Fall 10-30-2014

Determining the Difference between Nebraska Administrators' and Nebraska Secondary English Teachers' Perception of the Teacher Evaluation

Michael Scott Musil
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, mmusil@paplv.org

Determining the Difference between Nebraska Administrators'

and Nebraska Secondary English Teachers' Perception

of the Teacher Evaluation

by

Michael S. Musil

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Professor Jody Isernhagen

Lincoln, Nebraska

October, 2014

Determining the Difference between Nebraska Administrators'

and Nebraska Secondary English Teachers' Perception

of the Teacher Evaluation

Michael S. Musil, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 2014

Adviser: Jody Isernhagen

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation. The study explored teacher and administrator perceptions of the teacher-evaluation process as it relates to Nebraska secondary English teachers. Teachers and administrators from across the state of Nebraska had equal opportunity to participate in this study.

Both groups of teachers and administrators responded by Likert scale to 42 online statements arranged by theme about their experiences regarding the teacher-evaluation process. Participants aggregated themselves by geography, school size, gender, experience, and socioeconomic status of students. Quantitative data was analyzed by t test with significance noted at (p < .05). Twelve voluntary online participants (six teachers and six administrators) were randomly selected for follow-up interviews. Follow-up interview data was collected, prepared, analyzed, and organized into themes.

Determining the Difference between Nebraska Administrators'

and Nebraska Secondary English Teachers' Perception

of the Teacher Evaluation

University of Nebraska

Author Note

Michael S. Musil, Department of Educational Leadership, University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

Correspondence concerning this dissertation should be addressed to Michael S. Musil, Department of Educational Leadership, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588. E-mail: mike.musil@yahoo.com

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Chapter I

Introduction

Whatever plan or plans are employed in selecting teachers, and whatever demands
as to training and experience are made of candidates for positions, teachers
entering the force need to be stimulated to improve their teaching technique, and
the classroom work which they do needs helpful professional supervision.
(Cubberly, 1929, p. 339)

Even as far back as Cubberly wrote in 1929, teacher evaluation was intended to

foster the growth of the teacher; however, in more recent times, teacher evaluation has

been viewed not as a vehicle for growth and improvement [for teachers], but rather as a

formality that must be endured (Strong & Tucker, 1999, p. 356). Danielson (2001) stated

that evaluation has often been a meaningless exercise, endured by both teachers and

evaluators and that most systems of evaluation are not taken seriously by neither (p. 12).

The overall conclusion from Zimmerman and Deckert-Pelton (2003) was that the

principle purpose of appraisal is to improve, which returned to Cubberly's idea in 1929 –

improve teaching technique.

Moving forward to 2013, as teacher evaluation instruments are still being revised

nationwide, the nation once again reexamined the process. Of course, with this

reexamination came new issues. In Florida students' standardized test scores included in

teacher evaluation compelled six Florida teachers and their unions to file a lawsuit

against Florida officials that challenges the state's educator evaluation system. With a

new policy in place, teachers are evaluated with standardized test results of students for

whom they have not taught. For example, 40% of the teacher evaluation of Florida's

2012 Teacher of the Year was based upon test scores of 40% of students from a feeder

school, students she had never really taught until their first year in her building, the year

she administered the standardized test (Strauss, 2013).

As Cubberly reported in 1929, teacher evaluation was designed to improve

teacher technique. As mentioned previously, at least once in recent times, standardized

test scores of students who have not been taught by the teacher administering the tests are

being used to evaluate the teacher. Nearly a century after Cubberly, teacher evaluation

has gone from a process of support to a process that must be endured to a process against

which teachers are filing lawsuits.

Statement of Problem

When looking at the reasons teachers and administrators aren't always

comfortable with the teacher-evaluation process, cited factors included: stress (Kyriacou

& Sutcliffe, 1977); negative affects on teaching (Conley & Glasman, 2008; Larsen, 2005;

Larsen, 2009; Storey, 2000; Troman, 2000); the evaluation process is not always carried

out regularly, a time-consuming process, with both administrators and teachers needing

to be properly trained on the process (McDaniel, 2008); and the current method of

appraising not accurately capturing the strengths and weaknesses of teachers, making it

difficult to provide for professional development that can address the needs of individual

teachers (Research for Action, 2009).

Denning (2011) stated about the single best reform for education:

> To my mind, the biggest problem [with K-12 education] is a preoccupation with,
> and the application of, the factory model of management to education, where
> everything is arranged for the scalability and efficiency of "the system," to which
> the students, the teachers, the parents and administrators adjust. "The system"
> grinds forward, at ever-increasing cost and declining efficiency, dispiriting
> students, teachers and parents alike. . . . Given that the factory model of
> management doesn't work very well, even in the few factories that still remain in
> this country, or anywhere else in the workplace for that matter, we should hardly

be surprised it doesn't work well in education either. (Root Cause: Factory Model of Management section, paras 1, 2)

Two of Denning's eight reforms include evaluation or management-type reforms: (a) the role of administrators shifting from that of controller to that of a helper, and (b) shifting from communication to conversation (Denning, 2011).

Simon (2012) stated there's much angst, which has led to experiments in reform and has left some of the most talented teachers demoralized.

Much thought, research, and practice have been invested to develop valid tools and gain reliable outcomes (Gullickson & Howard, 2009; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam 1995). Bridges found that:

> They [administrators] ignored or overlooked the poor performance, filled written observation reports sprinkled with glowing generalities such as 'I really enjoyed my visit.' They used double talk in written evaluations to muffle criticism of the teacher performance, and inflated performance ratings in the mistaken belief that these evaluations would act as positive reinforcement. (Bridges, 1992, p. 148)

Furthermore, in half of the cases investigated by Yariv (2006), principals preferred to ignore the difficulties until the serious nature of the failures forced a response.

Additionally, in a report entitled "Philadelphia's Teacher Appraisal System," Research for Action (2009) shared, "recent reports have exposed the many problems that pervade teacher evaluation systems across the nation" (p. 2). The most widely cited of these reports, *The Widget Effect: Our National Failure to Acknowledge and Act on Differences in Teacher Effectiveness* (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009), reported that current performance evaluation systems treat teachers as interchangeable parts whose classroom effectiveness does not vary (as cited in Research for Action, 2009). Furthermore, most appraisal processes

do not adequately distinguish strong, solid, and weak teaching practices, and teachers are rarely rated unsatisfactory or terminated. The report contended that denying individual teachers' strengths and weaknesses is deeply disrespectful to teachers [and] in its indifference to instructional effectiveness, it gambles with the lives of students. (p. 2)

In order for the teacher evaluation process to truly have meaning, Valliant (2008) identified political, conceptual and operational factors, which may facilitate or hinder the teacher evaluation process. She goes on further to reinforce the importance of taking into account the context in which a teacher evaluation system is implemented as well as the instruments, and the need for feedback among others. Simply put, if a quality system is to be developed [implemented], it is important to look at the ways at which both administrators and teachers see the evaluation process and the relationship between them (Chow, Wong, Yeung, & Mo, 2002).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation. The respondents for the study will be Nebraska secondary English teachers and Nebraska administrators who have completed the teacher evaluation process at least once in the current school building in which they work.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process?

2. What is the relationship between the administrator and teacher?

3. How do administrators determine the quality of their teachers?

4. To what extent does collaboration play a part in the teacher evaluation process?

5. What kind of training has both the evaluator and teacher received regarding the evaluation process?

6. To what extent do the teacher and administrator feel the feedback given (as a part of the evaluation process) is useful to teacher growth?

Assumptions of the Study

This study has several strong features: (a) the study focuses only on English teachers and the administrators who evaluate them; (b) the survey takes a sample from across the state of Nebraska; (c) every teacher is required to be evaluated as stated in the Nebraska Department of Education's *Rule 10: Regulations and Procedures for the Accreditation of Schools* (NDE, 2012b); and (d) every evaluator must have an administrator's certificate, also in accordance with the Nebraska Department of Education's *Rule 10: Regulations and Procedures for the Accreditation of Schools* (2012b).

Delimitations

This study takes place within the state of the Nebraska. Only Nebraska secondary English teachers will complete the survey and participate in the follow-up interviews; as well, only Nebraska secondary administrators will participate in this study. Furthermore, according to the Nebraska Department of Education's *Rule 10: Regulations and Procedures for the Accreditation of Schools* (2012b), "All evaluators, with the exception of the local board of education when it evaluates the superintendent, possess a valid

Nebraska Administrative Certificate and are trained to use the evaluation system used in the district" (p. 24).

There is no consideration of the size, location, or population of the school. Regardless of these factors, the school was included, so long as the administrator and teacher had participated in the teacher-evaluation process at least once in their current building and was willing to participate in the study.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. One limitation is the size of the population. The only administrators and teachers to participate in this study are those who have participated in the teacher evaluation during the current school year in the state of Nebraska. Furthermore, the study will limit results to the time at which the study was conducted. In order to protect the anonymity of the teacher, the teachers and evaluators will not be linked together. The study is limited by the nature of and the wording of the questions used by the researcher in designing the questionnaire. The study is limited by the technological medium used by the researcher, the Internet. Respondents will be limited to those who could be contacted by e-mail and were able to access the web-based questionnaire.

The researcher is currently a high-school teacher who has participated in the Nebraska teacher-evaluation process; therefore, the results of this study may be limited given the bias of the researcher. All efforts, however, have been made to eliminate researcher bias.

There is no statewide evaluation instrument in Nebraska; therefore, each district may have its own.

Significance of the Study

Currently, the teacher evaluation process is one required for the state of Nebraska. This study will begin to discover how evaluators and teachers currently work together and how they might make the evaluation process beneficial and of growth rather than a process that "must be endured" as previously stated by Strong and Tucker (1999). This study aims to identify the elements needed for Nebraska school districts to develop an effective evaluation process in which administrators and teachers work together to improve student achievement.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms and definitions will provide consistency in language used in this study that may not be previously understood and/or have been defined as such:

1. Evaluation process: The process used to "evaluate" teachers on an ongoing basis. For the purpose of this study, evaluation and appraisal shall be synonymous.

2. Administrator: In Nebraska, the only person who can *evaluate* the teacher in the classroom.

3. Teacher: the person who is evaluated (a teacher).

4. Summative evaluation: This process often forms the basis for initial certifications of teachers, renewal of contracts, and perhaps promotion and dismissal of teachers. In most situations a pre-observation meeting, a formal observation, and a post-conference meeting is conducted for the teacher.

5. Formative evaluation: This process emphasizes personal development through the evaluation process. In most situations a pre-conference meeting and a

post-conference meeting is conducted for the teacher to assess personal goals agreed upon by both parties (evaluator and teacher). In some situations it may include informal and/or formal observations.

6. Observation: For the purpose of this study, there may be two forms:

    a. A formal observation: An observation during which a teacher has been formally observed including a preconference, observation and post conference.

    b. An informal observation: An observation during which a teacher receives either oral or written feedback, which may or may not be included as part of the formal evaluation.

7. The purpose of teacher evaluation is twofold:

    a. Teacher evaluation is designed to improve student learning: Teachers receive feedback to enhance performance and enhance student learning.

    b. Teacher evaluation seeks to improve the teacher's own practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further development (Isoré, 2009).

Summary

Evaluating teachers is necessary to teacher growth, and there has been much time and research devoted to the development of an ideal process and instrument by which to evaluate them. Much thought has been given to teacher evaluation to enhance the process and to yield better outcomes in both teacher instruction and student achievement. Still, there appears to be some apprehension by teachers and administrators alike when it comes to the process.

Chapter I has identified some of the perceptions of the teacher-evaluation process. English teachers and administrators should work together in the process in order to encourage growth. Therefore, there is a need to examine the perceptions of Nebraska teachers and administrators regarding teacher evaluation. Chapter II will review the available literature on the purpose, teacher/administrator relationship, evaluation quality, teacher/administrator collaboration, teacher/administrator training, and the feedback involved in teacher evaluation.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

The Beginning of Teacher Evaluation

Educators of the 21st century have at their disposal several models and their accompanying rubrics, complete with detailed descriptors and performance-level indicators to help educators focus in on the necessary elements of effective teaching; however, this hasn't always been the case. In looking at the literature, teacher evaluation, the process, and its purpose have been discussed often. For example teachers of the 1700s were subjected to highly varied feedback because there was no agreement as to the importance or nature or pedagogical expertise [of teaching] (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011, p. 12). During the mid-1800s educators recognized pedagogical skills as necessary to effective teaching; however, the specific skills were not identified (Marzano et al., 2011, p. 13). In fact, determining the effectiveness of teaching is elusive when one considers the multitude of contexts in which teachers work (Strong, Ward, & Grant, 2011).

Cubberly in 1923 stated the aim of teacher "rating" was to provide a somewhat objective and practical method by means of which teachers may be rated and the efficiency of their work determined. Cubberly also suggested the principal could aid himself in being objective if he kept a series of numbered classroom supervisory-visit records for each teacher (p. 480).

Cubberly (1923) suggested five categories of teacher expertise:

1. Personal Equipment, which included items such as appearance, voice and self-control;
2. Social and Professional Equipment, items such as academic and professional preparation as well as ability to meet and interest parents;

3. School Management, such care for light, heat, and ventilation, care of routine, and discipline;
4. Technique of Teaching, such as skill in teaching how to study, skill and care in assignment;
5. Results, such as attention and response of the class, growth of pupils in subject matter, and moral influence. (p. 481)

In 1929 Cubberly stated about teacher evaluation, "that expert technical knowledge in each subject is needed less than is that knowledge as to sound teaching procedures which is common to any subject or type of instruction" (pp. 346-347). Therefore, regardless of the supervisor's curricular expertise, he or she must have solid knowledge of teaching expertise.

Good and Mulryan (1990) stated about teacher rating systems:

Rating systems were developed primarily for reasons external to teachers, that is to demonstrate to the public that students were receiving appropriate instruction or that teachers were competent, rather than to provide teachers with information that they might use to improve instruction. (p. 200)

Good and Mulryan's (1990) findings certainly are accurate when looking at the evaluation rating categories and objectives of 1923.

The reasons for evaluating teachers have been varied. Looking at the research will provide a list of reasons for evaluation from teacher worth to efficacy to hiring and promotions (Peterson, 2000). Peaker (1986) suggested that evaluations "were not created to single out poor teachers, for it was known they already existed" (p. 79). A study of Hong Kong teachers revealed that the main purposes of a formal appraisal system in the school should be for teachers' professional development and identifying areas for their improvement (Tse Chun Yin, 2005, p. 53).

In more recent history of the criticism of the teacher-evaluation process, Cohen and Brawer (1969) stated in a study of teacher evaluation that "The reason for appraisal is

often said to be 'to improve instruction,' but the methods seldom relate to instructional practice and even less often to the results of instruction" (p. 52).

In Babel's (1972) speech about the purposes of teacher evaluation, presented at the 104th American Association of School Administrators Annual Convention in Atlantic City, he said, "Briefly, some ingredients of an appraisal system are . . ." as he addressed the use of appraisal as a means of not only helping teachers improve, but dismissing those who are a "dead beat of the worst order" (p. 1).

Babel (1972) continued on with the "improved" method by which teachers must be evaluated, a program with five elements: Involvement, Management System, Clear School Goals, Communication, and Commitment (p. 1). Babel further elaborated that no one system is used; in fact, many are used.

In a paper presented by Frank Gray in 1975 to the 107th Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, he reported, "There has not been too much progress in the area of measuring practitioner [teacher] effectiveness because of the educator's stand that it is impossible to make valid judgments about anything as complex and personal as teaching ability" (p. 2).

Carlson and Park (1976) noted two purposes for teacher evaluation: to know and to assess. However they further expanded on the idea of evaluating teachers to including seven purposes:

1. Professional growth for improvement of instruction
2. Clarifying the goals and objectives of a department, building, or district
3. Measuring progress toward those goals and objectives
4. Clarifying in-service needs of a department, building, or district
5. Judging the contribution of the teacher to pupil progress
6. Determining salary
7. Determining employment status. (p. 6)

Scriven (1973) found the primary purposes of teacher evaluation were to determine the value, worth, or merit of teaching. Lortie (1975) suggested that teacher evaluation must let teachers know in trustworthy ways that what they are doing is valuable. While Owens (1991) identified:

> A greater motivational need [than pay, security, and advancement] . . . is for teachers to achieve feelings of professional self-worth, competence, and respect; to be seen . . . as people of workplaces, growing, persons with opportunities ahead to develop even greater competence and a sense of accomplishment. (p. 113)

Reassurance for the audience of teachers is also important, as is the most visible purpose for teacher evaluation, to make staffing decisions (Bridges, 1992). Still, the most discussed purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve practice (Peterson, 2000). Strong and Tucker (2003) stated, "without capable, high quality teachers in America's classrooms, no education reform effort can possibly succeed" (p. 3). Furthermore they stated that without high quality evaluation systems, we cannot know if we have high quality teachers (Strong & Tucker, 2003).

Natriello (1990) wrote the three purposes of teacher evaluation in schools were the following:

> first, evaluation may be used to control or influence the performance of individuals with particular positions; second, evaluation may be used to control movement into and out of positions; and third, evaluation may be used to legitimate the organizational control system itself. (pp. 36-37)

Because of these three purposes, Natriello wrote there are three intended or unintended effects of teacher evaluation as a result: individual, organizational, and environmental.

Beerens (2000) believed there are three main purposes to evaluate teachers:

1. To improve teacher effectiveness
2. To encourage professional growth
3. To remediate or eliminate weak teachers. (p. 9)

Two of the reasons above focus on the development of teachers while the last focused

upon the teacher's need for assistance or ability to gain future employment.

According to Larsen (2005) many of the early 1980s performance-based

assessment programs do not exist today because they have been overhauled, slashed, or

disbanded altogether, because of political reasons and or educational budgets. Most of

the evaluation systems adopted during that time have been replaced by evaluation

systems based on cognitive performance measures (p. 295). Cognitive performance skills

would include teaching skills that can overtly be observed: providing and communicating

learning goals, recognizable lesson structure, chunking content into manageable bites,

using physical movement, and more (Marzano, 2012b).

A meta-analysis by Goe, Bell, and Little (2008) concluded with a five-point

definition of effective teachers that includes the following traits:

1. Effective teachers have high expectations for all students and help students
   learn, as measured by value-added or other test-based growth measures, or by
   alternative measures.
2. Effective teachers contribute to positive academic, attitudinal, and social
   outcomes for students such as regular attendance, on-time promotion to the
   next grade, on-time graduation, self-efficacy, and cooperative behavior.
3. Effective teachers use diverse resources to plan and structure engaging
   learning opportunities; monitor student progress formatively, adapting
   instruction as needed; and evaluate learning using multiple sources of
   evidence.
4. Effective teachers contribute to the development of classrooms and schools
   that value diversity and civic-mindedness.
5. Effective teachers collaborate with other teachers, administrators, parents, and
   education professionals to ensure student success, particularly the success of
   students with special needs and those at high risk for failure. (p. 8)

Harris (2010) argued the current system of teacher evaluation and accountability

has enough major problems that it's worth experimenting with some uses of value-added

assessment of teacher effectiveness (p. 69).

Teacher evaluation should help ensure teacher quality and promote professional development (Danielson, 2010). Danielson (2010) also stated there are two challenges in developing such a system: (a) trained evaluators, and (b) finding time for the professional conversations.

Teacher evaluations must identify the kind of learning we value, recognize that teacher evaluation expresses what we value as good teaching practice, and synchronize data collection with reasonable beliefs about how quickly teachers' performance changes (Pallas, 2011, pp. 68-71).

Marzano (2012b) stated that an evaluation system that fosters teacher learning will differ from one that aims to measure teacher competence. This flurry can be traced to reports and efforts of several reports that stated teacher evaluation systems have failed to measure teacher quality because they don't do a good job discriminating between effective and ineffective teachers nor have teacher evaluation systems aided in developing a highly skilled teacher workforce (Marzano, 2012b).

Research about teacher evaluation in the state of Nebraska isn't as plentiful, though there are some studies available. Nebraska law requires school districts to adopt evaluation policies and those methods of evaluation must take into account instructional performance, classroom management, and personal and professional conduct. However, Nebraska State School Board members were reluctant to mandate all school districts use a statewide evaluation instrument (Diejk, 2012). As of July 2012, the State Department of Education Leadership Committee has recommended two instructional frameworks for the development of *voluntary* teacher and principal evaluation models in local districts (Diejk, 2012). Marzano (2014) has provided a state-aligned report for Nebraska that

includes the following effective practices of foundational knowledge, planning and preparation, the learning environment, instructional strategies, assessment, professionalism, and vision and collaboration.

When examining the overall quality of teachers in the state of Nebraska, teachers score well according to teacher evaluation (The Platte Institute for Economic Research, 2012). Weisberg et al. (2009) refer to this as The Widget Effect, the tendency of school districts to assume effectiveness is the same from teacher to teacher (Weisberg et al., 2009, p. 32).

However, when assessing the true state of teachers in the state of Nebraska, the Platte Institute for Economic Research (2012) found the following:

Table 1

Nebraska Teacher Policy Grades

Policy Area	Grade
Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers	D
Expanding the Teacher Pool	F
Identifying Effective Teachers	D
Retaining Effective Teachers	C-
Existing Ineffective Teachers	F
Overall Grade	D-

Source: Platte Institute Policy Study (2012, p. 5)

This information was paired with information from the late 1990s, when the state of Florida reported similar statistics about its own pool of teachers. Platte Institute for

Economic Research (2012) stated Florida schools were failing and ranked near the bottom in every national survey (p. 10). As a result the recommendation of the Platte Institute for Economic Research was that

> Strong teacher selection and evaluation policies are a cornerstone of Florida's success, and through them the Sunshine State works to fulfill the promise of an effective teacher for every student. To fulfill that promise for Nebraska students, policymakers should adopt similar reforms. (p. 11)

Taking a look at the way that Nebraska teachers and administrators view the teacher-evaluation process requires more than just understanding the purpose; one must also look at the overall history of teacher evaluation. There is a wealth of studies at the national and international level regarding the relationships and perceptions between the evaluators and teachers in regard to the teacher-evaluation process; however, when it comes to research available with Nebraska teachers' and administrators' perceptions regarding teacher evaluation, there is a lack of specific information.

This study attempts to remedy the lack of existing information about the teacher evaluation process in Nebraska and will help administrators and teachers alike to improve the teacher evaluation process. This study will examine the perceptions of Nebraska teacher and administrator perceptions of the purpose of the teacher evaluation process.

Teacher Evaluation Effectiveness

Teachers and the process. According to the literature, teachers are skeptical about the purpose of teacher evaluation. Whether teacher concerns are about the process, the administrator, or the purpose, many items factor into why teachers don't feel as though an evaluation system may not be effective. The first of which is integrity of the system.

Integrity of evaluation process. First, to have administrators observing the same teaching skills at the same time has proved to be difficult. The accuracy of principal reports of teacher classroom performance is called into question by 80 years of research (Peterson, 2004).

Sartain et al. (2011) stated in their report about the Chicago Public Schools Systems (CPSS) that traditional teacher evaluation systems didn't differentiate among the best, good, and poor teachers. In fact, "the system identified 93 percent of teachers as either Superior or Excellent–at the same time that 66 percent of CPSS schools were failing to meet state standards, suggesting a major disconnect between classroom results and classroom evaluations" (p. 1).

Research demonstrated that most administrators do have the capacity to discern the range of teacher quality. However, the practical and sociological conflicts of reporting rankings and superiorities preclude accurate reporting of classroom performance (Peterson, 2004, p. 72).

A teacher may be said to be good when satisfying one evaluator's expectations; while that same teacher may perform differently when evaluated by another because of different expectations. Peterson (2004) also stated that some evaluators would prefer the teacher who has a welcome, friendly atmosphere, wherein another would welcome a strict, punitive environment (McFadden, 1970; Searles & Kudeki, 1987; Sorenson & Gross, 1967). "A big problem arising from the use of traits and characteristics is that it is highly improbable that any two persons could ever reach agreement on what it was that an effective teacher did when he was thought to be in possession of such traits"

(McFadden, 1970, p. 1). Lo (1998) found that evaluators were more positive towards the formative and summative purposes than those of teachers.

Likewise, teachers believe the standards used for evaluating teachers are too vague and ambiguous to be considered effective. Teachers also felt the rating was more dependent upon the idiosyncrasies of the [administrator] than their own behavior in the classroom (Wolf, 1973, p. 160).

Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardley, haertel, and Rothstein (2011) found that not all instruments consider factors such as class sizes, home and community supports, student needs and abilities, health, and attendance, peer culture, prior teachers and school, current teachers, socioeconomic status, and tests used (p. 3). In an analysis by Briggs and Domingue (2011), when researchers used a different model to recalculate the value-added scores for teachers, they found that about half get noticeably different scores using an alternative statistical model that accounted for student assignments in a different way.

In another study, the same phenomenon where teachers behave differently was found. "One of the reasons supervision is a neglected task is that principals are well aware that teachers may become anxious and unhappy at the prospect of being supervised" (Heichberger & Young, 1975, p. 210). The same article mentioned a survey where 70% of teachers surveyed indicated the supervisor as potentially dangerous.

In Bartlett's 1998 qualitative study of three schools, he found teacher comments about the evaluation process such as, "You've got to have something down – how about this?" (Bartlett, 1998, p. 486). The same study found some teachers very fearful of the evaluation process and its possible consequences. In addition, teachers felt if they

reported their fear to their appraiser, it would be interpreted as mistrust between the teacher and appraiser (Bartlett, 1998; Larsen, 2009).

Another teacher talked of the experience wherein the administrator said,

> He said, "this is what I want you to say" I said, "yeah okay, I'll write that up. Can I add a bit about your use of resources?" He said, "no, not really", and I said, "why not?" He said, "because if you say that I'm good at it, I'll have to keep doing it, and I might not want to in the future. . . ." I want it to be open ended. . . . (Bartlett, 1998, p. 487)

McLaughlin (1990) wrote about the process, "Teachers are evaluated by one means or another in virtually every school district. And in most of those districts, teachers and administrators agree that the activity is ritualistic and largely a waste of time" (p. 403).

Even the Texas Education Agency reported, when teachers or students aren't achieving, "Note: Any selected strategies may indicate a need for professional development," and "Note: Lack of student progress may indicate a need for professional development" (Wood & West, 1998, p. 5).

Some teachers indicated that they felt the evaluator's goal is to catch teachers off guard and a negative cycle begins (Dudney, 2002), which may even lead to a system where no real change takes place (Flores, 2011). Each suggested that if the teacher was going to be found doing something wrong, they may not try to improve in the first place.

In a 2009 mixed-methods study by Larsen, a number of teachers stated that the performance evaluation was only as useful and meaningful as those people who were conducting it. In the same study Larsen also found,

> Furthermore, a number of teachers interviewed (6 out of 25) spoke about feeling like a "child", a "student" and in one case a "servant" in a master-servant relationship. These words were not only by beginner teachers, but also well-experienced teachers who were surprised by these feelings given their overall sense of confidence in themselves. The process also led to feelings of self-doubt. .

. . A number of respondents (5) noted that teachers save or create "special" lessons "full of bells and whistles" and "sparks" for their appraisal day. (p. 22)

Additionally, Conley and Glasman (2008) stated that individual teachers fearing summative evaluation may be less than forthcoming about their performance shortcomings and/or goals, and supervisors may hesitate to give teachers detailed feedback. Therefore teachers may fear that evaluation is less about personal improvement involving professional growth and more of a political hurdle (p. 68).

Another noted aspect of teacher evaluation was whether or not the skills necessary to teach could be isolated to skills that ignore the complexities and highly contextualized nature of teaching (Larsen, 2005). Larsen shared that each competency "usually has a series of 'look fors'; statements that provide concrete examples of observable behaviours [*sic*] characteristic of that competency. Such checklists measure decontextualized skills and knowledge rather than holistic, contextualized understandings and teaching practices" (p. 298). While this seems like the perfect solution to evaluating teachers, Larsen found isolating teaching to individual skills cannot be so easily done. In fact, it may inhibit creativity, flexibility, and sensitivity to teaching (Larsen, 2005).

Lastly, a critical question to be considered when teachers are being observed is, "Are teachers performing or acting naturally?" Searles and Kudeki (1987) suggested the presence of an observer affects normal performance.

Relationship between administrator and teacher. While the integrity of the teacher evaluation process was questioned, the relationship between the two parties involved was brought to light as well. Once appraisal is used diagnostically in assisting teachers in their professional development, it could also conceivably go a long way toward solving the fundamental controversy over appraisal that exists between teachers

and school management (McFadden 1970, p. 1). While some teachers reported no effect on their relationship with the administrator, some did. Four out of 25 respondents in Larsen's (2009) study spoke specifically to the detriment to the relationship, that the relationship deteriorated as a result of the evaluation, leaving teachers nervous and on-edge in the presence of their supervisors.

Furthermore, teachers feel uncertain and threatened by rating procedures that are primarily administratively designed because the instruments put teachers in a passive role; teachers don't feel stimulated to improve and at best feel the systems are neutral. Teachers must be partners in the process (Redfern, 1973).

Lack of training. The next area in which teachers felt distrust was that of training in the use of the teacher evaluation system. Are the evaluators trained well enough or have experience enough to be using the teacher evaluation system? And in some cases the question was asked, are the teachers trained enough in the use of the evaluation system? Provisions for training and technical support are integral (Redfield, Craig, & Elliott, 1989).

Teachers also stated their administrators have a lack of training in the use of the instrument. In a quantitative study by Flores (2011), she found the following responses on a questionnaire about a new teacher evaluation process implemented in Portugal: "I think the appraisers do not have the required training to do their job. I think this is a big problem" (Flores 2011, p. 12). The study further found similar comments by administrators:

> I think that the training we've got as appraisers – I am not saying that we haven't learned anything – but it wasn't enough. I feel that we should have had more time. To be honest with you, both appraisers and appraisees should have had training about the new policy of teacher performance evaluation. . . . (Flores 2011, p. 12)

The Philadelphia's Teacher Appraisal System guide (Research for Action, 2009)

stated that it is essential to provide the training of administrators to conduct meaningful

appraisals. The manual stated:

> Administrators must have a thorough understanding of the process, the
> instruments, and the standards used in appraising teachers. The initial training for
> administrators must be meticulous and supplemented by ongoing support.
> Administrators should be assessed on their use of the appraisal system and
> provided necessary supports to use the tools more effectively. (Research for
> Action, 2009, p. 14)

Additionally, measurement error can occur when the person observing and

scoring a teacher doesn't adequately understand or use the observation system (Marzano,

2012a, p. 82). As well, the observer may see a class that is not typical of the teacher's

usual behavior. For example the teacher might regularly ask questions of all students but

on the day of the observation does not for any number of reasons (Marzano, 2012a).

Support during teacher evaluation. Support during the teacher evaluation

process was another area cited in studies where teachers felt as though the process let

them down. "Recognition of the need for evidence-based feedback on teacher practice to

enhance teacher learning and effectiveness is also a common thread among the stated

policies that arose in response to Race to the Top" (Coggshall, Rassmussen, Colton,

Milton, & Jacques, 2012, p. 2), part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of

2009 created to spur innovation and reforms in state and local district K-12 education.

In Larsen's (2009) mixed-method study,

> 80 % of respondents did not feel that they had the support they expected from
> their vice/principal. Seventy percent of the teachers surveyed did not believe that
> their vice/principal understood them as a teacher and almost eighty percent of
> survey respondents *disagreed* with the statement: "The person who conducted my
> TPA [teacher performance appraisal] was supportive throughout the process."
> (p. 14)

In addition, Darling-Hammond et al. (2011) reported that there is a widespread consensus that current teacher evaluation systems in most school districts do little to help teachers improve or support personnel decisions (p. 2).

Teachers seeking performance feedback or areas for improvement may find themselves disappointed reported Curtis and Wiener (2012). "Performance evaluations have historically been largely perfunctory: no meaningful feedback is provided, no improvement expectations are established, and no positive or negative consequences flow from high or low ratings" (p. 3). They go on to report that "meaningful evaluation is built on an expectation of continuous improvement, and this principle needs to be applied to the system for evaluation" (p. 4).

Danielson stated about feedback, "The conversations following an observation are the best opportunity to engage teachers in thinking through how they could strengthen their practice" (2012, p. 36).

In a pilot study about reworking the teacher evaluation system for Chicago Public Schools, one of the main reasons stated was that "evaluation systems in Chicago were failing to give teachers meaningful feedback on their instructional practices or guidance about what is expected of them in the classroom" (Sartain et al., 2011, p. 1). Support, indeed, is important if teachers are to feel the process will help them grow.

Likewise, as far back as 1929, Cubberly stated that the purpose of all supervision should be constructive. The supervisor who goes about as an inspector, a detective, or a judge, will not render services of much value. Furthermore, Cubberly shared, "He [a supervisor] will never see the best work of any teacher, and the more the teacher is in

need of assistance the poorer the quality of work she will do beneath his critical eye.

Neither is the dictator of much real assistance to teachers" (Cubberly, 1929, p. 357).

Administrators and teacher evaluation. No method of assessing teacher performance is ideal, but principals provide a valuable window on the causes of teacher ineffectiveness (Torff & Sessions, 2005, p. 532). Even so teachers are not alone in voicing concern about teacher evaluation processes; the administrators are open about their concerns as well.

The success of observation is dependent upon the quality and techniques administrators use to collect and share the data (Nuernberger-Currin, 1992), and collecting the data necessary to evaluate teachers is complex (Stanley & Popham, 1988).

Added stress and negative effect on classroom. As teachers prepare to be observed and are aware of the presence of a superior in the room, the normal teaching dynamic is likely to change. Teachers are well aware that having an external person in the classroom performing an observation is a significant source of stress or it can negatively affect the classroom and may even have a negative influence on the teaching and relations with students, parents, principals, and one another (Bartlett, 1998; Conley & Glasman, 2008; Kyriacou, 2001; Larsen, 2009; Pithers & Soden, 1998).

Studies also found that evaluators stood to gain the most in terms of power over the teachers, for it is the evaluator who acquires the management skills, gains information about subordinates, and ultimately stands to gain most from the process. Furthermore, improvement targets chosen can be generally chosen for an individual so a teacher is not made directly accountable for quantifiable outcomes (Bartlett, 1998; Larsen, 2009; Troman, 2000).

Lastly, evaluating the act of teaching and then determining long-term goals can be daunting as found by Dudney (2002):

> The supervisor [administrator] also feels pressure since evaluating the act of teaching is itself a very complex task requiring specialized skills. It is virtually impossible to capture the essence of the instruction in an objective manner unless the observer and the teacher share at least part of the instructional context that determines the teacher's long-term objectives and day-to-day teaching decisions. (p. 3)

Avoiding confrontation. Additionally, two studies referenced administrators' preference to avoid that which needs to be brought up, avoiding confrontation, or seeking to avoid the potential conflict. Individuals are predisposed to avoid unpleasantness in social encounters. They prefer to be spared the emotional ordeal entailed in criticizing and finding fault with the behavior of others (Bridges, 1992, p. 25). Districts honestly facing the long-lasting repercussions of incompetent teaching are more likely to reshape recruitment, hiring, and induction processes (Smith & Piele, 1989, p. 246).

Time involved. Teachers and administrators alike know that the teacher evaluation process takes time. If you've got 35 people to evaluate [appraise], your contact is going to be limited to what's required (Dudney, 2002; Ediger, 2000; Goldstein & Noguera, 2006). Additionally, Natriello (1990) found that teachers who are seldom evaluated feel isolated and undervalued; and that some teachers who were infrequently evaluated actually preferred more frequent evaluations even when the evaluation produced negative outcomes.

Teachers have also questioned the validity of the teacher-evaluation process.

> Since teachers view appraisal activities as having limited validity, they seriously question the credibility of these activities as an information source for determining tenure. . . . Generally, the teaching profession has gravitated toward the conviction that the use of appraisal in such a fashion *does more to interfere*

with professional concern for quality teaching than it does to assist it. (McFadden, 1970, p. 1)

Marshall (2012) stated filling out elaborate rubrics after every visit, as the MET (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Measures of Effective Teaching) study suggests, creates an impossible workload for administrators, leaving less time for informal classroom visits and interactions with teacher teams (p. 50).

Administrators as instructional leaders. Lastly, administrators need to view themselves as instructional leaders. Principals need to perceive the process as a means to provide instructional leadership (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983). Beerens (2000) wrote "Why should older and more experienced teachers listen to what I had to say about their teaching?" (p. 3) when discussing his first years out of graduate school going into veteran teachers' classrooms to do their appraisals.

Cubberly (1929) suggested that helpful leadership, rather than dictation or criticism, is what teachers need. . . . Encouragement, suggestion, and basis for constructive help, should represent the supervisor's chief efforts (p. 357).

Teacher Evaluation with Purpose

Findings from research revealed that when the teacher evaluation process has purpose, the following elements are present. After all, Wragg, Wikelye, Wragg, and Haynes (1996) found that the purpose of evaluation was to create an opportunity for teachers to gain feedback about their classroom practice.

Purposeful teacher-evaluation process. First, there's a better definition of the teacher evaluation process. Colby, Bradshaw, and Joyner's (2002) meta-analysis of 57 research studies aimed to summarize findings about teacher evaluation. In the introduction the authors stated,

As an understanding of the appropriate role for teacher evaluation and its impact on instructional quality increases, educators are anxious to integrate meaningful and effective evaluation as a component of systemic reform with the primary goal of greater student learning. (p. 3)

In a comparison between Montgomery County Public Schools and the District of Columbia Public Schools, Simon (2012) determined the following must be present for effective teacher evaluation: collaboration, professional culture, deep knowledge base in teaching, integration with professional development and school culture, responsiveness to differentiated needs, and reliance on intrinsic rewards (p. 61).

Redfern (1973) suggested:

It makes more sense to design evaluation procedures which call for performance objectives, specify a cooperative plan of action to achieve these goals, engage in both self-evaluation and evaluator assessments, and conduct a conference between teacher and evaluator to discuss implications of the evaluations and make plans for the future. (p. 4)

The Cambridge Institute of Education (1989) found, that in general:

the factors with successful appraisal are: school has an open climate, where teachers are ready to discuss their work; suitable training has been provided for both appraisers and appraisees; the head [principal] is committed to the process; both appraisers and appraisees are clear about their responsibilities and understand the scheme; the process is well presented and well managed by the head or by an appraisal coordinator; there is previous experience of appraisal or a deliberate implementation strategy; and professional relationships are good. (pp. 63-64)

McFadden (1970) suggested that if an evaluation system is designed to obtain data to make effective decisions with regard to the personal development and growth of individual staff members, it should also include provisions for allowing a staff member an opportunity to identify their own weaknesses and areas for growth and personal development. Likewise, Williams et al. (2010) stated that higher performing middle schools ensure that teacher evaluation is substantive and meaningful.

Darling-Hammond et al. (1983) also found that not only do the purposes for evaluation need to be made explicit, but also teachers need to perceive the evaluation as a process to help them improve their performance.

Thus, a crucial element in teacher evaluation systems is the link to teacher professional development and school improvement. Moreover, the existence of clear criteria and standards of performance are seen as key factors for quality teaching evaluation systems (Wheeler & Scriven, 2006; Williams et al., 2010).

Time allotted to the process. Also, when the teacher appraisal process is effective, the appropriate allocation of time must take place. Research findings (Ovando, 2001) supported the view that more time allocated to evaluation may lead to increased teacher growth. Despite this belief, the evaluation of teachers in most schools consisted of an administrator visiting a classroom a few times a year for a very brief period (Bradshaw & Glatthorn, 2001).

Administrator viewed as instructional leader. If educational leaders play a strong, positive role in evaluation, they must be perceived as instructional leaders. Strong educational leaders were highly involved in the teacher evaluation process as well as the teaching and learning processes within the school on a daily basis. In addition, strong leaders:

> (a) possessed knowledge and dispositions that helped maximize the potential of teacher evaluation and its impact on professional growth, (b) focused on learning, (c) promoted collaborative interactions with evaluates [teachers], (d) provided useful feedback and (e) facilitated reflection on practice. (Colby et al., 2002, p. 8)

Machell's (1995) mixed methods study of 11 elementary teachers concluded that the qualities of the feedback they received, the person who evaluated them, and the evaluation context of the school district were related to the impact of the evaluation

(p. 272). Also in this study it was concluded that in order for administrators to have the

strongest impact on teachers, the teachers felt they should receive in-depth, specific and

non-judgmental feedback. This study also recommended the inclusion of teachers in the

evaluation process, meaning teachers are provided staff-development activities as well as

take part in the development of the evaluation plan itself. Lastly, the two means of

evaluation perceived by teachers to have the most impact on their practice were the

processes of self-evaluation and that of forming yearly growth plans (Machell, 1995).

Marshall, in his 1996 qualitative study about his first few years as a new principal,

came to the conclusion that basically teachers just need reassurance and constructive

criticism. He based this conclusion on specific examples only after the first few years of

being a principal and his inability to provide the copious amount of feedback and keep up

with the numerous observations of teachers. His reflection revealed he couldn't keep up

with what was truly helping teachers to become better teachers. His ultimate conclusions:

(a) principals need to give praise, (b) principals need to reinforce, (c) principals need to

offer suggestions, and (d) principals need to offer critical feedback (Marshall, 1996, p.

344).

Peer observation. Lastly, in effective teacher evaluation models, peer

observation is an essential element. In Bartlett's 1998 qualitative study of three schools

he reports a teacher stated,

> It would be nice if we could all have the opportunity to go into each others'
> lessons and watch how different people tackle things . . . that could be far more
> valuable than doing this kind of thing . . . form filling and writing reports.
> (Bartlett, 1998, p. 482)

Pointing to a method that is more able to help teachers increase their skills is that

of Darling-Hammond (1998). She cited the practices of the Interstate New Teacher

Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Council for Teachers of

Mathematics (NCTM), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Ideally, the first year or two of teaching would be structured much like a residency in

medicine, with teachers continually consulting a seasoned veteran about the decisions

they are making and receiving ongoing advice and evaluation (p. 6).

Kyriacou (1997) cited the role of administrators in the process to be fair in

judgment and to do the teacher justice during the evaluation interview and the classroom

observation.

Born in Ohio in 1981, The Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR) allowed

excellent teachers to mentor and coach inexperienced and poor-performing teachers to

get them up to par. In 1999, the state of California legislature initiated a statewide PAR

program that essentially required all school districts to have PAR in place for veteran

teachers (Goldstein & Noguera, 2006).

In relation to formative purpose, there are also debates about who is in the

position to accurately define teachers' needs for improvement and provide the most

constructive feedback. Peers and colleagues who have the same characteristics and teach

the same subject to the same student grade are more likely to obtain the confidence of the

teacher being evaluated. The teacher may more easily engage in self-reflection about her

practices, and express her feelings and concerns during interviews without fearing

potential sanctions. However, principals are still essential for improvement since she is

more likely to be able to engage in an ongoing conversation (Isoré, 2009).

Trends and the future of teacher evaluation. While charter schools have

offered an additional choice for education, they have also brought about changes in

education. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (also known as Race to the Top), signed into law by President Barack Obama, sets aside 4.35 billion for states to improve their education systems. One key area of the reform is teacher evaluation (Pathe & Choe, 2013).

Next, the definition of professional development should be broadened and more definitively included in the teacher-evaluation process. According to Allen (2013) professional development cannot be a one-size fits all approach; rather it must focus on the students and the teachers in the schools. Further, Allen (2013) suggested that in order for professional development to be effective, teachers need to be active in their professional development by book studies, professional reading, or leading active research in grade-level.

Professional development as a means of improving teacher skill must be as varied as the teachers themselves. Allen (2013) asserted, "I can promise you that I probably don't need the same PD [professional development] as my colleague next door, who doesn't need the same PD as the teacher across the hall" (p. 1). Allen also claimed that the National Board Certification process needs to be embraced.

In addition, the current system seems to be a "gotcha'" system. Berkowicz and Myers (2013) stated the accountability system for most of us is not about catching a failing teacher or principal, it can be about investing in continuous improvement (p. 2).

Current controversies in teacher evaluation. Policymakers today are dissatisfied with teacher evaluation, and feel this is an area for new policy (Sykes & Dibner, 2009, p. 31). According to Pathe and Choe (2013), in 2009 the District of Columbia Public Schools Chancellor Michelle Rhee launched IMPACT – an evaluation

system best known for its prioritization of value-added assessments, representing 40% of a teacher's evaluation (2009: Michelle Rhee Launches IMPACT section, para 1, as cited in Pathe & Choe, 2013).

In January of 2013, the Los Angeles Teachers Union reached an agreement that teacher evaluations could, in part, use students' standardized test scores in their evaluations. However, Los Angeles Unified restricts the use and agrees that evaluations be based on raw state test scores, school-wide value-added scores, and high-school exit exams, as well as suspension, attendance, graduation and course completion rates (Pathe & Choe, 2013).

While there is evidence that value-added methods have proved valuable for examining the potential influences on "teacher effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, professional development programs, and various kinds of evaluation systems" (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 6), there is also evidence that suggests external factors such as "course, class size, student demographics, limited English proficiency, and parents' education levels can also impact teacher effectiveness" (Newton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, & Thomas, 2010, p. 11).

Sawchuk (2013) stated 98% of Michigan teachers were rated effective or better under new teacher-evaluation systems recently put in place, 97% of Florida teachers were deemed effective or better, and 98% of Tennessee teachers were "at expectations or better" (p. 1).

Sawchuk (2013) also found that principals often inflated their ratings compared to other observers, in part because of cultural expectations (Sawchuk, 2013).

Anderson (2013) stated that in the past we have changed proficiency standards 21 times in the last 6 years. It makes it difficult to evaluate someone in a system in which the levels are changed all the time.

Ms. Goe, an adviser to the Great Teachers and Leaders Center stated, "With value-added [evaluations] in particular, you are essentially ranking results for teachers, so . . . you have some who are necessarily going to be closer to the bottom. Whereas with observations you can have all teachers at the top" (Sawchuk, 2013, p. 3).

Summary

Chapter II examined the history and current literature of teacher evaluation. Brought to light were the issues in how both teachers and administrators perceive the process as well as some of the issues that are a part of teacher evaluation. Teachers reported teacher evaluation is simply a process that every teacher must endure while administrators reported they may not evaluate accurately because they want to avoid confrontation. In addition teachers and administrators not only felt training was inadequate, but teachers also felt the feedback they got from their evaluations failed to have meaningful feedback on their instructional practices.

When examining educators' feelings about teacher evaluation, Nebraska educators were not alone. Nationally and internationally, the feelings were just feelings of negativity. For some, the feelings are of doubt; educators simply question if the process or instrument used is of quality, and therefore they don't really doubt the evaluation process itself.

In fact, Nebraska's recent teacher performance of 2012 paralleled that of Florida in the late 1990s and recommendations were made by the Platte Institute to adopt strong

teacher-selection and evaluation policies. As of 2012, Nebraska State School Board members were reluctant to mandate all school districts use a statewide evaluation instrument. Currently the Nebraska State Department of Education Leadership has recommended two instructional frameworks for the development of voluntary teacher and principal models in local districts: a Marzano or a Danielson framework.

Chapter III presents the method of data collection for this study.

Chapter III

Methodology

Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation. The respondents for the study were Nebraska teachers and administrators who have completed the teacher evaluation process at least once in their current school building in which they work. Chapter III outlines the methodology of the study.

Research Design

Mixed-methods research provides strengths that "offset the weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 12). Collection of data will use a mixed-methods, sequential explanatory design using a web-based survey with follow-up telephone interviews. "Mixed methods designs are procedures for collecting, analyzing, and linking both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or in a multiphase series of studies" (Creswell, 2005, p. 53). "The purpose of a sequential explanatory design typically is to use qualitative results to assist in explaining and interpreting the findings of a primarily quantitative study" (Creswell, 2003, p. 215).

The researcher was aware of the strengths of this type of design, including the design, its straightforward and is easy implementation, making it easy to design and report. The researcher was also aware of the weakness as well: "the length of time involved in data collection, especially if both phases are given equal priority" (Creswell, 2003, p. 215). The researcher understood the time added by a qualitative interview follow up, and values the data provided in the follow-up portion as it provided additional

information about the perceptions of teacher evaluation by both administrators and

teachers. Triangulating data sources is also a means for seeking a convergence of data

sources (Jick, 1979). From this triangulation emerged additional reasons for mixing

different types of data. For example, the results from one method can help develop or

inform the other method. Alternatively, one method can be nested within another method

to provide insight into different levels or units of analysis (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori &

Teddlie, 1998).

The rational for using a web-based survey was identified by Dillman in *Mail and

Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (2000). The benefits include "efficiencies

derived from accelerated timelines for survey implementation and a quick ability to

overcome geographical boundaries that might hinder some surveying efforts" (p. 352).

Study Population

This was a descriptive study in how Nebraska secondary English teachers and

administrators perceived the teacher evaluation process. The study population was a

representative population of educators and evaluators (Creswell, 2005), consisting of

Nebraska public high-school administrators and high-school English teachers. Nebraska

schools are classified according to size into the following classifications from highest to

lowest populations: A, B, C, and D. Class C and D schools represent more rural settings

while Class B can be rural and larger towns, and Class A are larger cities. Teachers were

asked to report their gender, years of experience, and their primary teaching assignment

of English to avoid teachers who may be teaching out of their endorsed area. Efforts were

made to represent each class division, gender, age, focusing only on secondary English

teachers.

Sampling Frame

The high-school administrators for this study were identified through the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) once district superintendents granted permission for schools within their districts to participate. NDE maintains an up-to-date, statewide listing of all high-school administrators in its database. The high-school administrator listing was downloaded from: www.education.ne.gov/1Email/index.html on a date timely to the study.

The Nebraska Department of Education website reported there were 22,256 public school teachers in Nebraska in 2012-13 (Nebraska Department of Education, 2012b). No database is maintained of all the English teachers in Nebraska other than that of the Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) members, which was unwilling to release members' names. Teacher names to be considered for the survey were provided by principals, phone calls, or school websites.

Dillman (2000) defined sampling error, "the type of error that occurs because information is not collected from every member of the population" and "only when a subset of the entire population is surveyed" (Dillman, 2000, p. 205). Coverage error will be kept to a minimum because the list of administrators maintained by the NDE is kept current and updated regularly August through May every year. As for teachers, 2.7% of all Nebraska teachers will have the opportunity to be surveyed.

Both teachers and administrators were asked on the survey if they were willing to be contacted for a follow up qualitative interview. Those contacted for follow-up questioning were referred to in third person in the final report to protect their anonymity. Efforts to equalize data were made in school size, setting, gender, and in content area

taught. The survey was aimed to be sent to a minimum of 500 teachers and all administrators listed with the Nebraska Department of Education.

Some surveys may not be included in the final results (i.e., incomplete biographical data, incomplete survey) or for other reasons unforeseen by the researcher.

Quantitative Survey

Survey procedures. That which follows is the chronology of how the study was conducted, all email contacts, and the follow-up procedures. The IRB forms are included in the appendices.

1. A listing of all public secondary schools was downloaded from the Nebraska Department of Education.

2. A request to survey schools and a return permission letter template was sent to all public school districts in Nebraska.

3. Follow-up phone calls were made to increase the sample of districts and schools included in the study.

4. A request to survey teachers and administrators including a return permission letter template was sent to all public schools that had been granted permission by their superintendents.

5. A pre-notice email was sent out one week prior to the release of the questionnaire linking potential respondents to the web questionnaire.

6. The web questionnaire comprised of the questionnaire and letter of informed consent was provided. No financial token of appreciation was included.

7. The web questionnaire became active at the time of the pre-notice email, but once the questionnaire was completed, the questionnaire was no longer accessible to respondents.

8. Respondents volunteered for follow-up interviews as a part of Phase II in the qualitative research at the conclusion of the online survey.

9. A follow-up email was sent to all respondents who hadn't completed the questionnaire, which served as a reminder. Potential participants were urged to participate in this survey.

Variables. "In simple random sampling the researcher selects participants (or units, such as schools) for the sample so that any individual has an equal probability of being selected from the population" (Creswell, 2005, p. 147). The sample for this study is high-school administrators and teachers in Nebraska. Any of the Nebraska State Education Association member teachers and administrators in the Nebraska Department of Education's database had a chance of participating in this research.

Variables in common for both administrators and teachers were the following: size of school, poverty, experience, and gender.

Variables unique to administrators only were the following:

1. Do you conduct formal teacher evaluations in your school (in larger schools associate principals may do all the evaluating whereas in smaller schools principals may do all the evaluating)?

2. For how long have you been conducting teacher evaluations?

Variables unique to teachers only were the following:

1. For how long have you been teaching?

2. In which content area do you teach the majority of your day (please identify abbreviations used, i.e. FCS would be Family and Consumer Sciences)?

Measures. Most often descriptive research involves determining whether there is a difference between two groups according to some quality; therefore, *t* test will was used in this study. According to Dane (2011) such research involves comparing the central tendency of one group with the central tendency of another, and the *t* test is the appropriate statistic. "It enables one to determine whether groups have equivalent or different mean scores" (Dane, 2011, p. 94).

Leong and Austin also stated, "A way to compare the [two] groups is to find the average test score for each group and to judge whether they are significantly different" (Leong and Austin, 2006, p 297). Additionally, Leong and Austin stated, "…parametric tests are generally more powerful than nonparametric ones, and *F* tests with one degree of freedom in the numerator, and their equivalent *t*-tests, are more powerful…" (Leong and Austin, 2006, p 126).

Survey instrument. The survey instrument (Appendix C) contains 6 themes in which statements about teacher evaluation have been grouped according to the literature review. Themes included: purpose, quality of the process, training involved to participate in and to conduct, feedback, collaboration between administrator and teacher, and relationship between administrator and teacher (see Table 2).

Table 2

Breakdown of Questionnaire by Theme with Question Totals

Theme	Number of Statements
Purpose	7
Quality	9
Training	5
Feedback	6
Collaboration	3
Relationship	3
Total Statements	33

The researcher was aware that the last two themes ask three questions each. According to experts at the Nebraska Evaluation and Research Center (NEAR) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, three questions are the minimum to determine reliability (personal communication, April 2, 2012).

Respondents rated their agreement to each of the statements using a Likert scale from one to five: 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – Neither agree nor disagree, 4 – agree, and 5 – strongly agree.

Survey pilot study procedures. A draft form of the questionnaire was piloted, the main emphasis to attain content validity. The pilot was conducted in an Educational Administration School Culture class at a large Midwestern university. Of the ten students completing the survey, three were administrators and seven were teachers. The professor of the class did not take the survey, but gave feedback on the instrument only.

Feedback from the respondents helped make the final instrument more effective in soliciting the results presented here. First, respondents gave feedback on the overall aesthetic of the questionnaire:

1. Was the questionnaire easy to read?

2. Were the section's questions complete?

3. Were there any spelling, grammar, etc. mistakes?

4. Did they find it easy to fill out?

5. Could anything be improved in terms of its ease and manageability?

In terms of the clarity of questions, respondents were asked:

1. Was each question clear?

2. Did each question only ask for one response?

3. Was the Likert scale appropriate for each question?

Survey pilot results. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for the pilot survey. The researcher was aware that with a small pilot group, the standard deviation isn't reliable, especially in the administrative group as only three administrators filled out the survey.

An expert panel comprised of the following people gave feedback before the final online survey went live: the Director for Curriculum for one of the largest districts in Nebraska, the Director for Curriculum for a moderately sized school district in a smaller community, and the Director of Professional Development at Educational Service Unit #3 in Nebraska. Based on their feedback and suggestions, the survey entered its final stage as it appears in the appendix.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Pilot of Administrator and Teacher Surveys

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	*SD*. Deviation
Administrator					
Purpose	3	28.00	30.00	29.0000	1.00000
Quality	3	34.00	39.00	36.3333	2.51661
Training	3	17.00	24.00	20.3333	3.51188
Feedback	3	26.00	28.00	27.0000	1.00000
Collaboration	3	11.00	12.00	11.3333	0.57735
Relationship	3	12.00	15.00	13.3333	1.52753
Valid N (listiwise)	3				
Teacher					
Purpose	6	23.00	29.00	26.3333	2.16025
Quality	6	21.00	38.00	32.0000	5.96657
Training	6	13.00	24.00	19.5000	4.03733
Feedback	5	17.00	29.00	22.0000	4.89898
Collaboration	4	8.00	12.00	11.0000	2.00000
Relationship	4	8.00	15.00	12.2500	3.09570
Valid N (listiwise)	4				

Qualitative Interviews

Follow-up interview questions. Follow-up questions were determined after the results of the survey were returned and data was analyzed for potential similarities and disparities between administrator and teacher answers.

Interview procedures. Those selected for follow-up interviews were chosen based on willingness to participate as indicated on the survey, but the researcher made

efforts to make sure the following subgroups were represented: school size, gender, and experience. Then the researcher analyzed any differences between the administrator and teacher responses to determine which respondents participated.

Follow-up interview data analysis. The core feature of qualitative data analysis is the coding process. "Coding is the process of grouping evidence and labeling ideas so that they reflect increasingly broader perspectives" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 208). Additionally, Miles and Huberman (1984) stated "it is not the words themselves but their meaning that matters (p. 56). Follow-up data will be open coded, grouped into themes, and compared. Themes will be presented and discussed in the findings.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine what differences and similarities exist between the Nebraska administrator and teacher perceptions of the teacher evaluation process. This study used a mixed-methods, sequential explanatory design to collect data. The study aimed to include 500 Nebraska teachers and all administrators listed in the Nebraska Department of Education's database in efforts to include all high school settings for the state of Nebraska. The researcher confirmed the study is free of bias and the research questions were answered.

Chapter IV will discuss the findings of the study.

Chapter IV

Results

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation. The respondents for the study were Nebraska secondary English teachers and Nebraska administrators who have completed the teacher evaluation process at least once in the current school building in which they work.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process?

2. What is the relationship between the administrator and teacher?

3. How do administrators determine the quality of their teachers?

4. To what extent does collaboration play a part in the teacher evaluation process?

5. What kind of training has both the evaluator and teacher received regarding the evaluation process?

6. To what extent do the teacher and administrator feel the feedback given (as a part of the evaluation process) is useful to teacher growth?

Participants

The population for the study consisted of secondary English teachers and administrators in Nebraska. Contact information for public school districts with secondary and middle schools was provided by the Nebraska Department of Education's

website. Requests for permission were sent to 246 public school districts in Nebraska. From those districts that granted permission for their schools to participate, a second permission letter was sent to the secondary and/or middle schools of the district to obtain permission for the principal for teachers of those buildings to participate. A link to the online teacher or administrator survey was sent to respective groups that had been granted permission (see Tables 4-7).

Table 4

Statewide Approval of School-District Participation by Superintendent

Districts Asked to Participate	Superintendent Approval	%
246	66	26.8

Table 5

Statewide Principal Approval of Schools (After Superintendent Approval)

Districts Approved to Participate	Building/Principal Approval	%	% of Nebraska
66	21	31.8	8.5

Table 6

Response Rate

Source	Sample	Respondents	%
Administrators	55	26	47.3
Teachers	116	44	37.9
Total	171	70	40.9

Table 7

Demographics of Respondents

	Administrators	Teachers
Gender		
Male	21	13
Female	5	31
Experience		
Range of years	2 – 25	1 – 45
School Size*		
< 100	1	1
101 – 200	3	5
201 – 499	3	1
500 – 1,099	3	6
> 1,000	13	31
Poverty**		
< 10	1	0
11 – 20	2	3
21 – 30	3	4
31 – 40	3	7
41 – 50	6	13
51 – 60	2	8
61 – 70	2	4

* Not all participants reported school size (number of students)
** Not all participants estimated percentage of students who receive free and or reduced lunch assistance.

Independent Variables

The independent variables of this study included the two groups: teachers and administrators. The first group, teachers, was comprised of a random sampling of secondary (grades 7-12) English teachers ($n = 44$) from across the state of Nebraska including size of school, poverty, teaching experience, and gender. The second group, administrators, was comprised of a random sampling of administrators ($n = 26$) from across the state of Nebraska including size of school, poverty, years as an administrator, and gender. Because some school districts are smaller, some administrators may supervise K-12 or any combination the district has assigned. These two groups – teachers and administrators – comprise the sample for the study. Additionally, invitations were for both teachers and administrators, but both groups for each school may not have completed the survey.

There is no statewide evaluation process in Nebraska at the time of the study, so each district uses its own process and instrument; therefore, the evaluation process is different for most schools. In addition, 17 school districts in Nebraska are currently piloting 2 different teacher evaluation processes in various stages of implementation; as a result, some teachers and evaluators referred to a compilation of teacher evaluation processes for the study.

Findings by Question and Theme of the Survey

The following themes/categories were used to analyze the perceptions of Nebraska evaluators and secondary English teachers of the teacher evaluation process. Where the survey statement was used on both the teacher and administrator survey, only one statement is included in the results below. Where the survey statement differs

because of group, both statements are included, the teacher statement first/then the administrator statement.

The purpose of teacher evaluation as perceived by Nebraska secondary English teachers and Nebraska administrators.

Survey item #1. The teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of teaching. Teachers had a mean score of 3.74 (SD = .795), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.38 (SD = .500). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52)$ = -2.96, p = .005).

Analysis. Survey item #1 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions that the teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of teaching. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 8.

Survey item #2. The teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of student learning. Teachers had a mean score of 3.53 (SD = .862), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.38 (SD = .619). Administrators had a statistically significantly higher mean score than teachers ($t(52)$ = -3.56, p = .001).

Analysis. Survey item #2 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions that the teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of student learning. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 8.

Survey item #3. The teacher-evaluation process focuses on the identification of my professional development needs./The teacher-evaluation process focuses on the identification of the professional development needs for those whom I evaluate.

Teachers had a mean score of 3.37 (*SD* = 1.051), where as administrators had a higher

mean score of 4.31 (*SD* = .479). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers

(*t*(52) = -3.43, *p* = .001).

Analysis. Survey item #3 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the

significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions that the

purpose of teacher-evaluation process focuses on the identification of teachers'

professional needs. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 8.

Survey item #4. The teacher-evaluation process provides useful information for

me to improve my performance./The teacher-evaluation process provides useful

information to improve the performance for those whom I evaluate. Teachers had a mean

score of 3.55 (*SD* = .891), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.69

(*SD* = .793). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(32) = -.550, *p*

= .586).

Analysis. Survey item #4 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the

significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions that the

teacher-evaluation process provided useful information about the teacher's performance.

Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 8.

Survey item #5. The results of the teacher-evaluation process are used for

accountability purposes. Teachers had a mean score of 3.58 (*SD* = .826), whereas

administrators had a higher mean score of 4.13 (*SD* = .719). Administrators had a higher

mean score than Teachers (*t*(32) = -2.43, *p* = .021).

Analysis. Survey item #5 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the

significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions that the

teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of teaching. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 8.

Survey item #6. I think the teacher-evaluation process is threatening for me./I think the teacher-evaluation process is threatening for those whom I evaluate. Teachers had a mean score of 2.47 (SD = 1.109), whereas administrators had a lower mean score of 2.44 (SD = .892). Teachers had a higher mean score than Administrators ($t(35)$ = .126, p = .900).

Analysis. Survey item #6 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of whether or not the teacher-evaluation process was threatening for the teacher. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 8.

Survey item #7. I understand the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process. Teachers had a mean score of 4.05 (SD = .655), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.69 (SD = .479). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52)$ = -3.494, p = .001).

Analysis. Survey item #7 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of whether or not teachers understand the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

The Purpose of Teacher Evaluation as Perceived by Nebraska Secondary English Teachers and Nebraska Administrators

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
1. The teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of teaching.	T	3.74	.795	52	-2.96	.005
	A	4.38	.500			
2. The teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of student learning.	T	3.53	.862	52	-3.56	.001
	A	4.38	.619			
3. The teacher-evaluation process focuses on the identification of my professional development needs.	T	3.37	1.051	52	-3.43	.001
3. The teacher-evaluation process focuses on the identification of the professional development needs for those whom I evaluate.**	A	4.31	0.479			
4. The teacher-evaluation process provides useful information for me to improve my performance.	T	3.55	0.891	32	-0.550	.586
4. The teacher-evaluation process provides useful information to improve the performance for those whom I evaluate.	A	3.69	0.793			
5. The results of the teacher-evaluation process are used for accountability purposes.	T	3.58	0.826	32	-2.43	.021
	A	4.13	0.719			
6. I think the teacher-evaluation process is threatening for me.	T	2.47	1.109	35	0.126	.900
6. I think the teacher-evaluation process is threatening for those whom I evaluate.	A	2.44	0.892			
7. I understand the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process.	T	4.05	0.655	52	-3.494	.001
	A	4.69	0.479			

* T = Nebraska secondary English teachers, A = Nebraska administrators
** First statement of the same number from teacher survey; second statement of the same number is from administrator survey

The quality of the teacher-evaluation process as perceived by Nebraska secondary English teachers and Nebraska administrators.

Survey item #8.   The teacher-evaluation process results are reliable./The teacher-evaluation process results accurately reflect a teacher's ability. Teachers had a mean score of 3.18 (*SD* = .926), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.56 (*SD* = .814). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(32)$ = -1.496, *p* = .145).

Analysis. Survey item #8 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of whether or not teachers the results of the teacher-evaluation process are reliable. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #9. The number of classroom teacher observations is adequate to evaluate my instructional skills./The number of classroom teacher observations is adequate to evaluate the instructional skills for those whom I evaluate. Teachers had a mean score of 3.16 (*SD* = 1.079), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.63 (*SD* = .719). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(42)$ = -1.862, *p* = .070).

Analysis. Survey item #9 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of whether or not administrators and teachers feel the number of classroom visits is adequate to evaluate the instructional skills of teachers. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #10. The rating system used to evaluate teachers is useful for my growth./The rating system used to evaluate teachers is useful for those whom I evaluate. Teachers had a mean score of 3.26 (*SD* = .860), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.88 (*SD* = .500). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(46)$ = -3.266, *p* = .002).

Analysis. Survey item #10 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not administrators and teachers feel used to evaluate teachers is useful for their growth. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #11. The indicators on the teacher-evaluation instrument take into account the critical aspects of my teaching./The indicators on the teacher-evaluation instrument take into account the critical aspects of teaching for those whom I evaluate. Teachers had a mean score of 3.29 (*SD* = .984), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.81 (*SD* = .655). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(42)$ = -2.287, *p* = .027).

Analysis. Survey item #11 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the teacher-evaluation instrument takes into account the critical aspects of teaching. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #12. The teacher-evaluation process allows me to explain the classroom decisions and actions./The teacher-evaluation process allows the teachers I evaluate to explain their classroom decisions and actions. Teachers had a mean score of

3.58 (*SD* = .948), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.94 (*SD* = .998).

Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -1.250, *p* = .217).

Analysis. Survey item #12 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not teacher evaluation allows teachers to explain their classroom decisions

and actions. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #13. Once the post-observation meeting takes place, teachers feel the

teacher-evaluation process is dependable./Once the post-observation meeting takes place,

I feel the teacher-evaluation process is dependable. Teachers had a mean score of 3.50

(*SD* = .830), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.81 (*SD* = .834).

Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -1.261, *p* = .213).

Analysis. Survey item #13 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not teachers feel the teacher-evaluation process is dependable once the

post-observation meeting takes place. Means and standard deviations were displayed in

Table 9.

Survey item #14. My evaluator makes two or more informal visits throughout the

year./I make two or more visits throughout the year. Teachers had a mean score of 4.13

(*SD* = .777), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.50 (*SD* = .816).

Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -1.568, *p* = .123).

Analysis. Survey item #14 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not evaluators make two or more informal visits throughout the year. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #15. The pre-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher-evaluation process. Teachers had a mean score of 3.11 ($SD = 1.110$), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.75 ($SD = .856$). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52) = -2.074$, $p = .043$).

Analysis. Survey item #15 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the pre-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #16. My evaluator uses an appropriate amount of time to meet with me for my pre-observations./I use an appropriate amount of time when meeting with teachers I evaluate for their pre-observations. Teachers had a mean score of 3.32 ($SD = 1.165$), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.88 ($SD = .619$). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52) = -1.809$, $p = .076$).

Analysis. Survey item #16 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not administrators use an appropriate amount of time at the pre-observation meetings. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #17. The post-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher-evaluation process. Teachers had a mean score of 4.24 ($SD = .634$), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.44 ($SD = .512$). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52) = -1.120$, $p = .268$).

Analysis. Survey item #17 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the post-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #18. My evaluator uses an appropriate amount of time to meet with me to discuss my post-observations./I use an appropriate amount of time when meeting with teachers I evaluate for discussing their post-observations. Teachers had a mean score of 4.00 (*SD* = .735), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.19 (*SD* = .544). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -.918, *p* = .363).

Analysis. Survey item #18 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not administrators us an appropriate amount of time to meet with teachers to discuss their post-observations. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #19. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel my students' achievement has improved./Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel student achievement has improved. Teachers had a mean score of 2.63 (*SD* = 1.076), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.63 (*SD* = .806). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -3.315, *p* = .002).

Analysis. Survey item #19 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not teachers feel their students' achievement has improved as a result of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #20. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel my students have better reading skills./Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel students have better reading skills. Teachers had a mean score of 2.26 (SD = .829), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.19 (SD = .655). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52)$ = -3.966, p = .000).

Analysis. Survey item #20 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not teachers feel their students' reading skill has improved as a result of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #21. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel my students have better writing skills./Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel students have better writing skills. Teachers had a mean score of 2.32 (SD = .904), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.13 (SD = .719). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52)$ = -3.178, p = .002).

Analysis. Survey item #21 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not teachers feel their students' writing skill has improved as a result of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item # 22. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel any achievement gap in my classes has been narrowed./Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel any achievement gap in English classes has been narrowed. Teachers had

a mean score of 2.37 (*SD* = .883), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.00 (*SD* = .894). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -2.391, *p* = .020).

Analysis. Survey item #22 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not teachers feel the achievement gap in English classes has been narrowed as a result of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #23. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I have made significant changes in the way I instruct my classes./Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel English teachers have made significant changes in the way they instruct classes. Teachers had a mean score of 2.79 (*SD* = 1.044), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.31 (*SD* = 1.195). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -1.610, *p* = .113).

Analysis. Survey item #23 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not teachers have made significant changes in the way they instruct classes as a result of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 9.

Survey item #24. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I have made significant changes in the way I assess my students./Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel English teachers have made significant changes in the way they assess students. Teachers had a mean score of 2.71 (*SD* = 1.160), whereas administrators had a

higher mean score of 3.44 (*SD* = .964). Administrators had a higher mean score than

teachers (*t*(52) = -2.203, *p* = .032).

    Analysis. Survey item #24 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not teachers have made significant changes in the way they assess students as

aresult of the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed

in Table 9.

Table 9

The Quality of the Teacher-Evaluation Process as Perceived by Nebraska Secondary
English Teachers and Nebraska Administrators

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
8. The teacher-evaluation process results are reliable.	T	3.18	0.926	32	-1.496	.145
8. The teacher-evaluation process results accurately reflect a teacher's ability.**	A	3.56	0/814			
9. The number of classroom teacher observations is adequate to evaluate my instructional skills.	T	3.16	1.079	42	-1.862	.070
9. The number of classroom teacher observations is adequate to evaluate the instructional skills for those whom I evaluate.	A	3.63	0.719			
10. The rating system used to evaluate teachers is useful for my growth.	T	3.26	0.860	46	-3.266	.002
10. The rating system used to evaluate teachers is useful for those whom I evaluate.	A	3.88	.500			

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
11. The indicators on the teacher-evaluation instrument take into account the critical aspects of my teaching.	T	3.29	0.984	42	-2.287	0.27
11. The indicators on the teacher-evaluation instrument take into account the critical aspects of teaching for those whom I evaluate.	A	3.81	0.655			
12. The teacher-evaluation process allows me to explain the classroom decisions and actions.	T	3.58	0.948	52	-1.250	.217
12. The teacher-evaluation process allows the teachers I evaluate to explain their classroom decisions and actions.	A	3.94	0.998			
13. Once the post-observation meeting takes place, teachers feel the teacher-evaluation process is dependable.	T	3.50	0.830	52	-1.261	.213
13. Once the post-observation meeting takes place, I feel the teacher-evaluation process is dependable.**	A	3.81	0.834			
14. My evaluator makes two or more informal visits throughout the year.	T	4.13	0.777	52	-1.568	.123
14. I make two or more visits throughout the year.	A	4.50	0.816			
15. The pre-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher- evaluation process.	T	3.11	1.110	52	-2.074	.043
	A	3.75	0.856			
16. My evaluator uses an appropriate amount of time to meet with me for my pre-observations.	T	3.32	1.165	52	-1.809	.076
16. I use an appropriate amount of time when meeting with teachers I evaluate for their pre-observations.	A	3.88	0.619			
17. The post-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher-evaluation process.	T	4.24	0.634	52	-1.120	.268
18. My evaluator uses an appropriate amount of time to met with me to discuss my post-observations.	T	4.00	0.735	52	-.918	.363
18. I use an appropriate amount of time when meeting with teachers I evaluate for discussing their post-observations.**	A	4.19	0.544			

Table 9 continues

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
19. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel my students' achievement has improved.	T	2.63	1.076	52	-3.966	.000
19. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel student achievement has improved.	A	3.63	0.806			
20. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel my students have better reading skills.	T	2.26	0.829	52	-3.966	.000
20. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel students have better reading skills.	A	3.19	0.655			
21. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel my students have better writing skills.	T	2.32	0.904	52	-3.178	.002
21. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel students have better writing skills.	A	3.13	0.719			
22. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel any achievement gap in my classes has been narrowed.	T	2.37	0.883	52	-2.391	.020
22. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel any achievement gap in English classes has been narrowed.	A	3.00	0.894			
23. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I have made significant changes in the way I instruct my classes.	T	2.79	1.044	52	-1.610	.113
23. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel English teachers have made significant changes in the way they instruct classes.**	A	3.31	1.195			
24. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I have made significant changes in the way I assess my students.	T	2.71	1.160	52	-2.203	.032
24. Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel English teachers have made significant changes in the way they assess students.	A	3.44	0.964			

* T = Nebraska secondary English teachers, A = Nebraska administrators
** First statement of the same number from teacher survey; second statement of the same number is from administrator survey

Training involved in the teacher-evaluation process.

Survey item #25.   I have the necessary training to participate in the teacher-evaluation process./I feel I have the necessary training to evaluate teachers.   Teachers had a mean score of 3.95 (*SD* = .73), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.50 (*SD* = .516).   Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -2.73, *p* = .008).

Analysis. Survey item #25 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not each group feels it has the necessary training the teacher-evaluation process. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 10.

Survey item #26.   I understand each of the indicators on the teacher-evaluation instrument.   Teachers had a mean score of 3.97 (*SD* = .716), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.50 (*SD* = .516).   Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -2.657, *p* = .010).

Analysis. Survey item #26 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not each group feels it understands the indicators on the teacher-evaluation instrument. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 10.

Survey item #27.   I participated in formal training regarding the teacher-evaluation instrument./I participated in formal training regarding the use of the teacher-evaluation instrument. Teachers had a mean score of 3.05 (*SD* = 1.251), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.06 (*SD* = 1.063). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -2.825, *p* = .007).

Analysis. Survey item #27 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not each group participated in formal training regarding the use of the teacher-evaluation instrument. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 10.

Survey item #28. My evaluator has the required knowledge to conduct my teacher evaluation./I feel I have the knowledge to conduct the teacher evaluation. Teachers had a mean score of 3.05 (SD = 1.251), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.06 (SD = 1.063). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(52)$ = -2.635, p = .011).

Analysis. Survey item #28 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the administrator has the knowledge to conduct the teacher evaluation. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 10.

Survey item #29. My evaluator is viewed as an instructional leader in my school./I am viewed as an instructional leader in my school. Teachers had a mean score of 3.76 (SD = 1.125), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.13 (SD = .342). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(49)$ = -1.795, p = .079).

Analysis. Survey item #29 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the administrator is viewed as an instructional leader in the school. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

Training Involved in the Teacher-Evaluation Process as Perceived by Nebraska

Secondary English Teachers and Nebraska Administrators

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
25. I have the necessary training to participate in the teacher-evaluation process.	T	3.95	0.73	52	-2.73	.008
25. I feel I have the necessary training to evaluate teachers.**	A	4.50	0.516			
26. I understand each of the indicators on the teacher-evaluation instrument.	T	3.97	0.716	52	-2.657	.010
	A	4.50	0.516			
27. I participated in formal training regarding the teacher-evaluation instrument.	T	3.05	1.251	52	-2.825	.007
27. I participated in formal training regarding the use of the teacher-evaluation instrument.	A	4.06	1.063			
28. My evaluator has the required knowledge to conduct my teacher evaluation.	T	3.05	1.251	52	-2.635	.011
28. I feel I have the knowledge to conduct the teacher evaluation.	A	4.06	1.063			
29. My evaluator is viewed as an instructional leader in my school.	T	3.76	1.125	49	-1.795	.079
29. I am viewed as an instructional leader in my school.	A	4.13	0.342			

* T = Nebraska secondary English teachers, A = Nebraska administrators
** First statement of the same number from teacher survey; second statement of the same number is from administrator survey

The impact of feedback from the teacher-evaluation process on teacher skill.

Survey item #30. The feedback from the teacher-evaluation process is supportive

of my growth./I feel the feedback from the teacher-evaluation process is supportive of

teachers' growth. Teachers had a mean score of 3.63 (*SD* = .970), whereas administrators

had a higher mean score of 4.06 (*SD* = .250). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(47) = -2.54, *p* = .014).

Analysis. Survey item #30 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the teacher-evaluation process is supportive of teachers' growth. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 11.

Survey item #31. The feedback from the teacher-evaluation process focuses upon suggestions for my improvement./I feel the feedback from the teacher-evaluation process focuses upon suggestions for teachers' improvement. Teachers had a mean score of 3.63 (*SD* = .970), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.94 (*SD* = .574). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(46) = -1.43, *p* = .158).

Analysis. Survey item #31 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the teacher feels the teacher-evaluation process focuses upon suggestions for the teacher's improvement. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 11.

Survey item #32. Engagement in the teacher-evaluation process encourages me to reflect on my teaching./Engagement in the teacher-evaluation process encourages a teacher to reflect on his/her teaching. Teachers had a mean score of 3.71 (*SD* = 1.113), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.13 (*SD* = .619). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(48) = -1.74, *p* = .088).

Analysis. Survey item #32 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not the teacher-evaluation process encourages teachers to reflect on their teaching. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 11.

Survey item #33. The teacher-evaluation process has made me more aware of my strengths./The teacher-evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their strengths. Teachers had a mean score of 3.45 (SD = 1.005), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.00 (SD = .730). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(39)$ = -2.25, p = .030).

Analysis. Survey item #33 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the teacher-evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their strengths. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 11.

Survey item #34. The teacher-evaluation process has made me more aware of my areas in need of improvement./The teacher-evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their areas in need of improvement. Teachers had a mean score of 3.39 (SD = 1.028), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.00 (SD = .516). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers ($t(50)$ = -2.87, p = .006).

Analysis. Survey item #34 was analyzed using an independent t test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the teacher-evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their strengths. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 11.

Survey item #35. I receive feedback on informal visits that occur throughout the year./Teachers receive feedback on informal visits throughout the year. Teachers had a mean score of 3.63 (SD = 1.051), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.44

(*SD* = .512). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -2.91,

p = .005).

     Analysis. Survey item #35 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not teachers receive feedback on informal visits throughout the year. Means

and standard deviations were displayed in Table 11.

     The Collaboration Involved in the Teacher-evaluation Process.

     Survey item #36.   At the pre-observation meeting, telling my evaluator what to

look for while observing me focuses my teacher evaluation./At the pre-observation

meeting, having the teacher tell me what to look for while observing helps me focus the

teacher evaluation. Teachers had a mean score of 3.58 (*SD* = .793), whereas

administrators had a higher mean score of 4.00 (*SD* = .365). Administrators had a higher

mean score than teachers (*t*(51) = -2.669, *p* = .000).

     Analysis. Survey item #36 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not telling the evaluator what to look for while observing focuses the teacher

evaluation. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 12.

     Survey item #37.   The discussion between my evaluator and me in the

pre-observation meeting focuses upon the key elements of the observation./The

discussion between the teacher and me in the pre-observation meeting focuses on the key

elements of the teacher observation. Teachers had a mean score of 3.47 (*SD* = .893),

whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.88 (*SD* = .500). Administrators had

a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(48) = -2.098, *p* = .004).

Table 11

The Impact of Feedback from the Teacher-evaluation Process on Teacher Skill as Perceived by Nebraska Secondary English Teachers and Nebraska Administrators

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
30. The feedback from the teacher-evaluation process is supportive of my growth.**	T	3.63	0.970	47	-2.54	.014
30. I feel the feedback from the teacher-evaluation process is supportive of teachers' growth.	A	4.06	0.250			
31. The feedback from the teacher-evaluation process focuses upon suggestions for my improvement.	T	3.63	0.970	46	-1.43	.158
31. I feel the feedback from the teacher-evaluation process focuses upon suggestions for teachers' improvement.	A	3.94	0.574			
32. Engagement in the teacher-evaluation process encourages me to reflect on my teaching.	T	3.71	1.113	48	-1.74	.088
32. Engagement in the teacher-evaluation process encourages a teacher to reflect on his/her teaching.	A	4.13	0.619			
33. The teacher-evaluation process has made me more aware of my strengths.	T	3.45	1.005	39	-2.25	.030
33. The teacher-evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their strengths.	A	4.00	0.730			
34. The teacher-evaluation process has made me more aware of my areas in need of improvement.	T	3.39	1.028	50	-287	.006
34. The teacher-evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their areas in need of improvement.**	A	4.00	0.516			
35. I receive feedback on informal visits that occur throughout the year.	T	3.63	1.051	52	-2.91	.005
35. Teachers receive feedback on informal visits throughout the year.	A	4.44	0.512			

* T = Nebraska secondary English teachers, A = Nebraska administrators
** First statement of the same number from teacher survey; second statement of the same number is from administrator survey

Analysis. Survey item #37 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the discussion between the evaluator and the teacher in the pre-observation meeting focuses upon the key elements of the observation. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 12.

Survey item #38. In the evaluation process the collaboration between the evaluator and the teacher has helped teachers become better teachers./In the teacher-evaluation process the collaboration between the teacher and me has helped teachers become better teachers. Teachers had a mean score of 3.34 (*SD* = .966), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.94 (*SD* = .574). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(46) = -2.802, *p* = .008).

Analysis. Survey item #38 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not the collaboration between the evaluator and the teacher in the evaluation process has helped teachers to become better teachers. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 12.

The Effects of Relationship Between the English teacher and Administrator in the Teacher-Evaluation Process.

Survey item #39. My evaluator established a relationship with me before the evaluation process began./I establish a good relationship with teachers before the evaluation process begins. Teachers had a mean score of 3.82 (*SD* = .955), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.19 (*SD* = .655). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -1.419, *p* = .162).

Table 12

The Collaboration Involved in the Teacher-evaluation Process as Perceived by Nebraska

Secondary English Teachers and Nebraska Administrators

Survey item	Group*	M	SD	df	t	p
36. At the pre-observation meeting, telling my evaluator what to look for while observing me focuses my teacher evaluation.	T	3.58	0.793	51	-2.669	.000
36. At the pre-observation meeting, having the teacher tell me what to look for while observing helps me focus the teacher evaluation.**	A	4.00	0.365			
37. The discussion between my evaluator and me in the pre-observation meeting focuses upon the key elements of the observation.	T	3.47	0.893	52	-2.098	.004
37. The discussion between the teacher and me in the pre-observation meeting focuses on the key elements of the teacher observation.	A	3.88	0.500			
38. In the evaluation process the collaboration between the evaluator and the teacher has helped teachers become better teachers.	T	3.34	0.966	46	-2.802	.008
38. In the teacher-evaluation process the collaboration between the teacher and me has helped teachers become better teachers.	A	3.94	0.574			

* T = Nebraska secondary English teachers, A = Nebraska administrators
** First statement of the same number from teacher survey; second statement of the same number is from administrator survey

Analysis. Survey item #39 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of

whether or not a good relationship between the evaluator and teacher is established

before the evaluation process begins. Means and standard deviations were displayed in

Table 13.

Survey item #40. I have a good relationship with my evaluator./I have a good relationship with the teachers I evaluate. Teachers had a mean score of 4.05 (*SD* = .804), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 4.13 (*SD* = .500). Administrators had a slightly higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -.333, *p* = .740).

Analysis. Survey item #40 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not teachers and administrators feel they have a good relationship. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 13.

Survey item #41. When I am experiencing difficulty in the classroom, I feel safe asking my evaluator for advice./When teachers are experiencing difficulty in the classroom, they feel safe asking me for advice. Teachers had a mean score of 3.79 (*SD* = 1.143), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.88 (*SD* = .806). Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -.272, *p* = .787).

Analysis. Survey item #41 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine the significance of the difference between teachers' and administrators' perception of whether or not teachers feel they can ask their evaluating administrator for advice if they are experiencing difficulty in the classroom. Means and standard deviations were displayed in Table 13.

Miscellaneous statements regarding the teacher-evaluation process.

Survey item #42. I took part in the development of the teacher-evaluation instrument used in my school./Teachers took part in the development of the teacher-evaluation instrument used in my school. Teachers had a mean score of 2.13

Table 13

The Effects of Relationship Between the English Teacher and Administrator in the

Teacher-Evaluation Process as Perceived by Nebraska Secondary English Teachers and

Nebraska Administrators

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
39. My evaluator established a relationship with me before the evaluation process began.	T	3.82	0.955	52	1.1419	.162
39. I establish a good relationship with teachers before the evaluation process begins.**	A	4.19	0.655			
40. I have a good relationship with the teachers I evaluate.	T	4.05	0.804	52	-.333	.740
	A	4.13	0.500			
41. When I am experiencing difficulty in the classroom, I feel safe asking my evaluator for advice.	T	3.7	1.143	52	-.272	.787
41. When teachers are experiencing difficulty in the classroom, they feel safe asking me for advice.	A	3.88	0.806			

* T = Nebraska secondary English teachers, A = Nebraska administrators
** First statement of the same number from teacher survey; second statement of the same number is from administrator survey

(*SD* = 1.166), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 3.38 (*SD* = 1.088).

Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -3.646, *p* = .988).

 Analysis. Survey item #42 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers and administrators as to whether or

not each took part in developing the teacher-evaluation instrument in their school. Means

and standard deviations were displayed in Table 14.

Survey item #43. Peer coaching is a part of my teacher evaluation./Peer coaching

is a part of teacher evaluations for teachers in my school. Teachers had a mean score of

1.97 (*SD* = .885), whereas administrators had a higher mean score of 2.69 (*SD* = .946).

Administrators had a higher mean score than teachers (*t*(52) = -2.652, *p* = .365).

Analysis. Survey item #43 was analyzed using an independent *t* test to examine

the significance of the difference between teachers and administrators as to whether or

not peer coaching is a part of teacher evaluations for teachers in their schools. Means and

standard deviations were displayed in Table 14.

Table 14

Miscellaneous Statements Regarding the Teacher-evaluation Process as Perceived by

Nebraska Secondary English Teachers and Nebraska Administrators

Survey item	Group*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
42. I took part in the development of the teacher-evaluation instrument used in my school.	T	2.13	1.166	52	-3.646	.988
42. Teachers took part in the development of the teacher-evaluation instrument used in my school.**	A	3.38	1.088			
43. Peer coaching is a part of my teacher evaluation.	T	1.97	0.885	52	-2.652	.365
43. Peer coaching is a part of teacher evaluations for teachers in my school.	A	2.69	0.946			

* T = Nebraska secondary English teachers, A = Nebraska administrators
** First statement of the same number from teacher survey; second statement of the same number is from administrator survey

Summary

Additional qualitative data was gathered in Phase II of this mixed-methods study to help the researcher further explore the survey respondents' perceptions of teacher evaluation in Nebraska. This additional data will be presented in Chapter V.

Chapter V

Findings

Phase II Qualitative Data

The qualitative phase of the explanatory mixed-method study was designed to provide further examination of the results and assist in the explanation of findings. Five questions for each group of teachers and administrators served as a follow up to the quantitative survey results. Questions for teachers were as follows:

1. How does your relationship with your evaluating administrator impact the teacher-evaluation process?

2. How do you feel the teacher-evaluation process assesses your performance?

3. How does the collaboration involved in the teacher-evaluation process impact your teaching skill?

4. What kind of training did you receive to prepare you to take part in the teacher-evaluation process?

5. How does the feedback from the teacher-evaluation process impact your teaching?

Questions for administrators are as follows:

1. How does your relationship with your teachers impact the teacher-evaluation process?

2. How do you feel the teacher-evaluation process assesses your teachers' performances?

3. How does the collaboration involved in the teacher-evaluation process impact your teachers' skills?

4. What kind of training did you receive to prepare you to take part in the teacher-evaluation process?

5. How does the feedback from the teacher-evaluation process impact your teachers' skills?

Sample

The population of the study represents a diverse sample of administrators and secondary English teachers across the state of Nebraska. All Nebraska public school districts were invited to participate. Two hundred forty-six (246) districts received invitations, 66 superintendents granted their schools permission to participate, and 21 principals granted their schools permission to participate (see Table 15).

Table 15

Statewide Principal Approval of Schools (After Superintendent Approval)

Districts Approved to Participate	Building/Principal Approval	%	% of Nebraska
66	21	31.8	8.5

Roughly 9% of Nebraska schools were represented in this study with efforts to seek input from schools across the state (see Table 16); however, demographics were not aggregated in results.

Those interviewed voluntarily agreed separately while completing the online quantitative survey. Among those who volunteered to be interviewed, efforts were made to obtain a varied sample to represent the state of Nebraska.

Table 16

Total Voluntary Participants Interviewed

	Districts Invited in Study	Schools Granted Permission	Total Schools Participating	Administrators Interviewed (of part. schools)	Teachers Interviewed (of part. schools)
	246	66	21	6	6
Total	246	27%	32%	29%	29%

Table 17 shows experience, grade-level, school size, and estimated poverty level of school for those who participated in the voluntary interviews.

Qualitative Data Analysis Procedures

Data was organized by having interviews transcribed by a third party who signed a privacy agreement. Participants each received their respective transcription to review for errors or to revise. Data was prepared for analysis, and then read as a whole in order to gain a general impression of what respondents were saying and how it was or was not relative to the qualitative portion of the study.

Qualitative research is subjective by nature and the researcher worked to validate findings through the use of a thorough and complete review of the data provided in the transcripts keeping in mind any biases the research may have. The researcher has experience as a teacher and practice experience as an administrator and recognizes teacher evaluation as a mandatory aspect of both the teachers' and administrators' responsibilities. These perspectives, while at the heart of the study, have been bracketed during the research process to ensure they do not skew the perspective in reviewing and reporting the study results.

Table 17

Demographics of Interview Respondents

	Administrators	Teachers
Gender		
Male	6	5
Female	0	1
Experience		
Range of years	2 – 25	1 – 45
Grade level		
High school	6	4
Middle or junior high	0	2
School Size*	0	1
< 100		
101 – 200	2	0
201 – 499	2	0
500 – 1,099	1	2
> 1,000	1	3
Poverty**		
< 10	0	0
11 – 20	0	1
21 – 30	1	1
31 – 40	0	0
41 – 50	3	3
51 – 60	1	0
61 – 70	1	1

* Not all participants reported school size (number of students)
** Not all participants estimated percentage of students who receive free and or reduced lunch assistance.

Quantitative Survey Themes Based on Data

Follow-up questions had already been organized according to the quantitative

survey responses according to the following five themes (also noted in Table 18):

1. What characterizes the teacher and administrator relationship?

2. Does teacher evaluation accurately assess teacher performance?

3. Does collaboration impact teacher skill?

4. What training is involved in the evaluation process?

5. What is the role of feedback in improving teacher skill?

Sub-themes between teachers and administrators were then noted under each main theme

and analyzed. Three additional themes with sub-themes arose from the analysis of the

interviews, which are the following (see Table 18):

6. Purpose of teacher evaluation

7. Language

    a. Language of the process

    b. Language used to describe the process

8. Suggestions for the process

Theme #1: Role of teacher and administrator relationship. Teachers and

administrators are in agreement that relationship plays a key role when it comes to

teacher evaluation.   While reviewing the responses, trust and a positive relationship as a

factor that impacts the teacher-evaluation process were cited overwhelmingly by both

groups. One administrator said,

Table 18

Themes for Qualitative Study

	Themes from interviews
1.	Role of teacher and administrator relationship
2.	Teacher evaluation's assessment of teacher performance
3.	Collaboration and its impact upon teachers skill
4.	Training involved in the evaluation process
5.	Impact of feedback on teacher skill
6.	Purpose of teacher evaluation
7.	Language used in teacher evaluation
	a. Language of the process
	b. Language used to describe the process
8.	Suggestions for the process

I believe the relationship is huge. There first has to be some kind of personal relationship, that there's some kind of connection just like you'd have with students or anybody else. The second part of that that's even more important, you've got to have a trusting relationship. And whether or not you're best friends, which is typically not, you've got to have a legitimate trust of each other.

Another administrator said, "I think that relationship is huge because if that groundwork of trust and affirmation is laid, then those conversations about the teacher-evaluation process become about improvement and not necessarily about evaluation."

One teacher said, "I guess I would say that I feel like the better the relationship I have with my appraiser, the more confident I feel throughout the process and also the more willing I am to consider their feedback."

A positive relationship appears to be key for administrators and teachers, such that, respondents of each group talked about what happens when there is an absence of a positive relationship and/or trust.

One administrator shared about the break down of trust,

> Those kinds of things, disagreements, really can break down trust, and I've learned a lot over the 24 years I've been an administrator. Part of it is you do need to get to know them, and they do need to get to know you. And there's [sic] still times even when you think you have that relationship, you disappoint them, and they turn around and disappoint you by not trusting you or whatever. You've just got to continue to be consistent and fair, and I really believe you have to lead with your heart to let them know: I'm about, first of all, welfare of students, secondly, helping you be the best instructor you can be so students can be successful.

One teacher said, "When [my administrator] comes into my classroom to evaluate me, we don't have that much of a relationship to fall back on."

Finally, an administrator who had replaced another administrator of just over 10 years, talked about building trust among a staff that was used to someone else,

> I had to work pretty hard to build some relationships because obviously, new [administrator], different thought process than the old principal. He was here for [more than 10] years, and everyone was in a comfort zone. It took some time to build some relationships.

Both teachers and administrators see the importance of a positive, and at the very least, a professional relationship. Each group appears to understand what happens when the relationship is absent: teacher evaluation cannot work. The administrator who has 24 years of experience knows that despite how others act, the administrator must model fair and consistent behavior to help maintain that trust because emotions can and do cloud the way individuals act.

Theme #2: Does teacher evaluation accurately assess teacher performance?

Whether or not teacher evaluations accurately assess a teacher's performance was at issue

for both groups. Important to note is some, especially administrators, who felt they used

a more solid teacher-evaluation instrument, gave more favorable responses.

Administrators spoke about consistency of training, which would aid in obtaining

a more quality assessment of a teacher's skill. One administrator from a rural school has

gone to many meetings and taken part in frequent webinar trainings and is responsible to

report back to the district. The administrator said,

> We've worked on coaching techniques where two principals and one of the staff
> developers actually went into classrooms, and we did our own observation, and
> then we went out and reflected on what we seen [sic], trying to get fidelity. No
> matter who goes in the room, they see kind of the same thing, and they're looking
> for the same things, and scoring it the same way and getting better at what we do.

As one teacher put it, "five different administrators can see five different things"

when doing a teacher's evaluation, so the purpose of more and better training is to have

more accurate assessments of what's going on in classrooms.

One administrator talked about the rigor of the school's new model currently

entering its fourth year of use. The administrator stated, "I really feel like with this

teacher-evaluation model, getting distinguished is hard, and I think that's good. I think

that even our good teachers, I feel like, have research and the model to push them to be

great." The administrator felt the model was rigorous and also achievable because it not

only had the research behind the model, but it also had the necessary information to guide

teachers to growth.

Two teachers talked about the inaccuracy of comments from both the appraiser

and teacher involved. One teacher stated,

> At the end of the year, they ask us to self-evaluate and in the second year I did a
> self-evaluation. My administrator said something along the lines, and this is
> misquoted, something along the lines of "I went off of what you did and
> essentially did the same." That didn't make me feel like – I was hard on myself

because I try to be reflective, but that's not what she saw necessarily, if that makes any sense.

The responses of many teachers included the phrase, "snapshot," meaning the evaluation is an accurate assessment of a specific moment in time that the administrator observed.

One teacher said,

> I think an appraisal is like any grade I give; it is like a sign on a highway at that particular moment in time. . . . I think it's ridiculous to assume that a 40-minute observation in any way becomes a magnifying glass for all things or a microscope, either way you want to look at it.

And perhaps the "snapshot" wasn't accurate because the teacher performs in a way that isn't the norm, or as one administrator called it, " a dog and pony show." In other words, this sudden change in the teacher's style won't be an accurate observation and evaluation because this isn't how the teacher normally performs.

Additionally, some teachers may take a risk on the day of their teacher evaluation to try an activity or lesson that also isn't the norm, and often times, it's so different from the normal mode of teaching that it may produce an inaccurate assessment. Might, however, this observation broach the discussion of new methods, encouragement of taking risks?

One administrator said,

> How many teachers take their teacher formal observations as an opportunity to try something they've found on the Internet or maybe something they heard about at a conference? This is your evaluation, you know, and we talk about it [the observed lesson] and go through the motions. And we do this elaborate evaluation over a lesson – Well, when you put it like that, it sounds like I'm encouraging teachers not to – I am, I do . . . I don't, I just don't want to evaluate a lesson on a [sic] evaluation that was bad when the teacher had never tried it before.

However, in defense of the "snapshot," one teacher said,

I don't know if it's assessing my whole performance. But, I also can see the point that if my routines are not set up correctly, if the kids do not know what to expect, then it's not going to suddenly, magically work the day one person comes in to watch.

The key for both administrators and teachers is multiple visits in order to make the teacher-evaluation more accurate. One administrator said, "Well, if you show up once a year for 30 minutes, you really haven't gotten a good feel for what they do or don't do in the classroom."

A few administrators who spoke about new teacher-evaluation instruments or piloting new instruments for the Nebraska Department of Education had more favorable feedback about the accuracy of teacher evaluation. They cite more focus on conversation, developing common language, discussing what good teaching is, more accountability, and more rigorous instruments and processes.

One administrator who is on year three of a new instrument and process said,

Some of that [documentation] can be a little cumbersome, but overall, I feel like the whole process opens up a whole different part of conversation with the teacher because you're so focused on instruction, and what they're doing in the classroom and how they can make it better. I think our process, overall, does a great job assessing their performance.

There appears to be some apprehension in both groups as to whether or not an evaluation can be an accurate assessment of a teacher's performance. Teachers may respond differently when another person is in the room and therefore the "snapshot" an administrator evaluates may be nothing more than a "dog and pony show." Administrators and teachers who are using more current instruments feel the process does more accurately assess teacher skill.

Theme #3: Collaboration and its impact upon teachers' skills. Collaboration is, perhaps, one of the most important parts of the teacher-evaluation process because this is where the conversations about teaching take place. The typical teacher evaluation includes the following:

1. A few informal visits (walk-throughs or drop-ins)

2. A pre-observation conference

3. An observation

4. A post-observation conference.

Incorporating collaboration about the teaching process may prove difficult given the nature of these activities. The goal of collaboration is to work together; however, teachers felt the only place any collaboration may take place is in the post-observation conference or often times it's not even a part of the formal evaluation process. Often, teachers used the term "collaboration" synonymously with the term "feedback," so clarification and further questioning was needed.

Teachers felt pre-conference isn't collaborating because it includes the teacher simply telling the administrator what the lesson is about or what the administrator should look for while observing.

One teacher said,

I think the collaborative part for me comes after, in the post-evaluation [meeting], when you sit and you go through the rubric, and he shares with you the observations he made and gives you the feedback. A lot of times I've gotten some good, collaborative effort, especially when it comes to student involvement from my administrator. . . .

After clarification of the difference between feedback and collaboration, one teacher said, "I always go in there [administrators' offices] and run ideas by them. Our

administrators anyway are so open to that dialogue." It's important to note, still, that this

isn't collaboration that happens as a result of the teacher-evaluation process.

Another teacher said, "I suppose that [collaboration] impacts the way I look at

planning my lessons and things. I don't know that's impacting my skill at all."

Yet another teacher said,

I would just say, its' also hard – I think it [collaboration] would be good because these people [my administrators] aren't from my content area, so they could bring insights, so just insights into what the students may be thinking because I teach the lower kids. I'm the English person; I think a certain way about English. They could have brought in some of those insights, and I think that would have helped the collaborative process of me improving. There is no collaboration. It's just a checklist for them. I don't think they take meetings [meetings related to teacher evaluation] seriously, or if they do, it's a last-minute thing for them.

One administrator said,

I think that's [collaboration] key. Having an ongoing conversation as to what's happening as close as you can on a day-to-day basis is what it's all about . . . in getting them to not only listen to what you say but being – or what I say – but also being reflective on their own processes. So you're encouraging them to constantly evaluate themselves. Not in a threatening way, but how did this go, how could it go better?

Administrators would like to see teacher evaluation be more of a conversation that

is teacher driven as opposed to administratively driven, and they stated that collaboration

takes more time, something of which many administrators don't have. Those

administrators working with new models felt collaboration had more of a role, but again,

it took more time.

Collaboration should be the least of the outcomes in the teacher-evaluation

process, but as teachers and administrators responded, there is some question about what

it actually is, when and where it should take place, and how to encourage it. Most stated

collaboration is important but weren't able to talk about how it has impacted their teaching skill.

Theme #4: Training involved in the evaluation process. Both administrators and teachers spoke to great extent about training involved in the teacher evaluation process. While some schools were in the process of adopting new models, all stated or implied how important teacher evaluation training was. On the whole administrators responded more favorably in this theme. Though two mentioned much of the training they received was a result of their administrative education and certification, they spoke about new and better training, on-going training, helping administrators to become more efficient and effective, and how to collaborate.

Two administrators spoke similarly about their training, stating that most of it came as a part of their education while getting their administrative certifications. One administrator said about training,

> A lot of it was my staff-appraisal class at the university. [My professor] used the Danielson book as the textbook for the class. . . . Then, with my student-principal practicums where I was out in the field, they were just starting to implement the Danielson model.

When administrators spoke about training in their schools, answers were varied. One said the two other principals in the district pulled out the teacher-evaluation instrument the district used and said, "You're not going to like this."

Where training has been strong, it's been in districts that have recently implemented new processes or those that are participating in the state's pilot program.

One administrator with 25 years of experience said, "When I got into administration . . . we didn't have a class on how to appraise or anything. . . . You're kind of thrown into the fray. . . . I just got a couple of tips." He went on to say,

However, moving forward since then . . . more training so we've gotten development every year about how to appraise people . . . and we had a couple of two or three-day sessions, and then we do a fresh up every year, too. . . . But now we spend time on the philosophy of it [teacher evaluation] and how to do the whole process. Not only the hows but also the how to collaborate with the teacher .. . .

Another said,

We have 2-o'clock outs [early release school days] twice a month for in-service. So during the fall at every in-service that we had, we talked about some piece or part of the evaluation process. . . . Some of it was Q & A, other times it was what the new process was going to be like, other times we gave them two books; one was the Danielson book and we had them read.

Use of technology was key in helping schools have access to the necessary support and training needed to tighten up the teacher-evaluation process. Rural schools talked about webinars as not only a way to share information, but more importantly, a time saver when it comes to driving long distances for presentations.

In addition technology takes the worry of forgetting to do something out of teacher evaluation. Reminders are programmed in, so administrators receive weekly reminders about what parts of the process still need to be completed and for whom. As one administrator put it,

It's become a way that's forced you into the classroom more because as an administrator, you can get busy with anything and everything, and that's one of those things that can go by the wayside, but it's always there on the document.

Teachers remarked about having no training whatsoever, overwhelming training, being taught necessities but not the process, and lack of focused and on-going training.

Teachers at the two smaller, rural districts reported a lack of training in general. One said, "None. The first time was like, 'Hey, I'm going to come evaluate you and then gave me the class period.' Otherwise, [the administrator] didn't tell me what [the administrator] was going to do."

Another rural teacher said, "I would say my first year, my administrator did a better job explaining these components, especially at the end of the year."

As a rule, most teachers in larger districts stated more training was taking place. One teacher said,

> I got two types of training: one was the new-teacher orientation, and we discussed this at new-teacher orientation because that was the first year this was going to be implemented . . . and the other training I received was at [name of school]'s beginning of the year, you know, teacher day, when you first come back to work. We spent maybe a day on it.

Where there was more training involved with the teacher evaluation, teachers talked about the overwhelming amount of training or not having resources needed to get through the process of the evaluation.

> One teacher said,

> I remember getting this big booklet and then learning about domains, or trying to learn about domains, and looking at these immense . . . checklists of what observations would fit with this domain, things that you might be observed doing. . . . Then you have to memorize new words, which I find confusing sometimes.

Another teacher responded the same way, "I remember being so overwhelmed. . . "

> A teacher from a large school stated,

> A lot of it was just kind of you as an individual teacher kind of figuring out the process because there wasn't a lot of training involved, at least on our part it was 'this is what you're going to be evaluated on, this is what you're going to be assessed on, this is how you log in, this is how you fill the rubrics out online, here is how you submit things, here's how you save things.'

In other words, teachers felt they were taught the necessities of the process, not the hows of the process.

There was a varied range of the "hows of the process" training. Teachers mentioned large-group brainstorming of what kinds of items would be classified as

artifacts (items the teacher uses as support of the teacher's reflection and growth

statements as a part of the evaluation). Some schools provided a laminated list of the

items that could be used as examples to all teachers. When the researcher asked if new

teachers were provided this same list, teachers responded they didn't know.

Also, in larger schools where teachers had received more training, teachers

responded they were often left to figure out the process, and from there, teachers received

little or no follow-up training.

One teacher said,

And so pretty much we were trained on the software and how the domains work,
and we're measured according to those domains. Other than that, and that was
two, three years ago when I received that, we've discussed it a few times in PLC
[professional learning communities], but for the most part, and I know this from a
lot of other instructors in my department, that's the training you get. Here's the
software for [the teacher-evaluation process used at this school]. And here's how
you submit things. And that's about it.

Another teacher at a suburban middle school said,

I think we helped each other because, you know, the way this is set up, we spend
a lot of our planning time in there together. So somebody figures it out and then
helps someone else through it. And they [sic] probably showed us.

Training is integral if teachers and administrators are expected to use the process

well. Where there is little training happening teachers expressed lack of ability to use the

system, which may translate into lack of trust in the system or cause teachers to question

how the process will affect the outcome of the evaluation.

Where training is strong, focused and ongoing training appears to be a concern

among teachers. In some schools in which rubrics are being used, teachers felt

discussions and brainstorming were helpful at the onset of learning the teacher-evaluation

process but were concerned about ongoing training. Teachers would like to revisit

rubrics, artifacts, and have ongoing training.

Theme #5: Impact of feedback on teacher skill. Feedback's affect on teacher

skill should be among the most important aspects of the teacher-evaluation process; after

all, the teacher-evaluation process should be at least one mandatory time in which both

the teacher and administrator should enter into a meaningful discussion about what's

going on in the teacher's classroom. As one administrator stated,

> I think a lot of it helps them be more reflective. Not a lot of your veteran
> teachers, they know what they're supposed to do on a day-to-day basis and class-
> by-class basis. Maybe sometimes they get a little sloppy; they get busy with other
> things, and they're not as thorough as they should be. Through those
> conversations, it helps them reflect. Yeah, I started doing that. . . . Through those
> conversations, it helps them reflect, "Yeah, I used to do that when I first started
> teaching, but I kind of got away from it."

Subthemes included that teachers want and desire feedback, it is better than the

process, it needs to be timely as well as constructive and critical, and there must be

follow up.

Both groups stated feedback is an important part of the teacher-evaluation

process.

> One teacher stated,

> It may be worth noting that I'm a pretty big feedback person, and I always solicit
> feedback, even from people who aren't assigned to me. . . . I'm trying to get better
> all the time. I actually really like appraisals in general, not necessarily specific to
> [model this school uses], but I really do feel like I get a lot out of meetings with
> an appraiser. Like I said, I always take into consideration their suggestion for
> improvement, and that really lingers with me in different ways.

> Another teacher stated, "I'm a new teacher, and I want feedback!"

> Agreeing that new teachers want feedback, an administrator stated, "the younger

teachers who have gone through better training and everything, they're much more . . .

what's the right word? Much more adept, much more open to constructive criticism.
How can I get better?

Another administrator said, "All teachers like feedback, even the veterans. I think
the new teachers are coming to us needing feedback now. They are used to it as a part of
better teacher training. They want feedback."

There were many allusions to the effect of feedback on teacher skill noted by both
groups. One teacher at a large suburban middle school who reports a trusting relationship
with the appraiser stated about feedback, "So, so, I guess I would say, I do think about
those things afterwards, and if I think they're meaningful, try to incorporate them."

In regard to feedback, administrators reported they felt it was more important than
the process itself.

One administrator in a rural school stated, "I think the feedback provides them
with a basis of where to go. I think there's more success in giving the feedback than
there is in the process."

Another rural administrator stated about feedback, "It makes teachers take more
of a look at what they're doing, why they're doing it, maybe be more reflective."

The timeliness of feedback is no secret among educators, as they know students
must receive immediate feedback to make gains. This applies to feedback for teacher
growth as well. Most teacher-evaluation systems include the opportunity for a
pre-observation meeting, the observation, and then a post-observation meeting. Typically
the post-observation meeting is conducted as close to the observation itself to make
feedback timely.

A newer teacher in a smaller town used the teacher-evaluation process to solicit help from the appraiser in working with a problematic class. As part of the pre-observation meeting the teacher asked the appraiser to observe key students as well as be prepared to offer critical feedback as to how the teacher might more effectively manage the class. The teacher stated,

> so I had a new set of classes in January and [the appraiser] came in the second week of school, which is fine. I had a rough class of like 28 freshmen, 12 SPED [sic] kids in there, and the rest were at-risk students if that make sense. . . .So my pre-observation little questionnaire I had asked some advice to help manage this tough group of students. She got back to me, I think, in late March, and she didn't answer that question.

Another teacher said, "He was like, do you have any questions? You either say yes or no. When I did ask and said, 'Hey, you can work on time management?' [checked on the evaluation], it was, 'Well, everybody can work on that.'"

The same teacher continued about how feedback impacts instruction,

> Really it doesn't. If you can't point to a specific issue where I am having classroom management issues. Hey, you've got two kids in the back that are constantly chatting, or you have no way to bring your class back. If you let them have that partner time to discuss an answer, it took you thirty seconds to get their attention again. He didn't have any of those specific instances for me to work on. I didn't know – there was nothing for me to work on. He was like, "Oh, keep working on it. Everyone can work on classroom management."

At least one administrator talked about the on-going conversations that are taking place among staff members. Though these meetings aren't considered feedback per se, the administrator stated that those conversations were, perhaps, having more impact on the teacher-evaluation process. The administrator shared, "Not to the extent it [feedback impacting teacher skill] should. I think what's impacting teachers' skills is [sic] the conversations that happen outside of the evaluation instrument."

Lastly, follow up was believed to be an important part of feedback as well. While no administrators spoke about feedback, two teachers discussed how follow up would benefit them.

One middle school teacher said,

we don't really see a lot of comparing from year to year to see if we've moved categories or if we've stayed the same. Within a year you can, but I think it would be interesting to go back and see what my rubric looked like a few years ago and compare it to where I am at now to see if there are areas that I've fallen in.

A rural high school teacher in a smaller school who had asked for help to manage a particularly difficult class during the pre-observation meeting, not only received feedback three months later, but the administrator didn't check with the teacher to ask if management was improving or could the teacher still benefit from help, nor did the administrator offer to help.

Another teacher in a rural setting said,

hey, these are some things I noticed you could work on. Then give you that opportunity for places to work, for them to check back with you. Hey, we talked about time management at your last evaluation; do you feel like you're getting better at that? Do you need additional resources or training? . . . Then it gives you a purpose for those random walk-throughs, informal evaluations that your principal is supposed to do, too. If they don't have anything you're working towards, what's the point of the walk-throughs?

While both teachers and administrators felt feedback was important and impacts teacher skill, there was still some question within and between both groups about whether or not feedback is, indeed, improving teacher skills. Timely feedback, critical and constructive feedback, and follow up were agreed to be essential elements of the feedback process.

Additional Themes and Subthemes based on Interviews

    Theme #6: Purpose of teacher evaluation. The purpose of teacher evaluation

has long been at the core of the debate as to why the process is needed. In recent times

and over the history of education, teacher evaluation has been an important part of

education, and the why of teacher evaluation has been traced back to the early experts.

Both teachers and administrators talked about the purpose as well.

    Teachers talked specifically about the information gleaned from the process and

for what it's used while administrators still talked about the process making a difference,

especially if teachers were only performing on the day of their observations.

    One teacher said of the electronic information saved from the teacher-evaluation

process, "It's again that system serving itself and creating work that feels repetitive and

probably untapped or unready. You imagine crickets, that there's really maybe no one

who's checking in on what I'm saying."

    The teacher with three years of experience said,

> hey, these are some things I noticed you could work on. Then give you that
> opportunity for places to work, for them to check back with you. Hey, we talked
> about time management at your last evaluation; do you feel like you're getting
> better at that? Do you need additional resources or training? . . . Then it gives
> you a purpose for those random walk-throughs, informal evaluations that your
> principal is supposed to do too. If they don't have anything you're working
> towards, what's the point of the walk-throughs?

    A middle school teacher said,

> My administrator said that's [student connections] something that I really shine
> on. I should keep that up. I don't want to regress. That is maybe one flaw that I
> would say about this particular system is we don't really see a lot of comparing
> from year to year to see if we've moved categories [proficiency levels] or we've
> stayed the same.

A high school teacher in an urban setting said, "I don't know if they were hoping

for great advances between this and the old system. I don't know. Maybe there have

been some." The same teacher said, "I think there must be very few teachers who look at

this with gratefulness and say, "Thank God! 'Cause I wasn't doing so well, and you

really helped!"

Administrators questioned the authenticity of the process if teachers are still

putting on "dog and pony" shows. Others spoke about whether or not the process really

does make a difference in teacher skill. One administrator said, "I don't know whether

that [teacher evaluation] impacts student learning. We can only hope."

Another administrator said, "Still I wonder, does it [teacher evaluation] make a

difference?"

A great amount of effort locally, statewide, nationally, and even internationally

has been put into identifying the best way to evaluate teachers. Regardless of the

training, the adopting of new models and processes, incorporation of technology, or other

changes, efforts, or movements, both teachers and administrators are still skeptical of the

purpose of teacher evaluation. Interestingly, not one teacher or administrator spoke about

using evaluations to collect evidence against poorly performing teachers, so perhaps there

is a more positive perception about why teachers go through the process.

Theme #7: Language used in teacher evaluation. The issue of language in

teacher evaluation was observed in two ways: (a) language of the process, and

(b) language used to describe the process.

Language of the process refers to that which the teachers and administrators used

to identify parts of the process. For example, when teachers or administrators began to

talk about the proficiency levels of the teacher-evaluation instrument used in their districts, they struggled to identify the terminology used in the scales or rubrics.

When a middle school teacher with 12 years of experience talked about whether or not new teachers in the building may feel as though they're being monitored, the teacher said, "Well, especially since you're called a probationary teacher." The concern was with the negative connotation of the word probationary. It was the teacher's suggesting that such words might imply a different purpose of the process.

One administrator, whose school is among the 17 schools in Nebraska piloting one of two new teacher-evaluation models, said language of the process changed in the building. The administrator said, "Then, with the pre-observation and post-observation conversations – they're not meetings anymore; they're called conversations."

Other administrators and teachers talked about common language, which has helped them throughout the process.

One administrator said,

If you're speaking a common language, if you know what good teaching looks like, if you know what that goals of the district are, what the goals of each individual teacher are, then you sit down and have that evaluation. Everyone's on the same page as far as here's what great looks like, here's what good looks like, here's what mediocre looks like.

Two teachers talked about brainstorming lists so all teachers in the building would know what items would be considered good artifacts to be used as support of the teacher's goals, comments, and reflections on the teacher evaluation.

The second area of language addressed was that language used to describe the teacher-evaluation process. Consistently, when either group asserted whether or not the teacher-evaluation process was effective, both teachers and administrators used more

tentative rather than definitive language to answer. Table 19 shows the first few words of

the statement from each group, when each educator was asked, "Does teacher evaluation

accurately assess teacher performance?"

Table 19

Beginning Teacher and Administrator responses when asked, "Does teacher evaluation

accurately assess teacher performance?

Respondent	Administrator Responses	Teacher Responses
1	Right now, I don't feel . . .	Just because I'm hearing . . .
2	You know, I think . . .	This system is a lot more thorough . . .
3	I feel that it does the job . . .	Well, I don't know . . .
4	We don't have a very good one . . .	I don't think, at our school at least . . .
5	I think our new process has stepped everything up in a good way.	I would say, this is one subject that really frustrates me because
6	I think it's a lot more accurate of what goes in.	I think an appraisal is like any grade I give . . .

Teachers also used words like "hope," as in "I hope it's [teacher evaluation]

making a difference," or "feel," as in, "I feel I have strong relationship with my

administrator," when talking about the ability of the process. One teacher said about the

feedback given, "I guess I would say I do think about those things afterwards. . . ."

When participants discussed elements of the teacher-evaluation process that were

more negatively perceived aspects, teachers and administrators used more definitive

language. When one teacher talked about the impact of the feedback received, the

teacher simply stated, "Really it doesn't." The same teacher spoke about collaboration

the same way, "I would say this is one subject that really frustrates me. . . ." This teacher didn't appear to be tentative about the feelings associated with the appraisal process in this teacher's experience. In other words, she didn't "think" the process was ineffective in her situation; she "knew" it was.

The theme of language appeared for both teachers and administrators and each demonstrated areas in which it was important. One teacher noted the pejorative sound of the term used to describe a new teacher (probationary" while an administrator had made efforts to change the pejorative sound of the process (pre- and post-observation meetings are now called conversations). Both teachers and administrators were tentative rather than definitive when stating absolutes about the positive effects or aspects of the teacher-evaluation process.

Theme #8: Suggestions for the process. Though not solicited, administrators and teachers offered suggestions; after all, they're the ones who are in the thick of the process. Whether they were using a well-established instrument, piloting one of the two models for the state of Nebraska, or in the first few years of a new process, each group offered suggestions.

One middle school teacher who talked about extra duties a teacher may perform said, "I'm the first one to volunteer for anything that needs to be done . . . .I don't know if there's a different place for that."

Another middle school teacher mentioned the lack of longitudinal use of data from the process and stated, "That is maybe a flaw that I would say about this particular system is we don't really see a lot of comparing from year to year to see if we've moved categories or if we've stayed the same."

One teacher felt teachers are evaluated on items even when they aren't present in the lesson. The teacher stated, "most of the time they're pretty accurate with mine, with the performance that they see, it just troubles me sometimes that they have to give you a grade for something that wasn't present in the class that day." The teacher's concern being "downgraded or perhaps not be proficient as possible because they still have to mark you for something they didn't observe."

Administrators offered suggestions, too. One rural administrator said there must be more consistency and conversation,

> The whole idea is that we're supposed to be sitting down having a conversation about good practice and what's going on in the classroom and having that common-language approach and making sure people are on the same page . . . .I still think there's [sic] times on this one where we sit down, and I've even had to mention. . . . What I have down here maybe isn't exactly how the previous principal may have viewed this particular section.

More collaboration was a suggestion as well. One middle school administrator said, "so much more planned for, expected time to talk about curriculum. Not only curriculum, but what good teaching is and how they do it."

A rural administrator talked about frequency of observation and the need to include peer observation as a part of the process. The administrator said,

> We'd all like to say it's to improve our teachers' skills in the classroom. It's got to be more often and it's not only to be the administrator, but I think we need to get into the peer-to-peer observations as well because colleagues help each other out all the time.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation and the quantitative data gathered in Phase I of the study paired with the

qualitative data gathered in Phase II of this study help the researcher to explore the

perceptions. Chapter VI presents the summary, discussion, and recommendations based

on the study.

Chapter VI

Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

Data obtained from this study begins to shed light on how secondary English teachers and administrators in Nebraska perceive the teacher evaluation process. There were differences perceived within and between teachers and administrators both quantitatively and qualitatively. Chapter VI will summarize, discuss the results, and offer recommendations as brought forth by this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation. The respondents for the study were Nebraska secondary English teachers and Nebraska administrators who have completed the teacher evaluation process at least once in the current school building in which they work.

Summary

Determining the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation served as the frame for this study. Quantitative data was collected in Phase I using a web-based survey to study participants' perceptions about teacher evaluation in their schools. Qualitative data was collected from open-ended questions using individual interviews in Phase II of the study. The researcher chose a sequential mixed-methods model to more closely examine and explain the findings from the study. The comparison of the two groups is provided in the final chapter to expand on the breadth of the study.

Discussion

The findings of this study occurred during a changing teacher-evaluation process for Nebraska secondary English teachers and the administrators who conduct them. A statewide pilot involving 17 schools, each piloting either Marzano's or Danielson's teacher evaluation, is in its second year while schools not participating expressed discontent with their current models.

Six research questions comprised the collection and analysis of data within the Phase I quantitative portion of the study. They included:

1. What is the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process?

2. What is the relationship between the administrator and teacher?

3. How do administrators determine the quality of their teachers?

4. To what extent does collaboration play a part in the teacher evaluation process?

5. What kind of training has both the evaluator and teacher received regarding the evaluation process?

6. To what extent do the teacher and administrator feel the feedback given (as a part of the evaluation process) is useful to teacher growth?

The mixed-methods model for the study was sequential as perceptions were analyzed in the Phase I quantitative portion of the study and then explained in the follow up qualitative phase. The interview protocol was aligned with Phase I of the survey and the themes identified for the qualitative analysis aligned accordingly:

- The effect of relationship between administrator and teacher on teacher-evaluation process

- The effect of teacher evaluations accuracy in assessing teachers' skills

- The effect of collaboration on teacher skill

- Training of educators to take part in and use the teacher evaluation

- The effect of feedback on teacher skill

- The purpose of teacher evaluation

- Language of teacher evaluation

  o Language used in the process

  o Language used to describe the process

- Suggestions

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

When administrators responded to the statements in the section of the purpose of teacher evaluation as perceived by Nebraska secondary English teachers and Nebraska administrators, significance (p < .05) was noted on three related statements:

1. (#1) The teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of teaching.

2. (#2) The teacher-evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of student learning.

3. (#3) The teacher-evaluation process focuses on the identification of professional development for teachers.

Administrators' mean score for these three statements was "agree," while teachers' mean score was "neither agree nor disagree." Whatever the reason for the difference, teachers are not as confident as administrators that the teacher-evaluation process is raising

standards of teaching, standards of student learning, or identifying the professional development needs of teachers.

Given this information, significance was also noted when administrators' had a mean "agree" (teachers' mean "neither agree nor disagree") to statement (#5), "The results of the teacher-evaluation process are used for accountability purposes." Nebraska secondary English teachers may have had a higher mean score for accountability if they felt more favorably that the process was raising teaching standards, learning standards, and identifying professional development needs.

Purpose of the teacher-evaluation process is not seen the same for both teachers and administrators as shown through quantitative data; however, with qualitative data, both groups appeared to question the purpose. "Still, I wonder, does it [teacher evaluation] makes a difference?" asked one administrator. A teacher similarly stated, "You imagine crickets [figuratively, where all the observation results are kept electronically], that there's really maybe no one who's checking in on what I'm saying." When teachers and administrators are asked closed-end questions about teacher evaluation, they appear to be less in agreement; when allowed to elaborate through open-ended questions, they appear to be more in agreement.

Quality of Teacher Evaluation

The second section of the quantitative survey examined the quality of the teacher-evaluation process as perceived by teachers. While significance ($p < .05$) was noted on seven of the 17 statements, Nebraska secondary English teachers and administrators both gave the same mean score for the following three statements:

1. (#20) Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel students have better reading skills.

2. (#21) Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel students have better writing skills.

3. (#22) Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I feel any achievement gap in my classes has been narrowed.

When discussing the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process for English teachers, not only should achievement increase, but also student reading and writing skill. Nebraska secondary English teachers' and their administrators' mean scores were "disagree" or "strongly disagree."

Comparing this result with that of quality in section one of the online survey, teachers and administrators may have similar feelings for the above quality statements, for teachers "neither agreed nor disagreed" about the purpose of the teacher-evaluation process being to raise the standards of teaching, the standards of learning, and identify professional development needs.

As a result, teachers' mean score for the following two statements was "disagree," while significance was only noted on the number 24.

1. (#23) Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I have made significant changes in the way I instruct my classes.

2. (#24) Because of the teacher-evaluation process, I have made significant changes in the way I assess my students.

Nebraska secondary English teachers are not compelled to change methods of instruction or assessment as a result of participating in the teacher-evaluation process, and administrators are not entirely convinced teachers are making changes either.

Quality of the teacher-evaluation process is viewed much the same by both administrators and teachers; they both question whether or not the process is one of quality. Qualitatively, teachers mentioned being assessed on skills the appraiser doesn't observe because the appraiser has to, they feel there are elements of subjectivity to the process, and that even when the appraiser does a formal and a few informal observations, the process is still a snapshot evaluation. Qualitatively, administrators felt more confident about the process; however, they still mentioned concerns about evaluating a "dog and pony show" and not the true teacher, instruments with unclear objectives, and antiquated teacher-evaluation instruments. At the same time, both groups had positive remarks about the quality of the process, usually when involved with an updated or state-piloted process.

Training for Teacher Evaluation

Section three of the online survey examined perceptions about the training involved in the teacher evaluation process. For the five statements in this section, administrators' mean scores were "agree," while teachers' means scores were "neither agree nor disagree."

Significance ($p < .05$) was noted on two similar statements:

1. (# 25) I have the necessary training to participate in the teacher-evaluation process.

2. (#27) I participated in formal training regarding the teacher-evaluation

   instrument.

This doesn't mean teachers feel training is essential to the teacher-evaluation process;

however, it suggests they are unclear about the training received. The training received

about use of the instrument or the process might be a reflection of the importance either

the school, the district, or both places upon the teacher-evaluation process and thus

imparted unto the teachers, whom the process may affect the most.

When asked to respond to open-ended questions about training, administrators

were still more confident in their responses. A few veteran administrators stated how

much training has improved (for administrators) since they first began several years ago.

However, a few administrators expressed concerns like those of teachers. One

administrator said the training was nearly non-existent. Some teachers expressed the

same comments. Those who did remember training were strained to recall exactly how it

took place. One teacher said, "Well, you know, now that you mention domains, I do

remember a very long period of time it seemed like when we went through, we even in

small groups, brainstormed ideas of artifacts. . . . "

The Impact of Feedback on Teacher Skill

Section Four of the online survey examined the impact of feedback on teacher

skill. Significance (p < .05) was noted on three similar questions:

1. (#30) The feedback from the teacher-evaluation process is supportive of

   teacher growth.

2. (#33) The teacher-evaluation process has made me more aware of my

   strengths.

3. (#34) The teacher-evaluation process has made me more aware of my areas in need of improvement.

Teachers' mean scores were "neither agree nor disagree" and administrators' mean scores were slightly higher. Growth can occur with untimely and poor feedback, but it's likely to be limited. Teachers and administrators alike would agree that critical, constructive, and timely feedback is essential for growth.

The results may also be tied to quality when teachers and administrators were asked to rank their agreement with statements about how much teacher evaluation has changed their instructional or assessment process. If the feedback process is viewed as not informative, unhelpful, or nonspecific, making change can be difficult because areas in need of improvement aren't pinpointed.

Qualitative, open-ended responses were similar for both teachers and administrators; however, both groups talked more about the importance of feedback rather than the impact it has on teacher skill. One teacher uses the feedback to help make decisions. "So one of mine [strengths] is always building relationships and maintaining relationships with kids. So I use those that I'm already excelling at as a motivation to keep doing those kinds of things." The specific example wasn't exactly about instructional skill, per se, but it does reinforce the impact feedback makes on the teacher's teaching.

Teachers were mostly concerned about the timeliness and specificity of feedback for its bearing on teacher skill. One teacher said general feedback comments made no difference. Another said the administrator puts the same comment on everyone's evaluation – classroom management – because everyone can work on it. In turn the

administrator offers no specific guidance or suggestions to improve upon classroom management.

Administrators agree that feedback is important to impact teacher skill. They state teachers like feedback, must be receptive to it, it helps reflection, and feedback is better than the teacher-evaluation process. "I think there's more success in giving the feedback than there is in the process." Another administrator said, "We're getting better at giving constructive feedback without the teacher feeling threatened."

Collaboration in Teacher Evaluation

The impact of collaboration on teacher skill was section five of the online survey. Significance ($p < .05$) was noted on each of the three statements in this section:

1. (#36) At the pre-observation meeting, telling my evaluator what to look for focuses my teacher evaluation.

2. (#37) The discussion between my evaluator and me in the pre-observation meeting focuses upon the key elements of the observation.

3. (#38) In the evaluation process the collaboration between the evaluator and the teacher has helped teachers become better teachers.

For each of these statements, teachers' mean scores were "neither agree nor disagree," as were administrators' except for statement #36, which was "agree." Teachers and administrators exhibited similar feelings about collaboration, that as a part of the pre-observation, it's not likely that it's impacting teacher skill heavily.

Qualitatively, collaboration was difficult for both groups to address. A few teachers confused collaboration with feedback. One teacher said, "So, so, I guess I would say I do think about those things afterwards [feedback from the evaluation], and if I think

they're meaningful, try to incorporate them." But one teacher who talked about collaboration talked about it being administratively driven. Administrators spoke favorably about collaboration in every aspect except that it takes more time. They said it should be teacher driven, that teacher evaluation should be a conversation, and that collaboration, when done well, even helped veteran teachers make growth when those teachers often feel they don't have any room to grow.

The Effects of Relationship on Teacher Evaluation

Significance was not noted on any of the three statements in this section of the online survey. Both teachers and administrators were very close to agreement that relationship has an effect on the teacher-evaluation process.

Teachers and administrators did, however, differ in their responses to the statement "My evaluator established a relationship with me before the evaluation process began." Teachers' mean score was "neither agree nor disagree," while administrators' mean score was agree. As previously stated, no significance ($p < .05$) was noted.

The qualitative responses to the open-ended questions elaborated more on the quantitative data for this section. Teachers and administrators overwhelmingly agreed with 4 of 6 teachers and administrators stating that a positive relation is a key factor for the teacher-evaluation process. Both teachers and administrators talked about trust as well, and the delicate balancing act trust building requires. Teachers who feel they can trust their administrator state they feel safety as well.

Miscellaneous Statements about Teacher Evaluation

No significance was noted for the two statements included in this section of the online survey.

Qualitatively, no follow-up question was asked about teachers taking part in the development of the teacher-evaluation instrument; however, based on responses, no teachers would have as they were either too new to have participated in its development, a part of the statewide pilot, or a part of a district that adopted a national model such as that of Danielson or Marzano. One administrator mentioned that he would add peer observation to the teacher-evaluation process if he had the opportunity to do so.

Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation. Nebraska administrators and Nebraska secondary English teachers appeared to agree on the following:

- Teacher evaluation should have purpose
- Teacher evaluation should be of quality including quality training for teachers and administrators
- A positive and trusting relationship between the administrator and teachers is necessary in the teacher-evaluation process
- Feedback from the teacher-evaluation process is important
- Collaboration in the teacher-evaluation process is important (peer evaluation)

With these statements noted, the researcher makes the following recommendations based on his view of the data presented in this study.

The data collected by the study can serve as an aid for Nebraska secondary English teachers and Nebraska administrators to improve the teacher-evaluation process while engaging in and working through it. While neither English teachers nor

administrators identified a consistent purpose for teacher evaluation, both groups agreed there is a purpose.

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference between Nebraska administrators' and Nebraska secondary English teachers' perceptions of the teacher-evaluation process. Based on the analysis of this study and the purpose of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Recommendation #1. English teachers overwhelmingly scored statements in the purpose of the teacher evaluation section "neither agree nor disagree" while administrators scored the same statements "agree." This discrepancy isn't because English teachers don't believe teacher evaluation has purpose because both groups "agree" that they understand an overall purpose of teacher evaluation. Administrators and especially teachers must thoughtfully engage in the process for significant improvement in education to occur.

Recommendation #2. Not only must the teacher-evaluation process be of quality, but the teacher-evaluation instrument must be of quality, too. Both English teachers' and administrators' mean scores were predominantly in the "neither agree nor disagree" for this section. School districts must use up-to-date teacher evaluations as well as engage teachers and administrators thoroughly and thoughtfully as they go through the process. As well, teachers and administrators must have high-quality, ongoing training to establish common language and expectations, which would make the process less subjective.

Recommendations #3. English teachers and administrators agreed trust is an important part of the teacher-evaluation process. Administrators must continue to build

safe, trusting relationships with those whom they evaluate in order for teachers to feel like the process is not only worth while, but will also help them make positive changes. This is especially necessary for those deemed deficient or veteran teachers who may feel they don't need to grow because of experience and wisdom.

Recommendation #4. Both groups agreed feedback is the most important part of the teacher-evaluation process. Teachers must be receptive to the criticism and administrators must give feedback that is meaningful, not statements given to all teachers because all teachers can make improvements. Also observed by both groups, English teachers who are new to the profession (teachers who have just earned degrees and teaching certificates) are accustomed to and are seeking feedback; therefore, administrators must be willing to spend time with new teachers giving them feedback, time to reflect, and time to grow.

Recommendation #5. Both English teachers and administrators defined collaboration differently. The common language developed in better training will help both groups not only understand what collaboration is, but also understand the difference between it and feedback. Clear understanding of collaboration will allow teachers to continue to improve their skills. Additionally, teachers must view administrators as instructional leaders; teachers must view them as more than someone who provides a summative evaluation and discipline. When this change takes place, teachers can begin to rely on administrators as instructional experts for instructional advice and collaboration can take effect.

Future Research

  This study only analyzed Nebraska public secondary English teachers and the administrators who evaluate them, so the results cannot be generalized nor applied to other content areas or grade levels in public education. After analysis of the data from this study, the following suggestions for future research are proposed:

  Proposal #1. Because this study only analyzed secondary English teachers and their evaluating administrators in Nebraska, additional studies are needed in other content and levels of education. Teachers and administrators of other curriculum areas and other grade levels may respond differently to survey and interview questions. Studies in other content and grade levels are needed to provide insight into how other teachers and administrators perceive the teacher-evaluation process.

  Proposal #2. The purpose of teacher evaluation among secondary English teachers and their evaluating administrators in Nebraska appears to be unclear. The teachers' mean score was lower than administrators' mean score, and one teacher and one administrator stated they were unsure anyone looks at the final documentation of the teacher-evaluation process. Further studies are recommended, as this study did not flesh out the purpose of teacher evaluation.

References

Allen, M. (2013, January). I've got my teacher evaluation. Now what? *TransformED*.
Retrieved from http://transformed.teachingquality.org/blogs/01-2013/i-ve-got-my-
teacher-evaluation-now-what

Anderson, J. (2013, March). Curious grade for teachers: Nearly all pass. *The New York
Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/education/curious-
grade-for-teachers-nearly-all-pass.html?ref=nyregion&_r=1&

Babel, J. (1972). *Teacher appraisal: How to make it more meaningful*. Paper presented at
104th American Association of School Administrators Annual Convention,
Atlantic City, NJ.

Bartlett, S. (1998). Teacher perceptions of the purpose of staff appraisal: A response to
Kyriacou. *Teacher Development, 3*(2), 479-491.

Beerens, D. R. (2000). *Evaluating teachers for professional growth: Creating a culture of
motivation and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Berkowicz, J., & Myers, A. (2013, February). Teacher and principal evaluation that
makes a difference. *Education Week*. Retrieved from
http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/leadership_360/2013/02/teacher_and_principal_e
valuation_that_makes_a_difference.html?qs=leadership+360

Bradshaw, L., & Glatthorn, A. (2001). *Teacher evaluation for better student learning*.
Lancaster, PA: ProActive.

Bridges, E. M. (1992). *The incompetent teacher: Managerial responses* (2nd ed.).
Philadelphia: Falmer.

Briggs, D., & Domingue, B. (2011). *Due diligence and the evaluation of teachers: A review of the value-added analysis underlying the effectiveness rankings of Los Angeles unified school district teachers by the Los Angeles times*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center.

Cambridge Institute of Education (1989). *Report on the evaluation of the school teacher appraisal pilot study*. Cambridge: CIE.

Carlson, R. V., & Park, R. (1976). *Teacher evaluation: Relevant concepts and related procedures*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Burlington.

Chow, A., Wong, E., Yeung, A., & Mo, K. (2002). Teachers' perceptions of appraiser-appraisee relationships. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 19*(1), 67-85.

Coggshall, J., Rasmussen, C., Colton, A., Milton, J., & Jacques, C. (2012). *Generating teaching effectiveness: The role of job-embedded professional learning in teacher evaluation*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1969). *Measuring faculty performance (Research Report No. 690 262)*. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Colby, S., Bradshaw, L., & Joyner, R. (2002, April). *Teacher evaluation: A review of the literature.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Conley, S., & Glasman, N. (2008). Fear, the school organization and teacher evaluation. *Educational Policy, 22*, 63-85.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Cubberly, E. P. (1923). *The principal and his school: The organizations, administration, and supervision of instruction in an elementary school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Cubberly, E. P. (1929). *Public school administration: A statement of the fundamental principals underlying the organization and administration of public education.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Curtis, R., & Wiener, R. (2012). *Means to an end: A guide to developing teacher evaluation systems that support growth and development.* Aspen, CO: The Aspen Institute.

Dane, F. C. (2011). *Evaluating research: Methodology for people who need to read research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluations. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 12-15.

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

Danielson, C. (2012). Observing classroom practice. *Educational Leadership, 3*(70), 32-37.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypotheses from a national commission report. *Educational Researcher, 27,* 5-15.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching.* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2011). Getting teacher evaluation right: A background paper for policy makers. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association National Academy of Education.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A., & Pease, S. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 53*(3), 285-328.

Denning, S. (2011). *The single best idea for reforming k-12 education.* [Web log comment]. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com

Diejk, J. (2012, February 9). State creating teacher evaluation system. *The World-Herald.* Retrieved from http://www.omaha.com/

Dillman, D. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Dudney, G. (2002). *Facilitating teacher development through supervisory class observations (ED Report No. 469715).* Monterey, CA: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center.

Ediger, M. (2000, February). *How should teachers be assessed?* Retrieved from

    http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED440987.pdf

Flores, M. (2011). *Teachers' perceptions on a new policy on teacher performance*

    appraisal in Portugal. Retrieved from University of Minho, Portugal website:

    http://hdl.handle.net/1822/15720.pdf

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A*

    research synthesis. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher

    Quality.

Goldstein, J., & Noguera, P. (2006). A thoughtful approach to teacher evaluation.

    Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 3(6), 31-37.

Good, T. L., & Mulryan, C. (1990). Teacher ratings: A call for teacher control and

    self-evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The New Handbook*

    of Teacher Evaluation (pp. 191-215). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gray, F. (1975). *How successful is performance evaluation?* Paper presented at the 107th

    Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators,

    Dallas, TX

Gullickson, A., & Howard, B. (2009). *Personnel evaluation standards: How to assess*

    systems for evaluating educators (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Harris, D. N. (2010). Clear away the smoke and mirrors of value-added. *Phi Delta Kappa*

    International, 91(8), 66-69.

Heichberger, R., & Young, J. (1975). Teacher perceptions of supervision and evaluation.

    Phi Delta Kappan, 57, 210.

Isoré, M. (2009). Teacher evaluation: Current practices in OECD countries and a

    literature review. *OECD Education Working Papers,* No. 23, OECD Publishing.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/223283631428

Jick, T. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action.

    Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 602-611.

Kyriacou, C. (1997). Appraiser's views of teacher appraisal. *Teacher Development, 1*,

    35–41.

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review,*

    53(1), 27-35. doi: 10.1080/00131910120033628

Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1977). Teacher stress: A review. *Educational Review, 29*,

    299-306.

Larsen, M. (2005). A critical analysis of teacher evaluation policy trends. *Australian*

    Journal of Education, 49, 292-305.

Larsen, M. (2009). Stressful, hectic, daunting: A critical policy study of the Ontario

    performance appraisal system. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration*

    and Policy, (94), 1-44. Retrieved from

    http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ863211.pdf

Leong, F. T., & Austin, J. T. (2006). *The psychology research handbook: A guide for*

    graduate students and research assistants. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lo, C. (1998). Teacher appraisal-perceptions of appraisers (middle managers) and

    appraisees (teachers in Hong Kong secondary schools). University of Hong Kong,

    Hong Kong.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of
Chicago Press.

Machell, J. (1995). The teacher evaluation environment: An examination of attributes
related to teacher growth. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9*(3),
259-273.

Marshall, K. (1996). How I confronted HSPS (hyperactive superficial principal
syndrome) and began to deal with the heart of the matter. *Phi Delta Kappan,
77*(5), 336-346.

Marshall, K. (2012). Fine-tuning teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 3*(70),
50-53.

Marzano, R. (2012a). Reducing error in the teacher observation scores. *Educational
Leadership, 3(70)*, 82-83.

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

Marzano, R. (2014). *Nebraska teacher performance framework and the Marzano casual
teacher evaluation model alignment guide [Evaluation Alignment Guide].* West
Palm Beach, FL: Learning Sciences Marzano Center.

Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting
the art and science of teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development.

McDaniel, A. (2008). *Teachers' and principals' perceptions of the teacher performance
appraisal system in selected schools.* (Master's thesis, University of West Indes).
Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2139/2381

McFadden, D. N. (1970). *Project D: Appraising teacher performance (Report No. EA 005-055).* Columbus, OH: School Management Inst.

McLauglin, M. W. (1990). Embracing contraries: Implementing and sustaining teacher evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation* (pp. 403-415). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1984). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Natriello, G. (1990). Intended and unintended consequences: Purposes and effects of teacher evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp. 35-45). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nebraska Department of Education. (2012a). *Developing teacher/principal model evaluation systems.* Presented at Administrator Days, Kearney, NE.

Nebraska Department of Education. (2012b). *Rule 10: Regulations and procedures for the accreditation of schools (revised).* Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Department of Education.

Newton, X., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., & Thomas, E. (2010). Value-added modeling of teacher effectiveness: An exploration of stability across models and contexts. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 18*(23). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/810

Nuernberger-Currin, D. (1992). *Making sense of teaching: Novice and expert supervisors.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations and Thesis. University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Ovando, M. (2001). Teacher's perceptions of a learner-centered teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15*(3), 213-231.

Owens, R. G. (1991). *Organizational behavior in education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pallas, A. M. (2011). Measuring what matters. *Kappan, 92*(4), 68-71.

Pathe, S., & Choe, J. (2013, February). A brief overview of teacher evaluation controversies. *American Graduate*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2013/02/teacher-evaluation-controversies.html

Peaker, G. (1986). Teacher management and appraisal in two school systems in the southern USA. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 12*(1), 77-83.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Peterson, K. D. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(63), 60-79.

Pithers, R. T., & Soden, R. (1998). Scottish and Australian teacher stress and strain: A comparative study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*(2), 269-279.

Platte Institute for Economic Research. (2012). *Teacher selection and evaluation in Nebraska*. Omaha, NE: Alger

Redfern, G. B. (1973, August). *Involvement – a keyword in a performance evaluation program*. Paper presented at the Kentucky Association of School Administrators Meeting, Louisville, KY.

Redfield, D. L., Craig, J. R., & Elliott, J. (1989). *The role of student outcomes in dual purpose teacher evaluation systems: A model for meeting top down and bottom up needs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association San Francisco, CA.

Research for Action. (2009). *Philadelphia's teacher appraisal system: Needs improvement*. Philadelphia, PA: Royal & Tossman. Retrieved from http://www.researchforaction.org

Sartain, L., Stgoelinga, S. R., Brown, E., with Luppescu. S., Kapadia Matsko, K., Miller, F. K., Durwood, C., Jiang, J. Y., & Glazer, D. (2011). *Rethinking teacher evaluation in Chicago: Lessons learned from classroom observations, principal-teacher conferences, and district implementation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Urban Education Institute.

Sawchuk, S. (2013, February). Teachers' ratings still high despite new measures: changes to evaluation systems yield only subtle differences. *Education Week 32*(20). Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2013/02/06

Scriven, M. (1973). *Handbook for model training program in qualitative educational evaluation.* Berkely, CA: University of California Press.

Searles, W. E., & Kudeki, N. (1987). A comparison of teacher and principal perception of an outstanding science teacher. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24*(1), 1-13.

Shinkfield, A., & Stufflebeam, D. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice.* Boston, MA: Kluwer.

Simon, M. (2012, November). A tale of two districts. *Educational Leadership*, *3*(70).

    Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org

Smith, S. C., & Piele, P. K. (1989). *School leadership: Handbook for excellence* (2nd

    ed.). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Sorenson, G., & Gross, C. F. (1967). *Teacher appraisal: A watching process (Research*

    Report No. CSEIP-OR04). Los Angeles, CA: California University, Los Angeles.

Stanely, S. J., & Popham, W. J. (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success.*

    Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Storey, A. (2000). A leap of faith? Performance pay for teachers. *Journal of Education*

    Policy, 55, 509-523.

Strauss, V. (2013). A 'value-added' travesty for an award-winning teacher. *The*

    Washington Post. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com

Strong, J., & Tucker, P. (1999). The politics of teacher evaluation: A case study of new

    system design and implementation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in*

    Education, 13(4), 339-359.

Strong, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2003). *Handbook on educational specialist evaluation.*

    Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.

Strong, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A

    cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student

    achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education,* (62), 339.

Sykes, G., & Dibner, K. (2009). *Fifty years of federal teacher policy: An appraisal.*

    Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Torff, B., & Sessions, D. N. (2005). Principals' perceptions of the causes of teacher ineffectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*(4), 530-537.

Troman, G. (2000). Teacher stress in the low-trust society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 21*(3), 331-353.

Tse Chun Yin, S. (2005). *Teachers' perceptions of the introduction of an appraisal system in a secondary school in relation to professional development*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Hong Kong).

Turpin, S. L. (2005). *Teachers' perceptions of the teacher appraisal process*. (Doctoral dissertation. Clemson University.)

Valliant, D. (2008). Algunos marcos referenciales en al evaluacion del desempeno docente. *Revista Iberoamaricana de Evaluacion Educativa, 1*(2), 7-22.

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). The widget effect. *Education Digest*, *75*(2), 31-35.

Wheeler, P., & Scriven, M. (2006). Building the foundation: Teacher roles and responsibilities. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 27-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Williams, T., Rosin, M., Perry, M., Webman, B., Wilson, K., Payne, R., & Morgan Woodward, K. (2010). *Gaining ground in the middle grades: Why some schools do better*. Mountain View: EdSource.

Wolf, R. (1973). How teachers feel toward evaluation. In E. House (Ed.), *School evaluation: The politics and process* (pp. 156-168). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Wood, N., & West, B. (1998). *The next steps: A guide for the continuous improvement instructional planning process. Professional development and appraisal system (PDAs)*. Retrieved from the Texas Education Agency, http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Wragg, E. C., Wikelye, F. J., Wragg, C. M., & Haynes, G. S. (1996). *Teacher appraisal observed.* London: Routledge.

Yariv, E. (2006). Mum effect: Principals' reluctance to submit negative feedback. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(6), 533-546.

Zimmerman, S., & Deckert-Pelton, M. (2003). Evaluating the evaluators: Teachers' perceptions of the principal's role in professional evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(636), 28-37.

Appendix A

Permissions to Borrow Survey Questions

(or parts of) From Previously Developed Surveys

Zimbra   **mmusil@lps.org**

RE: Permission to use part of your paper

From : Maria Assunção Flores Fernandes   Wed, Jan 23, 2013 03:04 PM
    <aflores@ie.uminho.pt>
Subject : RE: Permission to use part of your paper
   To : Mike Musil <mmusil@lps.org>

Hello!

No, problem, as long as you aknowledge it in your work.
Good luck!
Best wishes,

Maria Assunção Flores, Ph.D.
Institute of Education
University of Minho, Portugal
Tel. 00 351 253 604606

***** Next ICET World Assembly: 25-28 June 2013 in Nonthaburi, Thailand:
http://icet4u.org/

***** Next ISATT Conference: 2 - 5 July 2013 in Ghent, Belgium:
http://www.isatt2013.ugent.be/

De: Mike Musil [mailto:mmusil@lps.org]
Enviada: qua 23-01-2013 17:19
Para: Maria Assunção Flores Fernandes
Assunto: Permission to use part of your paper

Dear Ms. Assuncao Flores:

I'm a doctoral student at the University of Nebraska - Lincoln, USA. I'm doing my dissertation
on teacher evaluation and came across your paper "Teacher Perceptions on a New Policy on
Teacher Appraisal in Portugal." I'm writing to ask permission to use items from the Teacher
Survey Instrument.

Very sincerely,

Mike Musil

Re: Permission to use part of TPA Survey

From : Marianne A. Larsen <mlarsen@uwo.ca>   Mon, Apr 01, 2013 08:38 PM
Subject : Re: Permission to use part of TPA Survey
To : Mike Musil <mmusil@lps.org>

Dear Mike,
Yes, you have my permission to use some of the questions in my survey as long as you cite
the article that you found the survey in. If I can be of any other help for your dissertation
work, please let me know.
Very best wishes,
Marianne Larsen

Marianne Larsen, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Faculty of Education
Western University
1137 Western Rd.
London, Ontario, CANADA
N6G 1G7

Phone: 519 - 661-2111, ext. 80159
Fax: 519 661-3833
On 04/01/13, **Mike Musil** <mmusil@lps.org> wrote:

> Hi Ms. Larsen,
>
> I'm a doctoral candidate at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA. I'm writing my
> dissertation about perceptions of teacher evaluation and would like to use some of the
> questions from your survey used and discussed in your paper "Stressful, Hectic,
> Daunting," as it appeared in the Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and
> Policy, Issue #95, October 26, 2009. The article will, of course, be cited in my works
> cited, and I will give you mention as I would like to use a few of the survey questions
> you developed as a part of my survey.
>
> Very sincerely,
> Mike Musil
> Doctoral Candidate
> University of Nebraska - Lincoln

--

Appendix B

Survey Instrument Used for Teachers and Administrators

The Purpose of the Nebraska Teacher Evaluation Process

Teacher Survey

Purpose of the Study: This research study will examine the perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding the Nebraska teacher evaluation process. The survey below focuses on statements about the teacher evaluation process in your school.

In effort to represent all areas of education, please answer the following information:

1. How many students are enrolled in your school

    a. More than 1,100

    b. Between 500 – 1,099

    c. Between 201 - 499

    d. Between 100 – 200

    e. Under 100

2. In which content do you teach the majority of your day (please identify abbreviations used, i.e. FCS would be Family and Consumer Sciences)

3. How many total years have you taught?

4. Gender?

Continue

Directions: In each section you will place an X indicating the degree to which you agree

with statement.

The following statements address the teacher evaluation process in your school.					
Item					
Purpose	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
1. The teacher evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of teaching.					
2. The teacher evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of learning.					
3. The teacher evaluation process focuses on the identification of my professional development needs.					
4. The teacher evaluation process provides useful information for me to improve my performance.					
5. The results of the teacher evaluation process are used for accountability purposes.					
6. I think the teacher evaluation process is threatening for me.					
7. I understand the purpose of the teacher evaluation process.					

Quality	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
8. The teacher evaluation process results are reliable.					
9. The number of classroom teacher observations is adequate to evaluate my instructional skills.					
10. The rating system used to evaluate teachers is useful for my growth.					
11. The indicators on the teacher evaluation instrument take into the critical aspects my teaching.					
12. The teacher evaluation process allows me to explain the classroom decisions and actions.					
13. Once the post-observation meeting takes place, teachers feel the teacher evaluation process is dependable.					
14. Evaluators make two or more informal visits throughout the year.					
15. The pre-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher evaluation process.					
16. The post-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher evaluation process.					

Training	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
17. I feel I have the necessary training to participate in the teacher evaluation process.					
18. I understand each of the indicators on the teacher evaluation instrument.					
19. I participated in formal training regarding the teacher evaluation instrument.					
20. I feel the evaluator has the required knowledge to conduct my teacher evaluation.					
21. My evaluator is viewed as an instructional leader in my school.					
Feedback	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
22. I feel the feedback from the teacher evaluation process is supportive of my growth.					
23. I feel the feedback from the teacher evaluation process focuses upon suggestions for my improvement.					
24. Engagement in the teacher evaluation process encourages me to reflect on my teaching.					
25. The teacher evaluation process has made me more aware of my strengths.					

Feedback Continued	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
26. The teacher evaluation process has made me more aware of my areas in need of improvement.					
27. I receive feedback on informal visits that occur throughout the year.					
Collaboration	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
28. At the pre-observation meeting, telling my evaluator what to look for while observing me focuses my teacher observation.					
29. The discussion between my evaluator and me in the pre-observation meeting focuses upon the key elements of the observation.					
30. In the teacher evaluation process the collaboration between the evaluator and teacher has helped teachers become better teachers.					
Relationship	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
31. The evaluator establishes a relationship with teachers before the evaluation process begins.					
32. I have a good relationship with my evaluator.					
33. When I am experiencing difficulty in the classroom, I feel safe asking my evaluator for advice.					

34. Some participants may be contacted for a follow-up interview. The purpose of the

follow up is to ask more questions about the teacher evaluation process. The entire

interview would last around 20 minutes. If you are willing to be contacted for a

follow-up interview (by phone, email, or in person) please provide your contact

information.

    Name:

    Phone Number:

    Email:

The Purpose of the Nebraska Teacher Evaluation Process

Administrator Survey

Purpose of the Study: This research study will examine the perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding the Nebraska teacher evaluation process. The survey below focuses on statements about the teacher evaluation process in your school.

In effort to represent all areas of education, please answer the following information:

5. How many students are enrolled in your school

    a. More than 1,100

    b. Between 500 – 1,099

    c. Between 201 - 499

    d. Between 100 – 200

    e. Under 100

6. Do you conduct formal evaluations in your school?

    Yes _____   No _____

7. How many years have you been conducting teacher evaluations?

8. Gender

    Female _____   Male _____

Continue

Directions: In each section you will place an X indicating the degree to which you agree

with statement.

The following statements address the teacher evaluation process in your school.					
Item	**Scale**				
Purpose	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
1. The teacher evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of teaching.					
2. The teacher evaluation process is essential to raise the standards of learning.					
3. The teacher evaluation process focuses on the identification of the professional development needs for those whom I evaluate.					
4. The teacher evaluation process provides useful information to improve my performance for those whom I evaluate.					
5. The results of the teacher evaluation process are used for accountability purposes.					
6. I think the teacher evaluation process is threatening for those whom I evaluate.					
7. I understand the purpose of the teacher evaluation process.					
Quality	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
8. The teacher evaluation process results accurately reflect a teacher's ability.					

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
9. The number of classroom teacher observations is adequate to evaluate the instructional skills for those whom I evaluate.					
10. The rating system used to evaluate teachers is useful for the growth for those whom I evaluate.					
Quality Continued	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
11. The indicators on the teacher evaluation instrument take into the critical aspects the teaching for those whom I evaluate.					
12. The teacher evaluation process allows the teachers I evaluate to explain the classroom decisions and actions.					
13. Once the post-observation meeting takes place, I feel the teacher evaluation process is dependable.					
14. I make two or more informal visits throughout the year.					
15. The pre-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher evaluation process.					
16. The post-observation meeting is an important part of the teacher evaluation process.					
Training	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
17. I feel I have the necessary training to evaluate teachers.					
18. I understand each of the indicators on the teacher evaluation instrument.					
19. I participated in formal training regarding the use of the teacher evaluation instrument.					
20. I feel I have the required knowledge to conduct the teacher evaluation.					
21. I am viewed as an instructional leader in my school.					
Feedback	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
22. I feel the feedback from the teacher evaluation process is supportive of teachers' growth.					
23. I feel the feedback from the teacher evaluation process focuses upon suggestions for teachers' improvement.					

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
24. Engagement in the teacher evaluation process encourages a teacher to reflect on his/her teaching.					
25. The teacher evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their strengths.					
26. The teacher evaluation process has made teachers more aware of their areas in need of improvement.					
Feedback Continued	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
27. Teachers receive feedback on informal visits that occur throughout the year.					
Collaboration	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
28. At the pre-observation meeting, having the teacher tell me what to look for while observing helps me focus the teacher observation.					
29. The discussion between the teacher and me in the pre-observation meeting focuses on the key elements of the teacher observation.					
30. In the teacher evaluation process the collaboration between the teacher and me has helped teachers become better teachers.					
Relationship	**Strongly disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neither agree nor disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
31. The evaluator establishes a relationship with teachers before the evaluation process begins.					
32. I have a good relationship with the teachers I evaluate.					
33. When teachers are experiencing difficulty in the classroom, they feel safe asking me for advice.					

34. Some participants may be contacted for a follow-up interview. The purpose of the
    follow up is to ask more questions about the teacher evaluation process. The entire
    interview would last around 20 minutes. If you are willing to be contacted for a
    follow-up interview (by phone, email, or in person) please provide your contact
    information.

    Name:

    Phone Number:

    Email: