Tennessee State Board of Education **Agenda**
April 21, 2006 **Report Item: II.C.**

Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth

The Background:

In 1997, the State Board of Education approved the *Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* as a teacher evaluation process that became effective in 2000. In June 2004, the State Board of Education approved revision to the Framework. The original Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth met requirements for evaluation and focused on student growth, teacher self-reflection and school improvement. The revised Framework maintained the integrity of the original model but improved both the rigor and structure of the model by substantially increasing its specificity and aligning it with the highly qualified provisions of NCLB. Committees of stakeholders that included administrators, teachers, supervisors, teacher association representatives, State Department of Education staff, and State Board staff provided input into the revisions and implementation plan for the revised Framework.

The revised Framework is grounded in current research and provides an increased emphasis on content, teaching skills, academic content standards, and accountability in the classroom. The increased rigor of the Framework allows its use as one of the approved HOUSSE options for teachers to meet the highly qualified teacher requirements of NCLB.

The revised Framework was phased in immediately with "not new" teachers (Section 9101 [23], NCLB) for meeting the requirements for highly qualified, and all entry year teachers. By 2006-2007 the revised Framework will be utilized for all comprehensive and focused teacher assessment processes.

The Tennessee Department of Education, in concurrence with the State Board of Education, has commissioned a study to determine how effective the revised *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* is as a process to guide teacher development. Primary investigators for the study were Dr. Sharon Yates, Associate Professor of Education, and Dr. Trevor Hutchins, Associate Dean of Education, of Belmont University. The intent of the study is to use the feedback to make further revisions to the documentation required and/or the nature of the process itself, if necessary. Respondents were invited to complete the on-line survey at (http://www.sitemason.com/form/fonOrC). To ensure that the study secured a wide range of views, two types of respondents were invited to participate: [1] all Tennessee K-12 school administrators, and [2] all newly employed teachers in Tennessee from fall, 2004 through fall, 2005. Response was voluntary and respondents were assured of anonymity.

The results of the data analysis and conclusions will be presented at the State Board of Education meeting in April 2006.

The Recommendation:

For information purposes only; no action required.

Report will be

Available at the Meeting

An Evaluation

of the

Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth

Presented to the

Tennessee State Board of Education
Executive Director: Dr. Gary Nixon

and the

Tennessee Department of Education
Commissioner of Education: Dr. Lana Seivers

Division of Teaching & Learning
Tennessee Department of Education
Assistant Commissioner: John W. Scott

April 21, 2006

Project Investigators
Dr. Trevor Hutchins,
Associate Dean of Education, Belmont University

Dr. Sharon Yates
Associate Professor of Education, Austin Peay State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
List of Tables	ii
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	6
Review of Literature	8
Research Procedures	16
Analysis of Data	19
Summary and Conclusions	41
Recommendations	45
References	48
Appendices	51
Appendix A: Institutional Review Board Approval	52
Appendix B: Online Survey	54
Appendix C: Letter to Respondents	60
Appendix D: Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth	62
Appendix E: Forms for the Framework	79

Executive Summary

In June 2004, the Tennessee State Board of Education approved a revision to the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth. The original *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*, effective July 2000, met requirements for evaluation and encouraged teacher quality by focusing on student growth, professional growth, and school improvement. The revisions improved both the rigor and structure of the model by substantially increasing its specificity and aligning it with the highly qualified provision of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (www.tn.state.gov/education).

According to state law and State Board of Education Policy, all classroom teachers must be evaluated using the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. A teacher with an Apprentice License must be evaluated every year. A teacher with a Professional License must be evaluated at least two times during the ten-year license period (www.state.tn.us/education).

The *Master Plan for Tennessee Schools: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century* (Fiscal Year 2006, State Board of Education) identified an evaluation of the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* as a strategy for Key Result Area Five, Teacher Education and Professional Growth: *Evaluate the implementation of the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth approved in 2004. Provide follow-up to ensure consistency of application and quality of professional growth plans. Gather feedback and revise Framework as necessary* (p. 10).

The Tennessee Board of Education in collaboration with the Tennessee State Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the revised *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* in September, 2005, to determine the utility of the *Framework* as a tool for evaluation, accountability, and professional growth. Additionally, they were interested in learning if further revisions were necessary to strengthen the evaluation process.

Research Procedures

An evaluation designed to investigate the effects of the 2004 revisions was developed using a descriptive statistical approach. Research questions for this study, were determined through two representative focus groups with classroom teachers and administrators. The focus groups indicated that the primary concerns regarding the revised *Framework* centered upon what was described as "excessive and cumbersome paperwork," the usefulness of the *Framework* in identifying exemplary and struggling teachers, and the quality of the training and preparation on the *Framework* provided to administrators and teachers.

Using the purposes for the evaluation given by the Tennessee State Board of Education and the Tennessee Department of Education, the feedback of the focus groups, and the structures of the *Framework*, a survey was developed to query the

usefulness of the *Framework* in identifying exemplary and struggling teachers, the quality of the training for the *Framework*, and the difficulty level of the documentation that must be completed for an evaluation using the *Framework*.

Letters requesting online participation in the survey were mailed to school administrators in all public schools in Tennessee and to all teachers who had entered the teaching profession in Tennessee since 2004 and, therefore, were required to be evaluated under the revised *Framework*. By January, 2006, 502 educators had completed the survey online. To encourage more participation in the survey, the *Tennessee Education Association* advertised the survey in their monthly journal, *teach.* All teachers who had been evaluated under the revised *Framework* were invited to respond. The survey response was concluded with 1006 responses on March 16, 2005.

Of the 1006 respondents, 275 were principals or assistant principals, 51 were supervisors or evaluators, and 581 were teachers. There were 99 respondents who did not report their professional assignment.

The data were collected through an on-line survey and processed by *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS). Responses for administrators and responses of teachers with 1-4 years experience and with over 20 years experience are reported as representative of responses for all experience groups. It should be noted that the level of experience for teachers did not appear to make a difference to the nature of their responses.

Conclusions

The data presented indicates that the revised *Framework* is generally well received by principals and evaluators; however, teachers are less positive about the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. The following conclusions are presented, based on the data from this study.

- **Approximately 355 of the respondents to the survey reported they had less than one-half day training in the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*.** When broken out by role, administrators were more likely to have more than one day of training with teachers having less than one half day. Teacher evaluators reported more value in the training they received than did the teachers. One possible explanation for this is the extra length and detail of the training provided to evaluators.

- **Teacher evaluators indicated they would value more training while those being evaluated did not perceive value in additional training**. Respondents who indicated the kind of extra training that would be valuable suggested assistance in developing the professional growth plan, assistance with completing the paperwork, and understanding the six domains.

- **The teacher evaluators perceived the forms required for the evaluation as easier to complete than did the teachers being evaluated.** Teachers generally indicated that the forms were difficult to complete because of insufficient training, redundancy, too much jargon, and the forms were too long.

- **The majority of respondents reported that Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* are useful to very useful in identifying exemplary performance**. Domain Five, Professional Growth, received more mixed responses from teachers as an identifier of exemplary performance

- **Both administrators and teachers reported that Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* are useful to very useful in identifying struggling teachers**. Domain Five, Professional Growth, is less supported by both groups.

- **Administrators reported that Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* are useful to very useful in identifying specific concerns, with teachers reporting it useful, but less so than administrators.** Teachers reported that Domain Five, Professional Growth, was least useful in identifying specific concerns.

- **Administrators rated Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* as useful to very useful as a diagnostic tool, with teachers equally divided on its utility as a diagnostic tool.** Teachers see Domain Five, Professional Growth, as having no use as a diagnostic tool.

- **Administrators viewed Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* as useful to very useful as a tool for teacher improvement**. Teachers agree that it is useful, but are less positive in their support. Teachers are evenly divided in their view of the usefulness of Domain Five, Professional Growth, as a tool for teacher improvement.

- **Administrators and teachers agreed that Domain Two: Teaching was an appropriate domain for the evaluation of teacher performance**. In findings for all other domains, administrators view them as useful to very useful for teacher evaluation, but teachers are equally divided as to the use of the other domains as evaluation of teacher performance.

- **Administrators know the criteria for each domain, but teachers generally do not**. Teachers indicated they did not understand the criteria

- **Administrators and teachers agreed the rubrics were useful in determining the level of teacher performance**. However, while administrators believed the rubrics identify what they should see at each level of performance, teachers did not echo that perception. Administrator responses were scattered in regard to rubrics

Recommendations

The results of this study revealed that both teachers and administrators generally support the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* as a useful and valid instrument. Administrators are more positive and confident about the *Framework* than are teachers. It is recommended that the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* continue to be used as a teacher evaluation process in Tennessee. However, there are areas of concern, when remedied, that will strengthen the instrument for use as an evaluation process and a process for professional development.

- The *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* has a strong research base, and the components for an effective teacher evaluation process. It is recommended that during training and preparation, the *Framework* is emphasized as a dialogical, collegial, and collaborative process for improving teacher knowledge and classroom instruction rather than an administrative instrument for top-down evaluation. It is recommended that the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* emphasize equally the components identified in its name—that of evaluation <u>and</u> professional growth, using the instrument as a tool to define and guide the professional development needed for teachers.

- The attention on teacher quality has moved teacher accountability to the national spotlight, with teacher evaluation taking on added importance. The results of this study suggest that teachers need more training and preparation in using the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. School-based study groups on the *Framework*, facilitated by a teacher evaluator, are recommended with the focus on understanding each domain, the criteria within that domain, and the performance levels for each criterion. Teachers should be encouraged and mentored to use the Framework as a reflective tool for self-assessment to inform the development of the professional growth plan. Additionally, attention should be given to the understanding of the documentation required for an evaluation using the Framework, assuring that teachers can complete accurately the information requested on each of the forms. Scoring procedures should be clarified.

- Additional dialogue with a representative group of classroom teachers is recommended, regarding the criteria for each domain. Teachers should be given opportunity for input as to the kind of descriptors that would best identify teacher performance for each of the domains at the three performance levels.

- Attention should also be given to assuring that administrators and teacher evaluators understand the domains and criteria within the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. Time and attention to full understanding of the what and the why of the criteria should be included in evaluator training. An annual renewal or review of the domains and criteria is recommended for teacher evaluators, with emphasis on understanding the domain and criteria as influenced by the context, student population, and current research.

- Results of the data suggested that Domain Five, Professional Growth, is not valued as highly as other domains by both administrators and teachers. A review of the content of this domain is recommended.

- The paper documentation related to a comprehensive evaluation using the *Framework* was viewed as difficult by most teachers. A review of the paperwork is recommended, with the purpose of reducing, combining, or eliminating paperwork that is not of high utility to the teacher's evaluation.

- To assure that all teachers and administrators in Tennessee support the Framework of Evaluation and Professional Growth as a tool to ensure teacher quality, the recommendations given in this section should be revisited and validated by a representative group of teachers and administrators from public schools in Tennessee.

Introduction

On April 23, l997 the State Board of Education approved a teacher evaluation process that became effective statewide July 2000. The *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* meets requirements for evaluation and moves teachers beyond their current level of performance by focusing on student growth, personal and professional growth, and school improvement. The growth-oriented process encourages teacher quality, collaborative efforts, and lifelong learning. The original *Framework* was piloted in approximately 50 schools across the state including more than 650 teachers and 100 administrators and supervisors (www.tn.state.gov/education).

On June 23, 2004, the Tennessee State Board of Education approved further revision to the original model. These revisions improved both the rigor and structure of the model by substantially increasing its specificity and aligning it with the highly qualified provision of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (www.tn.state.gov/education).

All classroom teachers, including special needs teachers, vocational teachers, and specialist area teachers such as art, PE, or music teachers, as well as Library Media Specialist, Counselors, and psychologists must be evaluated, using the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* according to state law and State Board of Education Policy. A teacher with an Apprentice License must be evaluated every year. A teacher with a Professional License must be evaluated at least two times during the ten-year period of the license (www.tn.state.gov/education).

The following table provides the number of observations required for apprentice licensed teachers and professional licensed teachers.

Observations Required for
Apprentice Licensed Teachers & Professional Licensed Teachers

Licensure	Years of Experience	Number of Observations
Apprentice	Years One & Two	Three observations per year
Apprentice	Year Three	Two observations per year
Professional	Within ten years	Two observations minimum or focused assessment

As can be seen in the table above, teachers with an Apprentice License must receive three observations, with feedback and accompanying documentation, during their first and second years of teaching,. In the third year of the Apprentice License, the teacher must receive a minimum of two observations with feedback and accompanying documentation. For teachers with a Professional License, a minimum of two observations or a focused assessment is required. A focused assessment is one which examines one domain, or one specific criterion from the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* (www.state.tn.gov/education).

A teacher may not be evaluated until he or she has been trained in the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* model. The current training model recommends three days spread over several months. After one day of training, the evaluator may begin the evaluation process (www.state.tn.gov/education)

Review of Literature for Teacher Evaluation

There is now widespread agreement that teachers are the most significant factor in children's learning and the foundation for education reform (Sanders,1996; Ferguson, 1991; Darling Hammond, 2004; Cochran Smith & Zeichner, 2006). Demands for accountability have led to a resurgence of interest in teacher evaluation. Teacher evaluations require attention to more than the teaching; it must consider the involvement and support of others involved in the education process (Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Berry, 1984). The evaluation process typically involves preparation, observation, data collection, reporting, and follow-up. Data collection normally follows a sequence of pre-conference, classroom observation, and post- conference. Formal observations are sometimes combined with unannounced visits to provide a broader perspective of the teacher's classroom performance.

Teacher evaluation should be a significant part within the larger context for school improvement (Mitchell, Wise, & Plake, 1990). Teacher evaluations should be a collegial dialogue focused upon professional growth rather than a top-down, non-collaborative exercise. In implementation, teacher evaluations should emphasize mentoring, collaboration, and collegiality (Shulman, 1987). Evaluators should know the subject matter, pedagogy, and classroom characteristics of the teacher being evaluated and school boards should ensure a process that allows and encourages evaluators and teachers to work together to improve and enhance classroom instructional practices (McKeachie, 1992).

This review of the literature on teacher evaluation explores the purpose of teacher evaluation, models of evaluation, characteristics of effective teacher evaluations, and concerns related to evaluation.

Purposes of Teacher Evaluation

The literature on teacher evaluation tends to repeat the following purposes of teacher evaluation:

- to document effective teaching (Petersen, 2000).
- to identify areas of concerns related to instructional practice and provide appropriate professional development as amelioration of those concerns (Stanley & Popham, 1988).
- to assure that students have competent teachers through structured assistance to marginal teachers (Stanley & Popham, 1988).
- to validate the selection and employment of teachers and assist in personnel decisions such as tenure, promotion, and dismissal (McGreal, 1990).

Models of Teacher Evaluation

Gitlin & Smyth (1989) have packaged teacher evaluations into two main categories: educative and dominant, with Walsh (1987) calling them participative and controlling. The educative and participative model can reduce the need for dominant, accountability forms of teacher evaluation (Gitlin & Smyth, 1989; Walsh, 1987) by moving from blaming the teacher for educational problems to the wider community accepting legitimate responsibility in setting and monitoring the goals of schools. However, the educative, participative model cannot be mandated.

While dominant forms of teacher evaluation might be designed to assure quality control, often they reflect the notion that teachers are not the experts, that educational hierarchies are necessary and just, and that teachers are not able to sustain educative dialogue about their practice (Gitlin & Smyth, 1989) This feeling is echoed by Walsh (1987): *The notion of teachers as independent, autonomous professionals has been eroded, and the importance of management and hierarchical accountability emphasized* (p. 148). In dominant forms of teacher evaluation, the teacher is effectively silenced. Teachers are reduced to implementing the ideas of others, rather than querying their own practice and its context (Gitlin & Smyth, 1989).

There has been the attempt to reduce evaluation to listing of behaviors and tasks for ease of assessment (Findley & Estabrook, 1991), in spite of the fact that these results reveal little of what teachers actually say and do during instruction (Boyd, 1989). Some of the most widely adopted forms of teacher evaluation in current use rely on behavioral indicators to assess teaching, without reference to the effects of the teaching behaviors being measured. Teacher evaluation systems based on whether teachers exhibit certain behaviors are conceptually flawed because they presume that these behaviors will invariably lead to successful results. Duke (1993) states that evaluation systems that mandate all teachers must grow according to a fixed schedule and in similar ways are without merit. Simply itemizing what a teacher possesses or demonstrates, argue Evertson & Weade (1991), can add up to a description of little utility to the system or the teacher. It can suggest that isolated behaviors make a difference independent of the context in which they occur. By default, the roles played by students and materials get left out of the picture (Evertson & Weade, 1991).

Twenty-first century conceptions of school reform and the professionalization of teaching cannot co-exist with early twentieth-century models of evaluation, especially when these afford unacceptable simplistic notions of teaching. The true test of approaches to evaluation will be whether or not they contribute to the needed reforms of teaching and teacher education. If evaluation does not become part of the solution, then it surely will become part of the problem (Shulman, 1987).

Characteristics of Effective Teacher Evaluations

A teacher evaluation system should provide teachers useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity to learn new teaching methods and strategies, and counsel from principals and other teachers on how to make changes in their classrooms and instructional practice. A clear set of standards used by evaluators should inform specific procedures and practices. The standards should relate to important teaching skills, be as objective as possible, be communicated and reviewed with the teacher before and after the evaluation, and be linked to the teacher's professional development.

If the goal of the evaluation is to promote growth, self-evaluation must be part of the process to provide teachers' perspective on their work. Surprisingly, few school systems require self-evaluations. Peer and student evaluations must also be considered. Teachers who want to improve their teaching are eager to know how other teachers and their students view them. These are the people who interact with the teacher everyday; their perspective should not be ignored during the evaluation process.

Issues and Concerns Related to Teacher Evaluation

Evaluator competence is probably the most challenging aspect of the evaluative process (Mitchell et al., 1990). Administrators, whose background may be in widely different fields often rely on simplistic measures such as checklists and *slip into mindless activity by allowing the structure of the* [evaluation] *instrument to control their sight and awareness* (Wood & Lease, 1987, p. 56).

Questions are sometimes raised about the extent to which an observer's script is an accurate record for what usually occurs in a classroom (Weade & Evertson, 1991), especially when, as documented in Miner's (1992) study, some principals complete evaluations after only 20 minutes of observation. Further, when a class is being observed, there is little doubt that the teacher and students take on *artificial roles that they believe to be appropriate to the occasion* (Weade & Evertson, 1991, p. 41). School executives often fail to observe and evaluate teachers, or they overrate the teachers they do evaluate (Langlois & Colarusso, 1988). Miner (1992) found that principals sometimes compromise the integrity of the evaluation by giving excellent evaluations to teachers who are friends with the principal. Often those responsible for evaluating teachers do not understand fully the rules or the procedures for conducting the evaluation (Rieck, 1999, cited in Sawa, 1995). Also, objectivity is lessened when administrators cannot separate their own attitudes and experiences from what they see and hear. Therefore, it is no surprise that studies have found no appreciable relationship between administrator judgments of teaching effectiveness and the amount students learn (Medley & Coker, 1987).

Teacher evaluators should be concerned with words, behaviors, methodologies, and pedagogies of teachers and not just what is taught. Teacher evaluation is judgmentally based and, therefore, varies according to an evaluator's conception of teaching. Teacher evaluation is only as valid as the evaluator. The need for better trained evaluators is more evident as teacher education moves toward being more collaborative, collegial, and dialogical and less directive. Teacher evaluation, often still dominated by inspection and control, must focus on becoming more concerned with assisting teachers in improving their practice.

There is general agreement among education writers that teacher evaluation must satisfy both individual and organizational needs. By separating evaluations that are for accountability and those that are for professional growth, the educational community learns more about itself and widens the pathway to professional development for results (Duke, 1993). Teacher evaluation can determine whether new teachers can teach, help all teachers to improve, and indicate what a teacher can or will teach effectively (Wise et al., 1984). Personnel decisions for tenure, promotion, and dismissal are greatly influenced by it.

Any system of teacher evaluation, however reliable, must first and foremost be faithful to teaching. A fair, non-threatening, valid, and comprehensive evaluation system offers an unprecedented opportunity to learn and develop that benefits the individual and the school, and meets the goal of evaluation-- to improve the quality of teaching and learning. The evaluation process holds great potential as a means to improve pedagogical skills and instruction in our schools (Peterson, 2000).

There is no recipe or template for a successful teacher evaluation program. Systems where effective, well-operated procedures for teacher evaluation are in place ensure that the previously mentioned concerns are considered in policy and practice. Furthermore, teacher evaluation processes must be continually monitored for consistency and fairness as they address organizational and individual interests.

Toward this end, several practices can be identified from the literature.

1. While multiple methods should be used for evaluating teachers, school systems must consider the purposes that each method serves, to ensure that teacher evaluation goals and processes do not conflict (Mitchell et al.,1990).

2. Defensible teacher evaluations should include the growth that teachers facilitate in students. Therefore, an evaluator must also be attentive to what students become, not merely what teachers do (Danielson, 1998).

3. Teacher evaluation processes are more appropriate and valuable when they take account of the context in which teaching occurs. These include such matters as the characteristics of the learners and aspects of the community, language, and culture (Shulman, 1987).

4. Rather than relying on the "annual" formal visit, many visits are required for a better understanding of a teacher's performance. By making frequent informal visits to classrooms, administrators can reinforce and acknowledge good teaching, gather data regarding curriculum implementation, and be proactive about instructional problems before they become damaging to the students, school, and community (Stein, 1992).

5. There is a professional and, often times a legal, obligation to provide professional development to assist teachers. Marginal teachers must be identified and assisted. Teacher evaluation has the capability of identifying professional development needs of faculty, providing the basis for the planning of professional development for teachers and administrators, providing information regarding the extent of knowledge and skills gained during staff development activities; and judging the degree of maintenance of the acquired skills and knowledge (Wood & Lease, 1987).

6. Training for both evaluators and teachers is crucial. Teachers, as well as evaluators, should know how to use evaluation instruments to acquire useful objective data, interpret results, and use those results to advantage. It is noteworthy that this provision is under-emphasized in school systems. At best it is represented in sporadic training for administrators; at worst it allows no orientation for teachers or administrators (Toledo Federation for Teachers, 1996).

7. Evaluation processes and criteria are developed with the rights of the teacher and the nature of the professional in mind. These imply involvement in the development of procedures, knowledge of criteria, right to second opinion, and opportunity to share viewpoints and perspectives. A clear distinction is made between tenured and non-tenured teachers and teachers placed on growth or remediation tracks (Findley & Estabrook, 1991).

8. Perhaps most important of all, evaluation is clearly and obviously of high priority in the school system as evidenced by a clear articulation of board philosophy of evaluation and budgeted financial support (Conley, 1987).

Research Procedures

The purpose of this section is to explain the design and the selection process used for this study. The instrumentation is described and the procedures for collecting and analyzing the data are discussed.

The *Master Plan for Tennessee Schools: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century* (Fiscal Year 2006, State Board of Education) identified an evaluation of the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* as a strategy for Key Result Area Five, Teacher Education and Professional Growth:

> *Evaluate the implementation of the Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth approved in 2004. Provide follow-up to ensure consistency of application and quality of professional growth plans. Gather feedback and revise Framework as necessary* (p. 10).

The Tennessee Board of Education commissioned the evaluation of the revised *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* in September, 2005. The Tennessee State Board of Education in collaboration with the Tennessee Department of Education was interested in determining the utility of the *Framework* as a tool for evaluation, accountability, and professional growth. Additionally, they were interested in learning if further revisions were necessary to strengthen the evaluation process.

An evaluation designed to investigate the effects of the 2004 revisions was developed using a descriptive statistical approach. The primary investigators for the study were Dr. Trevor Hutchins, Associate Dean of Education, Belmont University, and Dr. Sharon Yates, Associate Professor of Education, Austin Peay State

University. The design and the study were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Belmont University in October, 2005 (see Appendix A).

To determine the research questions for this study, two representative focus groups with classroom teachers and administrators were facilitated by the project investigators in October, 2005. Through the focus groups, it was determined that the primary concerns regarding the revised *Framework* centered upon what was described as "excessive and cumbersome paperwork," the usefulness of the *Framework* in identifying exemplary and struggling teachers, and the quality of the training and preparation on the *Framework* provided to administrators and teachers. Using the purposes for the evaluation given by the Tennessee State Board of Education and the Tennessee Department of Education, the feedback of the focus groups, and the structures of the *Framework*, a survey was developed that queried these issues. The survey included an opportunity for anecdotal comments (See Appendix B for survey).

In November, 2005, the survey was posted online. Letters requesting online participation in the survey were mailed to all school administrators in all schools in Tennessee and to all teachers who had entered the teaching profession in Tennessee since 2004 and, therefore, were required to be evaluated under the revised *Framework* (see Appendix C for letter). By January, 2006, 502 educators had completed the survey online.

To encourage more participation in the survey, the *Tennessee Education Association* advertised the survey in their monthly journal, *teach.* All teachers who

had been evaluated under the revised *Framework* were invited to respond. The survey participation was concluded with 1006 responses on March 16, 2005.

Analysis of Data

This section provides an analysis of the data, beginning with descriptive data about the study population. The findings of the study follow, arranged by the categories queried in the survey.

As described previously, the population for this study consisted of administrators in all public schools in Tennessee and classroom teachers who have been evaluated under the revised *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. Of the 1006 respondents, 275 were principals or assistant principals, 51 were supervisors or evaluators, and 581 were teachers. There were 99 respondents who did not indicate their professional assignment.

The data were collected through an on-line survey and processed by Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). SPSS is a widely available and powerful statistical software package that covers a broad range of statistical procedures.

For this study, two forms of data will be presented. The first are the summary data for each question showing the number of respondents and the nature of their response. The second set of data show the comparisons between principals and administrators versus teachers by each of the key questions. For the latter data we have reported responses for administrators and responses from teachers with 1-4 years experience and teachers with over 20 years experience as representative of responses for all experience groups. It should be noted that the level of experience for teachers did not appear to make a difference to the nature of their responses.

DEMOGRAPHICS

TABLE 1: Respondents by gender

Gender	Male	Female	Not stated	Total
Number of Respondents	194	764	48	1006

TABLE 2: Respondents by teaching level

Teaching level	K-4	5-8	9-12	Not Stated
Number of respondents	390	286	223	107

TABLE 3: Number of evaluators

Framework Evaluator	Yes	No	Not Stated
Number of respondents	367	572	67

TABLE 4: Respondent by years of teaching experience

Years of Experiences	1-4	5-7	8-10	10-20	Over 20	Not Stated
Number of respondents	98	77	64	245	469	53

TABLE 5: Respondent by years in this schools

Years in this School	1-3	4-7	8-10	Over 10	Not Stated
Number of respondents	319	219	94	289	85

DEMOGRAPHICS--PRINCIPALS

TABLE 6: Administrators by years of experience

Experience in Years	Principals	Assistant Principals
1-3	56	84
4-7	51	60
8-10	10	15
Over 10	85	19

TABLE 7: Size of school districts

Number of schools in District	Number of Districts
Less than 20 schools	217
20-50 schools	111
51-80	13
81-110	13
More than 110 schools	32
No Response	620

TRAINING IN THE FRAMEWORK

Amount of Training

TABLE 8: Number of days in training

Number of days training	Frequency
Less than half a day	355
Half a day	98
One day	117
More than one day	327
Not stated	109

Training by group and experience

TABLE 9: Number of training days by nature of respondents with over 20 years experience, and teachers 1-4 years of experience.

	Number of days of Training	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	1-4 Years Experience
	Less than half day	9	104	49
Over 20	Half day	9	20	12
years	One day	36	21	12
experience	More than one day	107	27	18
		161	**172**	**91**

Table 9 indicates teachers have far less training on the Framework than do those completing the evaluation and that the level of experience of teachers makes no difference.

TABLE 10: Perceived value of training

Value of training	Number
No value	91
Little value	187
Neutral	181
Valuable	314
Very valuable	108
Not stated	125

TABLE 11: Perceived value of training by respondents with over 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

	Reported value of of Training	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	1-4 years Experience
	No value	1	34	5
Over 20 years experience	Little value	26	49	23
	Neutral	16	35	29
	Valuable	108	39	29
	Very valuable	55	9	4
		206	**166**	**90**

Table 11 suggests that those administering the Framework see much more value in the training they received than did the teachers. This may be due to the extra length and detail of the training. The next section examines this possibility.

TABLE 12: Respondents views on whether more training would be useful.

Would more training be useful to you?	Respondents
No use	101
Little use	183
Neutral	208
Useful	286
Very useful	103
Not stated	125

TABLE 13: Perceived value of more training by respondents with more than 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

	Reported value of with More Training	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers 1-4 years
	No use	20	18	10
Over 20 years experience	Little use	44	38	16
	Neutral	55	39	21
	Useful	65	55	32
	Very Useful	22	17	8
		206	**167**	**87**

It is clear from Table 13 that those administering the Framework would value more training while those being evaluated do not see much value in further training.

Type of extra training that would be beneficial

When respondents were asked what type of extra training would be beneficial 528 chose not to reply. Those who did respond most frequently suggested, assistance in developing the professional growth plan, assistance with the forms and understanding the six domains.

Paperwork

TABLE 14: Responses to how easy the Framework paperwork was to complete.

	EIR	PIR	RIR	Self Assest	Edu Conf	Sum Rept	Future Growth
Very Easy	34	59	57	67	37	32	30
Easy	151	223	212	217	193	161	159
Neutral	194	195	207	169	255	203	191
Difficult	233	151	150	174	135	214	232
Very Difficult	45	21	20	31	18	41	46
No Response	349	357	360	348	368	355	348

To provide more detail about the difficulties in the process the data were broken out by nature of the respondents who had over 20 years of experience. The teachers in this group responded in a way that reflected teachers with less experience.

TABLE 15: Perceived difficulty in completing the EIR by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

	Reported difficulty with of EIR	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers 1-4 years
	Very Difficult	3	6	2
Over 20 years experience	Difficult	40	53	26
	Neutral	29	44	23
	Easy	45	23	22
	Very easy	10	2	4
		127	**128**	**77**

Teachers, regardless of experience level, see the EIR as harder to complete than the administrators.

TABLE 16: Perceived difficulty in completing the PIR by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

	Reported difficulty with of PIR	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers 1-4 years
	Very Difficult	0	5	0
Over 20	Difficult	9	51	15
years	Neutral	30	48	27
experience	Easy	68	22	27
	Very easy	21	2	6
		128	**128**	**75**

The experience teachers see the PIR as harder to complete than either the

administrators or the teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

TABLE 17: Perceived difficulty in completing the RIR by nature of respondent and
having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years.

	Reported difficulty with of RIR	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers 1-4 years
	Very Difficult	0	4	0
Over 20	Difficult	11	52	14
years	Neutral	36	46	30
experience	Easy	62	20	28
	Very easy	19	3	5
		128	**125**	**77**

Teachers with over 20 years experience find the RIR harder complete than

administrators or teachers with only 1-4 years of experience.

TABLE 18: Perceived difficulty in completing the Self Assessment by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4.

	Reported difficulty with of Self Assessment	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers 1-4 years
	Very Difficult	3	8	1
Over 20 years experience	Difficult	14	43	30
	Neutral	24	43	18
	Easy	56	32	25
	Very easy	31	5	3
		128	**131**	**77**

TABLE 19: Perceived difficulty in completing the Education Conference Form by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, plus teachers 1-4 years.

	Reported difficulty of Education Conference Form	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teacher	Yrs 1-4
	Very Difficult	1	3	0
Over 20 years experience	Difficult	15	38	16
	Neutral	36	58	33
	Easy	59	25	25
	Very easy	14	3	2
		125	**127**	**76**

TABLE 20: Perceived difficulty in completing the Summative Report by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years.

	Reported difficulty of Summative Report	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Trs 1-4
	Very Difficult	2	9	1
Over 20 years experience	Difficult	33	49	29
	Neutral	31	50	28
	Easy	50	22	16
	Very easy	11	0	2
		127	**130**	**76**

TABLE 21: Perceived difficulty in completing the Future Growth Plan by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with1-4.

	Reported difficulty of EIR	Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Trs 1-4
	Very Difficult	7	12	3
Over 20 years experience	Difficult	32	48	36
	Neutral	37	41	17
	Easy	44	26	17
	Very easy	7	3	4
		127	**130**	**77**

As can be seen from the preceding Tables 15-21, the evaluators see the forms as easier to complete than do the experienced teachers they are evaluating. However, new teachers find the forms much easier than the experienced teachers.

What makes them difficult?

When asked what made the forms difficult to complete respondents most often list, insufficient training, redundancy, too much jargon and the forms being too long.

Process

TABLE 22: Usefulness of each aspect of the process in determining strengths and weaknesses of teachers.

	No Use	Little Use	Neutral	Useful	Very Useful	No Response
IER	68	180	167	182	28	381
PIR	52	133	155	236	40	390
RIR	48	130	166	206	64	392
Self Assessment	39	124	96	300	79	368
Education Conference	33	83	149	268	84	389
Summative Report	35	113	131	272	78	377
Future Growth Plan	46	126	144	244	80	366
Lesson Panning	43	97	126	294	81	365
Scripted Classroom Obs.n	63	131	141	231	76	364
Pre-conference	68	159	164	211	34	370
Post-conference	30	74	95	326	115	366

TABLE 23: Perceived usefulness of the EIR in determining the strengths and weaknesses of teachers by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	2	21	9
Over 20	Little Use	27	36	21
years	Neutral	22	34	25
experience	Useful	62	20	19
	Very Useful	11	3	1
		124	**114**	**75**

It is clear from Table 23 that the administrators of the Framework find the paperwork for the EIR more useful in identifying strengths and weaknesses than do the teachers, irrespective of whether they are experienced or new to the profession. Excluding the Neutral category, 29 administrators rate the form as little use or worse while 57 experienced teachers and 30 new teachers make the same rating. At the high end 73 administrators see the form as useful while only 23 experienced teachers and 20 new

teachers see it as useful. This same pattern is repeated for the PIR, RIR, Scripted Classroom Observation, Pre-Conference and Post-Conference when we compare those with 20 years of experience. On several occasions in the next set of tables, the new teachers differ from the responses of the experienced teachers. When this happens the responses are included.

TABLE 24: Perceived usefulness of the Self Assessment in determining the strengths and weaknesses of teachers by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	5	11	9
Over 20	Little Use	16	28	21
years	Neutral	15	17	25
experience	Useful	63	51	19
	Very Useful	30	10	1
		129	**117**	**75**

Table 24 indicates that teachers and administrators appreciate the usefulness of the Self Assessment in determining the strengths and weaknesses of teachers. Excluding the Neutral category, 21 administrators rate the form as little use or worse while 39 teachers make the same rating. At the high end 93 administrators see the form as useful and 61 teachers see it as useful. In comparison, new teachers find the EIR less useful in determining strengths and weaknesses. This same pattern is found for the Education Conference, The summative Report, The Future Growth Plan, Lesson Planning. When it comes to the usefulness of the scripted lesson observations, Table 25, new teachers agree with the administrators that they are useful while experienced teachers do not find them useful.

TABLE 25: Perceived usefulness of the Scripted Lesson Observations in determining the strengths and weaknesses of teachers by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	All Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	4	20	4
Over 20	Little Use	14	38	16
years	Neutral	15	25	24
experience	Useful	72	30	5
		129	**120**	**79**

Purposes

Identifying Exemplary Performance

TABLE 26: The usefulness of each Domain in the Framework in Identifying Exemplary Performance.

	DOMAIN					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
No use	39	32	31	34	44	33
Little use	94	73	91	91	119	117
Neutral	86	76	113	97	121	113
Useful	275	276	278	257	251	250
Very Useful	113	154	93	125	74	97
No Response	399	395	400	402	397	396

TABLE 27: Perceived usefulness of Domain 1 in identifying exemplary performance of teachers by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teacher
	No Use	1	16
Over 20	Little Use	5	22
years	Neutral	11	24
experience	Useful	69	40
	Very Useful	36	11
		129	117

Table 27 clearly indicates that both administrators and teachers believe that Domain 1 is useful in identifying exemplary performance of teachers. This pattern is repeated in Domains 2, 3, 4 and 6. new teachers find the Assessment Domain more useful in identifying exemplary performance than do the experienced teachers. Table 28 indicates that Domain 5 receives more mixed responses from teachers in terms of its ability to identify exemplary performance. Again, new teachers view this domain more positively

TABLE 28: Perceived usefulness of Domain 5 in determining exemplary performance of teachers by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	3	16	3
Over 20	Little Use	16	25	17
years	Neutral	23	23	17
experience	Useful	56	40	29
	Very Useful	25	9	3
		124	**110**	**69**

Identifying Struggling Teachers

TABLE 29: The usefulness of each domain in the Framework in Identifying Struggling Teachers.

	DOMAIN					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
No use	39	36	36	34	47	37
Little use	96	77	101	90	121	109
Neutral	71	70	96	86	130	97
Useful	274	248	261	248	218	254
Very Useful	127	177	107	151	86	106
No Response	399	398	405	397	404	403

TABLE 30: Perceived usefulness of Domain 1 - Planning in identifying struggling teachers by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teacher
	No Use	2	14
Over 20	Little Use	7	21
years	Neutral	6	21
experience	Useful	73	39
	Very Useful	35	19
		123	**114**

Table 30 clearly indicates that both administrators and teachers believe that Domain 1 is useful in identifying struggling teachers. Administrators are strongly of this view, nine to 108 for useful, while teachers clearly see the value in this domain, 35 to 59 supporting useful. This pattern is repeated in Domains 2, 3, 4 and 6 with Domain 5 being supported but less so by both groups. The same pattern is shown by teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

Identifying specific concerns

TABLE 31: Perceived usefulness of each Domain in the Framework in identifying specific concerns.

	DOMAIN					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
No use	45	38	43	42	50	46
Little use	111	99	113	105	133	118
Neutral	112	95	122	109	147	123
Useful	252	250	148	237	215	232
Very Useful	83	121	77	108	54	81
No Response	403	403	403	405	407	406

TABLE 32: Perceived usefulness of Domain 1 – Planning, in identifying specific concerns by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teacher
	No Use	5	13
Over 20	Little Use	10	26
years	Neutral	13	23
experience	Useful	67	43
	Very Useful	26	8
		121	**113**

Table 32 clearly indicates the support of administrators for Domain 1 identifying specific concerns. Removing the Neutral leaves 15 to 93 supporting the usefulness of Domain 1 in identifying specific concerns. While sharing this belief teachers are less positive in their support, 39 to 51. Exactly the same pattern appears fro new teachers. This pattern is repeated for Domains 2, 3, 4 and 6. Table 33 indicates that experienced and new tteachers are much less positive about the ability of Domain 5 to identify specific concerns.

TABLE 33: Perceived usefulness of Domain 5 – Professional development, in identifying struggling teachers by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and for teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	7	14	6
Over 20	Little Use	19	23	12
years	Neutral	22	35	22
experience	Useful	52	32	27
	Very Useful	21	7	4
		121	**111**	**70**

As a diagnostic tool

TABLE 34: Perceived usefulness of each Domain in the Framework in acting as a diagnostic tool.

	DOMAIN					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
No use	51	45	46	50	59	51
Little use	121	110	120	117	136	120
Neutral	114	110	118	119	167	155
Useful	241	236	241	231	192	206
Very Useful	76	102	75	87	61	61
No Response	403	404	406	402	401	413

TABLE 35: Perceived usefulness of Domain 1 – Planning, as a diagnostic tool by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	3	14	5
Over 20	Little Use	12	28	12
years	Neutral	12	30	22
experience	Useful	67	36	27
	Very Useful	29	6	4
		123	**114**	**70**

Table 35 indicates that the administrators rate this Domain as useful as a diagnostic tool, 15 to 96. Teachers however, are totally divided on its usefulness, 42 for no use and 42 for useful. New teachers, on the other hand find this domain useful as a diagnostic tool. This pattern is repeated for Domains 2, 3, 4, and 6. Table 36 indicates that experienced teachers see Domain 5 – Professional Growth, as not being useful as a diagnostic tool while new teachers are ambivilent.

TABLE 36: Perceived usefulness of Domain – 5, Professional Growth, as a diagnostic tool by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	6	15	5
Over 20	Little Use	16	33	19
years	Neutral	26	36	21
experience	Useful	59	25	19
	Very Useful	17	4	6
		124	**113**	**70**

As a tool for teacher development

TABLE 37: Perceived usefulness of each Domain of the Framework as a tool for teacher improvement.

	DOMAIN					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
No use	42	37	35	42	48	45
Little use	106	101	116	102	118	119
Neutral	95	94	109	111	118	120
Useful	232	222	235	225	225	231
Very Useful	124	145	103	118	89	86
No Response	407	407	408	408	408	405

TABLE 38: Perceived usefulness of Domain 1 – Planning, as a tool for teacher improvement by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teacher
	No Use	2	11
Over 20	Little Use	13 (15)	25 (36)
years	Neutral	12	30
experience	Useful	54	32
	Very Useful	44 (98)	13 (44)
		125	111

Table 38 indicates that both administrators and teachers see Domain 1 – Planning, as providing a tool for teacher improvement. Once again, the administrators are much stronger than the teachers in their support of the Framework. This pattern is repeated

in Domain 2, 3, 4, and 6. Again, in Domain 5 – Professional Growth, the teachers are evenly split for and against this domain as a tool for teacher improvement. The same pattern is found for new teachers with them being slightly higher than experienced teachers in their support for each domain as a tool for teacher improvement.

As an evaluation of teacher performance

TABLE 39: Perceived usefulness of each Domain of the Framework as an evaluation teacher performance.

	DOMAIN					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
No use	48	44	46	48	60	50
Little use	122	100	123	106	147	122
Neutral	93	77	113	95	127	114
Useful	234	235	235	227	203	227
Very Useful	105	148	88	123	67	87
No Response	404	402	401	407	402	406

TABLE 40: Perceived usefulness of Domain 2 – Teaching, as an evaluation of teacher performance by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	3	14	3
Over 20	Little Use	7	25	11
years	Neutral	7	20	16
experience	Useful	56	38	28
	Very Useful	51	15	11
		124	**112**	**69**

Table 40 indicates that both administrators and teachers, irrespective of experience level, see Domain 2- Teaching, as an appropriate domain for the evaluation of teacher performance. In the findings for all other Domains the administrators see them as

useful in evaluating teaching but the experienced teachers are almost perfectly split in their opinion. New teacher ratings are closer to the evaluators than they are to the experienced teachers indicating they find most domains useful in evaluating teachers, with the exception of Domain 5 that is evenly split.

Information

TABLE 41: The information respondents have about the criteria of each Domain

	Not at all	Some-what	Ave	Very well	A great deal	No Response
Know the criteria	30	126	261	165	38	386
Understand the criteria	27	127	236	177	52	387

Table 42 indicates that administrators know the criteria for each domain but teachers, irrespective of experience level, generally do not. This is exactly the same pattern for the question of understanding the criteria. It seems that further training for teachers may be useful in both knowing and understanding the criteria of each domain.

TABLE 42: Reported knowledge of the criteria for each Domain in the Framework by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	Not at all	1	11	2
Over 20 years experience	Somewhat	7	35	20
	Average	56	47	36
	Very well	55	17	9
	A great deal	9	5	3
		128	**115**	**70**

TABLE 43: The usefulness of the rubrics in determining level of performance and specific behaviors.

	Not at all	Some-what	Ave	Very well	A great deal	No Response
Rubrics useful in determining level	44	117	148	234	72	391
Rubric identifies performance level	60	197	178	146	34	389
Rubrics identify behavior at levels	73	203	192	125	24	389

TABLE 44: Perceived usefulness of the Rubrics in determining the level of teacher performance by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, plus teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	No Use	0	0	0
Over 20	Little Use	12	34	14
years	Neutral	19	37	26
experience	Useful	64	27	24
	Very Useful	32	5	1
		127	**101**	**66**

It is clear from Table 44 that both administrators and new teachers see that the Rubrics are useful in determining the level of teacher performance. Experienced teachers are less convinced that the rubrics are useful in determining teacher performance.

TABLE 45: Perceived ability of the Rubrics to clearly identify what you should see at each level of performance by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience, and teachers with 1-4 years of experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teachers with 20 years	Teachers with 1-4 years
	Not at all	7	18	7
Over 20	Somewhat	31	47	24
years	Average	32	32	24
experience	Very Well	44	14	14
	A Great Deal	14	4	1
		128	**115**	**70**

Table 45 indicates that administrators state that the rubrics do clearly identify what they should see at each level while teachers, irrespective of level of experience, are less positive.

TABLE 46: Perceived ability of the Rubrics to clearly identify what you should hear at each level of performance by nature of respondent and having 20 years experience.

		Principal/Assistant/ Administrator	Teacher
	Not at all	7	22
Over 20	Somewhat	38	42
years	Average	39	36
experience	Very Well	34	10
	A Great Deal	10	4
		128	**114**

Table 46 indicates that administrators are ambivalent about the ability of the rubrics to identify what they should hear. On the other hand teachers, regardless of experience, feel that the rubrics do not specify what will be heard in classrooms.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This section provides a summary of the purposes, procedures, descriptive data, and findings of this study. Conclusions based on the findings are presented and recommendations are offered.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the revised *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* (2004), as directed by the Tennessee State Board of Education in collaboration with the Tennessee Department of Education. A survey based on the direction given by the State Board and Department of Education, and the feedback provided by two focus groups of classroom and administrators was posted online. The survey queried the usefulness of the *Framework* in identifying exemplary and struggling teachers, the quality of the training for the *Framework*, and the difficulty level of the paperwork that must be completed for an evaluation using the *Framework*.

In November, 2005, principals in all public schools in Tennessee and teachers who began teaching in 2004 were invited to respond. In January, 2006, to encourage more participation, the *Tennessee Education Association* advertised the survey in their journal, *teach*, asking all teachers to respond. The survey was concluded in March, 2006, with 1006 respondents, of which 367 identified themselves as administrators or evaluators, and 572 were classroom teachers, with 67 not stating their role.

The data presented in the previous section indicates that the revised *Framework* is generally well received by principals and evaluators; however, teachers

are less positive about the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. The following conclusions are presented, based on the data from this study.

1. Approximately 355 of the respondents to the survey reported they had less than one-half day training in the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. When broken out by role, administrators were more likely to have had more than one day of training with teachers having less than one half day. Teacher evaluators reported more value in the training they received than did the teachers. One possible explanation for this is the extra length and detail of the training provided to evaluators.

2. Teacher evaluators indicated they would value more training while those being evaluated did not perceive value in additional training. Respondents who indicated the kind of extra training that would be valuable suggested assistance in developing the professional growth plan, assistance with completing the paperwork, and understanding the six domains.

3. The teacher evaluators perceived the forms required for the evaluation as easier to complete than did the teachers being evaluated. Teachers generally indicated that the forms were difficult to complete because of insufficient training, redundancy, too much jargon, and the forms were too long.

4. The majority of respondents reported that Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* are useful to very useful in identifying exemplary performance. Domain Five, Professional Growth, received more mixed responses from teachers as an identifier of exemplary performance.

5. Both administrators and teachers reported that Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* are useful to very useful in identifying struggling teachers. Domain Five, Professional Growth, is less supported by both groups.

6. Administrators reported that Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* are useful to very useful in identifying specific concerns, with teachers reporting it useful, but less so than administrators. Teachers reported that Domain Five, Professional Growth, was least useful in identifying specific concerns.

7. Administrators rated Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* as useful to very useful as a diagnostic tool, with teachers equally divided on its utility as a diagnostic tool. Teachers see Domain Five, Professional Growth, as having no use as a diagnostic tool.

8. Administrators viewed Domains One, Planning; Domain Two, Teaching; Domain Three, Assessment; Domain Four, Learning Environment; and Domain Six, Communication in the *Framework* as useful to very useful as useful to very useful as a tool for teacher improvement. Teachers agree that it is useful, but are less positive in their support. Teachers are evenly divided in their view of the usefulness of Domain Five, Professional Growth, as a tool for teacher improvement.

9. Administrators and teachers agreed that Domain Two: Teaching, was an appropriate domain for the evaluation of teacher performance. In findings for all other domains, administrators view them as useful to very useful for teacher evaluation, but teachers are equally divided as to the use of the other domains as evaluation of teacher performance.

10. Administrators know the criteria for each domain, but teachers generally do not. Teachers indicated they did not understand the criteria.

11. Administrators and teachers agreed the rubrics were useful in determining the level of teacher performance. However, while administrators believed the rubrics identify what they should see at each level of performance, teachers did not echo that perception. Administrator responses were scattered in regard to rubrics identifying what you should hear at each performance level on the rubric. Teachers' responses indicated that the rubrics did not specify what is heard in classrooms at each level of performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions presented in the previous section provide the basis for the recommendations that are offered.

The results of this study revealed that both teachers and administrators generally support the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* as a useful and valid instrument. Administrators are more positive and confident about the *Framework* than are teachers. It is recommended that the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* continue to be used as a teacher evaluation process in Tennessee. However, there are areas of concern, when remedied, that will strengthen the instrument for use as an evaluation process and a process for professional development.

The *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* has a strong research base, and the components for an effective teacher evaluation process. It is recommended that during training and preparation, the *Framework* is emphasized as a dialogical, collegial, and collaborative process for improving teacher knowledge and classroom instruction rather than an administrative instrument for top-down evaluation. It is recommended that the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth* emphasize equally the components identified in its name—that of evaluation <u>and</u> professional growth, using the instrument as a tool to define and guide the professional development needed for teachers.

The attention on teacher quality has moved teacher accountability to the national spotlight, with teacher evaluation taking on added importance. The results of this

study suggest that teachers need more training and preparation in using the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. School-based study groups on the *Framework*, facilitated by a teacher evaluator, are recommended with the focus on understanding each domain, the criteria within that domain, and the performance levels for each criterion. Teachers should be encouraged and mentored to use the Framework as a reflective tool for self-assessment to inform the development of the professional growth plan. Additionally, attention should be given to the understanding of the documentation required for an evaluation using the Framework, assuring that teachers can complete accurately the information requested on each of the forms. Scoring procedures should be clarified.

Additional dialogue with a representative group of classroom teachers is recommended, regarding the criteria for each domain. Teachers should be given opportunity for input as to the kind of descriptors that would best identify teacher performance for each of the domains at the three performance levels.

Attention should also be given to assuring that administrators and teacher evaluators understand the domains and criteria within the *Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth*. Time and attention to full understanding of the what and why of the criteria should be included in evaluator training. An annual renewal or review of the domains and criteria is recommended for teacher evaluators, with emphasis on understanding the domain and criteria as influenced by the context, student population, and current research.

Results of the data suggested that Domain Five, Professional Growth, is not valued as highly as other domains by both administrators and teachers. A review of the content of this domain is recommended.

The paper documentation related to a comprehensive evaluation using the *Framework* was viewed as difficult by most teachers. A review of the paperwork is recommended, with the purpose of reducing, combining, or eliminating paperwork that is not of high utility to the teacher's evaluation.

To assure that all teachers and administrators in Tennessee support the Framework of Evaluation and Professional Growth as a tool to ensure teacher quality, the recommendations given in this section should be revisited and validated by a representative group of teachers and administrators from public schools in Tennessee.

References

Boyd, R.TC. (1989). Improving teacher evaluations. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 1, 7. Retrieved March 22, 2006 from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=1&n=7

Cochran-Smith, M. & Zeichner, K. (Eds). (2006). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education.* Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Conley, D.T. (1987). Critical attributes of effective evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership*. 44: 60-64.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. University of Washington: CTP.

Duke, D. L. & Stiggins, R. J. (1986). *Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth*. The National Education Association, Washington, D.C., ED 275 069.

Evertson, C. & Weade, G. (1991). Oh, what can be learned by observing teaching. *Theory in Practice.* 30, 1: 37-45.

Ferguson, R.F. (1991). Pay for public education: New evidence on how and why money matters. *Harvard Journal on Legislation*. 28, 2: 465-498.

Findley, D. & Estabrook, R . (1991). Teacher evaluation: A national dilemma. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. 10, 1: 95-104.

Gitlin, A. & Smyth, J. (1989). *Teacher Evaluation: Critical Education and Transformative Alternatives.* Lewes: Falmer Press.

Langlois, D.E. & Colarusso, M.R. (1988). Don't let teacher evaluation become an empty ritual. *Executive Educator*. 5: 32-33.

McGreal, Thomas L. (1990, September). The use of rating scales in teacher evaluation: Concerns and recommendations. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *4*(1), 41-58.

McKeachie, W.J. (1992). *Tools for teaching*. 9th edition. DC Heath & Company.

References continued

Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1987). The accuracy of principals' judgments on teacher performance. Journal of Educational Research, 80(4), 242-247.

Mitchell, J.V., Wise, S. L., & Plake, B. S. (Eds.) (1990). *Assessment of teaching: Purposes, practices, and implications for the profession*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Miner, B. (1992). *Rethinking schools*. 6, 3.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Popham, W. J. (1988). The dysfunctional marriage of formative and summative teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1, 3. 269-273.

Sanders, W.L. & Rivers, J.C. (1996). Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future students' academic achievement. *Research Progress Report*. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Value Added Research and Assessment Center.

Sawa, R. (1995). *Teacher evaluation policies and practices*. SSTA Research Centre Report 95-04. Retrieved March 22, 2006 from http://www.ssta.sk.ca/research/instruction/95-04.htm

Stanley, S. J. & Popham, W. J. (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stein A. (1992). *The supervision quandary*. The Executive Educator.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*. 57: 1-22.

Toledo Federation of Teachers. (1996). *Intern, intervention, evaluation. A professional development plan for classroom performance*. Toledo, Ohio.

Walsh, J. (1987). Toward educative forms of teacher evaluation. *Educational Theory*, 40, 1: 83-94.

Wise, A.E., Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1984). *Effective teacher selection from recruitment to retention*. California: RAND Corporation.

Wood, F. & Lease, S. (1987, Spring). An integrated approach to staff development, supervision, and teacher evaluation. *Journal of Staff Development*, 8:1.

M:\StateBoardEduc\2006 SBE Agendas\April 2006\II C Framework for Evaluation & Professional Growth Attachment.doc vlb 4/19/06

Appendices

Appendix A:	Institutional Review Board Approval
Appendix B:	Online Survey
Appendix C:	Letter to Respondents
Appendix D:	Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth
Appendix E:	Forms for the Framework