Time	17	0%
Seriousness of participants	16	0%
Professional development	10	20%
Observations	10	0%

Other topics mentioned in the respondent comments were rubrics, teaching standards, collaboration, standardized testing, teacher professional growth, evidence, parental support, teacher attendance, best practices, instructional practices, lesson planning, and the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS). Each of these topics was mentioned fewer than ten times.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Respondents rated their overall perception of the effectiveness of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system with a mean rating of 2.60 on a Likert-type scale of 1 (low) to 4 (high). The most frequent rating was 3 (49.28%). The second most frequent rating, however, was 2 (32.25%), followed by 4 (9.78%) and 1 (8.70%). The majority of principals (i.e., 59.35%) perceived the evaluation system as effective or very effective, while 113 (40.65%) perceived the evaluation system as ineffective or very ineffective.

Principals also rated the effectiveness of the system in enabling principals to evaluate the performance of teachers as aligned to the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards. The mean ratings varied from a low of 2.54 to a high of 2.90 on a 4-point scale. Respondent ratings of the self-reflection portion of the evaluation system have a mean of 2.56 and respondent ratings of the goal-setting portion have a mean of 2.71.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to assess principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth. Respondents were surveyed as to their perceptions of the performance evaluation indicators and the self-reflection and goal-setting portions of the evaluation system. The study addressed three research questions:

1. To what extent do principals perceive the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

2. To what extent do principals perceive the self-reflection process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

3. To what extent do principals perceive the goal-setting process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

SAMPLE

The population for this research study was all West Virginia principals at schools from kindergarten through twelfth-grade and vocational centers. Of the 695 principals fitting this description, a sample of 281 responded. This was a response rate of 40%.

METHODS

This study was primarily quantitative and attempted to assess principals' perceptions of the West Virginia teacher evaluation system's effectiveness in measuring teacher performance

and growth using a Likert-type scale. Questions were directly related to each element of the West

Virginia Board of Education Policy 5310: Performance Evaluation of School Personnel (2014).

The survey was administered via Surveymonkey.com. Survey invitations were sent by email.

The survey instrument consisted of three sections: demographics, perceptions, and comments.

The quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS 22 software package. The qualitative

data collected in this study were from Question 11 of the survey, which was essentially a

comments sections. These data were classified according to topic.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Research Question 1: To what extent do principals perceive the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

Principals were asked to rate the effectiveness of the West Virginia teacher evaluation

system in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth. The majority (59.06%) of

principals surveyed perceived the new evaluation system as effective or very effective (rated as 3

or 4 on a 4-point scale) overall in assessing teaching performance, while approximately 40% of

respondents perceived the new evaluation system overall to be ineffective or very ineffective

(rated 1 or 2 on a 4-point scale). Thus, it may be concluded that principals' perceptions of the

new West Virginia teacher evaluation system were mixed, but mostly favorable. While principals

generally seem to characterize the new system favorably, however, the meager number of "very

favorable" comments lowers this perception.

Principals were also asked to rate the individual standard elements on which teacher

professional growth is measured as to their effectiveness in allowing them to assess teacher

performance. The composite mean rating for each of these 14 standards was 2.66. Working with

46

parents, guardians, families, and community entities to support student learning and well-being had the lowest mean rating at 2.54 on a 4-point scale. Establishing and maintaining a safe and appropriate learning environment had the highest mean rating at 2.90 on a 4-point scale. Little variance was measured between responses to any the individual West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards. The mean rating of each was consistently between the effective and very effective levels. Data do not indicate that there was any great divergence in principal perceptions of the individual standard elements.

Research Question 2: To what extent do principals perceive the self-reflection process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

Respondents shared their perceptions of the new teacher evaluation system's self-reflection portion as to its effectiveness in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth. Approximately 56% of principals perceived the self-reflection tasks as effective or very effective (rated as 3 or 4 on a 4-point scale) while approximately 44% perceived the self-reflection portion as ineffective or very ineffective (rated as 1 or 2). The rating of this part of the evaluation system as very ineffective, however, was higher than for the performance measures; in fact, 12.10% characterized it as very ineffective. A higher percentage also rated the self-reflection as very effective compared to the performance measures (11.74% contrasted to 9.78%).

The mean rating for this section (2.56) illustrates the variable perceptions of the population as a whole as to the effectiveness of the self-reflection portion of the evaluation system.

Research Question 3: To what extent do principals perceive the goal-setting process in the West Virginia teacher evaluation system to be effective in measuring teacher professional performance and growth?

Principals were asked to share their perceptions of the goal-setting portion of the new teacher evaluation system as to its effectiveness in measuring teacher professional performance and growth. Approximately 61% of principals perceived the goal-setting portion of the evaluation system to be effective (rated as 3 on a 4-point scale) or very effective (rated as 4) at measuring teacher professional performance and growth, while approximately 39% perceived the same to be ineffective (rated as 2) or very ineffective (rated as 1). The percentage of principals rating goal-setting as highly effective, however, was greater than for either performance measures or self-reflection (18.15% for goal-setting, 11.74% for self-reflection, and 9.78% for performance measures). In addition, the percentage of principals rating goal-setting as very ineffective was smaller than for the other two areas (7.83% for goal-setting contrasted to 12.10% for self-reflection and 8.70% for performance measures). Also, with a mean rating of 2.71, the sample's perception of the goal-setting portion of the evaluation system was rated as more effective than the self-reflection portion (2.56) or the evaluation systems as a whole (2.60).

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Respondents were given an opportunity to provide additional comments concerning their personal reactions and views of the new teacher evaluation system being used in West Virginia in the comments section at the end of the survey. A total of 114 principals (40.5% of the sample) chose to submit comments. These comments were examined by the researcher and categorized by their topics and favorableness toward the new evaluation system.

Two-thirds of the submitted comments (75) were categorized as unfavorable (rated as 2) or very unfavorable (rated as 1), while one-third (39) of the submitted comments were categorized as favorable (rated as 3) or very favorable (rated as 4). The category of very favorable (rated as 4) was the least represented with fewer than 5% of the total comments.

The majority of comments expressed dissatisfaction with some or many portions of the new evaluation system and/or offered suggestions for how it might be improved or better implemented. Some principals described the system as "terrible" and "very dependent on individual personalities." Others believed portions needed to be reworded for clarity or expanded to offer administrators more choice in documentation. This data is generally inconsistent with the data collected from the survey items which suggested that the majority of principals perceived the evaluation system as a whole, the self-reflection portion, and the goal-setting portion as effective or very effective.

Some principals did feel, however, that the new evaluation system was better than the previous system as a whole or that certain portions of the system were improvements. Comments sharing these sentiments praised the new system for making the teacher a more active participant in the evaluation process, especially through the new self-reflection and goal-setting portions.

Performance Measures

The responses to the questions asking principals to rate their perceptions of the effectiveness of each item included in the performance evaluation criteria were relatively consistent, with the lowest mean rating ("how a teacher works with parents, guardians. . .") at 2.54 and the highest mean ("teacher's performance in establishing. . .") at 2.90 – a range of only 0.36. The primary conclusion that can be drawn from the data in this area would be that while

principals have an overall positive attitude toward the new system, they do not tend to regard it as extremely effective in enabling them to assess teacher performance.

The comments received from principals confirm an ambivalence regarding the degree to which the process and the instrument allow them to effectively evaluate how teachers are performing in their teaching responsibilities. These comments ranged from the bluntly negative (e.g., "This is a terrible system,") to the more circumspect (e.g., "This system is only as good as the teacher and the evaluator. It is extensive, and is not effective."). Suggestions included rewording the standards for clarity, altering the observation documentation to give the administrator more choices, and a reduction in the time restraints and amount of documentation required of the administrator.

Some respondents did feel, however, that the new evaluation system was "far better" than the previous system and that, "if used correctly, it is a great tool." One principal stated, "I think the new evaluation system is excellent and far superior to the old system."

Goal-setting

The topic most frequently mentioned by respondents in the comments section was goal-setting. Of these comments, 53% were categorized as favorable by the researcher. One respondent stated that "the goal-setting component is potentially the most valuable part of the evaluation process." Another stated, "The goal setting has sparked rich and interesting discussions among our staff. We set goals together and help each other teach and reach them." Another favorable comment was "the goal setting portion engages teachers in data analysis which is a great thing!" Several other comments mentioned how the goal-setting process both includes teachers as active participants in the evaluation process and holds them accountable for

50

their own growth. These findings may suggest that goal-setting is perceived as being more useful to the principal in evaluating teacher performance.

Other respondents mentioned that they felt the goal-setting process was the most difficult portion of the evaluation for teachers to understand and complete correctly. One respondent raised the concern that adequate professional development had not been offered on how to write and evaluate goals. Another suggested that teachers make the goals too easy so they can ensure that they are obtained. Concern was raised over the validity of the goal-setting process as a whole. One principal stated, "The whole goal-setting piece feels contrived in the sense that you are asking teachers to pick TWO areas where they will measure student growth. Teachers create SMART goals that don't feel real because they are being asked for specificity in such a broad content." Also, respondents stated several times that teachers and administrators do not have adequate time to do the goal-setting properly. One commenter represented these sentiments by stating, "There is no time to meet with teachers within the school day to set goals," and "teachers are willing, but they have to have a life outside of school and teachers are getting burnt out because of all the mandates."

Self-reflection

The topic mentioned second most frequently by principals was self-reflection. Of these comments, 54% were categorized as favorable by the researcher. "The personal reflection is a good tool that helps identify the needs of the teacher if done in the spirit that it was designed to do – a working relationship between administration and teacher to do what is best for all students," stated one principal. Other commenters agreed that "good teachers already self-reflect," and "the reflection makes most teachers look at themselves as teachers a little differently or more specifically/critically."

Other principals were unconvinced that the self-reflection process was a positive experience for teachers. "It has been my experience that the best teachers are the most reflective and that they tend to rate themselves a bit lower than they really are. I have found that the fair to poor teacher tends to mark themselves higher than they really are," stated one principal and this assessment was echoed by another. Still others felt that "teachers don't take the self-reflection seriously" and "teachers don't rate themselves according to the rubric."

Ancillary Findings

The following sections each present an area of concern for principals that was not addressed directly through the survey. These are listed in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned in the comments.

Subjectivity of evaluation process

Some of the concerns with the perceived subjectivity of the evaluation system were with the system itself. One principal stated, "Though there is a rubric attached to the new evaluation standards the whole process is rather vague and promotes inconsistency from one evaluation to the next." Another agreed that there are "many opportunities for misinterpretation."

Other concerns were focused on the specific evaluator involved in the process. One respondent stated, "The willingness of the administrator to fully implement the evaluation with fidelity and in a collaborative frame of mind plays a huge part." Another said, "The system is not what counts. It is the integrity, courage, and professionalism of the evaluator that counts the most. No system can accommodate a lack of those items."

The third concern with the subjectivity of the evaluation systems was with the teacher. "I don't like it because anybody can write anything but that doesn't mean it really happened and I

think teachers do them because they have to but don't take the content seriously," asserted one principal.

Time constraints

The majority of these comments expressed concern that principals do not have the time to perform required evaluation duties successfully. "Principals simply do not have the time to give merit to this process now. It has gone from a valuable process to one that is hurried and not given value to," said one respondent. Another respondent commented that there is no time during the school day to meet with teachers to set goals. The consensus of these comments represent a concern from respondents that the demands of the new evaluation system are time-consuming on the part of administrators.

Seriousness of participants

The majority of these comments seem to present the perception that the effectiveness of the system is heavily dependent on teacher buy-in, but it could be successful if taken seriously. A principal stated, "I think some teachers use this as a beneficial tool for personal growth. Others view it as a waste of time and just something else they have to do." Most respondents who commented on this topic had similar views.

Professional development

These comments represented a perceived concern that teachers and administrators have not received enough training to successfully participate in the evaluation process. Lack of understanding of the self-reflection and goal-setting processes by teachers were named specifically. Additionally, commenters mentioned the concern that administrators have not had the appropriate level of preparation to execute their evaluative responsibilities successfully. One

example of these sentiments is this statement: "I'm not sure that administrators in general have had enough training on using and understanding the system."

Observations

The majority of these comments were critiques of the process, but also included suggestions for how the process might be improved. One respondent stated, "What I observed did not fit into any one category and some things I needed to put on the evaluation didn't really fit where I put them." Another with a similar perception stated, "When doing an observation, I want more concrete descriptors of what to look for."

Other comments included principal perceptions of how the observation structure could be changed for the better. Several respondents stated that they felt multiple short observations would be more effective than a few long (30 minute) observations, as policy currently dictates.

Other

Other topics included rubrics, teaching standards, collaboration, standardized testing, teacher professional growth, evidence, parental support, teacher attendance, best practices, instructional practices, lesson planning, and the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS). These comments were generally negative and expressed dissatisfaction with various elements of the new teacher evaluation system. One principal whose comment represents this perception stated, "I personally feel that the system we have in place is simply enough to meet the requirement of having an evaluation system and that it is not effective whatsoever in actuality. There is a wide discrepancy in the time and effort that is put into this system from school to school and county to county, and I don't feel it is being implemented in a uniform or effective fashion."

SUMMARY

Most respondents who chose to leave additional comments were not favorable toward the new teacher evaluation system. Comments such as "it is no more effective than the previous system" and "this is a terrible evaluation system" represent the most negative comments collected. One principal stated, "I do not like the evaluation system we are using now. It needs to be revised or done away with. It is not a good way of evaluating teachers." Another commented, "This evaluation system does not help teachers improve their instruction."

Many principals, however, commented that the evaluation system was an improvement over the previous system. One respondent stated, "While the new evaluation system is not perfect by any stretch, it is far better than the previous in evaluating educators." While the comments on the evaluation system as a whole were mostly unfavorable, most respondents found that the self-reflection and goal-setting portions of the evaluation were positive additions. Comments such as "the personal reflection is a good tool that helps identify the needs of the teacher" and "the goal-setting holds teachers accountable for setting and reporting results of goals" were given.

DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The data collected from the survey instrument show that the majority of West Virginia principals perceive the new evaluation system as effective. Each of the Professional Teaching Standards by which teachers' performance and growth are measured and the evaluation system as a whole each received a mean rating of between 2 and 3 on a 4-point Likert-type scale. These data represent a perception by principals that the evaluation system is effective in measuring teacher development and growth.

More than half (56%) of the principals surveyed rated the self-reflection portion of the evaluation system as either 3 or 4 on a 4-point Likert-type scale. Likewise, more than half (60%) of the respondents rated the goal-setting portion of the evaluation system as either 3 or 4 on the same.

While each element of the evaluation system received a mean rating of between 2 and 3 on a 4-point Likert-type scale, these data show that the perceptions of principals are lukewarm at best. No part of the evaluation system measured in this study received a mean rating of 3 or 4. It appears that while principals are satisfied overall with the new evaluation system, they are not overly fond of any particular portion or of the system as a whole.

The qualitative data, however, were somewhat contradictory to the above quantitative findings. Of the 281 respondents, 114 (40.5%) chose to leave a comment at the end of the survey. The researcher examined these comments and categorized them by key words and topics. Seven topics were mentioned by 10 or more principals each. These, the most commented on topics, were examined as to their favorability toward the new evaluation system. The large majority of these comments were unfavorable. This seems in opposition to the fact that the majority of principals rated the evaluation system and its elements as being effective. This could be the result of respondents desiring to share what they felt was wrong with the system. Perhaps those who perceived the system to be working effectively felt no need to comment.

Many of the unfavorable comments gave suggestions for how the system might be improved. These include reducing the amount of time needed to complete the various tasks associated with the evaluation process for principals and teachers, offering more training to principals and teachers as to effectively use the evaluation system, and to make the teacher

observation process more meaningful by giving the observer more choice in when and how to observe teachers.

The qualitative data was not all conflicting, however. The two most frequently mentioned topics were goal-setting (30 comments) and self-reflection (24 comments). The researcher categorized these comments as being 53% favorable and 54% favorable, respectively. This was very much in agreement with the quantitative findings which showed these two portions of the evaluation system to be the processes which the majority of principals perceived as being effective.

Based on these findings, the researcher recommends that policy makers introduce adjustments in the evaluation system based on principal perceptions of the system. Self-reflection and goal-setting, being rated as the most effective and favorable portions of the evaluation system, should be supported and possibly even expanded in the future. Items to be considered for change should be the deadlines and time requirement that principals perceive as being much too stringent. Also, any efforts to make the observation and evaluation pieces more clearly defined could possibly alleviate some principals' perceptions that the process is too subjective, and therefore, not a good indicator of teachers' professional growth and development.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study could be replicated with the sample expanded to include West Virginia teachers who have participated in this new evaluation system. This could produce informative data on the differences in perceptions between principals and teachers. A comparison of principal and teacher perceptions of the evaluation system could provide valuable data for practitioners, such as principals, on how best to implement the various procedures to ensure these most

positive outcome in terms of teacher growth and development. For policy-makers, this data could clarify what elements of the evaluation system teachers and principals perceive to be practically ineffective.

REFERENCES

Ballard, K. K., & McBride, R. (2010). Promoting preservice teacher reflectivity: Van Manen may represent a viable model. *Physical Educator, 67*(2), 58-73.

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2011). Learning about teaching: Initial findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching project. Bellevue, WA: Author. Retrieved from www.gatesfoundation.org/collegeready-education/Documents/preliminary-findings-research-paper.pdf

Bogart, C. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation and classroom practice: Teacher perceptions in northeast Tennessee* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (3574387).

Breedlove, P. H. (2011). *Teacher evaluation in North Carolina: Teacher perceptions during a time of change* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (3456442).

Brinko, K. T. (1993). The practice of giving feedback to improve teaching: What is effective? *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 574-593.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cardno, C. (2001). Managing dilemmas in appraising performance. In D. Middlewood & C. Cardno (Eds.), *Managing teacher appraisal and performance: A comparative approach* (pp. 143-159). London: Routledge Falmer.

Cavanagh, S. (1997) Content analysis: Concepts, methods and applications. *Nurse Researcher, 4*, 5-13. http://dx.doi.org/10.7748/nr1997.04.4.3.5.c5869.

Church, A. (2012). Making performance-based evaluation work for you: A recipe for personal learning. *Knowledge Quest*, *41*(2), 38-41.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Cornish, L., & Jenkins, K. A. (2012). Encouraging teacher development through embedding reflective practice in assessment. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(2), 159-170. doi:10.1080/1359866X.2012.669825.

Danielson, C. (2010). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational Leadership*, *68*(4), 35-39.

DeNisco, A. (2014). Removing weak links from K12 classrooms. *District Administration*, 50-54. Retrieved from http://www.districtadministration.com/article/removing-weak-links-k12-classrooms.

Derrington, M. L. (2011). Changes in teacher evaluation: Implications for the principal's work. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 77*(3), 51-54.

Edwards, W. (2001). The issue of ethics in principal appraisal. In D. Middlewood & C. Cardno (Eds.), *Managing teacher appraisal and performance: A comparative approach* (pp. 58-71). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Elo, S. and Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*: 107–115. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Fisicaro, R. J. (2010). *Teacher evaluation: Assessing principals' perceptions in the state of New Jersey.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1319&context=doctoral.

A Framework for Faculty Growth. (2008). *ASHE Higher Education Report, 34*(3), 23-32.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 233.

Hoy, A.W., & Hoy, W. K. (2006). *Instructional leadership: A research-based guide to learning in schools* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Hunter, M. (1985). What's wrong with Madeline Hunter? *Educational Leadership, 42*(5), 57-60.

Ingvarson, L. (2001). Developing standards and assessments for accomplished teaching. In D. Middlewood & C. Cardno (Eds.), *Managing teacher appraisal and performance: A comparative approach* (pp. 160-179). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Jacobson, S. L. & Battaglia, C.F. (2001). Authentic forms of teacher assessment and staff development in the U.S. In D. Middlewood & C. Cardno (Eds.), *Managing teacher appraisal and performance: A comparative approach* (pp. 75-89). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Kalule, L., & Bouchamma, Y. (2013). Supervisors' perception of instructional supervision. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM)), 41(1),* 89-104.

Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Baumert, J., Richter, D., Voss, T., & Hachfeld, A. (2013). Professional competence of teachers: Effects on instructional quality and student development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(3), 805-820. doi:10.1037/a0032583.

Looney, J. (2011). Developing high-quality teachers: Teacher evaluation for improvement. *European Journal of Education, 46*(4), 440-455. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2011.01492.x.

Marzano, R. J. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 14-19.

Marzano, R., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching.* Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.

Middlewood, D. & Cardno, C. (2001). The significance of teacher performance and its appraisal. In D. Middlewood & C. Cardno (Eds.), *Managing teacher appraisal and performance: A comparative approach* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Morel, N. J. (2014). Setting the stage for collaboration: An essential skill for professional growth. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 81*(1), 36-39.

O'Meara, K., & Terosky, A. L. (2010). Engendering faculty professional growth. *Change, 42*(6), 44-51. doi:10.1080/00091383.2010.523408.

Overland, C. T. (2014). Teacher evaluation and music education: Joining the national discussion. *Music Educators Journal, 101*(1), 56-62. doi:10.1177/0027432114534448.

Popham, W. J., & DeSander, M. (2014). Will the courts save teachers? *Educational Leadership, 71*(5), 55-58.

Porter-Magee, K. (2004). Teacher quality, controversy, and NCLB. *Clearing House, 78*(1), 26-29.

Quinn, A. E. (2014). Looking at the bigger picture with Dr. Robert Marzano: Teacher evaluation and development for improved student learning. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 81*(1), 12-18.

Rousmaniere, K. (2007). Presidential address: Go to the principal's office: Toward a social history of the school principal in North America. *History of Education Quarterly, 47*(1), 1-22. doi:10.1111/j.1748-5959.2007.00072.x.

Sheppard, J. D. (2013). *Perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding the teacher evaluation process* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1856&context=etd.

Sinnema, C. L., & Robinson, V. J. (2012). Goal setting in principal evaluation: Goal quality and predictors of achievement. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, *11*(2), 135-167. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.629767.

Slepkov, H. (2008). Teacher professional growth in an authentic learning environment. *Journal of Research On Technology In Education, 41*(1), 85-111.

Thomson, D. L. (2013). *Teachers' perceptions of the new Massachusetts teacher evaluation instrument and process on instructional practice*. (Order No. 3608479, Northeastern University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 103. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2048/docview/1496776108?accountid=12281 (1496776108).

Towe, P. B. (2012). *An investigation of the role of a teacher evaluation system and its influence on teacher practice and professional growth in four urban high schools*. (Order No. 3520930, Seton Hall University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 269. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2048/docview/1033658578?accountid=12281 (1033658578).

Tracy, S. J. (1995). How historical concepts of supervision relate to supervisory practices today. *Clearing House*, *68*(5), 320.

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry, 6(*3), 205-228. Retrieved November 25, 2014, from http://amitay.haifa.ac.il/images/1/1f/Mannen.pdf.

West Virginia Performance Evaluation of School Personnel Policy 5310 (2013). West Virginia Code § 126-142-1 – § 126-142-27.

West Virginia Department of Education. (2010). *State of West Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, 4.*

Zhao, M. (2012). Teachers' professional development from the perspective of teaching reflection levels. *Chinese Education & Society, 45*(4), 56-67.

APPENDIX A: Instructional Review Board Approval Letter

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY
www.marshall.edu

Office of Research Integrity
Institutional Review Board
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755

FWA 00002704

IRB1 #00002205
IRB2 #00003206

September 9, 2015

Louis Watts, EdD
Leadership Studies, MUGC

RE: IRBNet ID# 800466-1
At: Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral)

Dear Dr. Watts:

Protocol Title:	[800466-1] Principal Perceptions of Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia

Expiration Date:	September 9, 2016	
Site Location:	MUGC	
Submission Type:	New Project	APPROVED
Review Type:	Exempt Review	

In accordance with 45CFR46.101(b)(2), the above study and informed consent were granted Exempted approval today by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Designee for the period of 12 months. The approval will expire September 9, 2016. A continuing review request for this study must be submitted no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date.

This study is for student Brent Griffith.

If you have any questions, please contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/ Behavioral) Coordinator Bruce Day, ThD, CIP at 304-696-4303 or day50@marshall.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

- 1 -

Generated on IRBNet

Anonymous Survey Consent

Marshall University IRB	
Approved on:	9/9/15
Expires on:	9/9/16
Study number:	800466

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "**Principal Perceptions of Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation in West Virginia**" designed to analyze effectiveness of the system used to evaluate professional teaching personnel as perceived by principals who perform the evaluations. The study is being conducted by Dr. Louis Watts, Associate Professor of Leadership Studies at Marshall University, and Brent Griffith, a practicing assistant principal and doctoral student at Marshall, and has been approved by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation process for Brent Griffith.

This survey is comprised of questions on the various components of the evaluation system in use in West Virginia schools. Your replies will be anonymous, so do not type your name anywhere on the form. There are no known risks involved with this study. Participation is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose to not participate in this research study or to withdraw. If you choose not to participate you can leave the survey site. You may choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. The intent of this survey is to remain anonymous, so please be careful not to provide any information in the open-ended question that could possibly identify you. Once you complete the survey you can delete your browsing history for added security. Completing the on-line survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions about the study you may contact Dr. Louis Watts at 304-746-1933 or Brent Griffith at 304-542-5654.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at (304) 696-4303.

By completing this survey you are also confirming that you are **25** years of age or older.

Please print this page for your records.

If you choose to participate in the study you will find the survey at

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/evaluationperceptions

APPENDIX C: Instrument

Griffith Principal Survey

1. What is your sex?

○ Female

○ Male

2. How many years have you been an educator?

[   ]

3. How many years have you been a principal?

[   ]

4. What is your education level?

○ Bachelor's Degree (BA or BS)

○ Master's Degree (MA)

○ Education Specialist Degree (Ed.S.)

○ Doctorate Degree (Ed.D. or Ph.D.)

○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

5. What is your daily workplace?

○ Elementary School (includes grades 1 through 4, but does not include grade 8)

○ Middle Level School (includes grade 8, but does not include grade 12)

○ High School (includes grade 12)

○ Vocational Center (CTE)

6. What is the approximate student population of your school?

[   ]

7. In which RESA is your school located?

- ◯ RESA 1
- ◯ RESA 2
- ◯ RESA 3
- ◯ RESA 4
- ◯ RESA 5
- ◯ RESA 6
- ◯ RESA 7
- ◯ RESA 8

8. What is your perception of the effectiveness of the West Virginia teacher evaluation in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth in the following areas with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest?

Demonstrating a deep and extensive knowledge of the subject matter.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Designing standards-driven instruction using state-approved curricula.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Using a balanced assessment approach to guide student learning.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Understanding and responding to the unique characteristics of learners.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Establishing and maintaining a safe and appropriate learning environment.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Establishing and maintaining a learner-centered culture.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Utilizing a variety of research-based instructional strategies.	◯	◯	◯	◯
Motivating and engaging students in learning, problem solving and collaboration.	◯	◯	◯	◯

Adjusting instruction based on a variety of assessments and student responses.	○	○	○	○
Engaging in professional development for self-renewal that guides continuous examination and improvement of professional practice.	○	○	○	○
Actively engaging in collaborative learning opportunities for self-renewal with colleagues.	○	○	○	○
Participating in school-wide collaborative efforts to support the success of all students.	○	○	○	○
Working with parents, guardians, families, and community entities to support student learning and well-being.	○	○	○	○
Promoting practices and policies that improve school environment and student learning.	○	○	○	○
Your **overall** perception of the effectiveness of the new West Virginia teacher evaluation system.	○	○	○	○

9. What is your perception of the self-reflection portion of the teacher evaluation process as to its effectiveness in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest?

○   ○   ○   ○

10. What is your perception of the goal-setting portion of the teacher evaluation process as to its effectiveness in measuring teachers' professional performance and growth with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest?

○   ○   ○   ○

11. Please provide additional comments in the space below concerning your personal reactions and views concerning the new evaluation system being used in West Virginia:

Comments have been lightly edited for clarity by the researcher to ensure readability.

Question 11: Please provide additional comments in the space below concerning your personal reactions and views concerning the new evaluation system being used in West Virginia:

1. The self-reflection aspect has potential to be of assistance to educators, if taken seriously by teachers. The goal-setting seems to fall short of accomplishing the intended purpose for instructors. Many see this as another 'task' to complete without much validity in whether the goal was accomplished or not.

2. It is no more effective than the previous system.

3. It has been my experience that the best teachers are the most reflective and that they tend to rate themselves a bit lower than they really are. I have found that the fair to poor teacher tends to mark themselves higher than they really are.

4. I do find the use of rubrics to be a help. I believe this system allows for more collaboration between principals and teachers.

5. I feel I can adequately evaluate teachers without this particular instrument.

6. I feel that the bureaucracy in Charleston and Washington has lost touch with what is really happening in our culture; that someone needs to acknowledge that a Student's performance and a Teacher's performance starts before the students even arrive at school. School personnel can only do with what they have to work with. It starts at home. We only have them for an eight hours per day. Not only must school culture change; but local, state, national culture must change; i.e. public assistance etc.

7. This is a terrible evaluation system.

8. While the "new" evaluation system is not perfect by any stretch it is far better than the previous in evaluating educators. The goal setting component is potentially the most valuable part of the evaluation process.

9. The new system makes the educator think. It is no difference than the old system except it is online. No one looks at it. The central office can't see them. It needs to be like other places of work where you can let them go without all of these laws/guidelines. Because some of them are repeaters and do not need to be in a classroom. They cannot teach. The younger teachers do not have the same ethics the older ones have. They are late, use all their sick days, and think you owe them.

10. The personal reflection is a good tool that helps identifies the needs of the teacher if done in the spirit that it was designed to do: a working relationship between administration and teacher to do what is best for all students. The same for the goal setting.

11. The boxes provided and the choices you have to mark as indicators make it difficult to reflect a poorly delivered or planned lesson. An additional box for comments or concerns would be a great addition.

12. Our evaluation system is more effective for those who are on the initial and intermediate levels. These teachers are observed and there is documentation supporting professional growth and development. Those teachers on the advanced level will not always be observed.

13. For some, I think its busy work that they have to complete and then don't look at again. If used correctly, I think it's a great tool.

14. I personally feel that the system we have in place is simply enough to meet the requirement of having an evaluation system and that it is not effective whatsoever in actuality. There is a wide discrepancy in the time and effort that is put into this system from school to school and county to county, and I don't feel it is being implemented in a uniform or effective fashion.

15. Good teachers already self-reflect. If this evaluation/self-reflection is done with goal setting in mind, it will be effective. If it is completed because it has to be completed and there is no thought put into it, it will not be effective. I find this rating system an ineffective evaluation of the system, because the ratings would be different for different staff members. I do believe there needs to be accountability for all, but until that accountability applies to parents, we will not achieve maximum achievement and growth from our students.

16. As an administrator, I feel the system is user friendly.

17. The efficacy of the program is dependent upon the knowledge teachers have on creating Smart Goals. I am not sure how much PD has been presented on creating effective Smart Goals.

18. I feel that what we have right now is a good step but most teachers are reluctant. It is hard to truly gauge how much and how often student centered learning is prevalent. Administrators have had too many other major changes thrust upon us to do everything well. It would be

great to have a few years without any additional initiatives or changes brought on so we could focus on making something like the evaluation system a useful tool. Which it easily could be.

19. Finding time is difficult for teachers. Teachers prefer to spend any free time planning and preparing lessons. I am afraid the Educator Evaluation System gets put to the side or last minute due to the lack of time.

20. I believe that the attendance question needs clarification. What specifically constitutes meets standard and below standard. Needs a numerical value that is consistent state wide.

21. I think the new evaluation system is excellent and far superior to the old system.

22. The requirement that all staff be evaluated has set the evaluation process back light years. Principals simply do not have the time to give merit to this process now. It has gone from a valuable process to one that is hurried and not given value to.

23. We have more and more to do that removes educators from the students. Testing is a joke. Feedback from testing to teachers is vague at best. The amount of time spent on testing is ridiculous and then to tie it to teacher's evaluations unfair. The state has lost focus.

24. Regardless the intent of such a program, you simply cannot "force" people to care about children or about their profession. It seems after 30 years, that I am seeing more and more, "guns for hire" coming out of undergrad, and entering the education field. Many of these young people do not have the ethic or the desire to affect positive change in children, or to invest themselves in students' futures. More and more, it seems that entrance into the teaching profession holds no more meaning than punching a clock at a factory. I suppose that

these are the times that we live in! This is not sour grapes....just an observation from a grizzled veteran of education!

25. The new evaluation system is limited in the areas where information can be observed.

26. Needs more in-depth observation piece.

27. I do not like the evaluation system we are using now. It needs to be revised or done away with. It is not a good way of evaluating teachers.

28. I don't like it because anybody can write anything but that doesn't mean it really happened and I think teachers do them because they have to but don't take the content seriously.

29. This evaluation system does not help teachers improve their instruction.

30. The teachers must take it seriously for the evaluation system to work and not just something else they have to do. I do like the learning goals... as long as they are taken seriously and work towards meeting those goals. For teachers who are motivated by external factors, just wanting to meet the goal isn't enough.

31. It is a compliance tool. The categories are vague and do not really give us measures for teachers. I completed an observation last week. What I observed did not fit into any one category and some things I needed to put on the evaluation didn't really fit where I put them. There needs to be more of a checklist for some areas. Classroom management is an important task.

32. It allows for teacher input.

33. It still is dependent upon the training and commitment of the evaluator.

34. Now I must qualify my answers. I believe that the system forces teachers and administrators to look at the top portion of this survey with a more deliberate motivation. I think all teachers should be evaluated- maybe not every year but certainly more than never after the first five years. The second and third portions of the survey I marked 3 and would have marked right in the middle at two and a half if possible. Reason: teachers self-reflect lower in many cases than they really are and goal setting- the true goal of the goal is to "meet it" not to set a goal for students. Teachers make the goal lesser in order to guarantee accomplishing it, which devalues the goal in the long run.

35. Roster verification was causing a lot of anxiety. I am glad to see it taken off the table. It was also very time consuming. I would like to see some type of system established where teachers must continue to take PD that meets certain criteria similar to what administrators do. After meeting at least five years, completing a certain number of courses through WVCPD, and having at least a MA. Then, the teacher would be eligible for a permanent authorization.

36. Principals need power and abort to get rid of weak teachers easier.

37. With any type of evaluation system, it has pros and cons to its effectiveness.

38. In an effort to help with observation and to help with time constrains this process had in fact made it more difficult to accomplish this task. There is no time to meet with teachers within the school day to set goals. We need a day set aside for goal setting and working to address student learning goals and student achievement. By the legislation removing full day faculty senate days or ISE day they have taken the collaboration time away from teachers and school staff but piled more collaboration requirements on the backs of professionals in the school

system. Teacher are willing to work but they have to have a life outside of school and teachers are getting burnt out because of all the mandates that are being required. Accountability is one thing but some of this is too much.

39. I think it is much better than what we had before.

40. I think that there is little distinction between standard two and three.

41. "Meets standard, Below Standard, and unsatisfactory": I would like a continuum instead of using these terms. Many teachers do not meet my standard, but without a concrete written standard, I am afraid I am setting myself up for litigation in marking one of the others.

42. Over all the new system is more effective in getting the teacher engaged and reflecting on the process than the old way of observations and paper evaluations.

43. I think some teachers use this as a beneficial tool for personal growth. Others view it as a waste of time and just something else they have to do. We try to incorporate our student data notebooks into goals at our school, so it brings some meaning to individual classrooms.

44. I believe this system is not perfect, but I prefer it over the previous system because it requires something from every educator and encourages self-reflection, goal-setting, professional practice, student assessment, and adjusting instruction to meet students' learning needs.

45. The reflection makes most teachers look at themselves as teachers a little differently or more specifically/critically. The goal setting holds teachers accountable for setting and reporting results of goals that some may not do. Many have goals, but do not always follow through with results. Accountability is a good thing, however, great teachers do not need this process. However, parts of the process are valuable for others.

46. I don't feel the standards are worded well. I feel the old evaluation system had better topics to get a better picture of the teachers performance

47. I feel that every teacher should participate in some sort of action every five years where a team of teachers evaluate all aspects of their teaching.

48. The goal setting has sparked rich and interesting discussions among our staff.   We set goals together and help each other teach and reach them. I also really like the fact that teachers are involved in self-reflection.   The reality is that in the beginning and ending of the year, we get crazy busy. Some of my best teachers just marked accomplished throughout because it was easiest to do. It doesn't really matter. I strong-armed a few and bumped them up to distinguished during our conferences. As far as the other specifics, the evaluation is as good as anyone cares to take the time to document. The rubric is helpful as compared to the older system of blank spaces and satisfactory/unsatisfactory.

49. I do not feel the evaluation system gives enough information to the evaluator to evaluate on each of the above standards. When doing an observation, I want more concrete descriptors of what to look for.

50. The questions you are asking are from the evaluation. The evaluation is only as good as the person evaluating. I am unclear what your outcome is for this.

51. A lot of the accuracy/effectiveness is derived from the teacher/principals' perceptive

52. I believe that having a system where the teacher and administrator can print a copy and talk about the positives and negatives are more appropriate. Teacher evaluation is more about teaching than goal setting.

53. I believe all of the items on the list are important components of teacher growth and effectiveness. However, I'm not sure the current system we have in place is a good way to measure that. I think this system is better than any I have used in the past in that teachers and administrators are communicating more and teachers have more ownership in the process (goals, etc.).

54. Teachers can be good on paper but lousy in the classroom. Evaluations should be from documentation only.

55. This is a valuable tool to monitor and ensure quality and effective instruction, not to mention accountability.

56. The system is only as good as the teacher and the evaluator. It is extensive, and is not effective.

57. My main concern is with the fact that the WVGSA is included as a portion of the teacher evaluation. The WVGSA is designed to evaluate student comprehension in Math and ELA, and Science at one grade level. One other concern is the fact that teachers at my school have yet to receive their summative performance rating.

58. The program is a tremendous waste of time that educators could be using to increase their teacher effectiveness.

59. A lot of additional steps, deadlines, and procedures with little benefits over old system.

60. The process of giving educators some control over their evaluation seems to take some of the evaluation burden off of me. However, this process is very time consuming, particularly with a younger staff.

61. I find this evaluation system much less effective at evaluating teachers than the one it replaced.

62. I think the willingness of the administrator to fully implement the evaluation with fidelity and in a collaborative frame of mind plays a huge part as well.

63. This is a better evaluation system compared to the system it replaced. This system is only as good as the knowledge and skills both the teacher and administrator have regarding best practices and teaching strategies. The evaluation practices should be helping to drive professional development. This system also has a better focus on reflective practice and the goal setting is a step in the right direction. The administrator is a key component in the evaluative process driving school improvement based upon what is observed during the evaluation process. Also, this process can be as strong or weak as the administrator wants it to be. How much time can be invested in the process? Is this only a system of jumping through the hoops for compliance purposes and putting the minimum amount of effort into the process? As an administrator and a teacher in regards to continual school improvement, you get what you put into it.

64. It is very consistent, clear, easily understood, teachers can access the information, teaching groups (WVEA) have been supportive. The rubrics are specific and education based.

65. If conducted the way it should be conducted, this evaluation tool is very time consuming for the administrator.   In theory, the administrator should meet with every teacher to go over the self-reflection and goals. Then, as observations are completed, conferences are to occur. Then, at the end of the year, conferences are conducted again with all teachers to look at goal

attainment. Add into this mix evaluations for service personnel, support staff such as speech therapists and coaches, and it can be overwhelming, especially to a "new" principal.

66. I don't think the last two standards should be included when you do observations. The standards listed should be items that are visible during the observation. I do like the conferencing piece. It enables teachers to think more deeply about their own practices.

67. I rated number nine low as we just came off an OEPA review in which we were chastised for daring to rate ourselves as accomplished, so it has had a negative impact on the ratings teachers have given themselves.

68. Self-reflection is necessary in order to establish goals for improvement. Goal setting that includes measurable progress is very effective

69. The system does not encourage growth in teachers. That personal quality must come from within the individual.

70. I believe it is very generic and leaves to many opportunities for misinterpretation.

71. Though I feel the old system was extensive it was however very rigorous. I liked that so many different measures were required to be addressed. When addressed with the teacher the standard was not questioned. I feel that though there is a rubric attached to the new evaluation standards the whole process is rather vague and promotes inconsistency from one evaluation to the next. I personally liked the old Evaluation Form better but do still like the goal setting component and self-reflection piece of the new system.

72. Teachers don't take the self-reflection seriously. It's only as effective as the administrator that implements it.

73. Being a reflective teacher is critical. The teacher evaluation system asks teachers to think about what they are doing and it opens the door for communication with teachers and administrators. The goal setting piece feels contrived in the sense that you are asking teachers to pick TWO areas where they will measure student growth. Teachers create SMART goals that don't feel real because they are being asked for specificity in such a broad content.

74. The results of one test affecting a teacher's evaluation is wrong. It does not accurately measure the effectiveness of a teacher's abilities and success.

75. I feel the evaluation process is too cumbersome to be effective. The goals are a simple thing to do, and success is only judged by those simplistic goals. Teacher effectiveness is not judged by test scores. We have far too many students finished in under 15 minutes for the test to be any kind of measuring stick for teachers. Until students are responsible for their performance on tests, teachers cannot be held accountable for them, either.

76. I believe the goal setting is the hardest part for educators and administrators alike. Some are not "confident" in the process and don't understand exactly how to develop SMART goals that are appropriately developed for their classroom. Others can make it sound fabulous on paper....but it doesn't mean they are actually DOING what they are claiming. It is a "jumping through hoops" process that just doesn't seem to have much value in the actual educator evaluation system.

77. Overall, the evaluation system, as a whole, is very ineffective. The only way to make it more effective is to be sure the principals over the evaluation perform the task the same across the board. Also, many principals are not up-to-date on what new teaching techniques are out there so it is often times unfair to the educator who is teaching with a principal with little to

no experience in administration because their idea of what is effective greatly differs from others.

78. It is not thorough and does not provide a means to address specific concerns. It is going through the motions without depth to really make a difference.

79. Teachers are still getting used to the process, but I believe it is reflective and forces them to focus on the critical components of the educational process.

80. The evaluation system is a tool for teachers that are capable of growth. For those few that are not it is not effective. In fact, with the new teacher hiring practices a poor evaluation would only ensure that you have that poor teacher who is unwilling to be helped for an extended period of time.

81. LOOKS GOOD AND SOUNDS GOOD BUT NOT VERY EFFECTIVE!

82. The process if utilized correctly is very time consuming for the Principal who has no Assistants to carry part of the load of taking care of the daily demands of the staff and students. I have always believed that the students come first, the staff second (so they can do their jobs well) and the paper work last.

83. It seems like the teachers go through the motions of completing the process but do not really use it as a means to improve.

84. Self-reflection is a very important piece of professional growth and learning. I think being able to be in our classrooms allows us to monitor goals. I believe the intent of our new system was to further develop professional growth and have individuals really think about best practices.

85. I have grave concerns about a teacher's evaluation being tied to a new testing instrument and student scores on that test. I am all in favor or teachers being evaluated based on their observations (formal and informal), attitude, and possibly a very small portion based on student academic growth. As a former classroom teacher, I had a special desire to work with children who were lower achievers and who didn't always fit the perfect student mold. I had "loaded" classes and they worked in a safe emotionally supported environment. My students worked very hard and we set high expectations, however my class scores were always a little below the other classes. I believe there are other teachers who have a passion for these students and will hesitate to volunteer to take these students due to the increased pressure of the evaluation. There is no easy method to evaluate teacher performance. Parent support, life situations, and health issues will always be factors in student progress and success. We are way too concerned about testing and are losing sight of what is really important, meeting the needs of our students! When they know we care about them they will work to their fullest potential. I am interested in seeing your survey results. Best wishes in your program!

86. Its time consuming. It's not a good judgment of the teachers work. It means very little in the big picture of things. The rubric will allow nearly anyone make emerging

87. My biggest concern with the system is that it is hard to use the rubric across all grade levels. Some of the statements are hard to apply to the younger grades.

88. The biggest drawback, administratively speaking, is the May first deadline to submit evidence. With standardized testing, trying to get some students to graduate, graduation, awards night and other activities, it is difficult to evaluate everyone in May. We used to be able to complete evaluations prior to May, which allowed us to more efficiently utilize our

time. While some teachers may submit evidence prior to May 1, we cannot compel them to. I believe it takes away from the depth and time on task with the evaluation process.

89. The only evaluation that matters is a bad one. Most teachers do not put much importance on the evaluation.

90. It provides focus for the entire staff, not just the new teachers.

91. It is a broken un-supported system that has changed too drastically for educators. Teachers do not see the value of the evaluation tool, only the portion that includes mapping of student test scores within their evaluation. WVDE has done a poor job of rolling out this new evaluation tool (as they have with many initiatives in the past few years).

92. Goal Setting, when done properly, is the most important and effective part of the evaluation system.

93. I answered according to the observations that I am doing at this time. It is so hard to observe what is listed during an observation time. You must be invested in the teacher to know what he or she is doing. I would like a much more specific observation form to state what we are looking for rather than a rubric. I do like that we can evaluate and challenge all teachers to set goals and to do a self-reflection as many more seasoned teachers could have just gotten into a slump. This is better than the old 5310, but could still use some tweaking. I hope they don't just get complacent and not make changes.

94. I think this evaluation system is very time consuming. I do like that I meet with each teacher to discuss the end of the year evaluation and talk to them about things they can do differently the following year. I am not sure that it really makes them reflect on their personal practice and then attempt to make changes. I believe they feel it is just one more thing that I have to

meet with them about. Some of them do try to submit evidence for a higher rating, but the vast majority just want to continue doing what they have always done. I do feel that many of the changes we have made within the school have made teachers more aware of the items on the evaluation system such as using the standards to drive instruction, it is not necessarily because of the evaluation. For me as an administrator, I have to complete evaluations for over 35 staff members. I then schedule meetings with all of them to discuss it. I did find that once we streamlined the student learning goals, it made it better for that part. Teachers no longer just put a goal that was easy to meet.

95. I believe this can be a very effective system but it is like everything else in education...it depends on the person evaluating. If the principal is not doing the coaching and meeting and providing feedback it will not be a good experience. But the opposite is true as well. It depends a lot on the administrator.

96. Before my email from (WV BOE Employee) it was effective for my purposes.

97. I believe the self-reflection and goal setting is a very important part of the evaluation system. Using baseline data and comparing this data to end of the year is very important to determine student academic growth.

98. I have worked under several systems. The system is not what counts. It is the integrity, courage, and professionalism of the evaluator that counts the most. No system can accommodate a lack of those items.

99. The new evaluation is good and I am glad we have it.

100. I feel the staff at my school do the minimum to meet the lowest possible standard. They do not try to better themselves and are happy where they are.

101.   This process is extremely time consuming and really has no return that is beneficial other than documentation.

102.   While the intent is good, the reality is, that in order to effectively assess classroom quality, there must be at least 10 plus mini-observations.

103.   I don't believe that spending time doing an evaluation system online is as beneficial as the administrator using that time and more to be in the classrooms every day.

104.   I think that the evaluation process is rigorous if done correctly. As a principal it takes time to truly evaluate each teacher throughout your school. It is also very important that you evaluate teachers consistently.

105.   I feel that setting goals is an effective professional practice but with everything that is constantly thrown at us as administrators in this state, we do things to get them done and very few things are done with any kind of quality. Our state is trying to make up for years of ineffective schools all at one time and it is getting worse not better.

106.   The evaluation system is totally subjective to the evaluator. It asks for a measurement for each of the areas on the evaluation instrument but does not provide any direction in evaluating an individual. Most teachers either over estimate themselves in the self-reflection or do not distinguish themselves because of the evidence part of the evaluation instrument.

107.   System is not aligned with capacity to properly measure teacher effectiveness in the development of "whole" child.

108.   Some teachers, despite staff development on using the self-reflection portion of the

teacher evaluation, seem to read the rubric but still mark themselves as accomplished when

they might only exhibit only one characteristic described in the rubric.

109.   I think the new evaluation system is a step in the right direction. It encourages teachers to

look at their practice and explore ways to improve. It helps them keep sight of Next

Generation Standards and to be accountable. It's a two-way system that makes both teacher

and administrator involved. I like that the intent is to make all teachers better. I'm not sure

that administrators in general have had enough training on using and understanding the

system.

110.   I think that the teachers need additional training on the system. In addition, WVEIS

(WOW) is NOT a user friendly system. Every year teachers have numerous problems

signing in and working through the WVEIS maze. The self-reflection and goal setting are

good ideas, but there needs to be a more user friendly system then the one the state has.

Possibly tying it into Office 365 to make it easier.

111.   I would like to see ten 10 minute observations in lieu of multiple 30 minute observations.

112.   The goal setting portion engages teachers in data analysis which is a great thing!

113.   The system is only as effective as those of us who are using the system. Having the

rubrics with the specific points of measure is a strong point, as well as having the self-

reflection as a means of starting a conversation between teacher and supervisor.

114.   As usual the Department of Education and Legislature cannot leave anything alone long
enough to see any benefit.

Brent D. Griffith

ACADEMIC DEGREES

Marshall University, Ed.D. Educational Leadership, May 2016.

Marshall University, Ed.S. Leadership Studies, 2014.

Marshall University, M.A. Leadership Studies, 2008.

West Virginia State University, B.S. English Education, 2004.

West Virginia State University, A.A. Literature, 2000.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Assistant Principal, Boone County Schools, 2012-Present. Duties: Student Discipline, Faculty and Staff Observations and Evaluations, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), 504 Plans.

Assistant Principal / Director of Career & Technical Education, Lincoln County Schools, 2011-2012. Duties: Student Discipline, Faculty and Staff Observations and Evaluations, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), 504 Plans, Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan, Career and Technical Education (CTE) Advisory, Earn a Degree – Graduate Early (EDGE) Program, ACT Workkeys Assessment, Global 21 Performance Assessment.

Reading/Language Arts Teacher, Boone County Schools, 2004-2011. Duties: Madison Middle School Strategic Improvement Plan Team, Boone County Assessment for Learning Team, Sixth-Grade Team Leader, Boone County Schools Leadership Development Program.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

SRCEA Conference, September 2012, New Orleans, LA. *Principal Assessment of the Efficacy and Appropriateness of Their Training* (with Dr. Barbara Nicholson and Dr. Louis Watts)